

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SUFFOLK COUNTY SEWER DISTRICT  
ASSESSMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)  
COMMITTEE

Yaphank Avenue  
Yaphank, New York

MAY 28, 2008  
2:35 P.M.

1

2

2     A P P E A R A N C E S :

3

4             Gilbert Anderson, DPW Commissioner

5             Ben Wright, Chief Engineer of Sanitation

6             Carrie Meek-Gallagher, Environment and Energy

7             Vito Minei, Health Department

8             Walter Hilbert, Health Department

9             Tom Isles, Director of Planning

10            Michael Cavanagh, for William Lindsay

11            Brendon Stanton, for Wayne Horsley

12            John Donovan

13            Debra Kolyer

14            Roz Gazes

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. ANDERSON: Welcome once again to the RFP committee meeting, the second meeting. We might as well as get right down to it.

We received two comments, one from the Health Department, the other from Gail Vizzini, BRO, and thought we might discuss them before we actually commit them to writing or put them into the RFP.

And I guess Ben and I discussed -- why don't we start with the Health Department's since that seems to be the bigger issue? There is a number of suggestions that are made. Two of them are concerns that were raised.

The first was regarding the scope approach. I don't know if you had time to look at this, but not to put you on the spot, I'm going to defer to you.

MR. WRIGHT: We discussed this a little last time with respect to the approach and whether or not we should issue something, an RFP that has a little

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

more information for the consultants to respond to us. That way, we could gain more information than being more specific on our own.

The two ways to look at the way we approach the initial draft was to assume that we had one point two million dollars. There were certain generalities that were included in the Legislative resolution that talked about County sewer districts' capacity, interconnecting sewage districts, whether municipal or private and then looking at new areas.

That outlines basically what was going to take place in the RFP. It depends on how the Committee feels they should proceed, whether or not we take advantage of consultants by them providing what they can do for one point two million or even indicating that they might give us more information with the idea that, you know, "for this many more dollars, this is what we can provide to you."

That is basically where we are with

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

that particular comment. It is just an approach that you know how you want to proceed with.

MR. ANDERSON: Any comments from anyone on that?

MR. CAVANAGH: The two approaches, one is more general, one is more specific. Now if we put a general approach, the idea we may get more information that way --

MR. WRIGHT: And know what it might cost to do. We've attached the legislation. There is resolve clauses two, three, and four that outline what the Legislature is directing the RFP to include.

The approach could be to take those three resolve clauses and develop a more specific approach by the RFP Committee to get the most as we can on certain critical areas and, you know, I agree that the way that this comment is made, that it would serve as a model.

It depends on how we want to focus on the resolution as compared to some

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

different interpretation by the Committee.

MR. CAVANAGH: Well, what do you think? I mean, just as a guess, what kind of information would we get by going more general in the scope?

MR. WRIGHT: It might assist in the selection of a consultant, because they might have more insight into the particular areas that are critical to be served or had more experience in different aspects of preparing, you know, a project to study. Whether it is capacity or critical areas of sewerage, it might help us in the selection process.

Might distinguish between consultants that may not have as much expertise in certain elements of the proposals that will be submitted.

MR. CAVANAGH: But we kind of evaluate that or -- anyway, I mean, when we're looking at whatever we ask for in the scope and then reviewing --

MR. WRIGHT: If we were very specific, we would be getting a response

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

to each specific item that we're asking for rather than leaving it up, maybe some innovative approaches that a particular consultant might have that would lead us to recommend them to be selected.

MR. ISLES: The other side of the coin, the intention is on the Health Department comments that the one point two million dollars may be limited in terms of what can be done on targeting on what is most precisely what the County wants to get out of this.

MR. WRIGHT: I agree that is probably going to end up, but that is not sufficient to do --

MS. GALLAGHER: As long as we find a high priority area in each of the eighteen legislative districts, we'll be fine, right?

But then it becomes a highest priority is the problem. But --

MR. CAVANAGH: I like the fact that it sort of focuses on something that can be done, rather than general with the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Health Department.

I also want to add to it some kind of sequencing which would be best time wise to start.

MS. GALLAGHER: I guess scope sequence of priorities and costs for -- or you mean even in the priority areas?

MR. CAVANAGH: Some kind of sequencing to say which would be the highest priority, but you would have to take cost analysis, in effect which one is more possible, but some kind of suggestion for sequencing which areas should be first.

MR. WRIGHT: That is in the scope right now, as far as developing a plan on how the sequence of new sewerage. Doesn't necessarily -- we can change it to include how particular service areas could be consolidated rather than looking at just areas for new sewerage.

MR. ANDERSON: The bottom line is we don't think we have enough money to do the study we're being asked to do, so, I

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

mean, the approach is we're looking for certain information, certain basic information we can add into the RFP.

How do we do that?

I think Ben is saying what we can do to get additional information for a limited amount of costs; may be a good idea. Something these guys have encountered elsewhere.

MS. GALLAGHER: You can do this approach or we could do an approach where we throw it out to them and say, well, we know that one point two million may not be enough to do everything. What could you give us?

Maybe phase it, so phase one, you could do phase one and part of two. They could break it down. Might be three or four phases of actual work. For one point two million dollars, you might get phase one and part of two.

This is how much money it would cost to do the rest of the scope.

MR. WRIGHT: It might be while

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

looking at the resolve clauses two, three and four, because that is pretty specific on what we're supposed to be doing.

Number two was to study -- to address all Suffolk County sewer districts with respect to current and anticipated future demand for services, coupled with a cost benefit analysis for possible enhancement of existing capacity through increased efficiency or expansion.

I guess that is pretty specific because we know where the County sewer districts are, and we have information on if there is any excess available capacity and what impacts there might be from increasing flows and what site restrictions there might be.

MR. ANDERSON: The fourth resolve is going to be the biggest.

MS. GALLAGHER: Right.

MR. ANDERSON: Unknown.

MS. GAZES: Originally when that one point two million number, where that came from was we looked at much a older

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

study of a more limited nature, and we just applied inflationary factors to come up with it.

I don't like to say it is not, you know, set in stone, but, you know, you still want it to be a good product that we get.

So if it is -- it is not impossible that there could be additional funding provided above the one point two, but that is --

MR. WRIGHT: I thought at the last meeting, Gail may have indicated that once we get to a certain place in this proposal, that in future years we could identify what is necessary, what additional funding.

MS. GAZES: Absolutely.

MS. GALLAGHER: Can we change the scope to target on the primary areas without having to -- would the resolution have to be changed because does it go against what the resolution is telling us to do?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

No. All we're saying, we're only going to do -- we want to focus on these high priority areas. That is more of a legal question, I guess.

MR. WRIGHT: I don't know if that is legal or not. I think we can expand on however the Committee feels we should have the scope of work.

MR. STANTON: Can you do both? If the resolution says do all you could, say do all and please make a priority list or present several one with, one without, one with all?

MR. WRIGHT: We could get costs on different elements, and we could eliminate one or put one off to the future if we wanted to.

MS. GALLAGHER: Sounds like the second bullet under that scope out of sequence priorities and costs for future evaluations.

MR. ANDERSON: The thing is not to mention one point two million dollars. Anybody who does their homework is going

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

to know that anyway.

MR. WRIGHT: During the sewer summit, the dollar amount was mentioned.

MR. MINEI: I think the idea is that the resolution is clear through those first four resolves what they want done. What isn't clear is the ultimate funding to do it.

The companion document is the capital program that says one point two million dollars, so the instructions in the RFP is that we have to do one, two, three and four, tell us how much of this element you believe is -- can reasonably be expected to be done for one point two million.

Now what we discussed last time was do we give them general guidance and say, "What could you do for more money," or you give them a threshold, "For two point four million, what can you do?" That is an open invitation. They're going to say that "I can't do it all."

The thing that can't be overlooked

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

is our -- we discussed it in January --  
was the idea of a generic environmental  
impact study. Somehow or other, it's  
going to have to be done.

The most time efficient way to do  
it is to do it concurrently. If you wait  
till this plan is finished and say,  
"Before we can talk seriously about  
implementation, we have to do a GEIS," and  
if you do that, then you're talking at  
least two, three years more time added  
before implementation can seriously be  
considered.

My suggestion is to somehow go back  
to the Legislature between now and the  
time the RFP is let and say, "Somehow or  
other we have to get supplemental funds to  
do a GEIS," and we recommend it be done  
concurrently and we suggest it might add  
half a million dollars to the cost of  
this.

I mean, we could come up with a  
reasonable -- whether they accept and say  
okay, go do it, but do it for a hundred

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

thousand, might be the response or no,  
"Let's wait to see what your plan says,  
see if we want you to go forward with a  
GEIS." That is always a possibility.

I wouldn't recommend it, because I  
think the overwhelming consensus is we  
really have to do planning for  
infrastructure needs, in this case sewers  
and sewage disposal. So I think we have  
to do that.

My point is I would, I think we  
have to abide by the resolution, in  
particular those first four resolve  
clauses, and then find how much we can do  
for one point two and the challenge to us  
is how coy do you want to be?

Do you want to just leave it "We  
have one point two million dollars, tell  
us if you can do this?" You could do it  
that way.

MR. ANDERSON: Generally what we  
would do normally, we would -- you would  
have an anticipated amount that you would  
expect a project to cost. We normally use

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

like ten percent of construction for a round figure.

Since we don't know what this is going to cost, I mean, it sounds like we have two options; narrow it down to the one point two million which we don't know what we're going to get or put it out there and see what comes back.

MR. MINEI: I think you kind of get to that point, Gil, in the way Ben put this together, because in one of the appendices, you tell them, "Give us a feasibility report," and then in another one, you say, "Give us a typical report of what you could do."

So you could expect an array of responses to this. Someone might say, "I can do four typical reports for you." You could say, "You could do one," we could leave it at that. "You have one point two million to do this."

I'm just a little concerned of leaving this second comment hanging out there. If you are really serious about

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

getting to the heart of all the social,  
economic needs about workforce housing,  
someone's got to tell us that we  
anticipate your regional sewerage plan  
will be done professionally and you will  
give us reasonable guidance how to  
proceed.

If someone comes in and says I can  
work strictly on County sewer districts, I  
will give you a very detailed evaluation  
of expansion capabilities, what needs you  
will meet by expanded County facilities,  
that might be a good way to go.

We'll leave the private sewer  
districts on there the way we handle it  
now. Then the matter of a GEIS becomes  
sort of more focused just on County sewer  
districts.

I'm kind of waffling. One point  
two million still sounds like a lot of  
money.

MR. WRIGHT: I agree about the  
GEIS. That can't be part of the one point  
two million. It is going to take away a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

lot.

MS. GALLAGHER: At least half.

MR. MINEI: The question -- you know, we probably should bring these kinds of questions back to the task force we're going to meet with when you're doing an RFP or got one point two million dollars. We've already agreed that we'll be candid.

You have developers, an engineering firm represented on there that someone has got to give guidance, a policy guidance. We will hold the GEIS question in abeyance until we see the value of your master plan.

That's a little cynical to my way of thinking. I would hope we're in a position to want to move forward in a very timely basis. I would recommend that they who have legislators on there and County Executive's office be ready to propose a companion document for a GEIS, and then it comes back to us.

Do you make that one RFP or not? I would suggest you would want to. The best

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

way to do this, as doing a management plan, is also to do a GEIS, spell out --

MR. ANDERSON: I don't have a problem with the GEIS. I'm still more concerned with narrowing the scope.

I realize one point two million is a lot of money. I would almost prefer to kind of throw this out there, see what they come back with. We can always revise the RFP and send it back out.

MR. MINEI: We leave it as general guidance; "If you don't think it is enough to do the job, promptly give us guidance." We may come back and say, "Those responses were all over the place."

We need to do our homework and come back with a response or craft it a little differently. It is, as Ben said, kind of getting free consulting services, but there is a big pot of gold at the end of this planning rainbow for them.

So I don't think any of the firms would complain in their business development mode to take a crack at this

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

for one point two million.

MR. WRIGHT: There might be some issues. If we go through this and award it to the firm or joint venture of some kind, there is one point two million dollars, whatever the other tasks are, we may not be going ahead with that particular consultant.

It may be enough money or different kind of tasks that are related, but different. That would send out another RFP to complete one of the resolve clauses in the resolution.

MR. MINEI: You resolve that right in the RFP. You accept it in whole or in part as to how responsive it is. I mean, I think our obligation is twofold.

You're trying to meet the directive from the Legislature as agreed to by the County Executive because he signed onto this, but also trying to make this as fair as possible to a community that we continue to work with.

So, you know, this is a legitimate

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

effort to track and get their planning study done for one point two million. How realistic are we?

We could rack our brains and say this is a four million dollar study. We're not moving forward until the Legislature coughs up another two point eight million or something.

MR. ANDERSON: Again, we could make the blanket statement, "We have one point two million dollars."

MR. MINEI: I think you have to. It is out there in the public. No sense in hiding that you have one point two million dollars.

These four resolve clauses are the heart of what our directive is. You've got formats here that I believe provides enough flexibility for a response.

It may be a little too subtle. We may want to tinker with the language you got in there. You want a typical report for these kinds of things. That would imply, "Maybe I don't have to do

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

everything that they anticipate."

I'm trying to think. I know you're about to discuss this tomorrow before this policy setting committee. We now have a public record of what we're discussing.

Our guidance, we should all agree on what we would like Gil to convey to them. It sounds like we're saying, if I could interpret, repeat myself for the ninth time, one point two million dollars, we don't believe, provides a very detailed comprehensive plan for all the sewerage needs for Suffolk County, both public and private sewage disposal plants.

We do believe we can take a very significant approach to the four resolve clauses. I don't know how far they'll get, and there is going to be a lot of interpretation of all this other meeting economic needs and all this other.

But the glaring discrepancy we see is that while there is enough money to start a very formidable planning exercise, the companion document of a GEIS, we

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

should give Gil some talking points.

I used half a million which, I think, in this day and age is not outrageous for this; that an additional half a million for a GEIS will be necessary.

So the charge then is do you wait two years for this study to be complete, wait for a review of it, wait for concurrence on it and wait for the go-ahead to do a GEIS now? Now you're out four years, and then you're out another year or two to do the GEIS.

You're out five or six years before you're actually ready to implement what only might be a core portion of what seems to be a very ambitious project.

MR. WRIGHT: Let's talk about the time frame a little bit, with or without the GEIS. If the funding -- we're going to hopefully have a selected consultant by a Legislative resolution without signing a contract, because we can't do that until we have funding.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

We have our recommendation to the Legislature for an award by the end of the year. It will take a couple of meetings in the early part of next year. Maybe February the funding would be there. A contract would be a month or so later.

It is really spring of next year when we should have a consultant on board. We haven't set a time frame. It could be a year, year-and-a-half for something like this, maybe longer even, depending on, you know, what we end up with as a scope.

That could end up with, let's say, a year-and-a-half, so the end of 2010 you could have a plan that you would like to proceed with.

So it was either starting the GEIS earlier or starting it at that point if there is funding to implement anything in 2011 or 2012 or whenever the schedule is.

MR. ISLES: We could put it in as an application in the RFP companion GEIS and a decision is made about funding provided that could be hooked onto the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

proposal as well.

MR. WRIGHT: We would know early on how much extra is necessary to do that.

MR. ISLES: The thing I want to go back to on the scope is, just getting a sense on the scale of this thing, and it is obviously clear that the Legislature wanted to have a broad look at the issue on sewers.

On one hand, I could see this being enormous and very comprehensive from one end of the County to the other and doing a very complete examination of the feasibility of sewers and cost benefit analysis and so forth.

On the other hand, I can also see that that's A, very big and expensive, B probably not necessary because we could probably take a look at a map of the County, knock out significant portions of the County that would likely never be considered for sewers for environmental reasons and so forth and combine that with economic development goals and interests

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

such as downtown redevelopment and so forth and begin to target the study down to probably what I think is more realistic in terms of where we would end up doing sewers in the future anyway.

In a way, I assume that part of this --

MR. WRIGHT: And it does.

MR. ISLES: You can ask the consultant to spell out how they would approach that. One concern I would have is it could be a whole range of "For one point two million, I can do a plan for you."

We may say that is inadequate or "I need ten million," and I could see a proposal, lots of questions about what the magnitude of this is intended to be.

So I guess what I'm getting to then is on one hand, we kind of throw it out as raw material, let them respond and see what we come back with.

On the other hand, I can see it being all over the place, kind of hard to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

kind of match it to ultimately what is going to be useful to the County.

The second point is the end result of this thing, hopefully, is something that is useful; that is, we're talking about a plan that will then guide investment and decisions in terms of sewer expansion in the County, which I assume would be subject to more closer examination from an engineering standpoint in terms of -- actual plans for those districts I would assume would have to be done, and they would be subject to SEQRA as well.

The main thing is that the scope in terms of it gets back to how we started. Is it better to throw it out big or focus it a little? I'm expressing that I would have a little bit of concern about making it too big in addition to the cost items but just what becomes useful to us and what's practical and useful in terms of a planning document that would help to sort and sift down.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

And I would also hope that at the end of spending one point two million dollars, that it doesn't have a lot of questions and you got to study this, this and this.

But it brings us to a certain point. We're all saying that at least one point two million may not be at the end but we have something that we can build on. We've established certain basic information. We know this, that we can build upon for further studies if we need to.

My point is just a little bit of concern for how a consultant would react to this. One can look at it and say, "I'll do a job right within that one point two," which is totally inadequate for us. Another one will say, "This is my way to a ten million dollar project."

I'm not sure if it is so good to have it that wide open. When you were talking about the other studies, Gil and Ben, if you're familiar with, do any of us

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

know of a model study that would be comparable to this that could also help as a guide so people are thinking and bidding on something that we know a little more about than what we do right now?

MR. WRIGHT: I was thinking about some of the things that are under way now. We're directed -- DPW is looking at Mastic Shirley. I'm not sure. Staff is going to do that that will be a good report.

The Town of Babylon looked at the Straight Path, Wyandanch area. Nelson and Pope are looking at small business districts; for Fairfield, which is relatively small, maybe a half mile long.

We have an RFP we just issued to do Kings Park and Smithtown Main Street area, and then a couple of years ago we did an engineering report for the areas adjacent to Bergen Point; Deer Park, North Bay Shore, North Babylon, I guess, and Wyandanch. That expansion project is going ahead for that five or more million gallons per day.

1

30

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is a lot of things still going on besides what was on before, and I know, I kid Vito about north central Brookhaven, but that is a type of study on a bigger area that would be kind of a model.

I think, Roz, where the one point two million came from was the west central study area which was seven hundred fifty thousand dollars years ago, and then was inflated. That was -- I don't remember the square miles of that, but probably the same as north central Brookhaven.

It was a pretty detailed scope of work, but still seven hundred fifty thousand dollars years ago for part of the County.

MR. MINEI: Again, that was always factored into what would be hundreds of millions of dollars of federal grant money and state grant money that was geared to that.

What I think we could do right now, you pretty much have a handle on a number

1

2

of County owned facilities. We pretty

3

much have a handle on some of the

4

municipal facilities, town owned and

5

village owned.

6

You could tell us within a short

7

time what the expansion capacity of the

8

Southwest Sewer District is with Jerry

9

Wolkoff's future world. The Jetsons

10

apparently are going to live there.

11

We certainly know from the history

12

subsequent to north central Brookhaven,

13

what happened to Selden Sewer District 11,

14

you could tell us. Certainly Windwatch,

15

we know what the future capacity of that

16

is, so I mean. It is like addition by

17

subtraction.

18

You could start taking out major

19

elements of this. We know by all the

20

factors constraining Riverhead, what their

21

future capacity is, what their plans are

22

for Route 58, we're trying to encourage

23

them to do.

24

Patchogue village is pretty much

25

while it has been the poster child of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

workforce housing, things like that, you could do that.

I think there is a lot of County owned and municipal facilities we could take off the table. What I'm concerned about is something we've been discussing almost ten years.

We don't get to the heart of the matter of accommodating downtown revitalization or workforce housing. We've had preliminary studies with the Town of Southold with looking at the Mattituck area and Southold area, we've been hearing about Mastic Shirley a little bit.

I even heard through one of the consultants they were asked to look at downtown Southampton Village, where would they go with a sewer main, things like that.

So I'm concerned that we're going to focus so much on this and going to miss a real opportunity to start addressing the other issues, so I would almost ask DPW to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

take out of the equation some of what people would suspect are the big issues of Bergen Point, Selden, some of your bigger facilities. We can do that at this point.

MR. WRIGHT: In order to properly do that, it is going to take time talking it over. This means taking some other project and putting it in the future sometime. It is a little difficult with the staffing we have right now to do that.

We could do something generally. We have a feel for how much land is associated with each of the sewage treatment plants, with limits, how much capacity you have, but at the same time, looking at this resolve clause, it is true you have to look at enhancement through increased efficiency and expansion, what type of new technology that reduces the footprint of the treatment process or increases the capacity of what you have as a footprint now.

You still have to get rid of it. You need land to do that, unless you're at

1

2

Bergen Point with an outfall. I don't know without sitting down with John and other staff to talk about how much of a burden this would be, as much to remove what other tasks we've been given to do that are not part of our everyday workload.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. MINEI: We're not subtracting.

10

I opt for plan A, abide by the resolve clauses but try to salt back into these clauses some of the thoughts that were lost from, I thought, important whereas clauses about workforce housing and what was lost from the sewer summit; overwhelming concern for downtown revitalization.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

I would take, upon our editorial prerogative, four resolve clauses with minor additions and address the issues of workforce housing and downtown revitalization, tell them, "We have one point two million." The rest of the format we could quibble over, but it's good to talk about typical engineering

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

reports and, you know, we could ruminate over the language, but you've got some of the things that when I read page one, jump out at me.

If you look at appendix C, scope of work, he has got legal considerations. We talk about this at every sewer agency meeting. What are legal constraints?

I would want to know the financial concerns. Now to my way of thinking, someone should expand on that and talk about economic development and things like that, if they're clever enough in responding to your RFP and cost opinions and trends.

I would, if I was responding to this, I would list out of that and say "Gee, I went into this with all good faith to give you the best one point two million dollar study I could, and I'm backing up against it. It can't be done, guys," and let them give us the free consulting.

Because I think we could spend another nine months discussing studies,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

this area, that area, but the one that jumps out at me as priority is Mastic Shirley for a number of reasons; the Forge River, population density served and all other issues; what is Dowling College planning to do, what is Montauk Highway and Mastic Shirley to do?

But, again, I had a meeting with Southold. If they were given guidance that said we could pull this together economically without bankrupting your town and frightening all the residents about making downtown Mattituck into Queens, they would jump at it, too, and so I'm not ready to do that, but some of these consultants have more inside information than we think we have.

So I would leave it up to their capabilities to make their proposal. Again, it is not trivial money we're talking about here. Let them respond and give us the guidance we need.

Like you said, Gil, you know before the end of the year, we could revisit this

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

and say, "This doesn't get us close to what we thought we do."

MR. WRIGHT: Part of the resisting or whether it is Gill making a statement tomorrow or going back to the Legislature, this resolution authorizing this Committee was six months before the summit. A lot was talked about in that six month period and afterwards.

That might be the reason why there has to be expansion or different interpretation of the resolve clauses that are here, at least clarifying some of the items that should have been in here.

MR. ISLES: Which is the whole purpose of this evaluation committee is to fine tune the RFP. Maybe with those four clauses which are in the Legislation as being the core of the scope of services, but then with particular focus or attention to such matters as affordable housing, economic development, revitalization; things of that nature to further target the consultant to those

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

locations.

MS. GALLAGHER: I think it is here under task two essentially. I think it is captured in the feasibility. That may be where we can provide a little more direction to them in terms of evaluating areas in need of sewerage for environmental, social, economic, revitalization purposes.

That is where the idea of doing these overlays of the maps of environmental areas, the downtowns, etc. It could, if we wanted to put any more specificity, it could be at a minimum include the following areas that have already been identified.

That gets to some of your high priority or primary areas, too.

MR. MINEI: Let's not fool ourselves, too. When you have the bidders conference, the clever firms don't show their cards. They don't like to reveal that. I'm taking this tack, but you might get a consensus when they start looking

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

that and start sinking their teeth into this where they call each other. These guys are feeling, "You can't do this."

We may know early on that they will keep with a unified front that says, "Guys, you've got to double this before you get anywhere near." You won't get. "I think I'll put in Mastic Shirley rather than Mattituck." You won't get all of that.

That is the card they hold, but if they think -- I hope they don't take the other tack, saying, "I'm not proposing, we're going to lose our shirts because we'll show those characters at public works and they'll wring every ounce of work out of us" where firms automatically drop by the way side because they misunderstand that we think more money is necessary.

But my point is with given this core, salt in some language with the frameworks Ben has, a little bit of tinkering, I think I'm ready to declare

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

victory here and move on.

We'll debate this. This is not the time to debate this. The idea is to start debating it once you start seeing work products. "Gee, this isn't getting us what we thought."

The only thing hanging out there is the GEIS.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm wondering if there is more information that we can gain from whoever we would like to get it from by the eleventh resolve clause that authorizes us to have informal hearings. Whether or not that was meant to be in specific areas where we think there is going to be a need, maybe some of the consulting firms would be present.

Then we could get some early additional information.

MR. MINEI: Your clock is running. I wish you well. Thirteen tells me you've got four months.

MR. WRIGHT: We did that, develop a draft. That is why I did it before April

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

sixteenth. Now we have the rest of the year.

Once the committee resolves this, the RFP, we have thirty days to issue it in public works.

MR. MINEI: Then you're right. This is getting better. This is good for a number of reasons.

At the task force, I raised an issue. I was a little concerned with, you have one engineering firm on the task force, you have a number of developers and builders who have very close working relationships with various engineering firms, and I was getting concerned that we'll go through this whole process and if that firm got it for whatever reason, someone would say, "He was privy to inside information I didn't have access to."

We started discussing, "Well, we'll make the meetings of the task force open to all engineering firms and they can come." That is going to get clunky.

I've heard from John Cameron's

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

firm. He would opt not to give up his seat on the task force, but he would recuse himself.

My point is that by having these hearings, then there is no issue of inside information, that he could feel comfortable. Again, I think we need the County attorney's opinion. He should feel more comfortable in not automatically giving up his opportunity to propose on that. That wasn't my intention.

It was not to hit a wall at the end of this where a lawsuit ensued, but I like this for a number of reasons. One, again getting free consulting is always a great opportunity getting this out in the open, and you're right. You might hear right away, "You guys are not on planet Earth anymore with this kind of funding."

I like it. I would move forward on this.

MR. ANDERSON: Maybe that is the next step we want to take is send out to the engineering community an invitation.

1

43

2

We did it with the jail. We invited the construction community to get an idea of certain concerns we had. It is perfectly legal.

3

4

5

6

You have to do it publicly. You don't have to necessarily -- you can put an ad in the paper to make sure it is publicly notified, and then send it out to everyone.

7

8

9

10

11

We can bring them in, "This is what we're doing, what do you think?" Throw it out there. Is one point two million enough -- kind of like saying do you want more cake after this?

12

13

14

15

16

MR. MINEI: That would be my suggestion. I like it, if you're comfortable that you've met the letter of your draft. I would tweak those resolve clauses a little bit; workforce housing, economic development, downtown revitalization, put that as a cover piece of guidance.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Get it out to the engineering community, tell them we're hoping to get

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

an RFP issued by this fall with a price tag of one point two million dollars, and you can even raise the issue in there, or not, of one of the concerns we could probably list, some issues going out to the first public meeting to be addressed, scope of work, funding level, need for a GEIS. Spell out and pose it to them.

MR. ANDERSON: I don't know that I would put it in writing, but verbally bring it to their attention during discussions to lead the discussion. You could do it very generically.

MR. DONOVAN: They want to give them this right there.

MR. WRIGHT: As an example, there's a firm --

MR. MINEI: Give them two resolves.

MR. ANDERSON: An outline.

MR. MINEI: This is the outline of what we're working on, prepare an RFP.

MR. ANDERSON: Even though we're making it public, not too detailed. I like your idea of running it by the County

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Attorney's office.

MR. WRIGHT: This is not the first time a recent study has been done around the Country, and because of some knowledge that this would be coming out, we've had some inquiries from firms that may or may not be able to propose to us. They may not be in Nassau or Suffolk, but as part of that inquiry, they sent us what they've done in Georgia or someplace else.

No reason why we can't provide or get information from them on how much it costs, because it is similar. The service area may be different, have different environmental aspects, but still we have that information without the cost.

We could get the cost, probably as a comparison.

MR. MINEI: To how they funded the implementation in this economic situation we're in. We're going to hear more tomorrow and enhancing state resolving funds. I'm not hearing grants yet.

MS. GALLAGHER: Gill, you will set

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

up some hearings?

MR. ANDERSON: Tomorrow I'll basically discuss the four issues we spoke about, which was concerns about the one point two million, looking for some type of prioritization of the resolve clauses for our benefit so that we can put it in the RFP.

Obviously we would be looking for additional funding, possibly in subsequent years. Make them aware, but also identify the GEIS. It is our recommendation to include it in this part of the RFP so it is --

MS. GALLAGHER: We would have to request other funding.

MR. ANDERSON: For the GEIS, it is separate. Then last, we will establish areas with the engineering community in the near future.

MR. CAVANAGH: On these, really the resolve two, three and four, we could prioritize those to say, like, four is just so broad, and you could spend a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

tremendous amount of money on that, and I don't know if we would get so much out of that.

MR. ANDERSON: Then again after what was said earlier, like Southold, maybe an area with no sewers. If you could focus on areas, as Tom said, we would have to identify those areas. Mattituck -- I don't know if you guys have any.

MS. GALLAGHER: Mastic Shirley, some of the downtowns. The Rocky Point area which has -- or that whole 25 A corridor on the north shore, that has so much development for it right now.

Places like that.

MR. CAVANAGH: We could get out of the hearing for one point two million dollars, we can give you a nice focus for this area. That might be what we want and leave the other part of that broad at the end, so that they can fit what they say they can do in a hearing.

We may get that at a hearing?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. ANDERSON: We'll certainly get you some feedback from the community that would say, "You guys are nuts," or "This is feasible."

I think dialogue itself would be useful to where we're taking this. Maybe Vito or somebody mentioned they're privy to information we're not. They may bring something to the table we haven't thought about or would not include or didn't think it is important.

I think it is good to have that out there and have that dialogue. At least it gets everything on the table. Nobody can say we're hiding something or not being forthright in something.

MR. ISLES: It is a very good idea. Saves us from getting into a situation, reduces the likelihood of doing the RFP and everybody is in the time crunch of doing a response, and we get something and none of these hit what we want. Then we have to redo the scope and send it back out again.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I think it is a good idea, a way of really getting ideas and helping us fine tune this into getting a useful product we're looking for.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. The only other thing --

MR. MINEI: In your presentation, you're going to mention to the task force that we recommend taking language from the whereas and insert it in the resolve, especially as it pertains to workforce housing, downtown revitalization and economic development.

That those issues have to be addressed in some fashion as we move forward.

MR. WRIGHT: That was kind of Gail's approach. Economic benefit wasn't really bold enough.

MS. GAZES: Gail had two comments.

MR. ANDERSON: I gave those out. Page six, part two scope of work, please add "including the economic benefit" to the criteria so that the economics are

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

addressed and cost benefit analysis.

Two, pages five to six, selection process/selection team -- the selection team should be the RFP committee as stated in resolved one of resolution 1277-2007. The description of the selection team is too narrow consists only of DPW and DPW sanitation.

I think that is fair. I have no problems with that.

MR. MINEI: We're fine with it. The only other thing is no limit to the submission? You guys are masochists. Really, on a technical submission you don't want to say thirty pages or something?

They can give you volumes of their other reports, but the body of the technical submission I would conjure up a number, because if you want a hundred fifty --

MR. WRIGHT: We've never had a problem where it is that lengthy.

MR. MINEI: If you're comfortable.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. GALLAGHER: Everything else is  
appendices.

MR. MINEI: We give guidance on the  
technical body of the report.

MR. ANDERSON: What do you use for  
a number?

MR. MINEI: Anywhere from thirty to  
fifty pages.

We also on some of our contracts in  
the payment, although others have already,  
we include a fifteen percent retainage on  
payments so they know that up front,  
fifteen percent relates to the amount of  
profit.

As they work through a project,  
they can look forward to submitting  
invoices on the work and document all  
that. We'll pay for it, but until we're  
satisfied with that task report, we don't  
give them the retainage, but some of my  
guys say, "Don't worry, I'm not paying the  
invoices until I'm happy anyway."

You guys play hard ball usually.  
If you're fine with that, good. Go with

1

2

it.

3

4

5

I've gotten burned where they said draft one, draft two. That is the only shot you've got, and then we rewrite it.

6

7

MR. WRIGHT: The rest of the comments is -- that was all.

8

9

MR. MINEI: We wish you well with your selection team. We reserve the right to --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. ANDERSON: I'll go about setting up informal hearings. Those will probably be by the next meeting we have sometimes towards the end of next month. We've given everyone time to do what they have to do.

17

18

The end of June, we'll try to set it up for that.

19

20

MS. GALLAGHER: Around your schedule.

21

22

MR. ANDERSON: Not a problem, okay.

23

Thank you.

24

(TIME NOTED: 3:35 P.M.)

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION

I, DONNA L. SPRATT, a Notary  
Public in and for the State of New  
York, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing is a true and  
accurate transcript of my  
stenographic notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have  
hereunto set my hand this 5th day  
of June 2008.

-----

DONNA L. SPRATT