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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I would
like to call the Rules Committee to order. I will ask Legislator Bynoe to lead us in the Pledge please.

Please remain standing for a moment just to have a moment of silence for those who have lost their lives to this COVID-19 pandemic, to their families, to all those who are suffering in our hospitals, as well as a moment of thanks for our first responders and our health care workers who are on the front lines of this war. Thank you.

Note the record that this room has been cleaned thoroughly before we got here and misted, among other things. That each of the legislators and the public who entered the room, actually the public is not here, but the individuals from the county who entered the room had their temperature checked. So we are taking every precaution. We have separated ourselves obviously and we have a number of legislators who will be participating remotely.

```
                                    If anyone is watching the stream of
```

Rules 4-6-20
this and wants to submit comments you may do so by emailing us to M. Pulitzer at Nassau County NY dot gov. Those emails will be made part of the record.

I will act as clerk and call the roll. Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Ranking
member Kevan Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And I am
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here. That's a quorum. We're going to do things a little bit differently today. We are obviously not having the rest of our committees meet but we have invited all legislators to participate in this Rules Committee meeting. They will able to make remarks, ask questions and the likewise. But Rules Committee members will be the only ones who will be voting on these items.

So we will go to the items first
starting with 77 of 2020. A local law
requiring legislative approval for
compensation paid in connection with the
compromise or settlement of a proceeding in
condemnation or eminent domain. It's a
Minority bill. Moved by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator
Bynoe. I don't know if anyone wants to speak about this.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Good day.
This bill is in response to a most recent item that had come to the floor where the legislative body had approved the administration at the time to engage in an
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effort to condemn a piece of property and take ownership through eminent domain. And the appraised value of that property on record to the legislature had been $\$ 750,000$. The final price for condemnation through the court process was actually $\$ 3.6$ million.

I feel, along with members of the Minority, we feel as though the legislature was precluded from being able to weigh in whether that was a fair and just price for that property, and we believe that this legislative body should have those items in the future come to the legislature so we can determine whether we feel it is a just price. So this item would require in the future that if they receive our approval to enter into these types of negotiations that they have to come back to us for the final actual completion of the process.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think, speaking for Majority, anything that provides more legislative input into the process and provides more transparency and additional checks and balances is something that we would
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be in favor of.
We did have a question, we want to make sure we have this question posed to the county attorney and we will look to get that question answered before the next meeting of the full legislature. But the question is whether this is something, this role in the process, the eminent domain process, is something that complies with state law. To the extent that what we're doing is in compliance with state law, again from the Majority, we certainly would want greater say for the legislature, greater role in transparency.

Anyone want to add anything?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Presiding Officer, just for background, when Legislator Kevan Abrahams and I began worked on this we requested the Minority counsel to engage with the county attorney's office. We had robust conversations and we received confirmation that it was sound based on state law. But by all means please interface and have confirmation of that.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sure. If
it was something that they gave you in writing we would like to have a copy of it.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm not sure
that we do. If we do we will forward it to you. And if not, we will request it and forward something to you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sounds
good. Anyone present or participating remotely? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

81 of 2020. A resolution authorizing the county executive to execute a grant agreement between the county of Nassau acting on behalf of the Department of Parks and the Museums at Mitchell doing business as the Cradle of Aviation.

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer
Kopel. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

MR. PERSICH: Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget. I'm speaking on behalf of the Parks Department. This is
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the annual for the Cradle of Aviation. It's $\$ 600,000$ and it's paid through hotel/motel tax.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is there any questions? Are there any questions? Sounds good. Hearing no questions, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. Thank you Andy.

84 of 2020 is a resolution
requesting the legislature of the state of New York to enact and the governor to approve an act to amend Chapter 269 of the laws of 1979 relating to and authorizing the county to lease certain lands acquired pursuant to the provisions of Article 15 of the Parks and Recreation Law in relation to extending such authorization to lease or permit certain premises.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. Any debate or discussion on this item? Committee members or anyone? Hearing nothing, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Rules 4-6-20
I'm going to call next number of items in a block. They are 86 of 2020. 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99 and that is it. These are resolutions to authorize the transfer of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020. As well as ordinances supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the fire department, the police department, the Department of Health, probation, Nassau County Crime Victims Assistance Program and the Office of Management and Budget.

> Motion by Legislator

DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. Any debate or discussion on these transfers and supplemental appropriations?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We are happy to support $O M B$ in any way that we can. We just want to make clear that these are basically transferring the funding that they are requesting. But we will be reviewing everything that comes before us as far as contracts and everything else. So, we are
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happy to support it but we are also going to be doing our due diligence, as we all always do.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We agree with that. Just note for the record many of these supplemental appropriations are completely grant funded items. So the money is coming from the state to pay for functions to be performed by our county government.

Who did you get the message from?
Let me ask the people remotely. Can you hear the feed? If you are not hearing the feed from the meeting please text. If you are in the Minority text either Delia or Siela. Or if in the Majority just text our counsel, Chris Otsuni. If you are having difficulties we can have Kevin Long take a look at it. I think we're good.

All in favor of those items signify
by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Item 100 is an ordinance supplemental to the annual appropriations -I'm sorry. It's an ordinance to implement a
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local government assistance program in Nassau County.

Moved by Legislator Schaefer. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. This is the sharing of revenues pursuant to state law with our towns, villages and cities. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Item 103 of 2020 is a resolution to authorize the execution of a tax exemption and PILOT agreement between the county of Nassau and Selfhelp Bergen Housing Development Fund Company. The company acknowledged and agreed to by Bergen Place L.L.C.

Moved by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. Dan Deegan representing --

MR. DEEGAN: The attorney for the applicant. I understand deputy county attorney Homel didn't have the technology or something, couldn't get in. So, I will just give an overview of the project. I know some of you are familiar with it, especially

Rules 4-6-20
Legislator Mule whose district this project is in.

This is basically an application to the county by the Selfhelp organization, which is a not-for-profit organization whose mission it is to provide affordable housing to vulnerable populations, including senior citizens.

This particular project that we're talking about today is a property at 8183 South Bergen Place in Freeport. And the proposal is for the Selfhelp organization to build a 45 unit housing development there that would be targeted towards and reserved for senior citizens making 60 percent of the AMI or less.

The project would provide on-site services including social services and health services to the residents there. Have some on-site staff. The project has been fully approved by the Village of Freeport. The project is being financed by low income tax credits from home funds and other financing sources for this type of housing. Those other
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financing sources, including the state, looks for the local municipalities to participate in supporting this type of project through a PILOT agreement.

So, as I say, the village has already granted an exemption for the village taxes but we come to the county legislature to ask for an exemption and payment agreement to cover the county, town and school taxes.

We have negotiated an agreement with the administration after going back and forth, but basically it provides for the current taxes that are on the property to stay intact and to have them escalate for a two year period of time.

The property has gone through quite the process and this project has gone through quite the process to get to this point. It is slated, if we can get this done on this next legislative cycle, it's slated to close on April 30th. We're really trying to keep to that despite the crisis going on. We think of that date. And hopefully when this crisis lifts or slows this will immediately provide
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construction jobs and a boost to the economy in the short run, in addition to obviously the long term benefits of providing a safe place for seniors to live at an affordable level.

The reason for the exemption is that the construction costs are very high and the rents are regulated to be very low. It's hard to make these projects work financially. Various funding sources recognize that.

That's of one of the reasons why they grant subsidies to projects like this and they have in this case and that they do look for local participation from the county and village and that's what we are here today to request.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR MULE: This is Debra Mule. May I speak?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sure.
LEGISLATOR MULE: So I'm very much in favor of this project. I think it will be beneficial in many ways, as Dan mentioned, in terms of construction jobs for the immediate. But more importantly, it will provide 44 homes to seniors at an affordable
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cost, and we know that there is a great shortage of affordable housing for Nassau County. So I think this is a great project.

I have been hearing about this from day one of me taking office, and I know it's been worked on for many years before that because I heard about it as a trustee when I was a trustee in the Village of Freeport. So I do support this project and I hope everyone else will. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you. We've had a lot of questions regarding PILOTS in the past. I know I was very disappointed in the one that happened in Glen Cove. However, speaking with Legislator Mule for the past couple of years I'd say, we believe that this is the type of project that a PILOT should be offered to and we are happy to have additional senior affordable housing coming to the island in Nassau. However, Minority Leader, Kevan Abrahams, do you want to say anything Kevan?
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Basically we really do take the stand that we don't support PILOTS in general. But again, I hope this project is successful.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else want to have a say on this? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Passes unanimously.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Nay.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The
Minority Leader is a nay. So it passes by a vote of six to one on the committee. Thank you.

Before we go into the contracts portion of the meeting we have two additional items on the addendum. Dan, thank you very much. We appreciate it.

MR. DEEGAN: Thank you very much. Stay safe.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You too. Two additional items on the addendum. We need a motion to suspend the rules. Moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of suspending the rules signify by saying aye. Those opposed?
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Carries unanimously.
Item 104 of 2020 is a resolution to authorize a transfer of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020.

That is moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. This is a transfer relating to the purchase of materials, personal protective equipment for the COVID-19 outbreak. It was polled by the legislature and approved. But now we are going through the formality of approving it now. Any discussion on this item? It is one of the reasons why we will be meeting on $a$ regular basis so that these types of items can be put before the legislature and formally approved on a timely basis.

Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

$$
105 \text { of } 2020 \text { is an ordinance }
$$

supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance and to transfer appropriations heretofore made within that to reconcile the
Rules 4-6-20
county's financial records for the budget year 2019.

> Moved by Legislator

DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. This is the year end transfer with an extraordinary amount of funds being transferred. Obviously it's on the addendum. So we have limited time to analyze this. It's done ever year so that they can prepare the CAFR. But obviously we have two more weeks after today so that we will continue to scrutinize this for any additional questions that we might have. But does anyone have any questions on item 105 of 2020?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi. Thank you for coming today. So, what we're trying to do is just make sure we provide everything necessary as far as funding and everything else. Do you mind stating on the record that all the procurement processes that we have in place will continue to be there?

MR. PERSICH: To my knowledge
yes. I just got an email on that that they will have to come for your ratification
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through this body. Even though we are in a state of emergency and the procurement gets a little unique $I$ will say. But it will be coming here for ratification.

With regards to 105, which is the year end one, $I$ just want to put on the record there may be a substitution because the comptroller's office worked feverishly to get this here on Friday. So there may be some small changes to this that $I$ will be adding before the full legislature and I will be glad to answer any questions at that time regarding the balance of the transfers.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Anyone have any questions? Thank you Andy. Hearing no further questions, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

The next area to cover will be contracts. This is the contracts portion of the calendar, and I'm going to call all of them at once. Then we will be considering them individually after that.

$$
B-4, B-9, B-12 \text { of } 2020 \text { are }
$$
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resolutions authorizing the county executive to award and execute contracts between the county of Nassau and Posillico Civil, 192 Branch Interior Services, Inc., Pratt Brothers Inc.

$$
E-50, E-51, E-53, E-54, E-55, E-57,
$$

E-58 and E-59 are resolutions authorizing the county executive to execute personal service agreements or amendments to personal service agreements between the county and PFM Financial Advisors, Crow L.L.P., TRIAD Group L.L.C., Nassau County Bar Association Assigned Counsel Defender Plan, the law office of Vincent D. McNamara, the Safe Center of Long Island Inc., Albrecht Viggiano Zureck and Company and the Nassau County Vocational Educational and Extension Board.

I'm going to actually take one of those items out of there because one of our members will have to recuse himself. That will be the item with TRIAD Group L.L.C., item 53 of 2020. So the rest of those items, however, are now being called. Motion by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by
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Minority Leader Abrahams.
And we will start with the first one, which is B-4. It's a resolution authorizing the county executive to award and execute a contract between the county and Posillico.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken Arnold, Public Works. B-4 is a resurfacing contract called priority phase three. There were four bidders. Posillico was the lowest responsible bidder. It was below the engineer's estimate. The MWBE compliance is at five percent.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions from anyone? I guess we're good. Which are the ones do you have?

MR. ARNOLD: $B-9$ and $B-12$.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Jump to B-9.

MR. ARNOLD: B-9 is a contract
amendment for our asbestos removal
contractor. The contract expired on 4-4 of this month. This is a six-month extension while we put in place our new contract. It's
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also for an additional $\$ 900,000$ capacity of which $\$ 500,000$ and is going towards the rifle range to do remediation on the sand berm for lead removal.

This contractor is in good standing with the department. We have reached out to the Department of Labor. As of March 5th all their violations were satisfied and were in good standing also with the Department of Labor.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: What other areas of the county are in need of asbestos abatement?

MR. ARNOLD: Right now the only major project is the rifle range, which is a lead removal project. But we run across asbestos projects in our normal course of business. Whether our facility guys are working or other contractors where we call this person in immediately to do the removal once we do the monitoring setup.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you.
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Good afternoon Ken. Is that rifle range operating? I mean overall? I don't know about right now but overall.

MR. ARNOLD: Right now I believe it's open to law enforcement. But we have certain bays closed out as we do our work. We can segregate the work.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Is it safe for them to work there now? Is it safe for them to actually be there and use it with the lead situation?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. We just
installed a new exhaust system in the facility. Part of the challenge is the sand is clogging the exhaust system up. So we are changing filters more than we want to. Once we get the sand remediated the filtering system will be much easier to maintain and keep up.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: At this point right now it's a state of the art filtering?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. It's a two-stage filter. We have a prefilter and a HEPA filter.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you. Hi Ken. Thank you for coming today also. Can you put on the record your comment regarding -- never mind. Could I ask Mr. Cleary to come up presiding Officer? Would that be okay?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is he here?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: He's not here.

MS. HORST: Katy Horst from the administration. He should be on. Robert, are you on? I can try to get him on the phone.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
There was just an issue with -- we wanted to get something on the record regarding the IG issues.

MS. HORST: Just give me a minute I'll try to get him on the phone.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
don't want to delay anything today.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Why don't
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we --
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Skip that one?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yeah. We will come back to that one later. $B-12$.

MR. ARNOLD: $B-12$ is our requirements contract for resurfacing. We only had one bidder for this project. We did reach out to bidders to find out what were their issues. We only really have three or four bidders in our pool right now for resurfacing. The issue that most bidders came back with was just the scope of work. That it's not defined. It's fill-in work. And they were putting their resources more towards larger projects.

This contract is a three-year contract plus one year extension at $\$ 4$ million per year. And the MWBE is at 14 percent. I know I always come up here and tell you on a requirements contract we don't have MWBEs. But in this type of work these guys will sub out particular type of contracting work, which in this case is concrete and trucking. So

Rules 4-6-20
they were able to define, based on our engineer's estimate, what that number will be. That number will grow depending on how much work we put into the project.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just a general question. Obviously the county's operations are essential and it includes repaving and projects of that nature. Are we proceeding with our repaving projects? It' seems like this would be a prime time to get those things done.

MR. ARNOLD: The department is
pushing forward all our construction contracts. The focus is on repaving because it's such a problem in the county. But all of our ongoing construction projects were considered essentially. We've been working with New York State ESD to be assured of that. And now we're just working with our contractors and make sure they can do social distancing on the job sites or the disinfectant policies.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: To make sure all the precautions are in place and
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social distancing et cetera. But it still can proceed with those --

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. My staff is working from home to move contracts along. We recognize, the administration recognizes that at the end of this we need to have work out there. So we are working very hard to keep doing that as much as possible.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Right. There's a value here to the county, to the public as well to get the streets repaved. But it's also economically a value to us in general to have this part of the industry still out there working generating income et cetera.

MR. ARNOLD: The department has spent a lot of time the past week putting together processes, the change orders committee, bid openings, everything we need to do to keep work going in a virtual setting.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions on this contract with Pratt Brothers?

MR. CLEARY: Can anybody hear
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me?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is that Robert Cleary? Robert, can you hear us?

MR. CLEARY: Yes. Can you hear me?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We can
hear you. You want to go ahead Delia?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you Mr. Cleary. Would you mind just putting on the record what your response was to the IG's questions regarding this contract?

MR. CLEARY: I'm sorry, which
contract?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: It would be B-9-20 which involves the firing range.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Branch

Interior Services is the vendor.
MR. CLEARY: The question was why was there not material information identified the department reviewed the information and determined that the information did need to be supplemented and was supplemented by the
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vendor but was not in fact material. The types of misuse that were identified, violations that were identified, are commonplace in that industry and they were all resolved to this regulatory agency.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can you specify the violations on the record for us?
MR. CLEARY: There is a list of
them in the package.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Speaking
for the Majority, our counsel has not received the IG's questions on this item. So it's kind of difficult for us to proceed without having seen that, reviewed it. We haven't received it. I think at this point, I mean with respect to Branch Services B-9 we are going to look to table this item. Again, we will be back in two weeks with the full legislature. If we can get the information from the IG at that point and then we can also obviously continue our conversation with Mr. Cleary.

At this point have a motion to table? Moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded

Rules 4-6-20
by Legislator Bynoe. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Majority Leader, if I'm reading this correctly, I believe there was also an IG issue let's say with E-54. I'm not sure if you're aware of that also.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Assigned counsel plan?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Yes. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We will
consider that once we get to that. Obviously that's something we do every year. I'm not sure what the issue could be. It's a state mandated program essentially.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Just
because it said that the contractor's disclosure -- I'm just making sure you're aware of that.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I guess
when we get to 54 we can take that up. $B-9$ has been tabled. Anyone have any questions on B-12, which is with Pratt Brothers? Hearing none, all in favor of that contract signify by
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saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

B-12 has been voted on. We will hold the rest of them until the end at which time we will vote on them as a group.

E-50 of 2020. Again, this is one with PFM Financial Advisors.

MR. PERSICH: PFM is our
financial advisors who does our financial analysis on our bonding and advises us financially on structure of deals and everything else. It's a renewal of a one-year contract. There's different hourly rates. But they have been with us for almost 20 years I want to say. Maybe even longer.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Actually
it's longer than that. It goes at least to the '90s. Anyone have any questions? Hearing none, we will move on to the next one, 51, which is a contract with Crowe L.L.P. That was with the comptroller's office.

MR. BLANCO: Good afternoon
everyone. Sergio Blanco from the comptroller's office to discuss this item.
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First, I want to make sure $I$ hope everyone is safe and sound and everyone's family is okay during this crisis. And on a lighter note, I want to thank everyone for giving me the opportunity to finally shave and get dressed for the first time in weeks. If I could tell you a little bit about this item.

This contract is with Crowe L.L.P. as for two services that we intend to use. The first is for GASB 87. We plan to have this firm's assist us due to the significant number of leases at the county that meet the criteria under new lease standard. As well as the decentralization of the county and the current lack of the technology solution.

With the lack of resources and needed technology and the ability to accumulate of information and prepare the necessary calculations as are required by the Government Accounting Standards Board accurately and timely is impossible without this assistance. Which is why we put forward this contract.

In addition, we are going to use
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this vendor to provide a financial impact analysis as it relates to COVID-19. The analysis will provide a series of projections on critical revenue so that Nassau County can best prepare for recovery of post-COVID-19 environment.

We plan to partner with Crowe L.L.P., a national top ten accounting firm, which can provide external benchmark and financial modeling enabling the county -LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sergio, can you move closer to the computer? It's a little bit garbled.

MR. BLANCO: Again, we plan to do an analysis to provide critical projections on how COVID-19 will affect the county's revenues in particular. We're going to start with a sales tax analysis. Get a modeling tool that will then be extended further out to the county's other largest financial revenue streams.

I will be happy to answer any questions. As well our director of accounting, Lisa Sikoris, is also on the call.
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LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Good
afternoon. It's a little bit hard to understand you, so I may be asking about something that you covered so bear with me.

How is this different than the core function of the comptroller? In other words, it seems like lot of the things you are describing are things that you would ordinarily do directly with your core staff. Why is this different?

MR. BLANCO: Of course COVID-19
is something that certainly none of us have ever experienced in our lives.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No question about it. But is this item strictly related to that?

MR. BLANCO: No, it is not.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: To the extent
that it is not COVID-19, and obviously everyone understands that that is different, but beyond that, what is it that the core staff is not able to do and why?

MR. BLANCO: Lisa can discuss the specifics with respect to accounting as to why
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we need them in particular for the GASB 87 and financial impact analysis.

MS. SIKORIS: Certainly. Good afternoon. This is Lisa Sikoris. I'm the county director of accounting. Again, I want to reiterate what Sergio said earlier. I hope you and your families are safe and well during these times.

So, the Crowe contract is basically two pieces. One is GASB 87 support and the work that they are going to do for us so the county can adopt GASB 87 in accordance with the GASB's time frame and ensure that our financial statements continue to be issued in accordance with GAP.

The second component --
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Forgive me for interrupting but isn't that something that you do every year?

MS. SIKORIS: GASB 87? No. GASB 87 is a new GASB that is being adopted. It's being implemented. The problem that the county faces is that similar to the FASB, the Financial Accounting Standards Board issuance
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on leases, that is governmental entities have to adopt the same type of lease requirements for reporting. It changes the way the county and other municipalities have to report their leases significantly.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: This is a new FASB requirement?

MS. SIKORIS: Correct
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: You anticipate then you are going to need this support every year from now on?

MS. SIKORIS: No. What's going to happen is, because this particular GASB is extremely complex and time consuming and we do not have the technology in the county to manage this. As a matter fact, all the experts are saying that if you have more than 50 leases you cannot use Excel. And at this point so many things under the new criteria will meet the requirement for reporting. Things like easements have to be reviewed. Things that may have been net leases have to be broken out into the lease component like lessee piece and the lessor piece. It is

Rules 4-6-20
extremely, extremely time consuming and --
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Once again -MS. SIKORIS: We don't have the technology.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I understand. Once again, this is not a one change just for now it's a permanent change by FASB, right?

MR. BLANCO: Not exactly. So, for the first two years we're going to need this vendor to get us up and running. If you look at the contract, the next three years are zero dollars. The only expense we're going to have in years three, four and five, four and five the option years, is if we continue to use their technology solutions. Which is a Crowe lease optimizer. That, in of itself, we had a concern when we went out to market we don't want to be beholding to a proprietary technology solution. So it actually can pull the data out to ourselves we want and transfer it to either an internal software solution or a different third party solution.

This is really needed for two years to get us up and running. And if you recall,
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this is such a big undertaking that the administration, in conjunction with our office, issued a directive a number of months back that we had to start getting ready for this. Because that's how big and laborious this task really is. So we're talking about a very large project. Two years afterwards we will transition off and be able to do it ourselves.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That answers that question. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do we have any other questions? Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Presiding Officer. This question I would like to address to Mr. Cleary. Mr. Cleary, this question is regarding the procurement process and whether we feel that -- because I know initially the scope was just for the GASB 87.

MR. BLANCO: If I can clarify
that. I'm sorry to interrupt legislator. The initial scope was not just GASB 87. In fact, the title of the RFP itself included two scopes. It was one GASB 87 and two additional
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as-needed services. In the title we referred to it as other technical services. The RFP did have two sections.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you. But we know that COVID-19 could not have been in their purview at that time. So given the fact -- Sergio, please let me finish. Thank you. Given the fact that COVID-19 was not a part of the original scope and this broadens the scope, I would like to make sure we are not in any way violating our policies as it relates to procurement.

MR. CLEARY: I did review the scope. The scope, although the majority of the scope was GASB 87, the scope itself in the RFP and also in the contract does include additional services. They're not defined as to specifically what their services are beyond public accounting services, including other GASB issues and other public accounting issues. Which I think is sufficiently broad. I think we would have a problem if this contract was not used for GASB 87.

Yes, the reason, the impetus for
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the original RFP was GASB 87. But I think from the outset it's clear that there was a recognition that there would be other additional services that may be required in other public accounting needs. It's true that COVID-19 was certainly not envisioned, imagined at the time that this was solicited. I think that if this contract was used even predominantly for COVID-19 that could be problematic because clearly that was not what the basis of the competition was focused on.

On the other hand, the baffle round included additional services. The contract itself includes additional services. The payment structure includes additional services. The scope itself did speak to non-GASB 87 services.

I think in this case, under these circumstance, this makes sense as a vehicle for this particular need. Especially since we are already a couple of months into the event and soliciting, involving vendors in another solicitation, asking them to put together proposals, asking us to review them during
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this circumstance is probably a distraction from the real focus and possibly dangerous frankly.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Perfect.
Thank you. Just wanted to put that on the record.

And Sergio this question would then be for you. It's expected that we will be able to stay within the contracted amount of \$510,000 coupling these two activities together?

MR. BLANCO: Absolutely. We expect all the services to be within the max amount. We don't plan to come back to the legislature and ask for more money.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you very much.

> Presiding Officer, just for the record, I would like to state -- we know that you saw Ellen Birnbaum and it was mentioned that Josh Lafazan is on the computer as well. But Carrie Solages and also Legislature Drucker are on as well. They wanted that mentioned.
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I believe the Minority Leader has a question as well.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Kevan? Is he still having problems with the audio feed?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just for the record, my questions were tied to the procurement process as it pertains to COVID, the $\$ 510,000$ max. I have no questions.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? I'm reverting back to the way we used to handle things. I guess we're doing this individually now. All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

We are going to skip to E-54 of 2020. It's a contract between the county and the Nassau County Bar Association Assigned Counsel Defender Plan. Andy.

MR. PERSICH: This is the annual renewal for the bar association for 18B. It's been around long in existence similar to PFM. It's the conflict between ILS and then they
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cover. This is for the administrative portion to facilitate the plan. And the funding I think is $\$ 453,384$.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton you had something that the IG reported?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thanks. I understand that some questions were sent out like regarding the IG earlier this morning. I think hopefully we all were aware of them. Do you mind just putting on record what you feel -- if you're comfortable with this or if you want to address each of her concerns if you don't mind.

MR. PERSICH: I believe the questions, which $I$ only received about an hour before the meeting, had to do with some of the disclosures statements. Which I think we had a problem in 2018 with this. That there was some opinion by the county attorney's office that mitigated this requirement with them.

On the record, they have been around for longer than I can remember and the administration, through the bar association,
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and it functions well in the court system that we have the conflict between ILS and 18B over there. This is just to keep the administration, to get the lawyers in court on time and everything else. I am very comfortable with the administration of this program.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
know Rich said it was from the '90s which we have to take his word on.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That was PFM.

## LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:

Anyway, is there anything -- I know that she specifically was concerned with something regarding the plan. The counsel plan the contract disclosure. The counsel plan, is that something that has been around for a while?

MR. PERSICH: This part of contract is for the administrative piece of this, which is for that. But they also administer who gets assigned to the individual branches of the court system. That's done
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through them.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: She had an issue with the assigned counsel plan contract disclosure. Do you know what exactly the problem was?

MR. PERSICH: I don't know specifically legislator. I'm being honest with you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Look, I mean, we didn't have a chance to review this either. There's no way that we can proceed with this until we take a look at the inspector general's questions and get the answers that we need. So, I think, again, we have a full legislative meeting coming up in two weeks. I think this is another contract that we're going to have to adjourn until that time so we have a chance to review what the inspector general is raising.

I will say, again, that this is a program that the bar association provides. It's a needed program. I'm sure ultimately we are going to be passing this along. But we have to do our due diligence.

Rules 4-6-20
MR. PERSICH: I completely
understand this body. I will say this and I get that we have to procure properly, he is in cash strapped position. Just keep that in mind for the next session because we're going to have to expedite it. Because it is an ever revolving fund to keep the administrative piece open. I just want to make you aware of that legislators.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You said
"he is in a cash strapped" --
MR. PERSICH: Talking about the administrator of the program over there, Bob Nigra. This is to fund the office hours and everything else. Just keep that in the back of your mind. It's been long and it's late and I understand that. When we get to the next session $I$ will work with you to get this thing expedited.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you
have the IG's comments with you? The email. Can you tell us what they are specifically so maybe -- do you have something to add Mr. Cleary?
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MR. CLEARY: Yes. In addition to the inspector general's question, $I$ have now a copy of the 2018 email that was sent from Dan Gregware of the county attorney's office explaining the reason the contract was approved previously in a similar fashion. It's speaking directly to this issue. The IG has not seen this email $I$ believe. It's a long email but basically if $I$ may read a little bit. This is from Dan Gregware and I can share this with everyone.

It is my opinion that a principal questionnaire form for the 18B Nassau County Bar Association Assigned Counsel Defender Plan administrator substantially complies with the county's requirements with respect to the individuals that need to complete the principal questionnaire form for the below-referenced contract.

Historically, the administrator is the individual that has completed this form on behalf of ACDP and this has been sufficient. The administrator is the day-to-day manager and exercises substantial control over ACDP
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and would therefore be the appropriate individual that should complete the form.

It should also be noted ACDP is not a traditional county vendor for the following reasons. One, the amounts provided to ACDP under the pending agreement are 100 percent reimbursable under state grant.

Two, ACDP is specifically
referencing the grant agreement as the ultimate recipient of the grant funds which is attached to the pending contract.

Three, the purpose of the agreement
is to improve the mandated services in accordance with the grant.

Four, the county is essentially acting as a pass-through of these grant funds from the state to ACDP.

And five, ACDP's sole function is to administer the county's mandated 18B indigent defense services.

So basically it's a mandated contract with a mandated vendor and this is the appropriate individual running the program. And that is why the county
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attorney's office previously, and again would as reaffirmed, believes that this is the appropriate filing process.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think
the IG raised a second question however. That does not address the second issue.

MR. CLEARY: The second question regards the political campaign contributions?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes.
MR. CLEARY: As of today, we checked the system this morning and there are no reportable contributions from the individuals that would have to be named in that form.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The
individuals that have to be named in that form who is that? Is it the administrator and president, vice president, treasurer and secretary of the Nassau County Bar

Association? Those are the individuals that have to be identified?

MR. CLEARY: That's my understanding but $I$ would have to confirm it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And the
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representation is that there were no political contributions by any of those five individuals?

MR. CLEARY: Again, that's my understanding. I would have to confirm specifically the five names to be able to answer clearly.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I'm just referring to the titles at this point.

MR. CLEARY: Yes. Those are the titles we are looking at, yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Just in
listening to the debate in light of the fact that obviously there is funding issues with the program itself based on the time limits of the contract. My understanding is, and I'm just throwing this out there, that the concern with respect to the disclosure requirements is that we want to make sure that this contract isn't being awarded based on some sort of political contribution that was made by one of the officers of the corporation. And in this
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particular instance you have a mandated vendor and a mandated service. A mandated contract.

So, I don't know that that actually
is a concern in this particular case because they are the only game in town so to speak. Even if somebody did make a contribution to a candidate it wouldn't have impacted the awarding of this contract in any way.

So, I would feel badly holding up this contract on a piece of information that in this particular case isn't relevant. Which is why, I would imagine, that exemption was granted back in 2018 or at least part of it.

MR. CLEARY: I believe so. I also confirmed yes, all the individuals named were checked.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Does anyone else have any other comments to make? I think Legislator Rhoads' approach is the correct approach. I agree with his analysis of this and I think we should try to move this along. They are providing a needed service. We don't want the officers over there to go without being paid and to put those hardships
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on the people that are administering this program under these circumstances would not be something I think would be in the interest of the county.

And of course you need, notwithstanding the COVID-19 outbreak, these services are still being provided to indigent persons who have been charged with a crime. The program has to continue. Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I agree that it's such an important program and we're going to do that. It still goes back and I know nothing's perfect and especially with what's going on we're probably going to have more issues in the future, but to have something that comes in late and doesn't really give the IG time maybe to review everything. And then we get it the morning of a meeting. We don't want to leave ourselves open to make a mistake on any contracts.

So, I'm also going with the trust that my colleagues have for the importance. But really we need to try to do the best we
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can to keep things done in a timely way so that we're not missing anything.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think also factoring into our equation is the fact that obviously the IG's office is hampered as well. Obviously they're working probably on a short staff, if not from home. They have been very prompt and thorough with their reports to date. So the fact that they got these to us this morning is probably the result of what's happening generally. We have to be a little bit more flexible at this time to make sure we keep the operations of government going forward.

Anyone else? Thank you Robert.
Let's move on to E-55, a contract with Vincent McNamara. Does anyone have any questions with respect to this? This is for the retention of Mr. McNamara's firm with respect to several actions that are currently pending against the county of Nassau. Anyone remotely have any questions about this item, E-55?

Hearing none, the next item is
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E-56. It's a contract with change -- I'm sorry, we're not calling that one. E-57 is a contract with Safe Center of Long Island, Inc. it's A contract with the police department for support services regarding domestic violence, sexual abuse and child abuse. $\$ 250,000$ increase to a new maximum total of $\$ 1.25$ million.

Any questions on the contract with Safe Center? Hearing none, we will move on to the next one.

E-58 is a contract with Albrecht Viggiano, Zureck and Company. That is also via the comptroller's office. I don't know if the comptroller's office wants to weigh in on this one. Sergio?

MR. BLANCO: Good afternoon everybody. This is essentially a contract close out from the comptroller's office's partner vendor who helped us prepare the CAFR. We do have a new vendor that this board did approve a few months back. But this is for out-of-scope additional services that were performed by the vendor over the last two
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CAFRs.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: These services were already done?

MR. BLANCO: These services have already been performed, that's correct.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Shouldn't you have come to us before they were done?

MR. BLANCO: I'm sorry, I didn't get that question.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What I had ask
is that the request for the additional funds should you have asked us for that before you already had the services done? In other words, you are already obligated for these services. For the money.

MR. BLANCO: I wasn't able to catch that one.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Why don't you get closer to your computer instead of standing. You might hear us better and we can hear you better. The question once again was, this is for money that you've already spent essentially?

MR. BLANCO: We did. That's
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correct. The contractor did contemplate that should any additional services be necessary they would be subject to additional approvals. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What I mean is, shouldn't you ask us for this money before you spend it?

MR. BLANCO: Lisa can elaborate, but this was essentially services that were performed while we were worried about getting the CAFR out in time. Failure to do this work and to go back to the legislature before we can get the work done could have risked our CAFR being released on a timely basis. The consequences of that can be rather grave. It can impact our bond rating.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I wasn't questioning whether or not you should have used these people or extended it. The question was, why didn't you come to us before you go ahead and spend the money? Before you obligate for the services. In other words, before instead of after. You've already spent it. We don't really have a choice now is what I'm saying.
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LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: The services were performed is that what you're saying?

MR. BLANCO: That is correct, the services were already performed. Of course the legislature has the authority to reject this amendment and the vendor will have to take other recourse. That is authority granted --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I get that but that wasn't the question. The question was, ought you not to have come to us before we are in that kind of situation? In other words, before you go ahead and have the authorized services. The point of this whole exercise by the legislature is to decide whether or not something ought to be done. This was already done essentially giving us no choice and that's not the way this is supposed to work. You should come to us before you go ahead and contract for the services.

MR. BLANCO: And we agree with
you. And for what it's worth sir, in the contract with the new vendor we've
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specifically written in there that we're going to require written approval before we authorize any out of scope work. Because we again learned from this experience and we wanted to address that in a subsequent procurement. Which we did indeed do. We agree with you sir. To the best of our ability, unless obviously exigent circumstances indicate, which we do not expect, we will not do that again and will seek approval from this body for any additional out of scope work for services in the future.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: For any
services for any vendor?
MR. BLANCO: Any services, correct.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Does
anyone else have any questions for Sergio? Hearing none, we will move on to the next contract which is E-59 of 2020. A contract with Emergency Management and the Nassau County Vocational and Educational Extension Board. This is a contract that provides
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services to our Nassau County 71 volunteer fire departments as well as EMS. They have been providing these services for many, many years. This contract is apparently a three-year contract totaling $\$ 110,000$. The only question $I$ have Katy is --

MS. HORST: It's a total amount of 1.1 million.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: $\$ 300,000$
per year somewhat. In excess of that. I thought last year we passed a contract with VEEB for two years and NIFA rejected it. Is there any concern that NIFA may not accept this three-year contract with VEEB?

MS. HORST: I don't have an answer for you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think we will do it anyway because $I$ think it's a good idea. They have a long-standing issue with trying to -- making sure their operations continue and each year when they have to come back to us at some time it's delayed and again they have the same issue in terms of paying their employees and things. So I think it's a
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good idea for stability and it's a good idea to make sure that they get paid for the services that they are providing to the county, which are essential.

MS. HORST: Absolutely.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else have any questions or comments?
Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's not directed to you Katy. This is more for the benefit of NIFA just so that they understand the services that are provided by VEEB. All of the training for every volunteer fire department takes place through VEEB at the Nassau County Fire Service Academy. The training for EMS personnel, volunteer EMS personnel, takes place through the Nassau County Fire Service Academy and through VEEB. When we're talking about providing a critical service, especially in light as you can see of the reliance that we have on our volunteer ambulance and fire services in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and just general services provided to the county, those
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services are absolutely essential and continuity of operations without having to worry about budgetary considerations, which this three-year contract provides, is absolutely vital to that program being able to continue to function.

In the past, when it was simply one-year contracts, at the beginning of the year there was always a question as to whether VEEB was going to have to shut down because the approvals couldn't take place fast enough for them to be able to continue to pay salaries and continue to run their operation. This solves that problem.

So, if anyone from NIFA at any point in time actually looks back to the minutes of the legislature, why would they consider what we have to think? know that the reason that this is being passed as a three-year contract is because it's vitally important to their continuity of operation and the service that they provide is vital to the residents of Nassau County. That's why it's being done.

Rules 4-6-20
LEGISLATOR WALKER: I would just have to agree with Legislator Rhoads. If we didn't have our volunteer fire fighters right now and our ambulances and everything that they are doing we would be in an awful mess. Because I can tell you my radio goes off continuously that they have COVID-19 cases that they have to roll out for. So, they have always been an invaluable service but we see that more now. So I think it's very important and hopefully this gets approved by NIFA.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions?

E-49 of 2020 we are going to have to untable that. Motion to untable by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. This is a contract with the county attorney and Sokoloff Stern.

Katy, you want to speak on this? All in favor of untabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Katy please.
MS. HORST: I will tell you I am not prepare for this one. I did not know this
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```
one was going to be untabled today. I'm going
to ask if anyone from the county attorney's
Office is on the line? Brian Libert?
MR. LIBERT: I'm here.
MS. HORST: Go for it.
MR. LIBERT: If you just give me
``` a moment to read my notes. Similar to you, I was not aware this was going to be untabled. If you could give me a moment.

I can speak on this item now.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Yes please.
MR. LIBERT: Brian Libert from the county attorney's office. This is an amendment with Sokoloff Stern with regard to the Galloway contract. This was basically a prior contract with regard to a conflicts matter on a previous case and the county attorney is trying to extend that contract into this Galloway matter and that will be to completion on the Galloway matter only.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Any questions
anyone? No one? Thank you.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Do
you remember why we tabled this?
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MR. LIBERT: Yes. I believe that the presiding officer made a point about having contracts be on specific individual contracts, which the office has understood and we are taking that directive very seriously. But certainly in this instance it would be useful at this point to be able to use the funding that's in place. But that's initially why it was tabled.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The one
item that we still have to call is item 53. I
think Legislator Rhoads is going to recuse himself. Will not be participating or taking any part in the debate and/or vote. This is a contract between the county and TRIAD Group. I don't know if \(I\) had a motion before but I will take one now from Legislator Bynoe. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Anyone want to speak about this?

MR. PERSICH: This is our third party administrator for worker's comp claims. Been with us since 2005 I want to say or six.
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Somewhere around there. They administer all the claims and help us in claims processing. Additionally, this TRIAD was the lead trying to get the money back from the state from the 15-8 stuff that we did last year. I know there were some questions from the IG on this. So \(I\) don't know if this is going to make it today. But this is not an urgent one I will say.

MS. HORST: The IG just checked the boxes currently are reviewing and investigating and with results of our review investigating pending. So we don't know her exact questions at the moment.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So then we can't proceed with this one.

MS. HORST: Correct.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Take a motion to table from Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? That item is tabled by a vote of six to nothing.

So now we have the contracts that
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have been discussed. Why don't we invite Legislator Rhoads back in.

First of all, we voted on two of them already. E-51 you said. And E-53 we just tabled, correct? The remaining items that we have discussed that will be before the legislator that have not been voted upon are \(B-4, E-50, E-54, E-55, E-57, E-58, E-59\) and E-49. Any further debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

I think the business of the Rules Committee is done for today. I would like to thank everybody for participating whether remotely or in person and the next meeting of the legislature will be in two weeks.

Motion to adjourn? Moved by
Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
(Committee was adjourned at 2:25
p.m.)
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