1. Public Notice

   Documents:

   8-15-16 RULES PUBLIC NOTICE.PDF

2. RECONVENED MEETING

   Documents:

   8-1-16 RECONVENED MEETING.PDF

3. Proposed Ordinances

   Documents:

   8-15-16R.PDF
   APPENDIX FOR PROPOSED ORD. 102-16.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 102-16.PDF

4. Rules Agenda

   Documents:

   R-8-15-16.PDF

5. Meeting Minutes

   Documents:

   AUGUST 15, 2016 - RULES.PDF
   AUGUST 15, 2016 - FULL - RECONVENED.PDF

PUBLIC NOTICE

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT

THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

WILL HOLD A MEETING OF THE

RULES COMMITTEE

ON

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 2016 AT 3:00 P.M.

IN

THE PETER J. SCHMITT MEMORIAL LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER

THEODORE ROOSEVELT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BUILDING

1550 FRANKLIN AVENUE, MINEOLA, NEW YORK

MICHAEL C. PULITZER
Clerk of the Legislature

Nassau County, New York

DATED: August 8, 2016

Mineola, NY

As per the Nassau County Fire Marshall's Office, the Legislative Chamber has a maximum occupancy of 251 people and the outer chamber which will stream the meeting live, has a maximum occupancy of 72. Passes will be distributed on a first come first served basis beginning one half hour before the meeting begins and attendees will be given an opportunity to sign in to address the Legislature for a maximum of three minutes. **Public comment is limited to Agenda items.** The Nassau County Legislature is committed to making its public meetings accessible to individuals with disabilities and every reasonable accommodation will be made so that they can participate. Please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Legislature at 571-4252, or the Nassau County Office for the Physically Challenged at 227-7101 or TDD Telephone No. 227-8989 if any assistance is needed. Every Legislative meeting is streamed live on http://www.nassaucountyny.gov/agencies/Legis/index.html.

PUBLIC NOTICE

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT

THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE WILL HOLD A MEETING OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

ON

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 2016 AT 3:00 P.M.

IN

THE PETER J. SCHMITT MEMORIAL LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER
THEODORE ROOSEVELT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
1550 FRANKLIN AVENUE, MINEOLA, NEW YORK

MICHAEL C. PULITZER
Clerk of the Legislature
Nassau County, New York

DATED: August 8, 2016
Mineola, NY

As per the Nassau County Fire Marshall's Office, the Legislative Chamber has a maximum occupancy of 251 people and the outer chamber which will stream the meeting live, has a maximum occupancy of 72. Passes will be distributed on a first come first served basis beginning one half hour before the meeting begins and attendees will be given an opportunity to sign in to address the Legislature for a maximum of three minutes. **Public comment is limited to Agenda items.** The Nassau County Legislature is committed to making its public meetings accessible to individuals with disabilities and every reasonable accommodation will be made so that they can participate. Please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Legislature at 571-4252, or the Nassau County Office for the Physically Challenged at 227-7101 or TDD Telephone No. 227-8989 if any assistance is needed. Every Legislative meeting is streamed live on http://www.nassaucountyny.gov/agencies/Legis/index.html.

L E G I S L A T I V E C A L E N D A R

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE — MINEOLA, NEW YORK
EIGHTH MEETING — AUGUST 1, 2016 1:00 P.M.
EIGHTH MEETING OF 2016

THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE IS COMMITTED TO MAKING ITS PUBLIC MEETING ACCESSIBLE TO INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES. IF, DUE TO A DISABILITY, YOU NEED AN ACCOMMODATION OR ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC MEETING OR TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING IN AN ALTERNATIVE FORMAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE AT 571-4252, OR THE NASSAU COUNTY OFFICE FOR THE PHYSICALLY CHALLENGED AT 227-7101 OR TDD TELEPHONE NO. 227-8989. AS PER THE NASSAU COUNTY FIRE MARSHAL'S OFFICE, THE PETER J. SCHMITT MEMORIAL LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER HAS A MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY OF 251 PEOPLE AND THE OUTER CHAMBER WHICH WILL STREAM THE MEETING LIVE, HAS A MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY OF 72. PASSES WILL BE DISTRIBUTED ON A FIRST COME FIRST SERVED BASIS BEGINNING ONE HALF HOUR BEFORE MEETING TIME.

EVERY LEGISLATIVE MEETING IS STREAMED LIVE ON
http://www.nassaucountyny.gov/agencies/Legis/index.html.

1. **HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW NO. -2016**

A LOCAL LAW TO ADD TITLE 83 TO THE MISCELLANEOUS LAWS OF NASSAU COUNTY IN RELATION TO A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY LOAN PROGRAM. 266-16(CE)

2. **HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW NO. -2016**

A LOCAL LAW TO AMEND A LOCAL LAW TO PROVIDE RELIEF FROM FEES CHARGED BY THE VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT TO THE VICTIMS OF HURRICANE/SUPER STORM SANDY. 295-16(CE)

3. **VOTE ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW NO. -2016**

A LOCAL LAW TO ADD TITLE 83 TO THE MISCELLANEOUS LAWS OF NASSAU COUNTY IN RELATION TO A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY LOAN PROGRAM. 266-16(CE)

4. **VOTE ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW NO. -2016**

A LOCAL LAW TO AMEND A LOCAL LAW TO PROVIDE RELIEF FROM FEES CHARGED BY THE VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT TO THE VICTIMS OF HURRICANE/SUPER STORM SANDY. 295-16(CE)

5. **ORDINANCE NO. 93-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $2,200,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 216-16(PW)

6. **ORDINANCE NO. 94 -2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $1,000,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 218-16(PW)

7. **ORDINANCE NO. 95-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $1,509,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 219-16(PW)

8. **ORDINANCE NO. 96-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $25,250,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 298-16(PW)

9. **ORDINANCE NO. 97-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $5,000,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 260-16(PW)

10. **ORDINANCE NO. 98-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $26,200,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 261-16(PW)

11. **ORDINANCE NO. 99-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $1,000,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 262-16(PW)

12. **ORDINANCE NO. 100-2016**

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AN ORDINANCE FOR THE PREVENTION OF FIRES BY ESTABLISHING UNIFORM REGULATIONS FOR THE CONTROL OF FIRE HAZARDS AND FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF SUCH REGULATIONS. 267-16(FM)

13. **ORDINANCE NO. 101-2016**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE MEDICAL EXAMINER. 258-16(OMB)

14. **RESOLUTION NO. 117-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFFS, WILLIAM SUPPLE AND JENNIE SUPPLE, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTIONS ENTITLED IN THE MATTER OF THE ARBITRATION BETWEEN CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION, A.F.S.C.M.E, LOCAL 1000, A.F.L.-C.I.O., BY ITS LOCAL 830 ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM SUPPLE V. COUNTY OF NASSAU AND IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF WILLIAM SUPPLE AND JENNIE SUPPLE v. THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, THE NASSAU COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT, NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, ET AL, PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 263-16(AT)

15. **RESOLUTION NO. 118-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF, CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION, LOCAL 830, AFL-CIO, AFSCME, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION, LOCAL 830, AFL-CIO, AFSCME v. COUNTY OF NASSAU, CONSOLIDATED ASSESSMENT GRIEVANCES, CASE NOS.89-11, 90-11, 119-11, 120-11, AND 129-11 PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 265-16(AT)

16. **RESOLUTION NO. 119-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS THAT NASSAU COUNTY HAS AGAINST THE NYCB THEATRE IN WESTBURY WHICH IS MANAGED BY THE WESTBURY MUSIC FAIR LLC, A SUBSIDIARY OF LIVE NATION, CONCERNING THE ENTERTAINMENT SURCHARGE TAX, PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 285-16(AT)

17. **RESOLUTION NO. 120-2016**

A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO NEW YORK GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW § 858(15) WITH RESPECT TO THE GARVIES POINT PROJECT IN GLEN COVE, NEW YORK. 268-16(CE)

18. **RESOLUTION NO. 121-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE VILLAGE OF MINEOLA. 264-16(PW)

19. **RESOLUTION NO. 122-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE LONG BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY TO RENOVATE THE LONG BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY. 270-16(CE)

20. **RESOLUTION NO. 123-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE BELLMORE FIRE DISTRICT IN RELATION TO OBTAINING NINE AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS. 286-16(CE)

21. **RESOLUTION NO. 124-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF LONG BEACH IN RELATION TO A PROJECT TO PROCURE A SHALLOW WATER BOAT. 287-16(CE)

22. **RESOLUTION NO. 125-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF LONG BEACH IN RELATION TO A PROJECT TO PROCURE COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. 288-16(CE)

23. **RESOLUTION NO. 126-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE TOWN OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD IN RELATION TO A STREET BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT. 289-16(CE)

24. **RESOLUTION NO. 127-2016**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO ACCEPT ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU A GRANT OF A PERPETUAL EASEMENT FROM LYNBROOK THEATRE GROUP, LLC FOR PROPERTY SITUATED IN THE VILLAGE OF LYNBROOK, TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD, NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK. 294-16(PW)

25. **RESOLUTION NO. 128-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT A GIFT OFFERED BY A DONOR TO THE COUNTY OF NASSAU. 271-16(CE)

26. **RESOLUTION NO. 129-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2016. 284-16(OMB)

27. **RESOLUTION NO. 130-2016**

A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A WARRANT DIRECTING THE TREASURER OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO PAY TO THE SUPERVISORS OF THE SEVERAL TOWNS AND TO THE TREASURERS OF THE SEVERAL VILLAGES AND CITIES WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, THE SUMS AS APPORTIONED BY THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE BASED ON A REPORT FILED BY THE COUNTY TREASURER AND THE COUNTY CLERK, SHOWING DEPOSITS FROM MORTGAGE TAXES FOR THE QUARTER BEGINNING APRIL 1, 2016 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2016; PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 290-16 (LE)

28. **RESOLUTION NO. 131-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD TO CORRECT ERRONEOUS ASSESSMENTS AND TAXES IN ACCORDANCE WITH PETITIONS OF THE COUNTY ASSESSOR ON SPECIFIC PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 273-16(AS)

29. **RESOLUTION NO. 132-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD TO PARTIALLY EXEMPT FROM THE REAL PROPERTY TAXATION CERTAIN REAL PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 274-16(AS)

30. **RESOLUTION NO. 133-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD TO PARTIALLY EXEMPT FROM THE REAL PROPERTY TAXATION CERTAIN REAL PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 275-16(AS)

31. **RESOLUTION NO. 134-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD TO CORRECT ERRONEOUS ASSESSMENTS AND TAXES IN ACCORDANCE WITH PETITIONS OF THE COUNTY ASSESSOR ON SPECIFIC PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 276-16(AS)

32. **RESOLUTION NO. 135-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF OYSTER BAY TO PARTIALLY EXEMPT FROM THE REAL PROPERTY TAXATION CERTAIN REAL PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 277-16(AS)

33. **RESOLUTION NO. 136-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF OYSTER BAY TO CORRECT ERRONEOUS ASSESSMENTS AND TAXES IN ACCORDANCE WITH PETITIONS OF THE COUNTY ASSESSOR ON SPECIFIC PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 278-16(AS)

34. **RESOLUTION NO. 137-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF OYSTER BAY TO EXEMPT FROM THE REAL PROPERTY TAXATION CERTAIN REAL PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 279-16(AS)

35. **RESOLUTION NO. 138-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE TOWN OF OYSTER BAY TO RESTORE TAXES ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 280-16(AS)

36. **RESOLUTION NO. 139-2016**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ASSESSOR AND/OR THE COUNTY TREASURER AND/OR THE RECEIVER OF TAXES OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH TO CORRECT ERRONEOUS ASSESSMENTS AND TAXES IN ACCORDANCE WITH PETITIONS OF THE COUNTY ASSESSOR ON SPECIFIC PROPERTIES SITUATED IN VARIOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ASSESSED TO DESIGNATED OWNERS APPEARING ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS FOR THE SPECIFIED SCHOOL AND/OR COUNTY YEARS PURSUANT TO THIS RESOLUTION; PURSUANT TO THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 281-16(AS)

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE ADDED TO THE CALENDAR ON AUGUST 8, 2016

37**.** **RESOLUTION NO. 140-2016**

A RESOLUTION DECLARING A CAPITAL BUDGET EMERGENCY PURSUANT TO §310(D) OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 306-16(AT)

38. **ORDINANCE NO. 102 -2016**

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 13-2016, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SIXTEEN FOR THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, CORRESPONDING TO THE FIRST YEAR OF THE FOUR-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 310 OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 305-16(PW)

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MAY BE UNTABLED

39. **ORDINANCE NO. 14-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS SPECIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, AUTHORIZING $74,986,552 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SAID EXPENDITURE, AND MAKING CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS PURSUANT TO THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT, PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 49-16(PW)

40. **ORDINANCE NO. 15-2016**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $164,283,342.78 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SAID EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 50-16(PW)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN **that the Nassau County Executive has executed the following personal service contracts, copies of which are on file with the Office of the Clerk of the Nassau County Legislature. These contracts are listed for informational purposes only.**

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and Unlimited Care. RE: Housekeeper Chore/Personal Care. $.01. ID# CQHS16000041.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and EAC, Inc. RE: Senior Center Recreation. $24,720.00. CQHS16000008.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and Allen Health Care Service. RE: Housekeeper/Homemaker. $.01. ID# CQHS16000035.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and Able Healthcare. RE: Housekeeper Chore/Personal Care. $.01. ID# CQHS16000033.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and The Salvation Army. RE: Transportation, Supportive Services, Congregation Meals & Caregiver Support. $348,278.00. ID# CQHS16000029

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and Herricks Union Free School District. RE: Congregate Meals & Caregiver Support, Adult Day Care. $180,134.00. ID# CQHS16000019.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and Family and Children's Associates. RE: Congregate Meals. $211,121.00.
ID# CQHS16000012.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Rockville Centre. RE: Case Management, Ancillary. $1,002,127.00. ID# CQHS16000003.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and EAC, Inc.. RE: Title IIIC-2 Home Delivered Meals. $237,893.00. ID# CQHS16000007.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and EAC, Inc.. RE: Transportation, Congregate Meals & Health Promotion. $702,337.00.
ID# CQHS16000006.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office for the Aging and The Life Enrichment Center at Oyster Bay, Inc.. RE: Congregate Meals, Transportation/Supportive Services. $203,897.00. ID# CQHS16000028.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Parks, Recreation & Museums and Town of Hempstead Department of Parks and Recreation.
RE: Nickerson Beach Park Lifeguard Staffing. $300,000.00. ID# CLPK16000002.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Parks, Recreation & Museums and The North Shore Pops, Inc. RE: Hotel/Motel Tax Grant Fund. $1,000.00. ID# CQPK16000051.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and VMC Group, Inc.
RE: Administrative Service. $300,000.00. ID# CLHE15000011.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Tri-Borough Home Care, Ltd DBA Family Pediatric Home Care. RE; Preschool Special Education. $.01.
ID# CQHE16000003.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Vocational Education and Evaluation Board. RE: Public Health Emergency Preparedness. $2,425.00. ID# CLHE16000004.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and James McGuiness & Associates Inc.
RE: Medicaid Billing Services for Preschool Special Education Program. $97,500.00.
ID# CLHE16000002.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Office of Community Development and Rockville Centre Village. RE: CDBG. $150,000.00. ID# CLHI16000004.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Office of Community Development and VHB Engineering Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C.
RE: Personal Services. $200,000.00. ID# CLHI16000003.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Office of Community Development and Valley Stream Village. RE: CDBG. $293.18. ID# CLHI16000002.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office of Mental Health, CD & DDS and Family Children's Association. RE: Substance Abuse Treatment/Prevention. $4,080.00. ID# CLHS16000011.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services, Office of Mental Health, CD & DDS and H.E.L.P. Services, Inc.. RE: Substance Abuse Treatment/Prevention. $244,396.00. ID# CLHS16000014.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Little Flower Children & Family Services. RE: Foster Care Services $.02. ID# CQSS16000008.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Lincoln Hall.
RE: Foster Care Services $.02. ID# CQSS16000006.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Family & Children's Association. RE: Outreach Van Services of Human Trafficking & Sexual Exploitation (Safe Harbor Project). $1,000.00. ID# CQSS16000019.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Mattea and Edwards Enrichment Corporation d/b/a The Learning Experience. RE: Day Care Services. $.01. ID# CQSS16000011.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Rozzie's Day Care, Inc.
RE: Day Care Services. $.01. ID# CLSS16000011.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and MercyFirst.
RE: Foster Care Services. $.02. ID# CQSS16000020.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and The Safe Center LI, Inc.
RE: Behavioral Health/Child Protective Services. $75,000.00. ID# CLSS16000031.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Long Island Council of Churches. RE: Emergency Food Services. $60,000.00. ID# CLSS16000006.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and NADAP, Inc.
RE: Employment Services. $950,300.00. ID# CLSS16000034.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Island Peer Review Organization (IPRO). RE: Medicaid Fraud Svcs. $150,000.00. ID# CLSS16000012.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Office of Community Development and Manorhaven Village. RE: CDBG. $11,406.64. ID# CLHI16000001.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services – Office of Youth Services
RE: Family & Children's Association, Inc. $195,000.00. ID# CQHS16000114.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services Office for the Aging and Aides at Home, Inc. RE: Housekeeper/Homemaker. $.01. ID# CQHS16000034.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Social Services and Island Harvest.
RE: Food Bank Services. $24,500.00. ID# CLSS16000004.

THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

WILL CONVENE NEXT

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 12, 2016 at 1:00PM

AND

FULL LEGISLATURE MEETING

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 26, 2016 at 1:00PM

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

11th TERM MEETING AGENDA

RULES COMMITTEE

AUGUST 15, 2016 3:00 PM

Norma Gonsalves – Chairwoman
Richard Nicolello– Vice Chairman
Dennis Dunne
Howard Kopel
Kevan Abrahams – Ranking
Judy Jacobs
Carrié Solages

Michael C. Pulitzer, Clerk of the Legislature

Clerk Item No.	Proposed By	Assigned To	Summary
305-16	PW	R	**ORDINANCE NO. -2016** AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 13-2016, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SIXTEEN FOR THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, CORRESPONDING TO THE FIRST YEAR OF THE FOUR-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 310 OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 305-16(PW)
306-16	AT	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION DECLARING A CAPITAL BUDGET EMERGENCY PURSUANT TO §310(D) OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 306-16(AT)
			THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MAY BE UNTABLED
A-4-16	PR	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF NASSAU COUNTY OFFICE OF PURCHASING TO REQUEST OVERSIGHT OF A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU ACTING ON BEHALF OF VARIOUS NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENTS AND HVAC INC. A-4-16
B-4-16	PW	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO AWARD AND EXECUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND R.J. INDUSTRIES, INC. B-4-16
E-51-16	TS	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC SAFETY BOARD AND DANIELLE P. RELLA. E-51-16
E-56-16	AT	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AFFIRMING TO AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL COUNSEL CONTRACT ENTERED INTO BY THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY AND WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN & DICKER LLP. E-56-16

Clerk Item No.	Proposed By	Assigned To	Summary
E-66-16	AT	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AFFIRMING TO AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL COUNSEL CONTRACT ENTERED INTO BY THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY AND LEVENTHAL, MULLANEY & BLINKOFF LLP. E-66-16
E-161-16	PW	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND LOOKS GREAT SERVICES, INC. E-161-16
E-182-16	PW	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, AND D & B ENGINEERS AND ARCHITECTS, P.C. E-182-16
E-188-16	AT	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL CONTRACT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AND RIVKIN RADLER, LLP. E-188-16
U-16-16	AT	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE OFFICE OF THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY, AND JACKSON LEWIS P.C. U-16-16
U-64-16	AT	R	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AND RIVKIN RADLER, LLP. U-64-16

OrderPriority	Main	Category	Project Number	Formatted Project Title	Cumulative Budget	2016 Debt	2016 Non County	2016	2017 Debt	2017 Non County	2017	2018 Debt	2018 Non County	2018	2019 Debt	2019 Non County	2019	FY2016-19	Total_Auth	New_Auth_Req	Lifetime TotalA
1	General Capital	Buildings	90023	Various County Buildings Backflow Prevention	$ 5,537,682.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,537,682.00	$ -	$ 5,537,682.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90025	Rehabilitation of Aquatic Center Building	$ 49,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 54,000,000.00	$ -	$ 54,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90026	Exterior Renovation of 240 Old Country	$ 1,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,750,000.00	$ -	$ 4,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90027	240 Old Country Road HVAC Improvements	$ 4,850,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,350,000.00	$ -	$ 6,350,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90031	Records Center Renovation	$ -	$ 1,354,482.00	$ -	$ 1,354,482.00	$ 5,169,272.00	$ -	$ 5,169,272.00	$ 5,937,478.00	$ -	$ 5,937,478.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 12,461,232.00	$ 12,461,232.00	$ -	$ 12,461,232.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90033	BOE Building Upgrades	$ 2,100,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,100,000.00	$ -	$ 2,100,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90375	Emergency Work at DPW Garages	$ 3,053,538.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,053,538.00	$ -	$ 3,053,538.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90400	Various County Facilities - General Construction	$ 17,450,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 21,450,000.00	$ -	$ 21,450,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90401	Various County Facilities - Electrical Construction	$ 8,400,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 10,400,000.00	$ -	$ 10,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90402	Various County Facilities - HVAC Construction	$ 10,050,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 13,050,000.00	$ -	$ 13,050,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90403	Various County Facilities - Plumbing Construction	$ 4,750,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 5,750,000.00	$ -	$ 5,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90404	Various County Facilities – Fire Alarm/Protection and Security Systems	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90405	Various County Facilities - Demolition	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90406	Various County Facilities - Design	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90611	Various County Court Facilities Renovation	$ 16,038,239.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 16,038,239.00	$ -	$ 16,038,239.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90612	Generator Upgrade - Various Buildings	$ 3,800,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,800,000.00	$ -	$ 3,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90617	Various County Buildings Electric Service & Engineering Upgrade	$ 6,275,023.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,275,023.00	$ -	$ 8,275,023.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90618	Various County Buildings Roof Renovation	$ 18,400,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 8,000,000.00	$ 26,400,000.00	$ -	$ 26,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90622	Hempstead Garage Improvements	$ 23,200,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 23,950,000.00	$ -	$ 23,950,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90625	Various Asbestos & Lead Abatement	$ 5,870,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 7,870,000.00	$ -	$ 7,870,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90629	Various County Fuel Station Upgrades	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90632	Family & Matrimonial Court	$ 94,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 112,000,000.00	$ -	$ 112,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90634	Nassau Coliseum Emergency Repairs	$ 6,800,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,800,000.00	$ -	$ 6,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90636	Warehouse and Staging Area	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ 6,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90637	Nassau County Department of Public Works Material Testing Laboratory	$ 3,100,000.00	$ 1,300,000.00	$ -	$ 1,300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,300,000.00	$ 4,400,000.00	$ -	$ 4,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90638	Nassau County Housing Improvements	$ -	$ 1,800,000.00	$ -	$ 1,800,000.00	$ 1,100,000.00	$ -	$ 1,100,000.00	$ 1,100,000.00	$ -	$ 1,100,000.00	$ 1,100,000.00	$ -	$ 1,100,000.00	$ 5,100,000.00	$ 5,100,000.00	$ -	$ 5,100,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90639	Data Center Fire Supression System	$ 850,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 850,000.00	$ -	$ 850,000.00
1	General Capital	Buildings	90981	Americans/Disabilities Act - Phase II (Construction)	$ 11,882,459.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ 13,850,000.00	$ -	$ 13,850,000.00
		Buildings Total				$ 11,704,482.00	$ -	$ 11,704,482.00	$ 13,269,272.00	$ -	$ 13,269,272.00	$14,037,478.00	$ -	$ 14,037,478.00	$ 7,850,000.00	$ -	$ 7,850,000.00	$ 46,861,232.00	$ 390,485,714.00	$ -	$ 390,485,714.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	11511	Health Department Equipment Replacement	$ 1,408,924.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,658,924.00	$ -	$ 1,658,924.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98060	Road Maintenance Equipment Replacement	$ 19,860,709.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 6,400,000.00	$26,260,709.00	$ -	$ 26,260,709.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98062	Automation of Fuel Sites and Vehicles	$ 1,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,250,000.00	$ -	$ 1,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98063	DPW Fleet Service Equipment	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98064	Road Maintenance Equipment Refurbishment	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98092	Snow Removal Truck Replacement	$ 13,150,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 17,150,000.00	$ -	$ 17,150,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98105	Fleet Management Life Cycle Vehicle Replacement	$ 19,210,237.00	$ 3,750,000.00	$ 1,335,119.00	$ 5,085,119.00	$ 3,750,000.00	$ -	$ 3,750,000.00	$ 3,750,000.00	$ -	$ 3,750,000.00	$ 3,750,000.00	$ -	$ 3,750,000.00	$ 16,335,119.00	$35,545,356.00	$ -	$ 35,545,356.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98180	Mosquito Control Equipment	$ 3,001,098.30	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 4,001,098.30	$ -	$ 4,001,098.30
1	General Capital	Equipment	98340	Printing Equipment Replacement Project	$ 2,110,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ -	$ 25,000.00	$ 525,000.00	$ 2,635,000.00	$ -	$ 2,635,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98341	Office Equipment Replacement Program	$ 2,850,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98342	Field Data Inspection Modernization	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 650,000.00	$ -	$ 650,000.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98343	BOE Voting Machine Upgrade	$ 18,773,625.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 19,356,625.00	$ -	$ 19,356,625.00
1	General Capital	Equipment	98344	Public Works Lab Equipment	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00
		Equipment				$ 6,600,000.00	$ 1,335,119.00	$ 7,935,119.00	$ 7,350,000.00	$ -	$ 7,350,000.00	$ 7,100,000.00	$ -	$ 7,100,000.00	$ 7,125,000.00	$ -	$ 7,125,000.00	$ 29,510,119.00	$ 114,257,712.30	$ -	$ 114,257,712.30
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	63029	Bridge Rehabilitation Program	$ 31,168,838.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$31,168,838.00	$ -	$ 31,168,838.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	63031	Bridge Painting Program	$ 18,971,795.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 18,971,795.00	$ -	$ 18,971,795.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	63400	Civil Site Studies	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 6,000,000.00	$ -	$ 6,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66016	Countywide Tree Management Program	$ 4,100,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 5,300,000.00	$ -	$ 5,300,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66017	Countywide Fencing Improvements	$ 1,300,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 5,800,000.00	$ -	$ 5,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66050	Requirements Contract Curbs and Sidewalks	$ 5,369,436.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ 5,769,436.00	$ -	$ 5,769,436.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66051	Pedestrian Accessibility	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ 7,500,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66302	Requirements Contract Roads/Drainage/Bridge/Joints	$ 21,784,630.00	$ -	$ 163,218.00	$ 163,218.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 1,663,218.00	$23,447,848.00	$ -	$ 23,447,848.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66305	Long Beach Parking Mall Improvements	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ 1,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	66306	Various County Parking Lot Refurbishment	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70040	NCC Life Science Building	$ 40,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 40,000,000.00	$ -	$ 40,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70042	NCC Master Plan Construction	$ 62,630,429.52	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 80,900,351.00	$ -	$ 80,900,351.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70050	NCC Master Plan Phase II Construction	$ 11,310,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 11,310,500.00	$ -	$ 11,310,500.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70060	NCC Energy Initiative	$ 12,310,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 12,310,000.00	$ -	$ 12,310,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70065	NCC Refurbishment of Plaza	$ 9,400,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 9,400,000.00	$ -	$ 9,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70071	NCC Tennis Courts	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 400,000.00	$ -	$ 400,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70073	NCC Fire Alarm Upgrade	$ 6,700,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,885,000.00	$ -	$ 6,885,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70074	NCC Rehabilitation Water Damaged Buildings Phase I	$ 5,308,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,328,000.00	$ -	$ 5,328,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70080	NCC Security System Expansion	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70084	NCC Health & Safety	$ 3,870,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,870,000.00	$ -	$ 3,870,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70086	NCC West/South Campus Parking Lot Rehab	$ 14,550,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 14,550,000.00	$ -	$ 14,550,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70087	NCC Renovation of Building V	$ 650,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 650,000.00	$ -	$ 650,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70088	NCC Renovation of Cluster C	$ 8,950,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 8,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,000,000.00	$ 16,950,000.00	$ -	$ 16,950,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70089	NCC Space Consolidation	$ 11,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 11,000,000.00	$ -	$ 11,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70091	NCC Public Safety Offices	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70092	NCC Road and Parking Paving	$ 5,400,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,400,000.00	$ -	$ 5,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70093	NCC Window Replacement	$ 7,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,200,000.00	$ -	$ 7,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70094	NCC Performing Arts Center	$ 2,250,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 14,000,000.00	$ 45,100,000.00	$ -	$ 45,100,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70095	NCC Library Renovation (Design)	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70096	NCC Infrastructure and Master Plan	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70097	NCC Elevator Restorations	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70098	NCC Information Technology Infrastructure	$ 6,200,000.00	$ 900,000.00	$ 900,000.00	$ 1,800,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,800,000.00	$ 8,000,000.00	$ -	$ 8,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70099	NCC Physical Plant Vehicles	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ 600,000.00

OrderPriority	Main	Category	Project Number	Formatted Project Title	Cumulative Budget	2016 Debt	2016 Non County	2016	2017 Debt	2017 Non County	2017	2018 Debt	2018 Non County	2018	2019 Debt	2019 Non County	2019	FY2016-19	Total_Auth	New_Auth_Req	Lifetime TotalA
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70100	NCC Foundation House	$ 120,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 120,000.00	$ -	$ 120,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70101	NCC IT Infrastructure and Equipment Upgrades	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70102	NCC Various Security Upgrades	$ 1,400,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,400,000.00	$ -	$ 1,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70103	NCC Various Facility Upgrades	$ 760,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 760,000.00	$ -	$ 760,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70104	NCC Infrastructure Repair	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70105	NCC Various Facility Upgrades Phase II	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70106	NCC Aademic Department Renovations	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70107	NCC Concrete Repair	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70108	NCC ADA Compliance	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70109	NCC - Property Transfer	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70110	NCC Medical Technologies	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	70111	NCC Building Improvements	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	81011	Hazardous Waste Response Fund Phase II	$ 29,677,817.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ 29,827,817.00	$ -	$ 29,827,817.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	81060	County Storage Tank Replacement Program	$ 23,846,840.00	$ 2,150,000.00	$ -	$ 2,150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ 2,600,000.00	$26,446,840.00	$ -	$ 26,446,840.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	91077	Pedestrian and Bicycle Pathway	$ 6,307,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,307,500.00	$ -	$ 6,307,500.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	91078	Westbury/New Castle Shared Multi Use Path Access to Eisenhower Park and Active Transportation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	91079	Motor Parkway Multi-Use Trail	$ 2,275,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,275,000.00	$ -	$ 2,275,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	92026	Veterans Memorial Coliseum Committee Study	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	92030	Nassau Hub Energy Study	$ 130,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 830,000.00	$ -	$ 830,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	92036	Disparity Study	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	99201	Community Environment Improvement Project	$ 1,650,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,650,000.00	$ -	$ 1,650,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	99205	Community Revitalization Program	$ 3,060,951.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,060,951.00	$ -	$ 3,060,951.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	99206	Various County Projects	$ 47,600,000.00	$ 5,700,000.00	$ -	$ 5,700,000.00	$ 5,700,000.00	$ -	$ 5,700,000.00	$ 5,700,000.00	$ -	$ 5,700,000.00	$ 5,700,000.00	$ -	$ 5,700,000.00	$ 22,800,000.00	$ 70,400,000.00	$ -	$ 70,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	99300	Engineering Documents Record Consolidation	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ 200,000.00
1	General Capital	Infrastructure	99502	Countywide Green Initiative	$ 5,501,490.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 5,751,490.00	$ -	$ 5,751,490.00
		Infrastructure				$ 16,650,000.00	$ 7,063,218.00	$ 23,713,218.00	$ 16,650,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 21,650,000.00	$10,750,000.00	$ -	$ 10,750,000.00	$ 10,750,000.00	$ -	$ 10,750,000.00	$ 66,863,218.00	$ 570,991,366.00	$ -	$ 570,991,366.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41006	Various Park Athletic Fields - Installation of Synthetic Turf Fields	$ 26,314,652.00	$ -	$ 350,000.00	$ 350,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 350,000.00	$ 31,400,000.00	$ -	$ 31,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41008	Museum & Educational Facilities	$ 250,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 5,750,000.00	$ -	$ 5,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41334	Nickerson Beach Improvements	$ 13,391,905.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 13,391,905.00	$ -	$ 13,391,905.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41363	Sands Point Park Seawall Rehabilitation	$ 4,800,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 9,800,000.00	$ -	$ 9,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41402	Batting Cages Refurbishment and Construction	$ 1,062,107.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,062,107.00	$ -	$ 1,062,107.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41410	Battlerow Campground Improvement	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 800,000.00	$ -	$ 800,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41420	Roslyn Grist Mill Restoration	$ 2,266,460.31	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,650,000.00	$ -	$ 4,650,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41482	Mitchel Field - Rifle Range Improvements	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41501	Cedar Creek Park Feasibility Study	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ 200,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41517	Fine Arts Museum New Additions	$ 2,600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,600,000.00	$ -	$ 2,600,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41802	Various County Parks Pond Dredging and Desilting	$ 2,042,189.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,400,000.00	$ -	$ 2,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41811	Various County Parks Restroom Rehabilitation	$ 4,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,500,000.00	$ -	$ 5,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41814	Various County Parks Fencing Repair	$ 3,418,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,668,000.00	$ -	$ 3,668,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41815	Various County Parks Ice Rink Modernization	$ 4,076,070.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 9,330,000.00	$ -	$ 9,330,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41820	Various County Parks Playground & Picnic Area Rehabilitation	$ 13,714,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 13,714,000.00	$ -	$ 13,714,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41826	Various Parks Preserve Buildings Rehabilitation	$ 9,421,939.91	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ 10,171,939.91	$ -	$ 10,171,939.91
1	General Capital	Parks	41829	Various Parks Outdoor Lighting Rehabilitation	$ 13,187,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 13,437,000.00	$ -	$ 13,437,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41834	Various Parks Path/Roadways/Parking Resurface	$ 7,920,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,920,000.00	$ -	$ 7,920,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41844	Various Parks Athletic Field & Court Rehabilitation Phase II	$ 4,875,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,875,000.00	$ -	$ 4,875,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41851	Various Parks Golf Course Renovation Phase II	$ 2,885,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,385,000.00	$ -	$ 3,385,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41855	Parks Equipment Replacement	$ 2,800,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 3,300,000.00	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41858	County Pools Improvements and Code Compliance	$ 5,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 5,800,000.00	$ -	$ 5,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41860	Various County Parks - Irrigation System Installation	$ 1,700,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,700,000.00	$ -	$ 1,700,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41861	Various County Park Buildings - Infrastructure Improvements	$ 17,508,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 17,758,500.00	$ -	$ 17,758,500.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41862	Various Parks - Pool Improvements	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41863	Dutch Broadway Park Improvements	$ 225,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 225,000.00	$ -	$ 225,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41864	Park Furnishings	$ 1,301,834.00	$ 250,000.00	$ 125,000.00	$ 375,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 625,000.00	$ 1,801,834.00	$ 125,000.00	$ 1,926,834.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41865	Inwood Bulkhead	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41866	Central Avenue Park, Valley Stream	$ 125,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 125,000.00	$ -	$ 125,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41869	Various Park Improvements	$ 10,250,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 2,700,000.00	$ 6,700,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 12,700,000.00	$ 20,250,000.00	$ 2,700,000.00	$ 22,950,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41870	Various County Beaches Restoration and Mitigation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41871	Various County Dock and Bulkeads	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41872	Wantagh Park Improvements	$ 4,000,000.00	$500,000	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41873	Milburn Park Improvements	$ 5,018,588.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,190,488.00	$ -	$ 5,190,488.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41874	Eisenhower Park Improvements	$ 6,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,000,000.00	$ -	$ 6,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41875	Cantiague Park Improvements	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Parks	41876	Centennial Park Improvements	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
		Parks Total				$ 10,750,000.00	$ 3,175,000.00	$ 13,925,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 2,250,000.00	$ -	$ 2,250,000.00	$ 2,250,000.00	$ -	$ 2,250,000.00	$ 21,925,000.00	$ 228,205,773.91	$ 3,325,000.00	$ 231,530,773.91
1	General Capital	Property	9B480	Land Acquisition	$ 52,804,241.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 53,804,241.00	$ -	$ 53,804,241.00
		Property Total				$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 53,804,241.00	$ -	$ 53,804,241.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	14003	Med Exam Equipment 3 Year Program	$ 4,659,583.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ 4,859,583.00	$ -	$ 4,859,583.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	14004	Med Exam DNA Laboratory	$ 1,425,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,425,000.00	$ -	$ 1,425,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	14007	Med Exam Crime Lab Equipment	$ 750,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ 950,000.00	$ -	$ 950,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	14008	Nassau County Crime Lab	$ 44,400,000.00	$ 3,600,000.00	$ -	$ 3,600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,600,000.00	$ 48,000,000.00	$ -	$ 48,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50210	Live Scan Replacement	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ 450,000.00

OrderPriority	Main	Category	Project Number	Formatted Project Title	Cumulative Budget	2016 Debt	2016 Non County	2016	2017 Debt	2017 Non County	2017	2018 Debt	2018 Non County	2018	2019 Debt	2019 Non County	2019	FY2016-19	Total_Auth	New_Auth_Req	Lifetime TotalA
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50320	Marine Bureau Repower Vessels	$ 400,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ 600,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50404	Police Department Renovation of Outdoor Pistol Range	$ 8,720,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,200,000.00	$ -	$ 10,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50570	Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch System	$ 15,700,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 17,200,000.00	$ -	$ 17,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50590	Police Department Interoperable Radio System	$ 51,050,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 53,000,000.00	$ -	$ 53,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50617	Police Department and other Agencies Bullet Proof Vests	$ 8,287,382.00	$ 400,000.00	$ -	$ 400,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ -	$ 400,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ -	$ 400,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ -	$ 400,000.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$9,887,382.00	$ -	$ 9,887,382.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50619	Police Department Ambulance Replacement	$ 11,600,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 15,600,000.00	$ -	$ 15,600,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50622	Police Department Specialty Vehicle Replacement	$ 10,291,342.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 850,000.00	$ -	$ 850,000.00	$ 850,000.00	$ -	$ 850,000.00	$ 850,000.00	$ -	$ 850,000.00	$ 3,050,000.00	$ 13,341,342.00	$ -	$ 13,341,342.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50627	AED Replacement	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ 450,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50628	Police Department Dual Engine Helicopter	$ 18,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 18,000,000.00	$ -	$ 18,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50680	Police Department Precincts & Auxiliary Precincts Renovation and Modernization	$ 81,209,379.00	$ 6,700,000.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 8,300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,300,000.00	$89,509,379.00	$ -	$ 89,509,379.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50685	Police Department - Ambulance Medical Control Upgrade	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50686	Police Fleet Replacement	$ 22,625,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 14,000,000.00	$ 36,625,000.00	$ -	$ 36,625,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50687	Village Police 911 Upgrade	$ 3,800,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ 10,800,000.00	$ -	$ 10,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50688	Fire Police EMS Academy	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 9,000,000.00	$ 19,490,000.00	$ -	$ 19,490,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50689	Police Department Firearms	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ 1,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50695	Police Department Fuel Management System	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50696	Local Municipality Interoperable Radio System	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	50697	County Wide Fiber Optic Infrastructure	$ 2,500,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 7,500,000.00	$ -	$ 7,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	51037	Jail Six Year Master Plan	$ 6,800,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 8,300,000.00	$ -	$ 8,300,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	51457	Jail Building 832 HVAC Upgrade	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	51459	Jail High Energy Efficient Lighting	$ 2,900,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,900,000.00	$ -	$ 2,900,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	52028	Hazmat Vehicle Purchase	$ 1,400,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,400,000.00	$ -	$ 1,400,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	52031	Fire Comm Radio Project	$ 400,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 850,000.00	$ 1,250,000.00	$ -	$ 1,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	52032	Fire Comm Computer Aided Dispatch	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	53001	First Responder Personal Protection Equipment	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	72490	Fire Service Academy, Various Improvements	$ 16,750,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 18,750,000.00	$ -	$ 18,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	72491	Fire Service Academy, Admin Building	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ 600,000.00
1	General Capital	Public Safety	98130	Countywide Radio System	$ 18,372,035.38	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 29,617,035.38	$ -	$ 29,617,035.38
		Public Safety				$ 26,000,000.00	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 27,600,000.00	$ 18,700,000.00	$ -	$ 18,700,000.00	$ 7,750,000.00	$ -	$ 7,750,000.00	$ 7,750,000.00	$ -	$ 7,750,000.00	$ 61,800,000.00	$ 429,754,721.38	$ -	$ 429,754,721.38
1	General Capital	Roads	60039	Wheatley Road Drainage Improvements, Old Westbury	$ 5,900,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,900,000.00	$ -	$ 5,900,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	60042	Middle Neck Road Drainage Improvement	$ 6,280,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,280,000.00	$ -	$ 6,280,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	60045	Park Street Drainage Improvements, Atlantic Beach	$ 1,050,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,800,000.00	$ -	$ 3,800,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	60049	Floral Park Drainage Improvements	$ 750,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ 1,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	60050	Sheridan Avenue, Mineola Drainage Improvements	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61025	Ocean Ave at Merrick Road, Lynbrook	$ 7,235,352.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,235,352.00	$ -	$ 7,235,352.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61078	Guide Rail Replacement Roadways and Bridges	$ 1,284,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,684,000.00	$ -	$ 1,684,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61082	Brookside Avenue Improvements, Roosevelt	$ 6,984,209.95	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 9,984,209.95	$ -	$ 9,984,209.95
1	General Capital	Roads	61083	Horse Hollow Road, Lattingtown	$ 3,760,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,560,000.00	$ -	$ 4,560,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61090	Cedar Swamp Road Improvements	$ 4,950,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,950,000.00	$ -	$ 4,950,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61091	Grand Avenue, Baldwin	$ 500,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 6,972,000.00	$ -	$ 6,972,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61100	Long Beach Road Improvement - South Hempstead	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ 300,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61101	Uniondale Avenue/Front Street Improvements	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61102	Bellmore Ave Rehabilitation	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,250,000.00	$ -	$ 4,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61103	Austin Blvd Road Improvement, Island Park	$ 6,900,000.00	$ 4,650,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 5,650,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ -	$ 7,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 12,650,000.00	$ 19,550,000.00	$ -	$ 19,550,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61105	Merrick Avenue, Merrick Road Improvements	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61106	Stewart Avenue, Bethpage Road Improvements	$ 1,305,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,705,000.00	$ -	$ 7,705,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61107	Farmingdale Road Improvements	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61108	East Rockaway Road, East Rockaway Improvements	$ 350,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61109	Branch Boulevard, Woodmere Road Improvements	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61111	Wantagh Avenue, Wantagh Road Improvements	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61112	Jerusalem Avenue, North Merrick Road Improvements	$ 1,700,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,700,000.00	$ -	$ 1,700,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61124	Main Street, East Rockaway Road Improvements	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61125	Manorhaven Boulevard, Manorhaven Road Improvements	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61126	Merrick Road, Bellmore Road Improvements	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61127	Westbury Avenue, Westbury Road Improvements	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61570	Remove and Replace Curbs and Sidewalks	$ 5,490,112.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 11,000,000.00	$ -	$ 11,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61584	Resurfacing Various County Roads 2003	$ 10,980,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 11,050,000.00	$ -	$ 11,050,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61587	Resurfacing Various County Roads	$ 216,150,000.00	$ 22,500,000.00	$18,850,569	$ 41,350,569.00	$ 22,500,000.00	$ -	$ 22,500,000.00	$22,500,000.00	$ -	$ 22,500,000.00	$ 22,500,000.00	$ -	$ 22,500,000.00	$ 108,850,569.00	$306,150,000.00	$ 18,850,569.00	$ 325,000,569.00
1	General Capital	Roads	61682	North Main Street, Freeport	$ 5,600,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 7,600,000.00	$ -	$ 7,600,000.00
1	General Capital	Roads	6179A	West Shore Road, Mill Neck	$ 54,966,996.00	$ -	$ 6,950,543.00	$ 6,950,543.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,950,543.00	$ 54,966,996.00	$ 6,950,543.00	$ 61,917,539.00
		Roads Total				$ 31,650,000.00	$ 26,801,112.00	$ 58,451,112.00	$ 30,500,000.00	$ -	$ 30,500,000.00	$23,500,000.00	$ -	$ 23,500,000.00	$ 23,500,000.00	$ -	$ 23,500,000.00	$ 135,951,112.00	$ 495,387,557.95	$ 25,801,112.00	$ 521,188,669.95
1	General Capital	Technology	97008	DPW Management Information System	$ 1,450,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ -	$ 100,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ 1,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97013	Integrated Financial System	$ 10,897,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,897,000.00	$ -	$ 10,897,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97101	HR, Payroll, and Benefit System	$ 15,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,000,000.00	$ -	$ 15,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97102	Assessment Cluster Workflow System	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,600,000.00	$ -	$ 2,600,000.00

OrderPriority	Main	Category	Project Number	Formatted Project Title	Cumulative Budget	2016 Debt	2016 Non County	2016	2017 Debt	2017 Non County	2017	2018 Debt	2018 Non County	2018	2019 Debt	2019 Non County	2019	FY2016-19	Total_Auth	New_Auth_Req	Lifetime TotalA
1	General Capital	Technology	97103	eGovernment	$ 5,250,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 7,300,000.00	$ -	$ 7,300,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97104	Disaster Recovery Plan	$ 3,515,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,515,000.00	$ -	$ 3,515,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97105	Case Management	$ 4,145,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,145,000.00	$ -	$ 4,145,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97108	Vehicle Management Inventory System	$ 270,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 270,000.00	$ -	$ 270,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97109	NIFS Upgrade / ERP System	$ 39,900,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000,000.00	$ -	$ 50,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97112	Student Registration System	$ 6,477,475.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,477,475.00	$ -	$ 6,477,475.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97113	Departmental Technology Equipment Replacement	$ 10,650,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 14,650,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 15,650,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97114	Traffic Parking Violations Agency Computer System Replacement	$ 2,050,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,050,000.00	$ -	$ 2,050,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97117	CAMDR	$ 2,950,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 4,450,000.00	$ -	$ 4,450,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97118	Server and Equipment Consolidation	$ 1,635,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,635,000.00	$ -	$ 1,635,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97119	Network Infrastructure	$ 12,205,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 14,205,000.00	$ -	$ 14,205,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97120	Data Center Storage	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00	$ -	$ 1,200,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97121	ADAPT	$ 6,500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 9,000,000.00	$ -	$ 9,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97123	Jail Management System	$ 3,150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,750,000.00	$ -	$ 3,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97124	Integrated Information Management System	$ 2,300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,500,000.00	$ -	$ 5,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97126	Countywide Document Management Program	$ 2,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97127	No Wrong Door Expansion	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ 6,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97129	Probation Caseload Explorer	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97130	OSCAR	$ 715,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 715,000.00	$ -	$ 715,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97131	First Responder Support	$ 180,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 180,000.00	$ -	$ 180,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97132	County Attorney - E-mail Storage	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97134	Integrated Voice Response System	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97135	VOIP Implementation	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97136	HHS Technology Development and Efficiency Program	$ 3,600,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ 750,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 6,600,000.00	$ -	$ 6,600,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97530	GeoBased Mapping & Information System	$ 15,830,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,830,000.00	$ -	$ 15,830,000.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97531	Tax Base Growth Management	$ 6,494,904.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,494,904.00	$ -	$ 6,494,904.00
1	General Capital	Technology	97532	Systematic Review County Assessment System	$ 4,700,000.00	$ 3,300,000.00	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00	$ 8,000,000.00	$ -	$ 8,000,000.00
		Technology Total				$ 9,050,000.00	$ -	$ 9,050,000.00	$ 3,350,000.00	$ -	$ 3,350,000.00	$ 3,350,000.00	$ -	$ 3,350,000.00	$ 3,350,000.00	$ -	$ 3,350,000.00	$ 19,100,000.00	$ 210,964,379.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 211,964,379.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62017	Traffic Signal Construction & Modification	$ 58,433,892.00	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00	$ 13,000,000.00	$71,433,892.00	$ -	$ 71,433,892.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62023	South Shore Traffic Signal Improvements	$ 4,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,175,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 15,863,000.00	$ 3,175,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 15,863,000.00	$ 3,175,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 15,863,000.00	$ 47,589,000.00	$51,789,000.00	$ -	$ 51,789,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62153	Federal Aid Durable Marking Program	$ 13,824,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	$ 16,324,000.00	$ -	$ 16,324,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62154	Traffic Durable Pavement Markings Phase II	$ 1,607,787.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,607,787.00	$ -	$ 1,607,787.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62160	Traffic Computerized Signal System Update	$ 10,413,689.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,413,689.00	$ -	$ 10,413,689.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62161	Old Country Road Signal Heads Phase I	$ 8,150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,150,000.00	$ -	$ 8,150,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62162	Old Country Road Signal Heads Phase II	$ 5,172,000.00	$ 540,000.00	$ 2,160,000.00	$ 2,700,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,700,000.00	$ 7,872,000.00	$ -	$ 7,872,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62175	Variable Message Signs Phase I	$ 5,242,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,242,500.00	$ -	$ 5,242,500.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62181	Traffic Signal Communications Phase II	$ 7,860,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,860,000.00	$ -	$ 7,860,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62190	Traffic Peninsula Boulevard Signal Head Replacement	$ 6,580,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,580,000.00	$ -	$ 6,580,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62191	Merrick Road Signal Head Replacement	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,250,000.00	$ -	$ 8,250,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62194	Traffic Management Center Upgrades	$ 225,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 425,000.00	$ -	$ 425,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62201	Traffic Calming Improvements	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 450,000.00	$ -	$ 450,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62202	Elmont Road Traffic Safety Improvements	$ 275,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 275,000.00	$ -	$ 275,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62203	Central Avenue, Valley Stream Traffic Safety Improvements	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ 200,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62204	Long Beach Road, Island Park Traffic Safety Improvements	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ 200,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62205	Lakeville Road Traffic Safety Improvements	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62206	Hewlett Traffic Triangle	$ 505,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 900,000.00	$ -	$ 900,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62207	Jerusalem Avenue, Uniondale Safety Improvements	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62208	Roslyn Road Traffic Modifications	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ -	$ 300,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00	$ 3,300,000.00	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62271	Signal System Operation Phase I	$ 1,425,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,425,000.00	$ -	$ 1,425,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62272	Signal System Operation Phase II	$ 1,450,800.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,450,800.00	$ -	$ 1,450,800.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62313	Traffic Sign Replacement - Phase V	$ 2,525,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 4,225,000.00	$ -	$ 4,225,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62321	LED Traffic Signal Installation Phase I	$ 410,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 410,000.00	$ -	$ 410,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62322	LED Traffic Signal Installation Phase II	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00	$ -	$ 2,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62453	Traffic Computerized Signal (Hempstead/Atlantic/Forest Avenues)	$ 15,917,066.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,917,066.00	$ -	$ 15,917,066.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62454	Traffic Computerized Signal (Central Ave/Rockaway Turnpike)	$ 25,926,946.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 26,126,946.00	$ -	$ 26,126,946.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62455	Traffic Signal Expansion Phase V	$ 6,835,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,368,000.00	$ -	$ 7,368,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62456	Traffic Signal Expansion Phase VI	$ 5,419,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,189,000.00	$ -	$ 6,189,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62457	Traffic Signal Expansion Phase IX	$ 450,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ 600,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62459	Traffic Signal Expansion Phase III	$ 5,700,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,700,000.00	$ -	$ 5,700,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62500	Traffic Studies	$ 2,750,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 4,750,000.00	$ -	$ 4,750,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62550	Traffic Signal Management System	$ 1,930,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,930,000.00	$ -	$ 1,930,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62560	Traffic Incident Management System - Old Country Road	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62562	Incident Management Phase II	$ 2,080,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,080,000.00	$ -	$ 2,080,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62563	Incident Management Phase III	$ 2,080,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,080,000.00	$ -	$ 2,080,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62564	Incident Management Phase IV	$ 2,094,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,094,000.00	$ -	$ 2,094,000.00
1	General Capital	Traffic	62900	Baldwin Complete Streets	$ 800,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 800,000.00	$ -	$ 800,000.00
		Traffic Total				$ 6,240,000.00	$ 2,160,000.00	$ 8,400,000.00	$ 10,425,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 23,113,000.00	$ 7,425,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 20,113,000.00	$ 7,425,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 20,113,000.00	$ 71,739,000.00	$ 288,818,680.00	$ -	$ 288,818,680.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91051	MTALIB 2006 FTA Grant Sect 5307 NY90-XX	$ 2,030,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,030,000.00	$ -	$ 2,030,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91056	MTALIB 2008 FTA Grant Sect 5307 NY90-XX	$ 2,125,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,125,500.00	$ -	$ 2,125,500.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91058	MTALIB 2009 FTA Grant Sect 5307 NY90-XX	$ 2,027,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,027,500.00	$ -	$ 2,027,500.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91060	MTALIB 2010 FTA Grant Sect 5307 NY90-XX	$ 2,120,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,120,000.00	$ -	$ 2,120,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91080	NICE - Alternative Fuel Buses	$ 3,479,442.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,479,442.00	$ -	$ 3,479,442.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91081	NICE - Grant Match	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91082	NICE - Grant Match	$ 755,313.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,002,000.00	$ -	$ 1,002,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91083	NICE - Grant Match	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00

OrderPriority	Main	Category	Project Number	Formatted Project Title	Cumulative Budget	2016 Debt	2016 Non County	2016	2017 Debt	2017 Non County	2017	2018 Debt	2018 Non County	2018	2019 Debt	2019 Non County	2019	FY2016-19	Total_Auth	New_Auth_Req	Lifetime TotalA
1	General Capital	Transportation	91084	NICE - Grant Match	$ 2,150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,806,500.00	$ -	$ 5,806,500.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91086	NICE - Grant Match	$ -	$ 2,700,000.00	$ -	$ 2,700,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,700,000.00	$ 6,930,000.00	$ -	$ 6,930,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91087	NICE - Grant Match	$ 1,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,980,000.00	$ -	$ 4,980,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91088	NICE - Matching Grant	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ -	$ 7,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91091	Nassau Hub Study	$ 10,074,596.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,074,596.00	$ -	$ 10,074,596.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91092	County Wide Planning Initiative and Study	$ 2,150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,450,000.00	$ -	$ 2,450,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	91200	Bus Fleet Refurbishment	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	92029	Veterans Memorial Coliseum Reuse EIS	$ 8,100,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,100,000.00	$ -	$ 8,100,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	92033	Hub Development Fund	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00	$ -	$ 2,000,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	92034	Baldwin Downtown Corridor Resiliency Study	$ 800,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 800,000.00	$ -	$ 800,000.00
1	General Capital	Transportation	92035	**Nassau Hub Transit Initiative - Final Design**	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ -	$ 7,000,000.00
		n Total				$ 2,700,000.00	$ -	$ 2,700,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 11,200,000.00	$ 74,425,538.00	$ -	$ 74,425,538.00
	General Capital Total					$ 121,344,482.00	$ 42,134,449.00	$ 163,478,931.00	$ 108,744,272.00	$ 17,688,000.00	$ 126,432,272.00	$79,162,478.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 91,850,478.00	$ 71,000,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 83,688,000.00	$ 465,449,681.00	$2,857,095,683.54	$ 30,126,112.00	$ 2,887,221,795.54
2	Building Consolidation Program	BCP	90230	County Office Campus Construction	$ 119,400,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 121,400,000.00	$ -	$ 121,400,000.00
2	Building Consolidation Program	BCP	90230P	Police and Fire Communications Center	$ 75,760,795.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 76,760,795.00	$ -	$ 76,760,795.00
		BCP Total				$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 198,160,795.00	$ -	$ 198,160,795.00
	Building Consolidation Program Total					$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 198,160,795.00	$ -	$ 198,160,795.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	30051	SD2 Interceptor Corrosion Survey & Rehabilitation	$ 6,510,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,760,000.00	$ -	$ 6,760,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	33991	Health Dept Birches Sewage Collection System	$ 14,959,931.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 14,959,931.00	$ -	$ 14,959,931.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	33992	Hempstead Harbor Sewer Study	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,000,000.00	$ 17,000,000.00	$ -	$ 17,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	33993	Seacliff Sewers	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	35101	Lateral Sewer Repair	$ 3,850,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	35107	East Hills Pump Station Improvements	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00	$ -	$ 3,250,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	35109	Force Mains/Pump Stations Long Beach	$ 4,741,406.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,741,406.00	$ -	$ 4,741,406.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	35110	Force Mains/Pump Stations Cedarhurst/Lawrence	$ 32,200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 32,200,000.00	$ -	$ 32,200,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	3P309	Ray Street Pump Station Improvement	$ 7,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,750,000.00	$ -	$ 7,750,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	3P311	Pump Station Rehabilitation	$ 101,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 101,500,000.00	$ -	$ 101,500,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	3P312	Pump Station Upgrades	$ 22,250,000.00	$ 19,000,000.00	$ -	$ 19,000,000.00	$ 16,000,000.00	$ -	$ 16,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 35,000,000.00	$ 57,250,000.00	$ -	$ 57,250,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	98041	SSW Motorized Equipment Replacement	$ 4,950,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 5,950,000.00	$ -	$ 5,950,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Collection	98042	SSW Motorized Equipment Refurbishment	$ 500,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 5,300,000.00	$ -	$ 5,300,000.00
		Collection Total				$ 29,500,000.00	$ -	$ 29,500,000.00	$ 21,500,000.00	$ -	$ 21,500,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 51,500,000.00	$ 264,661,337.00	$ -	$ 264,661,337.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	31150	Storm Water Outfall Improvements (Bay Park & Cedar Creek)	$ 2,125,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 89,955,000.00	$ -	$ 89,955,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35100	Bay Park & Cedar Creek Digester Rehabilitation	$ 40,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 40,000,000.00	$ -	$ 40,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35102	SSW Buildings Roof Repair	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ 4,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35108	SSW Building Improvements	$ 4,550,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ -	$ 7,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35113	Bay Park Total Residual Chlorine Improvement	$ 5,750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,798,734.00	$ -	$ 10,798,734.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35114	Wastewater Facilities Improvements	$ 56,155,000.00	$ 12,000,000.00	$ -	$ 12,000,000.00	$ 11,800,000.00	$ -	$ 11,800,000.00	$10,000,000.00	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00	$ 43,800,000.00	$ 99,955,000.00	$ -	$ 99,955,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35115	Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Design Improvements	$ 750,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,711,449.00	$ -	$ 6,711,449.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35116	Wastewater Facilities Odor Control Improvements	$ 30,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 31,300,000.00	$ -	$ 31,300,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35117	Wastewater Facilities Security Improvements	$ 10,500,000.00	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ 6,250,000.00	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ 6,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 12,500,000.00	$ 23,000,000.00	$ -	$ 23,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35118	Water/Wastewater Facilities Requirements	$ 1,750,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 3,250,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35121	Wastewater Facilities Storm Restoration	$ 350,745,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 350,745,000.00	$ -	$ 350,745,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35123	Superstorm Sandy Repair and Mitigation - Bay Park STP and Countywide Collection	$ 468,726,221.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 468,726,221.00	$ -	$ 468,726,221.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35124	Sandy Mitigation and Hardening Phase II	$ 150,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	35130	Capital Maintenance	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 7,000,000.00	$ -	$ 7,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3B116	Bay Park Outfall District Structure Pipeline Rehabilitation	$ 52,038,393.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 52,038,393.00	$ -	$ 52,038,393.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3B117	Bay Park Influent Pumping System Upgrade	$ 11,505,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 11,505,000.00	$ -	$ 11,505,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3B119	Bay Park Various Buildings and Equipment Modifications	$ 28,749,719.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 28,749,719.00	$ -	$ 28,749,719.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3B120	Bay Park Preliminary Treatment Modifications	$ 43,060,411.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 43,060,411.00	$ -	$ 43,060,411.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3B300	Bay Park Emergency Response Equipment	$ 375,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 375,000.00	$ -	$ 375,000.00

OrderPriority	Main	Category	Project Number	Formatted Project Title	Cumulative Budget	2016 Debt	2016 Non County	2016	2017 Debt	2017 Non County	2017	2018 Debt	2018 Non County	2018	2019 Debt	2019 Non County	2019	FY2016-19	Total_Auth	New_Auth_Req	Lifetime TotalA
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3C055	Cedar Creek Air Flotation Facility Rehabilitation	$ 22,303,527.57	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 23,103,527.57	$ -	$ 23,103,527.57
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3C057	Cedar Creek Sludge Dewatering Facility Improvement	$ 41,167,298.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 41,167,298.00	$ -	$ 41,167,298.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	3C067	Cedar Creek Equipment Replacement	$ 62,226,523.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,000,000.00	$ 77,226,523.00	$ -	$ 77,226,523.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Disposal	99999	Undetermined SSW Project Improvements	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 35,250,000.00	$ -	$ 35,250,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 35,250,000.00	$ 107,600,000.00	$ -	$ 107,600,000.00
		Disposal Total				$ 32,750,000.00	$ -	$ 32,750,000.00	$ 59,550,000.00	$ -	$ 59,550,000.00	$11,250,000.00	$ -	$ 11,250,000.00	$ 11,250,000.00	$ -	$ 11,250,000.00	$ 114,800,000.00	$1,679,017,275.57	$ -	$ 1,679,017,275.57
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	35103	Various County Parks Pond/Bulkhead Replacement	$ 1,187,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,837,500.00	$ -	$ 1,837,500.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	35104	Whitney Drain Rehabilitation	$ 3,300,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00	$ -	$ 3,300,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	35106	Rehabilitation of Various Public Works Waterbodies	$ 11,758,467.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 11,758,467.00	$ -	$ 11,758,467.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	35112	Mosquito Control Plan	$ 1,075,000.00	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ 1,275,000.00	$ -	$ 1,275,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	60046	Fencing at Drainage Facilities Replacement	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 600,000.00	$ -	$ 600,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	60051	Stormwater Basin 272 Fencing Improvements	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000.00	$ -	$ 150,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	80014	Massapequa Creek Stream Flow Improvement	$ 10,501,641.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,501,641.00	$ -	$ 10,501,641.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	80016	Stream and Wetlands Restoration	$ 3,715,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	80019	Storm Water Pump Stations Construction	$ 8,945,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,945,000.00	$ -	$ 8,945,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	80042	Groundwater Studies	$ 1,125,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,125,000.00	$ -	$ 1,125,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82001	Drainage Stream Corridors Reconstruction	$ 8,128,628.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$12,128,628.00	$ -	$ 12,128,628.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82008	Rehabilitation of Storm Water Basins	$ 11,484,878.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$15,484,878.00	$ -	$ 15,484,878.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82009	Drainage Facilities Sidewalk Rehabilitation	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00	$ -	$ 1,600,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82010	Implementation of Storm Water Management Program	$ 5,961,449.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ -	$ 250,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 6,961,449.00	$ -	$ 6,961,449.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82011	Storm Water Pump Station Upgrade	$ 650,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 650,000.00	$ -	$ 650,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82014	Horse Brook Drainage Improvements	$ 7,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,000,000.00	$ 22,000,000.00	$ -	$ 22,000,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82015	Five Towns Drainage Improvements	$ 1,135,575.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,206,384.00	$ -	$ 1,206,384.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82016	Barnum Island/Harbor Isle Drainage Improvements	$ 5,950,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,950,000.00	$ -	$ 5,950,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82017	Bay Park/ East Rockwaway Drainage Improvemtns	$ 3,430,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,430,000.00	$ -	$ 3,430,000.00
3	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District	Storm Water	82018	Lawson Avenue, East Rockway Backflow Prevention	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000.00	$ -	$ 200,000.00
		Storm Water Total				$ 12,450,000.00	$ -	$ 12,450,000.00	$ 7,250,000.00	$ -	$ 7,250,000.00	$ 2,250,000.00	$ -	$ 2,250,000.00	$ 2,250,000.00	$ -	$ 2,250,000.00	$ 24,200,000.00	$ 113,603,947.00	$ -	$ 113,603,947.00
	Sewer and Storm Water Resource District Total					$ 74,700,000.00	$ -	$ 74,700,000.00	$ 88,300,000.00	$ -	$ 88,300,000.00	$13,750,000.00	$ -	$ 13,750,000.00	$ 13,750,000.00	$ -	$ 13,750,000.00	$ 190,500,000.00	$2,057,282,559.57	$ -	$ 2,057,282,559.57
5	Environmental Bond Act	Environmental Bond Act	9E100	Environmental Bond Act - 2004	$ 51,525,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 51,525,000.00	$ -	$ 51,525,000.00
5	Environmental Bond Act	Environmental Bond Act	9E200	Environmental Bond Act - 2006	$ 102,146,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 102,146,500.00	$ -	$ 102,146,500.00
		Environmental Bond Act				$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 153,671,500.00	$ -	$ 153,671,500.00
	Environmental Bond Act Total					$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 153,671,500.00	$ -	$ 153,671,500.00
	Grand Total					$ 196,044,482.00	$ 42,134,449.00	$ 238,178,931.00	$ 197,044,272.00	$ 17,688,000.00	$ 214,732,272.00	$92,912,478.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 105,600,478.00	$ 84,750,000.00	$ 12,688,000.00	$ 97,438,000.00	$ 655,949,681.00	$5,266,210,538.11	$ 30,126,112.00	$ 5,296,336,650.11

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 102 –2016

AN ORDINANCE to amend Ordinance No. 13-2016, adopting the Capital Budget for the year two thousand sixteen for the County of Nassau, corresponding to the first year of the four year Capital Plan, pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2016, pursuant to Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, the Nassau County Legislature by Ordinance No. 13-2016 approved and adopted the Capital Budget (as amended, the "Capital Budget") of the County of Nassau for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 2016 and ending December 31, 2016; and

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2016, pursuant to Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, the Nassau County Legislature by Resolution No. 27-2016 approved and adopted the four-year Capital Plan for the County of Nassau for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 2016 (the "Capital Plan"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 310 of such County Government Law, the County Executive may propose, at any time subsequent to the passage of the ordinance approving the Capital Budget, an ordinance to amend the Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, based upon a review of the Capital Budget priorities by the Nassau County Department of Public Works, proposes that the amounts described herein be authorized in the Capital Budget for certain projects as hereinafter set forth in Appendix A attached hereto and incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Management and Budget has recommended this amendment to the capital budget with respect to the amendment contained in this ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive herein proposes changes as hereinafter described to the Capital Budget that provide for additional programs, projects or activities; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by County Legislature of the County of Nassau as follows:

Section 1. The Capital Budget, as adopted by Ordinance No. 13-2016, is amended as follows:

(i) under the column heading, "Roads", project title, "61587 Resurfacing Various County Roads", the amount listed under the column heading "Cumulative Budget (Pre 2016 Budget)", shall read "$220,650,000", the amount listed under the column heading "Expenditures Through 2015", shall read $190,200,918", the amount listed under the column heading "Carry Forward", shall read "$30,449,082", the amount listed under the column heading "2016 County Debt", shall read "$22,500,000", the amount listed under the column heading "2016 County Self-Funding", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "2016 Non-County", shall read "$18,850,569" and the amount listed under the column heading, "2016 TOTAL", shall read "$41,350,569;" and

(ii) under the column heading, "Roads", project title, "6179A West Shore Road, Mill Neck", the amount listed under the column heading "Cumulative Budget (Pre 2016 Budget)", shall read "$54,966,996", the amount listed under the column heading "Expenditures Through 2015", shall read $26,229,031", the amount listed under the column heading "Carry Forward", shall read "$28,737,965", the amount listed under the column heading "2016 County Debt", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "2016 County Self-Funding", shall read

“$0”, the amount listed under the column heading “2016 Non-County”, shall read “$6,950,543” and the amount listed under the column heading, “2016 TOTAL”, shall read “$6,950,543;” and

(iii) under the column heading, “Parks”, project title, “41872 Wantagh Park Improvements”, the amount listed under the column heading “Cumulative Budget (Pre 2016 Budget)”, shall read “$4,000,000”, the amount listed under the column heading “Expenditures Through 2015”, shall read $1,990,774”, the amount listed under the column heading “Carry Forward”, shall read “$2,009,226”, the amount listed under the column heading “2016 County Debt”, shall read “$500,000”, the amount listed under the column heading “2016 County Self-Funding”, shall read “$0”, the amount listed under the column heading “2016 Non-County”, shall read “$0” and the amount listed under the column heading, “2016 TOTAL”, shall read “$500,000;”

Section 2. It is hereby determined pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”), 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County that each Project identified on Appendix B attached hereto, if any, and incorporated herein as “Type II”, if any, under the heading “SEQRA” is a "Type II Action” within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required. It is further hereby determined pursuant to the provisions of SEQRA, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County that each Project identified as “Type I” or “Unlisted” under the heading “SEQRA” on Appendix B attached hereto, if any, and incorporated herein, has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment. A record of each such determination shall be maintained in a file, readily accessible to the public, at the office of the Clerk of the Legislature.

Section 3. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

Section 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

APPENDIX A

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

11th TERM MEETING AGENDA

RULES COMMITTEE

AUGUST 15, 2016 3:00 PM

Norma Gonsalves – Chairwoman
Richard Nicolello– Vice Chairman
Dennis Dunne
Howard Kopel
Kevan Abrahams – Ranking
Judy Jacobs
Carrié Solages

Michael C. Pulitzer, Clerk of the Legislature

Clerk Item No.	Proposed By	Assigned To	Summary
305-16	**PW**	**R**	**ORDINANCE NO. -2016** AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 13-2016, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SIXTEEN FOR THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, CORRESPONDING TO THE FIRST YEAR OF THE FOUR-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 310 OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 305-16(PW)
306-16	**AT**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION DECLARING A CAPITAL BUDGET EMERGENCY PURSUANT TO §310(D) OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY. 306-16(AT)
			THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MAY BE UNTABLED
A-4-16	**PR**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF NASSAU COUNTY OFFICE OF PURCHASING TO REQUEST OVERSIGHT OF A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU ACTING ON BEHALF OF VARIOUS NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENTS AND HVAC INC. A-4-16
B-4-16	**PW**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO AWARD AND EXECUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND R.J. INDUSTRIES, INC. B-4-16
E-51-16	**TS**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC SAFETY BOARD AND DANIELLE P. RELLA. E-51-16
E-56-16	**AT**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AFFIRMING TO AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL COUNSEL CONTRACT ENTERED INTO BY THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY AND WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN & DICKER LLP. E-56-16

Clerk Item No.	Proposed By	Assigned To	Summary
E-66-16	**AT**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AFFIRMING TO AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL COUNSEL CONTRACT ENTERED INTO BY THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY AND LEVENTHAL, MULLANEY & BLINKOFF LLP. E-66-16
E-161-16	**PW**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND LOOKS GREAT SERVICES, INC. E-161-16
E-182-16	**PW**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, AND D & B ENGINEERS AND ARCHITECTS, P.C. E-182-16
E-188-16	**AT**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL CONTRACT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AND RIVKIN RADLER, LLP. E-188-16
U-16-16	**AT**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE OFFICE OF THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY, AND JACKSON LEWIS P.C. U-16-16
U-64-16	**AT**	**R**	**RESOLUTION NO. -2016** A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AND RIVKIN RADLER, LLP. U-64-16

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

NORMA GONSALVES,
PRESIDING OFFICER

RULES COMMITTEE

NORMA GONSALVES,
CHAIRWOMAN

1550 Franklin Avenue
Mineola, New York

August 15, 2016
3:27 p.m.

REGAL REPORTING SERVICES
516-747-7353

A P P E A R A N C E S:

NORMA GONSALVES (Not Present)
Chairwoman

RICHARD NICOLELLO
Vice Chairman

DENNIS DUNNE (Not Present)

STEVEN RHOADS (Sitting in for Dennis Dunne)

HOWARD KOPEL

DONALD MACKENZIE (Sitting in for Norma Gonsalves)

KEVAN ABRAHAMS
Ranking

JUDY JACOBS

CARRIE SOLAGES

MICHAEL C. PULITZER, Clerk

LIST OF SPEAKERS

KEN ARNOLD. 6

DONNA BOYLE 10

SAMANTHA GOETZ. . . . . .

META J. MEREDAY 18

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I ask all legislators to please rise and ask Bill Gaylord to lead us in the Pledge.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CLERK PULITZER: The Rules Committee. Legislator Carrie Solages?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Judith Jacobs?

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Ranking Member Kevan Abrahams?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer Howard Kopel?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Steven Rhoads for Dennis Dunne?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: Vice Chairman Richard Nicolello?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Donald

MacKenzie for Chairwoman Norma Gonsalves?

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

We have two items for the Rules Committee today. The first item is 305-2016, an ordinance to amend Ordinance Number 13-2016, adopting the county budget for the year - the capital budget for the year 2016 for the County of Nassau, corresponding to the first year of the four year capital plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So moved.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator Kopel, seconded by Legislator Rhoads.

This item is before the Rules Committee.

Mr. Arnold.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken Arnold, Public Works. This item is the amendment of the capital plan for outside funding associated with the West Shore Road project and also road resurfacing. On

the West Shore we're resurfacing - we're allocating ships funding and paid New York funding to these capital projects. And for road resurfacing, we also have two other federal projects that we're allocating the outside funding towards. Page 32 and 33.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Within this is the resurfacing of various county roads, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct, the 61587.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: How many different projects within that?

MR. ARNOLD: We're looking at - for that work to do - page 32 and 33 are both federal projects, and, in addition, two, possibly three county phases of work.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Next is the West Shore Road construction project.

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. And that's the third phase of West Shore, the final phase of the seawall and the road reconstruction.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Lastly, you have Wantagh Park improvements; is that correct?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I see that the

money that we're getting there is non-county funds from Senator Michael Venditto.

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. We have some member item money that we're receiving there for Wantagh Park.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Does anyone else have any questions for Mr. Arnold? Legislator Solages.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you, Legislator Nicolello. Good afternoon, Mr. Arnold. Just briefly.

Is this just resurfacing or are there any traffic sign improvements to these projects? I just want to know. I just want to get some details about these projects.

MR. ARNOLD: On 61587, it's road resurfacing. But when we do road resurfacing we are required to bring handicapped ramps up to compliance, where feasible. If there are curbs that are damaged, we might look to fix the curbs. If there - if drainage structures have collapsed, they will be addressed as part of the project.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But it doesn't include any signage or nothing to that effect?

MR. ARNOLD: No. Signage would be done separately. We identify the conditions of the signs but the signage would come from a separate funding source.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I understand. So if there are any issues regarding signage before these projects, just at least bring it to your attention.

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. We do a full inventory of all signage as part of the project.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Mr. Arnold, just a few questions with respect to West Shore Road.

It's my recollection that there was previously, before the legislature, items to bond the funding for this phase; is that correct?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: So this normally wouldn't be the methodology that we would use to fund a project of this size and scope, is that fair to say?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. We're reallocating CHIPS funding and Pave New York funding from road resurfacing and applying to West Shore because

West Shore is a critical project to get done this year.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: And when you say reallocating, that means that money is being taken away from other projects and applied to West Shore Road because of the condition of the roadway and the public safety issues involved there.

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. We are moving it from one set of work to another set of work.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: And if you could, could you just briefly describe the history of West Shore Road and how this third phase interplays within that history, in terms of collapses and so forth?

MR. ARNOLD: I would like to bring up Donna Boyle, she's the design engineer for it. She can get into specifics on the condition of that section.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BOYLE: Donna Boyle, Nassau County Civil Engineer.

West Shore Road project has been around

for a very long time. It was tabled at one point and then Sandy hit. A portion of the road collapsed. We had another nor'easter after Sandy and a section at the north end, up by the bridge, the Bayville Bridge, also had some damage done and stuff. If you're familiar with that area, you'll notice that we did fix about 1,000 feet of seawall in that area.

The section that is left will run from about 1,000 feet south of the bridge to the end of the first section that we did. There are areas of localized deterioration in that area, in addition to the fact that there are some gabion seawall baskets that have been put there to stabilize the slope, there are some trees that are holding the slope in. If anybody wants to take a walk on the beach at low tide with me, I'll be glad to point out every area that I'm concerned about.

Now, the reason that this section was left for last was because it was in slightly better shape than some of the other sections. The section that we did first obviously collapsed, so that was obviously the worst

section. Further south, again, there were areas of localized collapse but it was a much smaller area of seawall. This last section that we're going to fix, right, will let you have the West Shore Road open continuously.

The reason that the job needs to happen this fall is because we don't want to take West Shore Road out of service during the summer, so we need to be out of there by May. If we start in October we can make May. If we don't start then, then the road will need to be closed for the summer beach season, which you obviously don't want to do.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Which would clearly affect the business owners, restaurants, marinas, and so forth, in the area if it was closed through next summer; is that correct?

MR. BOYLE: That is correct.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: I've seen some of the older maps which I believe took an audit of the road back in 2004. By my count, if I understood it correctly, this section had at least a dozen places that were marked in red on the map as being in danger of collapse back in

2004, so is that was you use as a basis for your testimony?

MS. BOYLE: That map that was prepared in 2004 is obviously in excess of ten years old. Areas that were repaired were not reflected on that map. We have made some interim repairs since then.

The DEC stopped granting us permits to go on the beach. They said fix it right or let it fall. When we found out that they weren't kidding, we had to fix it right. That permit that we have now will let us fix it right, it won't let us make interim repairs. They will be very unhappy is the wall falls in and they lose additional beach.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: And by you - when you say fix it right you mean perform this third phase reconstruction.

MS. BOYLE: Correct.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: And just to be clear, it's your professional opinion that the road is in danger of collapse and that is one of the reasons we need to rebuild at this time.

MS. BOYLE: The road is in danger of

collapse I believe the next time a nor-Easter hits. If we never have another nor-Easter, the road will probably be okay. It will withstand the normal tide movements; however, it does not withstand the nor-Easters.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Thank you.

MS. BOYLE: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Legislator Solages.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: So just to be clear, Mr. Arnold, we're able to get West Shore Road done without the bonding.

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. But we may have to bond additionally for resurfacing where this money would have been applied.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Not to confuse the issue. When you say reallocate, you mean you take the money that was going to be used to pave other roads that are in poor condition and allocate it to this project because this project is an emergency that would leave people stranded; is that correct?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: So to say that you don't have to bond this is really misleading and doesn't really address what's taking place here, is that true?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. At the end of the day we have work to get done. We're just moving the outside funding to the more critical project. But the other roads need to be resurfaced and will be looking for bonding in the future for those projects.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Minority Leader Abrahams.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you. How are you, Mr. Arnold?

MR. ARNOLD: Very good.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I guess I have a question in regards to the actual plan itself, in terms of the phases. I know you started to spell out the phases. And you were kind enough to come to meet with our caucus, in terms of the phases, in terms of what was going to be incorporated. But I guess for clarity, are there any activities that will be undertaken under this amendment that we wouldn't be able to undertake without the

amendment?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. Without the amendment we cannot move on Phase 32, 33, 44, 52, or start the new designs for construction that -

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no. Were they a part of the capital plan originally?

MR. ARNOLD: They might have been part of the budget but we need authorization and signed contracts. This outside authorization allows us to sign contracts to move forward and spend the money.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just so I'm clear. So we couldn’t carry out those activities without the amendment?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct. We are adding appropriation to the capital plan that allows us to enter contracts by identifying the outside funding for the state.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. I'm just trying to make sure I understand it, in terms of a point of clarity, where I'm reading the actual resolution that's been provided to the legislature where it states - and you may not be able to answer this, Mr. Arnold, probably more

for counsel.

It says that he 2016 capital budget would provide for additional programs, projects, or activities and pursuant to Section 310(d) of the County Government Law of Nassau County may be approved only if the County Legislature, by 13 affirmative votes, declares a capital budget emergency; now, therefore be it.

If we weren't able to do things as the current item that's before us and we are changing it, then it sounds like, to me, that this has to pass with 13 votes.

MR. ARNOLD: I believe the emergency has to pass not the actual item itself.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The emergency, yes. That's what I mean.

MR. ARNOLD: That's not my area of expertise. I would ask somebody else to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: My understanding is that the minority has raised these issues with respect to the resolution, the phrasing of it. And the issue that the Minority Leader just raised, we have someone from the county

attorney's office coming down to speak to that. I don't know if he's going to be here in time for the Rules Committee, but this item is also before the Full Legislature. If he's not here, I'd like to move this forward and then move on to the Legislature, itself.

Any other questions for Mr. Arnold?

(No verbal response.)

Any public comment on this item?

MS. MEREDAY: Good afternoon. Meta J. Mereday, Baldwin resident.

Yes. In terms of my questions that have to do with the fact that it was stated that state and federal funding will be used for this - again, not having all the information that you all are privy to, as far as the documents and the attachments, I still would question as to what is the program for participation with regard to service-disabled veterans, since it's a three percent mandate. I know unfortunately Nassau County, we put out a lot of mandates but we just don't put any teeth to it. Again, we're talking about federal dollars as this point. I would be interested to know what is the outreach and what

is the participation from service-disabled veteran-owned business, if any, and, if not, why are we not doing the outreach in this much needed area, considering the bipartisanship, which is very rare in this establishment, passed the Veteran-Owned Business Act back in April with the provisos that this type of outreach and participation would be something that would be made a priority. Again, it was mandated and unfunded, which seems to be a theme here for certain areas, definitely not as it pertains to the county attorney's office and all of the personal service contracts that you continue to approve on a regular basis for all of the legal support.

Again, my question has to do with what are the parameters that have been put in place to ensure that we are reaching some kind of goal that is inclusive of service and veteran-owned businesses.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Mr. Arnold, would you like to respond?

MR. ARNOLD: For the Phase 32 and 33, they're both 80 percent federal money. We follow

all the federal guidelines in our procurement documents, which include any DBE. I have to go back and see on the veterans, how that is applied to that contract. For our other contracts, the department follows Appendix EE, which is our utilization plan, best efforts for MWBE, and if the new service item comes to pass, that will also be included in our contracts.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: The other items you're speaking about are state funding, right? So I'm assuming there's a state requirement in place as well.

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. CHIPS funding is reimbursed, is a county-bid contract and then we get reimbursed by the other. 32 and 33 are actually state review contracts.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: All right. Thank you. Any other public comment?

(No verbal response.)

Hearing none; all in favor of Item 305-2016 signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The item carries unanimously.

Item 306-2016 is a resolution declaring a capital budget emergency pursuant to §310(D) of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: So moved.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator MacKenzie, seconded by Legislator Kopel.

Again, this resolution and the wording of this resolution is the issue that the county attorney must address. Rather than hold the proceedings up any longer, we'll just move this along and have that addressed at the time of the Full Legislature. The Full Legislature meets this afternoon.

Any comment?

(No verbal response.)

Any discussion?

(No verbal response.)

Any public comment?

(No verbal response.)

All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

It carries unanimously.

Legislator Rhoads makes a motion to adjourn, seconded by Legislator MacKenzie.

All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Rules is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Rules Committee recessed at 3:44 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, FRANK GRAY, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby state:

THAT I attended at the time and place above mentioned and took stenographic record of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter;

THAT the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcript of the same and the whole thereof, according to the best of my ability and belief.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of August, 2016.

_____

FRANK GRAY

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

NORMA GONSALVES,
PRESIDING OFFICER

FULL LEGISLATURE
RECONVENED FROM AUGUST 1, 2016

NORMA GONSALVES,
CHAIRWOMAN

1550 Franklin Avenue
Mineola, New York

August 15, 2016
3:51 p.m.

REGAL REPORTING SERVICES
516-747-7353

A P P E A R A N C E S:

NORMA GONSALVES
Chair

KEVAN ABRAHAMS
Minority Leader

SIELA A. BYNOE

CARRIÉ SOLAGES

DENISE FORD

LAURA CURRAN

FRANCIS X. BECKER

HOWARD J. KOPEL

VINCENT T. MUSCARELLA

RICHARD J. NICOLELLO

ELLEN BIRNBAUM

DELIA DeRIGGI-WHITTON

JAMES KENNEDY

LAURA SCHAEFER

DENNIS DUNNE, SR. (Not Present)

JUDY JACOBS

ROSE MARIE WALKER

DONALD MACKENZIE

STEVEN RHOADS

MICHAEL C. PULITZER
Clerk of the Legislature

LIST OF SPEAKERS

FRANCIS BECKER. 12
STEVE CORDEZ. 16
ANDREW ALBRO. 43
REGGIE SPINELLO 51
ANDREW LAWRENCE 58
PASQUALE CERVASIO 62
PAUL BASERMAN 64
BRUCE KENNEDY 68
AMY PETERS. 72
DEBRA DUMAS 74
ANN FISHER. 75
JOHN ROBILETTI. 76
AMY MARION. 77
DAVID BERG. 80
CHRISTIE PAGET. 83
WENDY ROSOW 83
JUDY DIBARTOLO. 85
JOHN ZAZZORO. 86
JEFF PERES. 87
MARCIA SILVERMAN. 88
META J. MEREDAY 92
THOMAS DOMNATO. 95

LIST OF SPEAKERS (cont'd)

DANIELA CROCCIOLLA 97

FRANK HAITEL 100

DAN GRIPPO 104

INSERTS TO TRANSCRIPT

Page 11, Line 2 - Page 12, Line 2

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Even though we're reconvening from August 1, it would be nice to call the roll.

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you.

Deputy Presiding Officer Richard Nicolello?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer Howard Kopel?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Siela Bynoe?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Carrie Solages?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Denise Ford?

LEGISLATOR FORD: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Laura Curran?

LEGISLATOR CURRAN: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator C. William Gaylor, III.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Vincent

Muscarella?

LEGISLATOR MUSCARELLA: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Ellen Birnbaum?

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Delia DeRiggi-Whitton?

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator James Kennedy?

LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Laura Schafer?

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Dennis Dunne, Sr.? Absent.

Legislator Judith Jacobs?

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Rose Marie Walker?

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Donald MacKenzie?

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Steven Rhoads?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: Minority Leader Kevan Abrahams?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Presiding Officer Norma Gonsalves?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Thank you very much.

First of all, we will begin with a procedural resolution. This is something that has been done during the history of this body. It has to do with a proposal for the cemetery in Old Westbury. In order for us to have a hearing down the road, in October, we need to put the item on the record.

Would you call the procedural resolution, please?

CLERK PULITZER: Yes, ma'am.

Procedural Resolution 21-2016 is a resolution directing the Clerk of the Legislature

to publish a notice of hearing on the application by the Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre, New York, Queen of Peace Cemetery to be held on October 19, 2016.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Motion, please?

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: So moved.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Moved by Legislator Schaefer, seconded by Legislator Walker.

Any questions regarding that procedural resolution? It's really a formality, as I just said, in order for us to hold a public hearing down the road.

If there are no other questions or concerns regarding the procedural resolution, then I will ask for a vote.

All those in favor of the procedural resolution regarding the cemetery in Old Westbury signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Any opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The procedural resolution passes.

Now we can proceed to - there were items - I know that there are several people who are here - for the Glen Cove item. However, we did put forth two items in Rules.

The following items were voiced in the Rules Committee. I will begin with Item 37, a resolution declaring a capital budget emergency pursuant to §310(D) of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

Motion, please?

LEGISLATOR WALKER: So moved.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Moved by Legislator Walker, seconded by Legislator Schaefer.

Any questions or comments?

(No verbal response.)

Again, I believe that there were comments in the Rules Committee. Frank, please incorporate them into this Full Legislative meeting.

(Whereupon, the following are the minutes of the August 15, 2016, Rules Committee meeting pertaining to Clerk Item 140-16.)

Item 306-2016 is a resolution declaring a capital budget emergency pursuant to §310(D) of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: So moved.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator MacKenzie, seconded by Legislator Kopel.

Again, this resolution and the wording of this resolution is the issue that the county attorney must address. Rather than hold the proceedings up any longer, we'll just move this along and have that addressed at the time of the Full Legislature. The Full Legislature meets this afternoon.

Any comment?

(No verbal response.)

Any discussion?

(No verbal response.)

Any public comment?

(No verbal response.)

All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

It carries unanimously.

(Whereupon, the following is the continuation of the minutes of the August 15, 2016, Full Legislature meeting.)

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Any other questions or comments other than what were raised in the committee?

(No verbal response.)

Any public comment?

(No verbal response.)

There being none; all those in favor of Resolution 37 signify by saying aye.

MR. BECKER: Madam Chair, we have Lisa Locurto here to answer your questions regarding the - I think the question was about votes necessary to move this forward.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Is Lisa here? We're waiting for testimony.

MR. BECKER: I apologize, Madam Chair. One moment.

Madam Chair, could you move onto something else temporarily? Lisa is --

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: I'm going to call for a motion to table.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Moved by Legislator Walker, seconded by Legislator Ford.

MR. BECKER: We can bring that up later on?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Yes.

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: It was seconded by Legislator Nicolello.

All those in favor of tabling Item 37 signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Any opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The item is tabled.

I'm going to believe at this point in time I may move along and just do - go back to the item that we had convened this body for August 1. I know there were several people who spoke at the August 1 meeting and have put in slips again today. I'm going to ask you very nicely, okay, we heard you once, we will be willing to hear you again. This time you adhere to the three minute rule, and if you're not, then

we're going to have to ask you to step down and come back after everybody else has had an opportunity.

At the August 1 meeting there were - there was a motion to table Item 120 or Item 17 on the calendar, and the resolution was pursuant to New York General Municipal Law with respect to the Garvies Point project in Glen Cove, New York.

I need a motion to untable Item 17.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: So moved.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Moved by Legislator Gaylor, seconded by Legislator Rhoads.

All those in favor of untabling Item 17 signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Any opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The item is now untabled. Here we are.

I don't know exactly who is here to testify on behalf of the project and also on behalf of the City of Glen Cove. I had several people who spoke at the last meeting who were members of the general public. If the Mayor is

here to speak, I think, Mr. Becker, please arrange for those who are from the development and from the City who are going to be here to speak.

MR. BECKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The key question I think before the Legislature the last go around was the percentage that the county would be sacrificing to allow this project to move forward. There were questions as to the percentage. The last time, you may recall, the assessor's office was not asked to be here and was unavailable to give any testimony because they hadn't done any analysis.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Right.

MR. BECKER: Since then, the assessor's office has done an analysis of the project and is capable now of answering your questions, any questions by this body. I have Steve here, Cortez, from the assessor's office.

I believe you all received a letter, a primary letter, I think there was some backup to it. He is here to testify and to answer questions regarding the letter that you received earlier on and any other questions you may have

in regards to the question that was posed and was a concern.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Hold on. His being here at the present time is in keeping with a number of the legislators who had expressed more information regarding the issue.

Legislator Bynoe, Legislator Curran, Legislator Solages and everybody else who was interested in hearing the information that was not forthcoming on the first, primarily because of the lateness of the hour and, of course, the intention of the entire piece of legislation that is before us, I thank you for making sure that somebody is here today to address that major concern that we have. Mr. Cortez, you're on.

MR. CORTEZ: Good afternoon, Madam -

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Tell us about what you found.

MR. CORTEZ: I'm sorry?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Tell us about what you found. Go ahead. Tell us what you have to say.

MR. CORTEZ: Basically, what I would like to start out with is to kind of correct what

former-Legislator Becker said or just modify that a little bit so there is no misunderstandings.

The Department of Assessment did not conduct a thorough analysis of this project, I just want that understood. We did something very, very cursory, something last minute because we were given a couple of days to review this project, a project that is very intense and very sizeable for this county.

What you have in that letter was the intent for us to tell you that basically the best we could do with this in the time allotted was to read the report, look at it, and analyze the methodology and some of the data that was in that report, which is basically what we've done.

We do agree, for the record, with the methodology that was used. We do understand that the City of Glen Cove is a homestead city, where Nassau County is a special district; so there are differences there in the methodology. We realize that they took that into consideration when they did their analysis.

We did do a cursory review of some of the data in the report concerning the residential and

rental rents and expense information that was used. We found it to be within market parameters that we generally use and that we accumulate from our ASIE findings. The best we were able to do was that and to at least ensure that what SES did was consistent with what we do in Nassau County.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Any questions of Mr. Cortez? Yes. Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, are you going to ask a question - yes, no? Not ready. Legislator Curran.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: All set.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: You have to understand something. We are here today to determine the impact on this county. The impact on the City of Glen Cove is the concern of the mayor of Glen Cove and those who are involved in this project. So we are really concerned about, Mr. Cortez, what this impact would be on Nassau County as a whole. Correct?

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Correct.

I sent a correspondence to Mr. Davis on August 12. Do you happen to know anything about the correspondence we sent and why we didn't get a response?

MR. CORTEZ: I was not in the office on Friday so I didn't get a chance to read that or go through it.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: When the cursory review of this determined that seven percent was the correct number, my correspondence basically asks how you got to that number, like some type of formula, a copy of how you came up with that.

MR. CORTEZ: Basically, what was done there - again, it was a very, very crude methodology. I can't say that enough because there was no time to do this. The SVS report took months to produce. We were asked to do this in a couple of days. I can't emphasize that enough to you.

I'm sorry. I know that's not the answer you're looking for -

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: No.

MR. CORTEZ: but that's the reality of it.

Basically, what we did was, again, checked the methodology, used our figures. We came to 7.7 through accounting measures. That

was the best we could do, figuring it leads us in some direction.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: There's a big discrepancy, depending on what percentage we depend on you to give us.

MR. CORTEZ: I understand that.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: The difference just from - Legislator Laura Curran asked last time, the difference from the 15 percent, which our independent financial office thought might be appropriate, down to the seven percent, which is where we are starting from, was 15 million in itself, which is a lot of money to a county that has no money.

I don’t know how anyone can vote on this, to be honest. I've said it before - and obviously I am from Glen Cove, but I also represent the Nassau County taxpayers. We're talking about a 30 year commitment and we don't know how much it's going to cost. As much as everyone might be in favor of seeing a project go forward, I think we need to do our due diligence as representatives of Nassau County and at least table this at this point.

MR. BECKER: Madam Chair, I'm not sure that this letter that was written by our assessor, Jim Davis, that was sent to you and I believe to everyone by e-mail. First of all, I'd like to enter this into the record, this letter. I'm not sure that it ever was. Without reading the entire letter, I'd just like to read the last paragraph to everyone.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Go right ahead.

MR. BECKER: This is from our assessor.

It says, Having reviewed this data, as noted previously, we have concluded that the county's percentage of tax receipts to be 7.7 percent, which is just slightly higher than the 6.7 percent found by Mr. Camalere (phonetic). We attribute to this slight variance in our findings to the lack of time DOA had to conduct its analysis, along with Mr. Camalere's extensive research and reporting of income and expense data.

I'd just like to note that the SVS report is like this big. I think the legislature has seen copies of that. It's pretty extensive.

It continues, we are of the belief that

our slight variance is well within a margin of error such an extensive analysis and project of this size and density, which would appear to support Mr. Camalere's conclusions.

This is from the assessor himself. I just would like to enter this into the record.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Fran, is that letter signed?

MR. BECKER: Well, no it wasn't signed. I don't know why that's so funny. This is all the time. You're suggesting that because it wasn't signed that he didn't write it? I would assume that he wrote it. Because we wanted to scan and e-mail it, I think a signature is perfunctory. This is from him, underlined with his signature. I don't think that's so funny.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I think if he's standing behind it he would sign it.

MR. BECKER: Legislator, you're saying now that he didn't sign it because he doesn't want to stand behind the letter?

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I'm asking

you if it's signed, Fran, and you said no. That's the only question I have.

MR. BECKER: And I answered your question.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: I would be sure -

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I don’t need you to tell me what I'm thinking or what the point of it is.

MR. BECKER: I'm not suggesting what you're thinking.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I just asked if it was signed or not.

MR. BECKER: You're suggesting that he's not standing behind this -

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you very much.

MR. BECKER: letter -

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I'm not suggesting anything.

MR. BECKER: because there's not a signature on it.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I'm asking

if it's signed, Fran. We'll agree to disagree.

MR. BECKER: Clearly written by him and his office.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Mr. Becker, let's move on.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Can I just ask one other quick question?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Excuse me. Mr. Cortez, do you have any more to add to your statement?

MR. CORTEZ: Sorry?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: I said do you have any additional information?

MR. CORTEZ: No. Unless there are other questions I can answer.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Nicolello has a question.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just wanted to confirm certain things. Your statement was your statement, that the party was rather short.

Again, looking at the letter that former-Legislator Becker read into the record, among the other things that were stated here is we, the Department of Assessment reviewed it with in-

house counsel, the appropriate laws which govern the methodology that is to be used to arrive at estimating the value of real property and conducted a review of various Class 2 parcels within the City to compare in this analysis. Is that accurate?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes, it is.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It goes on to say that DOA staff, Department of Assessment staff reviewed and compared the residential and commercial income and expense data used to that - found in our database for similar type property and locations. Was that done?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And the DOA came to the conclusion that the data provided by Mr. Camalere of SVS was well within market parameters for properties of this type and this location.

MR. CORTEZ: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And that both parties, DOA, have - and SVS have utilized appropriate methodologies in accordance with prior practice and the International Association of Assessing Officers standards and appraisal

theory. Is that statement accurate?

MR. CORTEZ: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You reviewed the methodology, reviewed the assumptions and they are appropriate?

MR. CORTEZ: We believe they are, yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So ultimately the percentage that you came up with was 7.7 as opposed to anything above that.

MR. CORTEZ: Yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I have no further questions at this time.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I don't have a question as much as a statement. I do have to render some concern here and put it on the record.

I am a proponent for development. This is something that I've dedicated my life to in developing. I'm finding myself as a crossroad here, in that I feel as though in statement Mr. Cortez has stated that there wasn't enough time allowed to really thoroughly assess and evaluate

the figures and also I feel as though the assessor also, in his letter, stated the same. I feel there is a disclaimer here and that we are, in fact, putting our assessment office at a disadvantage to be able to appropriately advise us.

I understand that there is an urgency, a sense of urgency. I think we've got to slow the train down and we've got to give them the time that they need. We need to have an assessment or we need an evaluation by the assessment department that doesn't come with a disclaimer that there wasn't enough time. I really think that we've got to pump the brakes here and we've got to slow the train down because I'm concerned.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Legislator Nicolello - my apologies. I was still remembering the last hearing. Legislator Gonsalves, may I please speak? Thank you very much.

The analysis that you were discussing with Legislator Nicolello before, is that the same analysis that you called crude?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Okay.

MR. CORTEZ: Well crude to the extent that it's not as in-depth as the SVS report and it's a comparison to data that we use on a regular basis.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But the SVS uses a different number, is that correct?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: To my understanding they use the number that is 11 percent.

MR. CORTEZ: What we did was to judge whether or not what they were doing fell within market parameters, that's generally what assessing does anyway.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: And it doesn't.

MR. CORTEZ: You fall into that range, that's basically what this was. In other words, is there an outlier? Is he, at $2,000 a month, say, for an apartment rent and we're at 4,000? Obviously, that would raise red flags and we would have to get further involved in that.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I'm all about solutions. How much time would you need in order to produce a report that's not crude, as you

said?

MR. CORTEZ: I would think it might be inappropriate for my department to do that. It's not a county project. We don't do analyses of that type. To devote that kind of manpower to that during other parts of our normal timeline, I just don't know that you could do that.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: How could it not be appropriate for your office to determine how much revenue we're giving up?

MR. CORTEZ: I’m saying it would be inappropriate for us to do this type of in-depth study and devote that kind of time and manpower to it. Certainly, if that's the request of this group we would -

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: There's a $30 million difference, to my understanding.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Solages, where did you come up with 30 million?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Just based on the report here that I was reviewing. My colleague from Glen Cove can answer that question.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I know we're going to have other people from the public that will come in and address this even better.

From what I'm understanding, I have the report of SVS. The 11 percent seems to be the number. It's the question of either 15 percent or 7 percent at the last meeting, now they're kind of saying it's a mixed use and 11 percent. The difference between the 11 percent and the 7 percent that they want us to think is where we're starting from is $15 million. I know what this County - for us to give an additional $15 million to this developer, it's a tough hit for the county, it's county taxpayers that are not in this area. I think we really have to think very serious about the commitment that we're going into for the next 30 years.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I just have a question for you, Mr. Cortez.

If you agree that the methodology is appropriate, then how can you disagree as to what they came up with? Especially if it's not

something that your office would do anyway, like, I'm just not understanding how you're getting there. You agree that's the way to get there but they probably -

MR. CORTEZ: We're doing it based on the methodology. Again, you have an issue here where you have properties that have been classified two different ways - some as a homestead property and some, as we do here, using income, so there's going to be some minor variations in there, so that's why I say our numbers are crude. Again, there might be some other things in there that we just didn't see because it got a cursory look.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: It's also not something that you'd be able to do that type of investigation into, is that what you just said before?

MR. CORTEZ: We probably wouldn't because access to certain data that SVS has is just not something people are very willing to give the assessor. As you know, with ASIE it's a very difficult issue.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Nicolello.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Something is not computing about your representation here. You're using terms like crude and limited. I understand limited, that's one thing. Using terms like crude has a certain connotation. Yet, you just said in response to Legislator Schaefer, that there's a minor variance. In fact, Mr. Davis' letter -

MR. CORTEZ: There's a minor variance in the final number.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Right. You get to a minor variance - his term is slight variance. When you're talking about crude you're giving people concern. Ultimately, the conclusion, according to this letter, is that there was a slight variance between what the county comes up with and what the developer comes up with - the City.

MR. CORTEZ: Please understand when I say crude I'm talking about a cursory look versus a 300-page report that somebody spends months on versus what we did in a couple days, in that

sense it has to be crude.

The methodology is what the methodology is. So the income approach and the sales comparison approach are very well established methodologies. Their use and how they function are not crude. But the fact that we couldn't put the time and effort into this, as SVS did, makes it crude, if you will. That's our term for it, however you want to use that term.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: I just have a question of you, Mr. Cortez. If the methodology is the same as it would take weeks or months to do, why would it be crude?

MR. CORTEZ: It's just crude because we don't have access to some of the same data. In other words, I can't go out and verify every piece of data that he has in his report because I don't have access to it like he does. I don't know where he obtained it from. What we did was we looked in our database and we said do these numbers fit into normal market parameters. The answer is yes. That's as much as we can do with the information that we have. Again, it's not as refined as what Mr. Camalere did because, again,

he spent several months doing that and had access to a lot of other data.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Just to sharpen this a little bit further, Steve.

What would you expect, reasonable expect, were you to spend the six months and whatever -

MR. CORTEZ: I'm sorry?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What would you expect - would you expect to find a significantly different last number by virtue of spending several months working on this? As you said, a total analysis -

MR. CORTEZ: I don't expect a big difference because, again, the methodology is the same.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The methodology - so, simply, all you're saying is that you're not reinventing every single piece of the wheel. You're not actually going and verifying every data point. Would that be a correct statement?

MR. CORTEZ: We did not verify the exact data because, again, we can't do that.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I understand. But

what I am asking you is whether that failure to go back and identify and verify every single data point, is that what you mean by crude?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes. Yes.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. Given the data point, do you have any reason to expect that the data point is accurate or that it is inaccurate?

MR. CORTEZ: We believe the data is accurate, at least what we can determine based on -

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The person who did the data, are these people reputable in their field and known to do quality work?

MR. CORTEZ: I believe so. I've known them for a good 30 years.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Is it reasonable for us to them accept the data points that they have provided as reasonable, as accurate?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes. Because, as it said in the letter, they did adhere to appraisal theory, IAA Standards.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So would it not then be wasteful for you to go back and redo all these things?

MR. CORTEZ: If we redid the same steps that they did, we should be at the same number.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: We should be at the same number. What I asked you is would it not be wasteful then, in other words, you said that it's a reasonable thing to accept their work as accurate, in terms of their data. That's what you said, right?

MR. CORTEZ: Yes.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Therefore, then, would it not be wasteful to go ahead and redo all this work?

MR. CORTEZ: You're going to end up basically in the same place, yes.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And you would probably hire the same person or someone just like them to do it.

MR. CORTEZ: That's what you'd ultimately have to do -

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So let's go back and reexamine the word and let me ask you if you'd like to change it and use a different word, instead of crude, would you?

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I don't

know if you should suggest that to someone who is testifying.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I can suggest anything that I seems reasonable to me.

MR. CORTEZ: Again -

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All right. He can suggest, just like you.

MR. CORTEZ: Again, I used that word crude just to emphasize the fact that we don't have a 300-page report. We've got a two-page letter.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No more questions.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Walker.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Just for the record. We would not have done all that work because it is not our project.

MR. CORTEZ: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, one more thing.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: In my letter I basically asked just that, I wanted to

see how you came up with the number that you came up with, what formula you use and -

MR. CORTEZ: I would have to get the accounting section to get that for you, yes.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: And that's what we would like to see, because there is a discrepancy.

MR. CORTEZ: Okay.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Now do you know when you did your numbers, is that for when the project is fully built?

MR. CORTEZ: I'm sorry? I missed the last part.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: How did you get your numbers? Is it when it was complete, the project, or prior to completion?

MR. CORTEZ: I would again have to check with the -

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I think that's kind of important because there is another discrepancy as to whether or not this was looked at correctly, as far as the full built out or partial build out. We really have - it's a really important thing - right - and that's what

we're trying to determine. The bottom line is we don't even know if - what portion you used, as far as your analysis.

SVS did do a decent job, but this is also hired by the developer. So we need to just do our own due diligence, we can't just take it at its word.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Jacobs.

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: Yes. I have just one question to ask you. I understand everything you've said; whether I agree with you, I am not an expert. I can only say that to me a $15 million difference of monies coming into the county does not necessarily render both reports within matching issues.

Look. I'm not an expert on this. I do live near Glen Cove. I understand the concerns there. Talking just on this issue of assessing and - I understand that there are people who are the tops and they had the time - not that you're not tops but they had the time to do what obviously you didn't. But when you say - I think it was Legislator Kopel who said this. They

would come up, more or less, in the same ballpark.

MR. CORTEZ: Assuming that the data is correct and the methodology is correct, the answer is yes.

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: So my dangling question here is then how could there be a $15 million difference in what comes to the county? That's my very layman type, simple concern here. Forgetting everything else about the project, that's what I'm really throwing out to you. I think that that bottom line is what really people up here are asking about.

MR. CORTEZ: I understand your question. It's, again, for the type of report we did I can't answer that, unfortunately, because it's not as refined as the SVS report is.

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: But you'd have to agree with me -

MR. CORTEZ: Oh, absolutely.

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: that $15 million is not a tiny amount of money.

MR. CORTEZ: Right.

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: Okay. All right.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Nicolello.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: There's a difference here because the numbers we've been provided are different. The difference between the requested allocation and the assessed allocation of 7.7 percent as opposed to 6.4 percent, the difference amounts to $4 million spread over 40 years. The discrepancy is not the number that you're talking about, based on the numbers we've been provided. In that context there is the other revenues for sales taxes, et cetera, that flow into the county that's estimated to be in the area of $80 million over those 40 years. So there's a different universe of numbers that we're dealing with.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Can I just have a quick question?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator MacKenzie.

LEGISLATOR MACKENZIE: Could you just give us briefly, describe for us what SVS did. It seems to me that you're using the term crude to describe that you didn't go through specific

properties, specific classes and get the underlying data, which limited your review in scope. You just saw that the methodology they used for that underlying data is correct, with the assumption that their data is correct. So maybe you can give us a brief synopsis of what they did and then what you did in a review of their -

MR. CORTEZ: I would let them give you that synopsis. I wouldn't dare to think I could tell you what's in their report.

MR. BECKER: I'd just like to note, Madam Chair, that the 15 million is discussed, Mr. Cortez doesn't know where that number came from himself. Where did that number come from? SVS?

LEGISLATOR JACOBS: They're basing it on different percentages.

MR. BECKER: I'm Fran Becker. I'm Legislative Affairs from the County Executive's office. Mr. Cortez, I was just asking him about the $15 million figure and he doesn't know where that number came from. SVS is here. If we want to talk about that 15 million, they can testify

to that, if that's an important question to the legislature. Would you like SVS to testify? Please.

MR. ALBRO: Good afternoon. Andrew Albro, Appraiser with Standard Valuation Services, and principal of the firms.

With respect to the $15 million, I can't speak to that either. And I'm not sure where these numbers are coming from. I think the parties involved should speak to that. I can speak to our analysis and entertain some questions, try to respond to what the differences may be between the allocation in the county taxes as part of the whole. But I can't speak to the certain 15 million or any other number. I can speak to how we arrived at the percentage that would go to the county portion of the tax roll.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: So speak to that.

MR. ALBRO: I will.

We were hired - and also to correct the statement made earlier - we were hired by the City of Glen Cove. We're not working for the developer. The initial scope of work that we were asked to do was to estimate the assessments

that the project would have for the various specific components of this project and to determine a real estate tax forecast for the project for the bond financing. Having completed that, we were later asked to, quite simply, calculate, mathematically calculate and allocate the real estate taxes to the various components. There is, within the City, you have the city school district, library, and the city taxes that is readily arrived at by multiplying the concluded values, using the methodologies that are suitable for the city's tax jurisdiction by the city tax rate, the mathematical computation, and the same goes for the county.

I believe the difference or the perceived difference is in the percentage allocation is the consequence of how the different municipalities are required to do their assessments.

You’ve heard the term homestead, non-homestead. That is an option that a municipality like Glen Cove can adopt and they have adopted it. Homestead applies to the manner in which one would assess single family residences, which includes condominiums. The vast majority of this

complex is residential or proposed to be residential. For the homestead option, which must be done when computing the market value in assessment and, consequently, real estate taxes for the city, the methodology is called the sales comparison approach. It's simply a comparison of like-kind sales, arriving at a market value, what I would refer to as a true market value for that type.

In contrast, the county has four tax classifications. For condominiums above three stories in height, which is what is proposed here, they're classified as what is referred to as a Class 2. The Class 2 includes rental apartment buildings, and cooperatives, and condominiums above three stories in height. The valuation methodology that is mandated for that is referred to as the come capitalization approach that universally results in a more conservative, lower valuation because it takes the perspective of the investor, which is not the typical buyer for a condominium. So what we've arrived at is the fact that the City's component for that large section of the project, the

homestead, the condominiums, is a substantially higher value than is typically reflected. I also believe that some of the other percentages, if they're rooted in anything, except arbitrarily assigned, may represent a typical cross section of either city or another municipality. What we have done is started with the specific project at hand, analyzed and valued each component based upon the methodologies that are suitable for each jurisdiction and arrived at the market value and mathematically leads to the allocation. If one was to take an allocation, the perceived allocation that maybe representative of the city at large, it's not going to match what this project is. It's completely different. It's not going to have 80 percent residential, if not more, maybe even higher as far as the size or the complex, and certainly it's not going to have that extent of high-end condos which have to be valued at a much higher rate. So I think that's at the root of the seeming disparity of the percentages assigned.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I was to first get to

some of the qualification.

You, by you I mean the corporate you. You do considerable work for Nassau County as well, isn't that true?

MR. ALBRO: Yes. We work for many municipalities -

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Many municipalities, I meant. In other words, overall, you do work for various municipalities, right?

MR. ALBRO: Yes. That's correct.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: My understanding is that there are standards for appraisers that qualified appraisers are expected to adhere to, is that correct?

MR. ALBRO: Yes, it is.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And you adhere to those?

MR. ALBRO: I certainly do.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I also understand that appraisers that adhere to a set of standards would be expected to arrive at substantially the same, given a very small margin of error, you should arrive, using those standards, should arrive at the same conclusions within a small

margin of error. Would that be a fair statement?

MR. ALBRO: I would expect so if the appraisers follow the standards that they are held to they will apply the appropriate methodology.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Consistently applied you would generally come to a similar conclusion.

MR. ALBRO: Yes.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. Now, what you're saying, if I understood you correctly, is that some of the - you don’t have exactly an apples to apples comparison here due to the various different classifications.

MR. ALBRO: Yes, on two counts. There's not an apples to apples when one compares the methodologies that each jurisdiction must apply. I don't believe there's an apples-to-apples comparison with some of the other - some of the substantially higher percentages that have been floated around. I can't imagine that they would possibly be following the same procedure.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Right. So following those procedures you're unable to justify those higher valuations.

MR. ALBRO: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That's what you're saying. Okay. No questions. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Hi.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Oh. I apologize.

When you mentioned before that the condos were to the much higher extent than anything else. How many condos are there?

MR. ALBRO: I know it's over 500. I have the precise allocation in my report.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: And how many rentals are there?

MR. ALBRO: There are 569 condominiums and 541 rentals.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: The backup for this item says 513 condominiums and 486 rentals. So to say that it's highly, much more homestead because the fact that they're condos, it's almost 50/50, correct? It's like 55/45.

MR. ALBRO: I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Before you

said it's primarily condominiums but it's really not. It's 55 percent to 45 percent. And the difference there, from what I understand - I understand the condominiums going under homestead, because homestead is basically what our homes are rated at, and the rentals would be more of a commercial rating because it's a commercial building, an apartment building, that's where the 15 percent came in, from what I understand, and the 7 percent was homestead. The average that I understood they worked out was to 11 percent.

MR. ALBRO: I can't speak for that 15. I'd be pleased to review and analyze anything put forth.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: How did they come up with a 10 percent that you mentioned last time, the blended 10 percent?

MR. ALBRO: I don't have a blended 10 percent. I have a blended analyses and I've been asked to follow up and compute. I've determined the market values, the assessments, and then off the assessments the taxes. That was completed. Then I was asked to simply allocate them among

the various districts. I didn't compute and arrive at any percent. I've done my analysis first, had my results, and it's a mathematical truism to just take the computed taxes for each section and divide it by the total.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: What percent does the county normally get for commercial buildings?

MR. ALBRO: I don't know if there is a standard. That's a wide-ranging question, what is normal.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Is Maurice here?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: No, he's not.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I think that's important. This is a mixed use project. We're saying 45 percent is going to be commercial and 55 percent will be the homestead. It's really - it's a big difference, that's where the big percentage as to how much the county is entitled to comes from.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The Mayor would like to speak for a moment.

MAYOR SPINELLO: Let me try to -

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: With all due respect, whether you agree or not.

MAYOR SPINELLO: Let me try to speak in vary lay terms on this because obviously I'm not an assessor.

This 15 million or whatever number, what's going on here is quite simply the difference in the assessment is that the condos are assessed for the city. The city assessed those condos at 500 million. The county, because of the income that they assessed them at about 150 million. So your difference is 350 million. That's why the percentage is much lower, because the city can only assess the way they can, as homestead, and the county assesses in Class 2 and Class 4. There is no difference here, okay. The only difference is that one percent, that margin of error. The average distribution that the county gets of taxes in Glen Cove is about 7.5 percent. Actually, it turns out that it's less than that.

When you talk about 15 percent, what you're really referring to, that's if the county assessed the whole project. But the county isn't

collecting the city tax or the school tax or billing them at that rate. The city bills at their rate. The school bills at their rate. The county's portion, okay, in relation to all the taxes is about 7.5 percent, it's actually a little bit less. What we're asking for here is about 6.4 percent. So you would have 21 million. You'd be getting 21.5. Even if that 7.7 was correct there would be a delta of about $4 million.

The real difference here is in the recurring revenue that you're going to get, which totals about over $60 million. There is a pot of about $96 million for the county, of which about $6 million is projected to be expenses. The county has about a 15 time multiple here. So there really is -

We're talking about something and I think we're getting off track. The fact is it is a simple deviation. The amount of money that's the difference - $4 million is a lot of money to anyone over 40 years. In the end, the amount that you're getting - for every million that you say you're losing you're going to pick up over

three million. I think this is becoming something bigger than the whole project.

The whole project is spitting off $622 million in revenue. The school is going to get 292 million. The county is going to get 96 million. The City of Glen Cove is going to get 76 million. The library is going to get eight million. There's over 1,000 jobs here. There's $40 million or more in payroll. There's $50 million going into the local economy.

This is a project that's 20 years in the making. Everything the City has done - we followed all the rules that the City created to try to make this project work. And that brings us right to here. Your vote is critical. There's people here looking for jobs and there's a lot of jobs to be had in the county. I would appreciate you voting on this in your support.

MR. BECKER: Madam Chair, does any other legislators have questions for the assessor - SVS, rather?

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: No.

MR. BECKER: Are we finished?

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I just want

to make one statement.

You're saying it's a simple deviation -

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: You're interrupting.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Go ahead, Norma. I'll wait for you. Go ahead.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Be brief.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: I just want to make one statement. To say a simple deviation, okay, that's great, but we don't know the exact number. How do we know that's a simple deviation? We don't know what we're deviating from. We don't know what we're deviating to. There are so many different formulas, Reggie. Whether or not the building is built out or half built out, the values are completely different.

MAYOR SPINELLO: The whole valuation is done on the build out. It's not done a partial, okay. You're figuring your tax base based on the completion of the project. And there are no different formulas. There is one formula for the City and there is one formula for the County. This is not rocket science. It's very, very

simple. The numbers are real.

The deviation is we're asking the county to take a little bit less, that's it. Everything else is full value. You get the rental taxes, you get full value after year 20. So there's a lot of different components to this. This is the smallest component of all of them in the total value of the project. I appreciate that you're trying to protect, but if we don't have this project we can be arguing about nothing times nothing is nothing. So we need this project to have something in everybody's kitty. This is cash positive from day one for every single jurisdiction.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: My suggesting is that we open it up to the public.

Are you completed with your presentation, Mr. Albro?

MR. ALBRO: I would just like to clarify, because there was a question on the seeming discrepancy in the number of condominiums. I think the number that you had did not include the workforce housing component that I had included in my count. So that would speak to the

different in the count.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: Just for the record, do you want to put the exact amount -

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: What's the workforce housing? What is that number?

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: 111, that's separate. You have a different number for this.

MR. ALBRO: I can explain that.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Please explain it.

MR. ALBRO: There are an additional 56 workforce condominium apartments and 55 affordable rentals, so that would add up to that figure.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: So the 486 for the rental, where did you get that number from? That's in the backup.

MR. ALBRO: The 486 is market rate housing and the additional are the affordable housing.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: And how many condominiums do you have? Because this is over the number that we've been seeing then.

MR. ALBRO: I'm not sure of that.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: If you don't know the number of condos and the number -

MR. ALBRO: We know the number.

LEGISLATOR DeRIGGI-WHITTON: It matters with the rate, just so you understand, what's commercial and what's private.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Right now we have the public out there waiting to be heard. I ask you, once again, to adhere to the three minute limit. If you overstep the three minutes, I'm going to ask you step down and come back after everybody else has had a turn.

MR. BECKER: Madam Chair, he just needs to clarify one thing.

MR. ALBRO: To clarify, there are a total of 569 condominiums, of which 56 are the affordable.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Let's begin public comment. The first speaker is Andrew Lawrence.

MR. LAWRENCE: Good afternoon. My name is Drew Lawrence. I sent all the legislators an email last week outlining what taxes, based upon today's rates, would be without a PILOT and what

it would be if a PILOT occurred and was approved.

As noted in that email, I am pro-development, just opposed to financing it. I spent seven years on the Board of the City of Glen Cove Community Development Agency where we redesigned the project and came to an agreement with Rex Corp in 2012, which required them to finance, construct, and maintain the amenities that this PILOT, in part, would be slated to finance.

Legislation was passed by the City Council in 2013, further recognized the requirement for Rex Corp to finance, construction, and maintain those amenities. And although there was some consideration of a PILOT being contemplated at that time, it was never intended that a PILOT be used to finance any portion of the project. In fact, the Fourth Amendment to the contract specifically stated that neither the City nor its agencies were to provide financing.

Rex Corp claims that the increases in construction costs require the financing. But Rex Corp is not taking into consideration in the

discussion the downturn in the economy that drove the prices down in 2008. If anything, we are only just realizing a slight rise above costs at that time.

The county assessor's letter of 8/10/16 addresses questions from the legislature. It outlines in spreadsheets applied that the non-homestead percentage, which is applicable to about two-thirds of the project, is seven percent. This does not mean a seven percent tax rate. Think of a pie. If you cut a small pie and take seven percent and then taken seven percent of a larger pie, you get more from the larger pie. The information provided as only based on the small pie of undeveloped land. The larger pie, or developed land, at build out is not addressed. However, this was addressed in the spreadsheet that I sent to you.

The PILOT proposal itself raises numerous questions. How did they arise at the figures presented? On what did they base them? What alternative was reviewed? Is the PILOT for the entire project or just the commercial portion? Why don't they ever mention the FEIS or the costs

associated with the project to the affected tax jurisdictions in relationship to the proposed revenue? Why haven't they applied for a supplemental EIS, as this proposal has a major impact on that document and SEQRA would require it?

No explanations have been offered. They continue to put the cart before the horse and both Rex Corp and the city agencies are in breach of contract by doing so.

It keeps being hammered into us that without the project there is no money. But without the project there are also no costs. We're told time is of the essence but the property can't be transferred until next year, when the DEC and the EPA have finished their cleanup. The only rush at hand is the mayor's need to fill a hole in his budget he created using one-shot revenue, unrealized projected revenues, and his threat of otherwise raising taxes to cover it is but a vein effort to get his way.

CLERK PULITZER: Sir, your time has expired.

MR. LAWRENCE: I have one more paragraph.

No matter how you look at this proposal is boils down to the losses of millions of dollars in tax revenue and provides the developer with savings that meet or exceed the entire cost of the construction of the project.

Passing of this PILOT is not in the best interest of the county residents at all. It only serves the interest of Rex Corp. I would respectfully request that this body deny this PILOT for the best interest of the people they serve. I would also further note that the Nassau County IDA has a policy of providing PILOTs that are issued for a maximum of ten years; this is 40.

I also wonder if this proposal would be considered a contract between the City of Glen Cove and the County of Nassau and subject to NIFA review.

Again, please deny this proposal for all the residents of Nassau County. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Pasquale Cervasio.

MR. CERVASIO: Good afternoon. Pasquale

Cervasio, 111 Sea Cliff Avenue, Glen Cove. Thank you for the opportunity you're offering me.

When all the dust settles and all the fog clears there is the reality of $622 million of revenues for all the municipalities concerned - school district, city, county, and library.

One would think that without the PILOTs, without the bond issue we would have more. No. In fact, it's totally not true. Without the PILOTs, without the bond issue we would have nothing. In fact, I would think that the scope of the IDA, this county, this city or whatever other incentive the municipality uses is just that, to grant facilitations and incentives to developers and investors to come into the community to invest and create jobs and create opportunities.

I am willing to bet that Suffolk Count, Essex County, or Sussex County would be more than happy to welcome into their neighborhoods $1 billion development, which it will create at the end of the day, $622 million of revenues for the municipalities.

I beg of you - cut through the clutter,

cut to the chase, see through the fog. The dust has settled. It is time for you to serious give the consideration that this project deserves after having endured 20 years of agonizing scrutiny. Please, please, please approve this project. This is good for the county. It's good for the city. It's good for all the municipalities concerned.

Not only $622 million, but look at what the trickle effect of $1 billion investment will bring into the local economy. It's the factor - the multiplying factor of ten, and that is a very conservative factor, is used, that's $10 billion worth of commerce that will be generate within the community, within the county.

You're not shortchanging yourself one iota. You're only shortchanging yourself of everything if you don't approve this project.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Paul Baserman.

MR. BASERMAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Paul Baserman, Sea Cliff, Nassau County.

I basically have a question to pose to the legislature. Has the EPA ruling happened? I

believe on the basis of that and the assessor's report the whole subject was tabled last meeting. Could anybody answer that?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It was not tabled based on the EPA. It was based on the allocation of the assessor's report.

MR. BASERMAN: Okay. That was my understanding at five o'clock on August 1, that there was an EPA report awaiting. But anyway.

I'd like to make a point about the environmental impact, which is basically the increased population that will be involved in the consolidated sewage and water treatment initiative.

We are looking at a 20,000 resident increase on the burden that's being put upon our system, that is the treatment plant in Glen Cove. Are we prepared for that and an additional, perhaps, 7,000 more residents plus businesses, students, tourists, daily visitors to the area? Could anybody respond to that without recourse to the EPA?

I'm suggesting that that's a 68 percent of the present demand on the treatment plant in

Glen Cove, that is the increased 20,000 new residents from the surrounding communities and the development. Will our infrastructure be adequate? If not, how are we going to pay for a new treatment plant when we're basically floating a bond to pay for this development? I think this is the downstream question that I'm posing to you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We'll be - apparently that was addressed in the report and we can provide you with an answer to that. Counsel is looking right now. I don't know if anyone from the city has the answer at their fingertips, in terms of whether the additional sewage capacities - whether additional capacity exists for any additional sewer usage by the development. Mayor, do you know?

MAYOR SPINELLO: I believe the sewer a capacity of about 5.5 million gallons per day. Right now it's somewhere between three and 3.5 million a day. This project will add about 350,000 a day or something. It's minimal.

MR. BASERMAN: I'm saying in addition to the final consolidation of four communities -

that is Glen Head, Glenwood Landing, Sea Cliff in addition to the present Glen Cove demand.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here's the thing. That is an issue that you can raise with the City and we'll try to get you an answer here. But our focus today is the allocation issue, as to whether the county should accept the PILOT. We are not approving the entire project. We are not overseeing the environmental remediation; that's in the hands of someone else. The only issue for us as a county is to determine we will accept an allocation that's lower than what we would be getting, in terms of taxes.

The report from Camoine (phonetic) Associates does indicate or bear out what the mayor just said, in terms of the additional 300,000-plus gallons per day and that there is adequate capacity of the city to accommodate the project.

MR. BASERMAN: I just reiterate for all assembled that there will be a 68 percent increase -

CLERK PULITZER: Sir, your time has expired.

MR. BASERMAN: My initial statement was under three minutes. I'm engaging in a dialogue.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just finish up. You can finish.

MR. BASERMAN: I lost my train of thought.

My point is that the 68 percent will perhaps overwhelm the system and we will have to replace it somehow, with monies from where? Borrowing? If that's only a city matter and I'm wasting the county's time, then I apologize.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You made your point. There is a response from the mayor and from the analysis.

MR. BASERMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Mayor Bruce Kennedy.

MAYOR KENNEDY: Good afternoon. Ladies and gentlemen of the Legislature, on August 13 I sent you an e-mail regarding the last hearing on this proposal. First off, as I stated in that e-mail, I reiterate that the proposal before you would aid an unlawful action taken by the Glen

Cove IDA in which it has agreed to participate in costs that is entirely the responsibility and legal liability of the redeveloper in accordance with the express terms of an agreement with the redeveloper. Yet, now on the backs of all Nassau County residents you are being asked to support this unlawful financial scheme.

The terms of the agreement cannot be more clear. Unlike the details of this application that have been hidden from your view, a copy of that agreement was provided to you well in advance, having the chance to review it before rendering a decision. Now the IDA and the redeveloper want tax breaks so that the rest of Nassau County residents can subsidize this ill-advised and unlawful financial scheme. For the legislature to approve the resolution is to become complicit in this transgression.

As a point of fact, the redeveloper is also seeking sales tax abatements and mortgage recording tax abatements. As it relates to the proposal before you, there is still a great deal of information.

The city submission of the Garvies Point

Tax Allocation Bi-parcel, as prepared by SVS, is inaccurate. The report claims that the county allocation of property taxes for Class 4 properties is 6.7 percent, but the county assessor's office states it's closer to 7.7 percent. The difference between these two allocation numbers is not within an acceptable margin of error. It is a 13 percent difference.

Despite these two numbers, I have a copy - and I will submit it as soon as I'm done. I have a copy of a 2016 City of Glen Cove tax bill for a property that clearly states the allocation of taxes to the county is 9.9 percent and that was prepared by the City.

Furthermore, the SVS report submitted recognizes that there are Class 2 parcels that provide the county with an 18.4 percent allocation. SVS blended these two allocation numbers and provided a 13.15 tax allocation to the county. I also have that and I will submit it when I'm done.

Whether you accept the 9.9 percent on the tax bill or the 13.15 percent it's a great departure from the 5.5 percent or 6.7, whatever

the mayor is asking for now.

There has been extensive talk about new revenues to the county but no discussion about the costs to the county in introducing 1110 new residential units. It is assumed that the county tax bills sent to property owners closely represent the actual costs of services provided by the county. If I'm wrong in that assumption, I ask you to stop me right now.

I have prepared a spreadsheet of the potential economic impact to the county by accepting the PILOT and deviation schedule being proposed by the city. The proposed properties -

CLERK PULITZER: Sir, your time has expired.

MAYOR KENNEDY: I'm just finishing up.

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you.

MAYOR KENNEDY: Proposed properties were valued by the income capitalization method, and it assumes the current value of the property being $11 million. It allows for a ten year full build out, considerably more time than the city and the redeveloper are promising and a full build out value of $1 billion, the amount the

developer is claiming that he's investing with no markup. Based on these assumptions, the city will be hemorrhaging money due to this project through 2053. While the county will be seeing 96 million in new revenues, it will also experience 168 million in new expenses. The next consequence will be consistent annual losses that total nearly $72 million by 2053.

I ask once again why should all the current taxpayers in the county be forced to subsidize this development for the next 40 years. And I thank you for your consideration and your vote of no. I will submit those documents.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Amy Peters.

MS. PETERS: Hello. Amy Peters, Glen Cove, New York. As Mayor Kennedy noted, my tax bill as a Glen Cove taxpayer is 9.9 percent, so I don't know where they're getting that 7.5 percent or less number from. As Mayor Kennedy pointed out, I also assume that my taxes are basically in line with what the costs are. If it really is only 7.5 percent, where is the other 2.7 percent going? Is that a profit going somewhere? I'd like to know that.

The other thing I'd like to say is I understand that developments get PILOTs and tax incentives to come to municipalities to develop and to create jobs, and I am all for that. Unfortunately, this particular development is being shoved down our throats. They are saying if they can't build it big, they can't build it at all; I don't believe that's true. Long Island Business News just had an article that said When Small is Big and showing that municipalities across Long Island are building much smaller developments and having great success with them, with great resident support. I don't see the residential support for this development anywhere.

The other thing I'd like to say is regarding the tax revenue. They're getting PILOTs, which is substantially less than what the normal tax revenue stream would be. That PILOT was voted on by a non-elected body. Even when Nassau County wanted to take out a $77 million bond for environmental preservation, they put it to a referendum and it was voted by 77 percent yes. So how can a city bond for $97 million with

no referendum? I don't understand how that's even possible.

Now they're taking out a $120 million bond to pay for the public amenities that the developer was contractually obligated to pay for. And now, in addition to that, they're asking the county, the schools, the library to take less when they should be giving 100 percent to each of those tax jurisdictions. I don't get it.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Debra Dumas.

MS. DUMAS: I'm Debra Dumas. I'm from Sea Cliff, New York, Nassau County.

When we walked in here and we were looking for a place to sit, I joked that this isn't a wedding. But actually I think an appropriate analogy might be a shot-gun wedding because, in effect, they are trying to force us into a partnership that we do not want to deliver a massive development that we do not want. Evidently, we are also being asked to supply a considerable dowry.

The Nassau County taxpayers, any taxpayers, should not be subsidizing this

development for an extremely profitable development company. This development is inadvisable anyway, being far too massive for the area. The negative impacts on the traffic, environment, and quality of life will be far reaching and permanent. If it is allowed to proceed, it will be located on what is basically a small peninsula, including several communities, with limited access and, more significantly, limited egress. It is unwise and it unnecessary. I ask you to think of your taxpayers, not the favors that you can do for this profitable company. In the end, it is your taxpayers that have to live with the consequences.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Ann Fisher.

MS. FISHER: Hi. My name is Ann Fisher. I'm from Sea Cliff. I believe the reason you have different assessment figures if you have no like building in the area to compare it to. If this private company believes their project is so great, they should fund it themselves.

I am against this project for

environmental reasons. And as a taxpayer I ask you to vote no and not subsidize private companies.

I would like to be able to afford to live in my home, so please do not give handouts to private developers.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: John Robiletti.

MR. ROBILETTI: Good afternoon. I've been a resident of Sea Cliff for over 32 years and a taxpayer. I also happen to have degrees in environmental science, landscape architecture and civil engineering. So I know a thing or two about site planning, regional planning, and environmental impact. I can say without any shadow of a doubt in my own mind that the impact of this project, the size and scale that it will have on our harbor is going to be way beyond what it can reasonably support. I am very, very concerned.

Not only am I vehemently opposed to the project, but not we're being asked to subsidize it by the very developers that want to build this project. I just find this unbelievable.

It's already been pointed out by you, legislators, that you asked them to come back with an analysis, a revenue analysis that, by their own admission, was done in two days crudely. We're talking about a 40-year commitment of Nassau County subsidizing these people, i.e., the taxpayers. So I implore you to vote no against subsidizing this project.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Amy Marion.

MS. MARION: Thank you. I would just like to say that by speaking here today and by the public speaking here today who is against this project, nobody is raving the procedural defect that by the way in which this resolution came before this committee.

As stated last time, the Rules Committee looked at this resolution, which had an appendix attached to it. The appendix had the significant tax projections by which this committee was to rule, and then that appendix, upon which the Rules Committee voted to pass this to the entire Leg, was then changed. So the Rules Committee has never even properly voted to pass this

resolution to the Full Legislative body here.

The Rules Committee voted on an appendix that had a completely different financial analysis. So, number one, procedurally you don't have jurisdiction to act here. In addition, this same full-body Legislature was called out by the highest court in this state. This is not about the project. It's about the county taxes.

New York State Constitution, Article 16, §1, expressly in bused the state government rather than any locality with the power of taxation. The delegation of any part of that taxation power to a subdivision, yourselves, of the state must be made in express terms. Article 9 empowers municipalities, like yourself, to legislative as to a wide range of matters as long as the local legislation is not inconsistent with the State Constitution or any general law. Nassau County Charter allows the county to pass a tax law by local ordinance and to provide for the administration of local real property taxes. And the Municipal Home Rule Law prescribes the enactment of local Charter legislation that supersedes any general or special law enacted by

the Legislature which - and this is critical to you - relates to the imposition of judicial review or distribution of the proceeds of taxes or benefit assessments. And that is exactly what you are doing here today.

The New York State Constitution and the Municipal Home Law prohibits the county from passing this resolution. Because in effect what you are doing is you are basically enacting, by this resolution, you are in direct contravention to the State Constitution which does not allow you to redistribute proceeds of the taxes or benefit assessments, and that is exactly what you are doing.

In addition, I implore you to look at the tax bill that Mayor Kennedy has given you as an exhibit that specifically says real estate taxes of a Glen Cove resident and the pie chart attached to the tax bill, how your tax dollar is distributed. And the pie section -

CLERK PULITZER: Ma'am your time has expired.

MS. MARION: that has county tax has 9.9 percent. How is it that you could, in any way,

in good conscience, let alone without even having any type of SEQRA review, rule today when your own county assessor has stated that this is a crude evaluation? I don't care what kind of leading questions Mr. Kopel put to that individual, I could put just as many leading questions. When that individual was not pressed, what he specifically said was, well, we don't have the 300-page report. We had a two-page report to look at. And the two-page letter that you are relying on specifically has the wrong percentage.

So I implore you not only to vote no, but please table this until you have had proper time to do an in-depth analysis.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: David Berg. David Berg.

MR. BERG: Yeah. I don't understand how you can do it. I really feel for the members of this board, of this legislative board.

You don't seem to have the proper information and the numbers seem to be shifting ever so slightly this way and that, with the least gust of wind. I think that most of the

numbers offered by the mayor and the developer, in most of the reports that I've seen, are speculative, at best, being that they are so far reaching 40 years in advance. I really don't know how you're going to do it.

I hope you'll make a wise decision, because as a resident of Glen Cove in Nassau County, I'm depending on you, as a taxpayer in Nassau County, I'm depending on you to make to make the wisest decision that you possibly can.

But I don't understand how you're going to do it. It must be difficult when the numbers keep changing.

The last, final environmental impact statement was done in 2012 based on data that was collected. It was approved in 2011 based on data that was collected in 2009. It seems like you need a little bit of updating. It seems like you don't even have the correct number of apartments and that that is even getting updated as we stand here. It just seems like the matter deserves further consideration before you jump to some type of snap judgment.

I watched the Mayor of Glen Cove get up

in front of the school board and talk about how the number of students projected from 1100 new housing units was projected to be 52, when the final environmental impact statement suggested it would be 217. Again, the word final seems to imply some kind of finality. It seems like further study needs to be undertaken about what's really going on here.

I think that you and the citizens of Nassau County, via your decision, may be sold a bill of goods here. I don’t think it's fair.

When I hear the number 1,000 jobs, I frankly ask where are those jobs and what are they doing? I don't see it. I've seen other numbers that are far different from that; again, all speculative. It just seems like somebody needs to stop and take a look at what's going on here before all this money is given to a $17 billion developer.

Thank you.

I'm sorry. I forgot to say something. To quote Mr. Reckler's cousin, it seems like this is a slow start to nowhere.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Christie Paget.

MS. PAGET: Good afternoon. I'd like to start - I'd like to just thank you, to those of you up there today who continue to ask the right questions, those dangling questions, keep asking. The numbers keep changing.

I am so deeply disturbed by the vague, crude BS and the lack of responsibility that I have witnessed more of today, especially by the experts who are supposed to be providing that information.

How can you vote for something that you cannot get straight answers on? I don't understand. I beg of you - please search your conscience, vote for the taxpayers, for the people who also helped to put you where you are today.

My children, who were born and raised in Nassau County, will likely not be able to afford moving back here unless you vote no.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Wendy Rosow.

MS. ROSOW: I thank you all for being able to hear myself and everyone else. I'm shocked at what I have come back to hear and

witness.

First of all, moving to North Carolina is not an option. I've lived in Nassau County for 61 years. I've raised my kids here. My parents have raised their children here and on and on. But what's happening right now as I'm hearing it, in Glen Cove, is something that's not okay. There's a situation that's out of hand. There is not a truth being told, it seems. What I'm hearing is numbers changing back and forth, and back and forth. It's been going on for years. I've been watching it. I've been hearing it. I've been concerned about people's health, their well being. I also would love for people to have jobs. I have no problems with having people being employed. It's a wonderful thing to be employed. But not to be employed to sit here and yell and heckle other people. That doesn't thrill me personally. If that is what's happening, that's a problem.

All I really have to say is very simple - I have been a resident, as I mentioned, for 61 years and I implore all of you to please vote no on the county allocation of Garvies Point PILOTs.

I do support development, smart development, sustainable development, something that can be practiced in a small way where everyone has the opportunity to be a member of a community and not pay where they can't afford to stay.

Thank you for your time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Judy Dibartolo.

MS. DIBARTOLO: Thank you. I am Judy Dibartolo. I'm a nurse living in Glen Cove. I just want to say that I don't want my portion of taxes allocated to this project. I'm very concerned.

As a nurse, I'm very concerned about potentially the lessening of services to our people, which are needed so badly. I'm in the healthcare field. I look at the change that might be occurring. Particularly since this is the first big meeting I've come to, though I've been reading an awful lot about what's going on. It's just too unsteady. There are just too many unknowns, too much information that is just back and forth and doesn't really jive. We have to vote no on this and not let it go on at this level without more deep study.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: John Zazzaro.

MR. ZAZZARO: I'm John Zazzaro. I live in Glen Cove. I own a home in Glen Cove. I own a business in Glen Cove. So I have a lot of concerns with this project.

First and foremost, I have concerns with the health of people that are building there. When they are building, the ramifications of it affecting people in town, in neighboring towns, our town. I really ask the union workers to do their due diligence and make sure that you're safe. I want you here and I want you heckling us. I mean, God forbid something happens like 9-11, EPA said that everything was fine. The people that went there to work and clean up the mess, they are fighting cancer now, various types of cancers. So that's one of my main concerns.

Two. As a small business owner in the City, I can't afford the taxes that we are paying and can't even fathom having to pay more. These sweetheart deals only benefit the builders and hurt what few mom and pop businesses are still left in the city.

Three. The steal that Glen Cove City Council members and IDA members have voted on said it wasn't their deal, it far proceeded them. But I beg to differ. As of, I believe it was, November, when the whole project took on a whole completely different look and size and recently when this $120 million bond came upon us, it became their project. The bond was never given to be handed over to RXR and should have been voted on on Election Day by the City of Glen Cove voters.

Nothing this big or drastic should ever be voted on by council members. Please take your time and make sure everything that is presented is all that should be considered or is there more to it.

If you approve this deal, this deal becomes your deal because not only does it have the GC Council and IDA fingerprints on it, it has yours as well. So please vote no.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Jeff Peres.

MR. PERES: Jeff Perez. I'd like to reiterate what the last speaker said. He's a small business owner in Glen Cove. I’m a

resident of Glen Cove all my life. If you're giving all these developers a break, can you give us a break? Can you give the small businesses in Glen Cove a break?

I urge you to vote no on this. This is taxation without representation. This is a board that votes that's appointed. The citizens of Glen Cove do not want it either, Mayor Spinello.

I was at the meeting a few weeks ago and it was - a month ago, rather - it was a four to three vote, which you were the tiebreaker. Obviously we don't want it.

We struggle. We pay our taxes. We pay our taxes in Glen Cove and Nassau County.

My mother can no longer afford to stay and neither can my neighbors either. Now I'm figuring out where it's going, it's subsidizing everything. I urge you to vote no and to look at it again.

Thank you. This is corporate welfare.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Marcia Silverman.

MS. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. I'm Marcia Silverman, a resident of Glen Cove. Thank you for your time today.

As I mentioned on August 1 when I was here in front of you, I am a finance person. I have a masters in finance, and I am baffled by the numbers presented. So I can't imagine what all of you are going through, trying to get a straight answer on what the numbers are.

A tax revenue alga rhythm is pretty straightforward. There are some calculations. If you know math you can calculate it. It's mostly multiplication. There are a couple of assumptions in this, on the table right now. The two assumptions are what will the value of the land be once it's developed and the other one is what is the ratio of homestead versus non-homestead or regular residential versus commercial, in layman's terms. Those are the two assumptions. We really don't have a clear answer to either one of those because the numbers keep changing. As Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton asked, the expert couldn't even answer those questions.

I'll give you a little information because I read through a ton of these documents myself, to educate myself. One assumption about the value of the land, of the project once it's

completed is this is the City's document before they voted. It says the company, meaning RXR Realty, the company provided all technical information regarding the project, including a description of the plan, uses of the project, the estimated assessed value of the project upon completion. So the numbers are based on an assessed value from the developer. I don't know about all of you but if you could choose your assessed value of your home, wouldn't you discount it a little bit, maybe a lot and pay less taxes?

Again, to Ms. DeRiggi-Whitton's point before, about documents coming from the city or coming from the developer and the county's experts not doing the due diligence that is required to really assess are these numbers right, how can you vote on anything of the sort? It baffles my mind.

On top of that, if you look at how RXR plans to spend the money on this development, you're giving away taxpayer money. We are giving away hundreds of millions of taxpayers' money. In their budget, in the last one because it

changes, there's $2 million alone for advertising and PR. You know that truck that drives around Garvies Point is Great, you know the flyers we get, you know those guys sitting back there, they're probably getting paid today. $2 million going to that when we're giving up taxpayer dollars. What if they - if this project was so great -

CLERK PULITZER: Ma'am your time has expired.

MS. SILVERMAN: Can I just finish this one thought?

CLERK PULITZER: Sure.

MS. SILVERMAN: If this project was so great why are they spending $2 million to allocate towards advertising and PR when that $2 million could be spent out of their money instead of taxpayers subsidizing another $2 million? Right. It's one pocket to another. So why are we paying to be convinced that this is a great project, because clearly it's not. I urge you to vote no.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Meta Mereday.

MS. MEREDAY: Yes. Meta Mereday. Concerned taxpayer, Long Island resident.

First and foremost, as someone mentioned, this definitely should be something that would be up for NIFA review. I feel if we had the inspector general, the independent authority that at least one side of this legislative group has been trying to push and it seems like the deadline is fast approaching and our esteemed county attorney seems to keep dragging out a scenario that could have been addressed weeks ago. We are not, again, affording the taxpayers all of the information that they require, despite whether the report was a two-page letter or a 300-page report.

We're taking on a number of assumptions. Again, the $620 million of revenue, I don't know where that's coming from. People are leaving here in droves. The majority of people who are no longer shopping in malls; again, that's a number that's going down. I just read some place in *Forbes* where they're saying that online is killing the shopping mall experience. So we need to continue to look at that. From what I read,

1200 malls nationwide, 15 percent, are 30 to 50 percent vacant. I don't know how this wish list, that they fill it, all these stores are going to be 100 percent occupied, everybody is going to be working in them, and folks are going to be shopping. When you can look around at the locations that we have now, about the only thing that we're getting more of in Nassau County are 7-11's, 365 Dental, Bolla, and let's not forget - did I mention 7-11's and urgent care, and nail salons and empty buildings. If we can't fill a supermarket in needed communities, how do you think you're going to be put a whole development - people are looking for destinations now.

Glen Cove is beautiful. It's a beautiful area. But as has been mentioned, it is not designed for all of this traffic as well as the infrastructure demands that will be taking place there.

Let's just look at, again, the Nassau County track record here. How much money were we supposed to make with the NICE Bus consolidation; seems like we're paying more for that. You're also looking at privatizing the prison system

that you already have an independent contractor there that's up under investigation; let's check that out. Let's also talk about that illustrious police consolidation disaster and you had more reports for that, more investigations, you had more savings from these experts - I'm still trying to figure out where they are, they must be well paid and living some place in North Carolina, for whomever brought that up.

Again, these projected numbers, miracle, at best, to happen. The cost for the taxes. Someone mentioned that trickle effect. It's a trickle. But we have -

CLERK PULITZER: Ma'am, your time has expired.

MS. MEREDAY: I'm wrapping up. We have a tsunami of taxes and costs. And the lack of consideration for the public comment, for all of these individuals who have been sitting here all day, listening to all of this, for them to have to be subjected to a three minute time limit, when the rambling and the discussion was going on and on - and I'm going to finish before you tell me again - that you allow me to be here. And we

don't want to have that discussion again. I'm just saying.

Again, vote not. Let's get an independent auditor, inspector, or whatever we need in here so you can stop bleeding the taxpayers dry.

Thank you.

One more thing. I really have no trust in federal agencies as it stands. Again, our veterans deserve to have the representation that they have. And when we continue to have these people up here who are representing a contract to say we follow the guidelines, that is not generating the job that I keep trying to come here to demand for our veterans and for our returning veterans who are leaving here in droves.

Yes, I'm a 9-11 responder who was lied to by the EPA. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Roger Freedman.

VOICE: He had to go.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thomas Donnato.

MR. DONNATO: My name is Thomas Donnato. I've been with the City as their assessment

consultant for the past five years.

I reviewed the report by SVS, okay, and I do conclude and agree with the methodology used for the allocations, okay, based on the four corners of the report.

I think the confusion goes back to the different methods that are required to be used by each municipality, as stated by the deputy assessor, Mr. Cortez, earlier. The county is required to value condominiums based on the income approach, where the city is required to value condominiums based on the sales approach. When you compare the two different methods, you're going to produce different ratios or percentages between the two approaches. If you were to value both the same, I'm sure you would see that nine percent that you see on taxpayers, okay, throughout the city. When you use the same method, you're going to have that type of outcome.

When you have different levels of assessment, you can't expect to have the same outcome, and that's what you're seeing there.

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Daniela Crocciolla.

MS. CROCCIOLLA: Can you hear me? Just a quick question. Has it been confirmed, clarified exactly how many stories the two towers are going to be? When I watched the meeting a few weeks ago, Mayor Spinello presented one five-story and a second 11 story. From what the schematics looks like to me, there are two 11 stories. Has that been resolved?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is that accurate?

MS. CROCCIOLLA: I am asking this so when you are voting on this you know exactly what's going on here.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: All right. Why don't you finish with your comments?

MS. CROCCIOLLA: Has it been - do you have the right information, is what I'm asking.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We have the right information. You can continue with your comments.

MS. CROCCIOLLA: Can I ask you what you've been told?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: No. You can

continue with your comments. It's public comment.

MS. CROCCIOLLA: Okay. Okay. I'm just a little late in the game here so I'm just not sure if I'm redundant.

In terms of flood, fire, FEMA, in the event of a catastrophe like Hurricane Sandy, who floats the bill for that? Does FEMA come in? Okay. It does come in.

I'm going to just kind of approach this quickly. I'm not going to take three minutes.

I just want to say, first of all, Glen Cove doesn’t have a direct train. The Oyster Bay line is the least ridership. There is no sensor. There is no structure, no core of Glen Cove. For the past 50 years there has been urban renewal project, after urban renewal project that has failed. Delia's father was one of the only mayors that actually stood up, tried to fight some of the stuff that went on, tried to fight some of the quality of life issues. This project is not going to be the be all, end all that saves Glen Cove.

I give so many of you, from all your

districts, credit. You cleaned up your towns. Long Beach, you cleaned it up. You made it a viable city with train service and buildings where people, young people want to go. This isn't going to be the be all, end all that attracts people. We have Avalon, two of them; they are not filled. All the rest of the apartments.

Glen Cove has become a place where you just throw down concrete wherever and anywhere. You drive through Baldwin - somebody just said they're from Baldwin. I'm there all the time for my job. Drive through Baldwin, Sunrise Highway, you see buildings that are all of similar structure. Glen Cove is old, new, high, low, whatever it is, wherever you want. Don't continue the process. This is your chance to help make Glen Cove right. We need your input.

You turned Long Beach around. You turned a lot of places around.

By putting this through, by approving this, I urge you not to approve it, and by approving it you're just letting another concrete slab to go down that's going to be another

failure of urban renewal, lining the pockets of Albany down. Don't do it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Frank Haitel.

MR. HAITEL: Good afternoon. My name is Frank Haitel and I work with RXR, the developer.

I want to start by saying that we have complete respect for the opposition and, in fact, have made all attempts to engage and speak to them, present the facts.

All of the questions, all of the issues that have arisen that have been mentioned today with regard to planning have been addressed by the planning board. We've been through this for ten years now. Questions about sewer capacity. The number of units. Where the units are located, whether it's one buildings or two buildings. These questions have all been addressed extensively by the planning board in thousands of hours of engineering, architectural, economic analyses, etcetera.

As I said earlier, we've reached out to those that are not happy with the project. We have a welcome center. We meet them. In fact, as recently as last Thursday night we had a large

number of people, including some people who are here, and tried to present the facts. The facts aren't always presented by the opposite side in an accurate way. Just a few examples.

Sewer capacity was represented here, that there are 20,000 residents; that's wrong by a factor of about 10. The actual number of expected residents is about one-tenth of it. The sewer capacity study was done. Again, it was determined that it was adequate.

More important to the issue of taxes here. The key here is without this project there is no deviation to be discussed. Without this project there are no taxes, there is no $50 million in additional economic benefit to the city and the county. The deviation is off of a hypothetical number as opposed to the reality on the ground.

Additionally, to address the timing of the vote. We believe the time is now and that is because the analyses have been exhausted. SVS has done an extensive analysis. Again, 300 pages of analysis. That analysis is exactly what every jurisdiction, including the county, relies on for

every other PILOT program that has been done, that is exactly the methodology, and this project should not be treated differently.

Again, without this project there are no revenues for the county, $96 million, and $622 million in revenues for all the taxing jurisdictions, and that's net after paying all of the costs of essential services as well as the interest and principle in the bond.

I urge you to do what has been on the planning board for, again, over a decade.

CLERK PULITZER: Sir, your time has expired.

MR. HAITEL: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: At this point in time I'm going to call the question. We have had an opportunity to listen to a number of the residents of Glen Cove. We have also had an opportunity to listen to the assessor's office, the mayor himself, and, of course, I believe to my colleagues here on the dais. I am calling the question.

At this time, all those in favor of - I'm sorry, this is the way it's going to go. All

those in favor of Item 17 as presented today signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Any opposed?

(Nay.)

Legislator Curran and Legislator Solages and there are 11 of us, so we have 13 as opposed to five. The item passes 13 to 5.

I know sometimes it's never what you were wishing for. Let's hope and pray. Mr. Spinello, make this happen and make it happen to the best of the people in Glen Cove. And if it happens to the best of the people in Glen Cove, guess what, it has to help Nassau County. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Motion to untable Item 306-16.

We have a motion by Legislator Rhoads to untable Item 306-16, seconded by Legislator Kopel.

All in favor of un-tabling Item 306-16 signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The matter is un-tabled by a unanimous vote.

We were waiting for a speaker from the county attorney's office on Item 306, which is the resolution declaring a capital budget emergency.

Fran, do we have a speaker from the county attorney's office?

MR. BECKER: Deputy Presiding Officer, we have a speaker on the issue of the vote that's necessary on one of the capital projects. Mr. Grippo is going to be speaking, okay.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Great.

MR. GRIPPO: Good afternoon.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Mr. Grippo.

MR. GRIPPO: Dan Grippo, county attorney's office. I was asked to review two clerk items, they were related - 305-16 and 306-16. 306-16, the item requests the capital budget emergency resolution. As I understand it, a question has been raised whether the capital budget emergency is needed.

We, in the county attorney's office, have reviewed Clerk Item 306-16, the resolution for

the capital budget emergency. Under the Charter, §310(D) requires that amendments to the capital budget that add projects, programs, and activities require a declaration of a capital budget emergency and the vote of 13 members.

We, in this instance, dug into the amendment, which is the actual item which is 305-16, and to determine whether, in our view, that specific amendment that was the subject of 305-16 would require a declaration of the capital budget emergency.

Our review has led us to conclude that 310(D) requires the addition of a capital project, to keep it simple. What we have in 305-16, rather than the additional of capital project or projects, I believe there are three categories of project referenced - the West Shore Bridge, the road resurfacing, and Wantagh Park improvements. Rather than adding programs or projects what we have, essentially, is a change in the funding source needed to do the work for these projects. So -

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So we don't need a resolution declaring a capital budget

emergency, is that where you're going?

MR. GRIPPO: That's correct. There is no capital budget emergency. You would withdraw Item 306-16. 305 is an independent item and there could be a vote on that independent.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Let's table that again.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: If I may, before you table, Deputy Presiding Officer.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sure.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Mr. Grippo, I don't know if you were here for the back and forth, the commentary that I had with Mr. Arnold. I thought he had mentioned on the record that some of these items would not be able to be completed if this amendment was not to take place. Does that change your opinion? I'm assuming you didn't not know that. But does that change your opinion if you did not know that? If you didn't know it and it doesn't change your opinion then it doesn't matter. I just wanted to make sure you knew that tidbit.

MR. GRIPPO: In other words, if the item adding - making the amendment to add the funding

were not approved it could jeopardize the timely completion of the bridge project, for instance. Yes, that is my understanding.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So you do have the understanding that there are additional activities that are a part of what we are considering today as part of this amendment and you still believe that this legislative body does not need 13 affirmative votes of the emergency to be able to go forward.

MR. GRIPPO: It's our view that Item 305, which is essentially a change in a funding source for the projects, is not the type of amendment under 310(D) that requires an emergency and the 13 votes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I was asking counsel then why - then why did you submit - why does it have that language when we look at the actual item?

MR. GRIPPO: I was asked to take a look at the two items, at the Charter. I would say that 306, that item was submitted in error. On a closer inspect, it was not necessary for this specific type of financial amendment as opposed

to a project addition. These projects already exist, is my understanding, and this is a change in a funding source, given difficulties with the originally anticipated funding sources. I understand at least on two of the projects was the county borrowing, and there seems to be a difficulty with that at the moment.

This type of financial amendment, in our view, not the type of project activity program amendment that requires the emergency.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We have a motion to table by Legislator MacKenzie, a second by Legislator Muscarella.

All in favor of tabling Item 306 signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Carries unanimously. Tabled.

Item 305-16 is an ordinance to amend the Ordinance Number 13-2016 adopting the capital budget for the year 2016 for the County of Nassau, corresponding to the first year of the four-year capital plan, pursuant to the

provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So moved.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN GONSALVES: Moved by Legislator Ford, seconded by Legislator Walker.

This item is before the committee.

This was discussed in the Rules Committee a little while earlier. Any other discussion among the legislators?

(No verbal response.)

Any public comment?

MS. MEREDAY: My initial question has to do with what are the projects related to this item and if it, in fact, includes anything that is tied to the project slated for Grand Avenue in Baldwin. That's my primary question for that. I don’t have a breakdown of what this is for.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Mr. Arnold is here. Can you answer the question about whether it involves Grand Avenue in Baldwin?

MS. MEREDAY: It does not.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It does not.

MS. MEREDAY: So what areas does it

involve?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I could tell you that, based on his comments before, you're talking about a global countywide project.

MS. MEREDAY: The majority of this, is this also state and federally funded in some aspect?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think it's all state and federal funds.

MS. MEREDAY: Okay. Again I put forth my request, my desire, again, to have, again, some more independence and transparency with regard to this overall process, be it an independent whomever, and to also put forward that we are consistently not doing enough in Nassau County, in a progressive and aggressive aspect, to be inclusive of service disabled and veteran owned businesses, as well as minority and women owned businesses, when you have two laws that are on the state books as well as laws that are on the federal books that prescribe a more aggressive format than the best efforts and let's just put it in two-point type in *Newsday* or however it is distributed out. We continue to

set up personal services agreements for all of these external consultants for legal issues and things of that nature. We're paying assessments and settlements to townships for erroneous property taxes and things of that nature when we can't seem to find a coin or two to aggressively develop our veteran-owned businesses so that we can create jobs and opportunities for them who are leaving and our young people who are getting educations on Long Island but they are leaving here.

With the breaths that I have left - and I am truly, after the number of procedures that I have had in these last two weeks due to my 9-11 exposure - I would like to think at some point that someone up there is listening.

CLERK PULITZER: Madam, your time has expired.

MS. MEREDAY: Always. In more ways than one at this point.

I am again just emphasizing that we need to have more independence, we need to have more scrutiny and more review, and we need to start directing funding to really developing our

veteran businesses, otherwise all of that picture taking for that Veteran Owned Business Act was just - it was just a sad, tired, and unfortunate joke, and I am not happy about it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. Mereday.

Any other public comment?

(No verbal response.)

All in favor of Item 305-2016? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

It carries unanimously.

Motion to adjourn by Legislator Kopel, seconded by Legislator Ford.

All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Full Legislature adjourned at 6:02 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, FRANK GRAY, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby state:

THAT I attended at the time and place above mentioned and took stenographic record of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter;

THAT the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcript of the same and the whole thereof, according to the best of my ability and belief.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of August, 2016.

_____

FRANK GRAY