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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So I am
now going to call the Rules Committee to order. Vice Chairman Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Minority
Leader Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I am
here. That makes a quorum.
We'll start off with the regular items on the committee agenda.
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\begin{gathered}
\text { Regal Reporting Service } \\
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\end{gathered}
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Rules 6-8-20
116, an ordinance making certain
determinations pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act and authorizing the county executive of the county of Nassau to accept on behalf of the county an offer of purchase from Nassau County Land Bank Corporation of certain premises located in Woodbury.

Note for the record that Legislator Bynoe is recusing herself. She left the room and will not be participating in any debate, discussion or vote on this item.

Moved by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. The item is before the committee. Is there anyone to speak on this item? 116.

MR. PAVEL: Craig Pavel, deputy county attorney on behalf of the Office of Real Estate Services on the item Woodbury Road.

This is a parcel of property in
Woodbury. It's a parcel of property that has gone out for requests for proposals a few times and we haven't had success in selling
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it. So the Office of Real Estate Services is proposing to give the land to the Nassau County Land Bank for purposes of affordable housing. I'm here for any other questions and I believe also the director of the land bank is here to speak.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do we have questions from the committee? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you. Is this going to be one house or you going to have multiple housings with this project.

MR. PAVEL: There is no house there currently. If that was your question. It's a wooded area and that perhaps is part why it's been difficult for us to release this parcel in the past. But the development I believe, and the land bank can confirm, would be for one affordable house.

MS. RUSSELL: Good afternoon. My name is Bridget Russell. I'm the executive director of the Nassau County Land Bank. Our desires is actually to put multiple dwellings

Rules 6-8-20
if possible. Have them work with an engineer and we're hopeful that we will be able to build several town homes on that lot for this considerably --

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So several town homes that's what you're hoping for?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. Our desire is to do that to help with the tax burden. Also just something affordable for the individuals who will purchase this.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Is the property zoned for several town houses?

MS. RUSSELL: It's zoned currently for residential. You would have to go to the BGA in order to get approval of the building for multiple family dwellings.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: My question then is, my understanding is there's a restriction from the Planning Commission's action that it be a single, one-family residence. So is it still possible to build
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town houses or multiple residences on this property if we pass this?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm not aware of that determination. I am aware that it is a sloping property and that issue because there's slope on the property and that this is specifically zoned right now for a single family. Our hope and desire is to be able to build multiple homes if possible.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else? I think it's in the resolution, which somebody just texted me, it's in the Planning Commission resolution, which is right here but I can't see it.

MR. PAVEL: Can you repeat the question? I'm having difficult hearing you. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It says in the whereas paragraph of the Planning Commission determination that the property was never sold and is now being proposed for transfer to the Nassau County Land Bank for the development of an affordable single family residence. Is it your position that it doesn't restrict the county from going ahead
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and doing a town house of some kind?
MR. PAVEL: In order to answer
the question $I$ would probably want to speak with somebody maybe at the Planning

Commission. But you are correct that your observation in the contract is, as you say the whereas paragraph, and I believe that the Land Bank is very well equipped, they're
represented by attorneys and they have
developers and their plans, I have full confidence, should be within the confines of the contract.

I cannot at this moment
specifically without more information in front of me fully grasp what the plans of the Land Bank are and whether they would be combined with the terms.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This is a committee hearing and the full legislature would not be for three weeks. If the committee wants to we can move this along and get the answers to that question between now and June 29th if that's acceptable to everybody.

Rules 6-8-20
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Can I ask a question please?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes
Legislator Drucker.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Good
afternoon. Could you tell me exactly where on Woodbury Road this parcel is?

MR. PAVEL: Yes. I'm just
referring to the appraisal report. I believe it's north of the expressway. And let me just confirm that. It's 302 Woodbury Road in Oyster Bay.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Woodbury
Road in Woodbury?
MR. PAVEL: Yes.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: It's a wooded parcel? There's no building to come down?

MR. PAVEL: Yes, sir, it is a wooded parcel with some sloping issues. It's got $I$ know from the appraisal report it has some sort of ponds or streams going through it. It is a completely undeveloped, vacant land with woods.
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LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: And what is the appraised value?

MR. PAVEL: The appraised value, sir, I believe it is $\$ 380,000$ as per the Land Bank's appraisal report dated as of December 5, 2019 .

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: How big is the parcel?

MR. PAVEL: The parcel I believe it is about, yes, it is 138 feet by 129 feet. However, it is an irregular shape and therefore the exact square footage I'm not positive of. But the appraisal report indicates 17,424 square feet.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Then I have a question regarding the Land Bank. How many units did you say of affordable housing will be built there?

MS. RUSSELL: We don't have a specific number of units right now. We are working with the engineer to see what we can fit pursuant to the town code that would allow us there. However, the building that we have been doing now we were doing single family
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homes on 4,000 square foot lots. Yes. In the Village of Hempstead.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Do you have an idea, Ms. Russell, about how much the rent would pay from for one bedroom, two bedroom or whatever the configuration is going to be?

MS. RUSSELL: There wouldn't be rent. Our desire is for homeownership. So it will be sold at either 80 percent AMI or less.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Do you have a price range on that what it would be?

MS. RUSSELL: It's somewhere around $\$ 320,000$.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: How did they arrive at that number?

MS. RUSSELL: It's based on the area median income and based on the HUD regulations. And that's about around the pricing that we have been determining our homes are for. The homes are about 1500 square feet, three bedroom, one and a half bathrooms with full basements. So we've arrived at that number based on the HUD regulation.
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LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Would there
be a big variation of disparity if the lot was
in another area of Nassau County?
MS. RUSSELL: The AMI is
determined I believe based on the county. Area of the income of the county.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay. Thank
you very much. Thank you presiding officer for allowing me to ask the question.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any time Arnold. Any other questions? I think the intention is to get some clarification on what can and cannot be done on the property between now and June 29th.

All in favor signify by saying
aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
120 of 2020 is an ordinance supplemental to annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the medical examiner.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. Actually we have to invite Legislator Bynoe back in.

Any debate or discussion on this item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by
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saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

123, a resolution authorizing the county executive to execute a grant agreement between the county and the Women's Opportunity Rehabilitations Center, Inc.

Moved by Legislature
DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. Any debate or discussion on this item? Again hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

124, 125, 126 are resolutions to authorize the transfer of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020 .

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. Any debate or discussion on these three? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

127, 128, 129, 130, 131, ordinances supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of
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Health and the Department of Social Services. Moved by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Any debate or discussion on these items? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. 132 is an ordinance supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Management and Budget.

Moved by Legislator Schaefer.
Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Item 133 of 2020 is an ordinance to adopt the Nassau County budget for Nassau County Community College for the fiscal year commencing September 1, 2020 and ending August 31, 2021 and to appropriate revenues and the total amount of monies to be raised by taxation within the county for the purposes of Nassau Community College for such fiscal year.
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Moved by Legislator Bynoe.
Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. I would just note for the record that traditionally with the college budget we tee it up the budget in the committees and then have a full discussion and presentation at the time of the full legislature. I'd also note however there's been an ongoing issue with the college in terms of two programs for students on the autism spectrum. Those programs, the Aspires Program and the Achilles Program, had been slated to be terminated and the college has now indicated to us those programs will in fact be restored and continued. Some of the details of that have yet to be worked out and some communication needs to happen, but we are optimistic that we can reach an agreement and go forward with the budget and maintain those two programs.

Anyone else want to discuss or debate this? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

134 of 2020 is an ordinance
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supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Public Works.

Moved by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator
Bynoe. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

136, a resolution to ceremonially designate a portion of the county road known as Old Country Road from the intersection of Kalda Lane to the intersection of Central Park Road in Plainview as Heroes Way and directing the Department of Public Works to install conspicuous signage along said roadway.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. Any debate or discussion? Anyone want to chime in? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

137 is a resolution to designate a portion of the county road known as Underhill Boulevard between Jackson Avenue and Queens Street in Syosset as Gus Scutari Way and
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directing the Department of Public Works to install conspicuous signage along said roadway.

Moved by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton and seconded by Legislator Schaeffer. Any debate or discussion on this item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

140 of 2020 is a resolution authorizing the county of Nassau to file an application for federal assistance with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

141, 142, 143 are all ordinances supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the correctional center and the board of elections. Actually I'm going to rephrase that. We already passed 142, 143. This is simply an ordinance supplemental to the annual appropriation in
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connection with the correction center.
Moved by Legislator Schaefer. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Now we have one other item which we will consider in a little bit. It's on the addendum. But for now we will go to the contracts. I'm going to call them all at once and we will hear them individually.
A-11, a resolution to authorize the commissioner of shared services to award and execute a purchase order between the county and Anderson Fire and Rescue.
A-27, A-31 a resolution ratifying
the commissioner of shared services award and execute a purchase order between the county and Acute Care Gases. Second, pulsar Eco Products.

B-8, a resolution authorizing the county executive to award and execute a contract between the county and Welsbach Electric Corp.

> Rules 6-8-20

$$
\mathrm{E}-70,71,72,73,74,75,76,81 .
$$

These are resolutions authorizing the county executive to execute personal services agreements or amendments to personal service agreements between the county and Aciss Systems, Adelphi University Institute of Parenting, Hispanic Counseling Center, Mercyfirst, Liro, Ken Maguire and Associates and Avenue Enterprise Solutions.

Lastly, E-78 is a resolution making certain determinations pursuant to SEQRA and authorizing the county executive to execute a permit agreement between the county and Historic Hudson Valley.

Just for the record, $E-81$ is also included and involves a personal services agreement and it's with Cornell Ruffian Equine Specialists.

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. Now we will consider each of the items. First two are with the police department. They are A-11 and E-81. Anyone from there the police department?
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MR. FIELD: Good afternoon.
Deputy Inspector William Field.
I'm here for the first item is item A-11-2020. That is for the Hendrickson Fire and Rescue Equipment. They authorized a sole source agreement with Hollowmark Sales and Service. They are providing us with a dealer-service technicians who have to maintain certification on their items for maintenance purposes and warranty purposes.

Hendrickson was the actual -- the dealer will be able to provide us with the dealer-service technicians. Emergency services is currently operating Hollowmatrum Grant equipment. New tools will also be compatible with our current system. In case there is ever a need to have interchangeable tools if a tool breaks or something at an operation of an auto accident or something similar. And it is in total it's grant federally funded $\$ 172,000$.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Deputy
inspector will you just give your name for the record again.

Rules 6-8-20
MR. FIELD: William Field.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any debate or discussion on this contract? Let's go to the second one.

MR. FIELD: The second item is item E-81-20. This is a contract between the police department and Cornell Ruffian Equine Specialists. They will be providing us with veterinarian services for our police service horses. These services include diagnostic exams, emergency medical care, emergency surgery and all required vaccines and medications. It is a term of contract for a five year contract. An RFP was issued in October of 2018. Cornell Ruffian was selected as one of the two top scoring proposers. The committee consisted of the police department's mounted unit as well as members from our police department field bureau. It is a total max value contract of $\$ 50,000$.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This
contract seems to be somewhat late in terms of January 1, 2019. Is there a reason why it's late?
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MR. FIELD: Yes. There were two separate things that came up. The first was the vendor's attorney happen to go on long term sick. So there was a delay in negotiating the contract until she came back. And after that there also was a delay due to the fact there were concerns around finishing the disclosure forms in the county portal. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions or discussion? Thank you. We will move on to the next one.

I don't know if Kevin Long is still here but I think it would helpful for us if we could see the speaker when they're speaking. I know when you do Zoom sometimes the speaker lights up. Right now Howard is taking up most of the screen. They don't have cameras. Okay.

Next two are with emergency management.

MR. PERSICH: Good afternoon.
Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget. A-27 is for the purchase during the pandemic to purchase $\mathrm{KN}-95$ masks through
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another vendor. It was at the time we were having a supply issue of getting masks. It's was one of the vendors that $I$ think they found other at OEM and we were able to procure these masks quickly and easily.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That was

 A-31, right?MR. PERSICH: That was A-27. I'm sorry, A-31. I apologize. I have them backwards.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Why don't you cover A-27 while you're here.

MR. PERSICH: A-27 at the initial onset of the pandemic the need for ventilators was of great concern. So, we ended up finding a vendor who had about 100 refurbished ones. The original order was for 930,000. We luckily didn't need all of them and we only purchased 20. And these were deployed I think through NUMC and A. Holly Patterson.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you know if those ventilators were actually used?

MR. PERSICH: I don't know.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you
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know where they are now?
MR. PERSICH: They're still in our possession. The actual whereabouts I don't know. I want to say they were deployed A. Holly Patterson but $I$ can get that information for you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions?

MR. PERSICH: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We're good
Andy. Next contract with public works, B-8, Welsbach Electric Corp.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken Arnold,
Department of Public Works. B-8 is a contract that provides daily $O$ and $M$ assistance to the department's traffic management center field operations. The department received two bids which Welsbach was the lowest responsible bidder. The contract is a three-year term and is reimbursed 80 percent by the federal government. This work has always been contracted out. It has never been done by CSEA members. It is similar as our signal maintenance contract has always been done by

Rules 6-8-20
contract.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Has the CSEA raised any objection about this?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, they did. They object to it and we responded that it was never contract work. That we were going to proceed without their concurrence. This is similar to the other item that was tabled last session for the office operations of the same group. That was I think E-66.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
have any questions? What's the time frame of this?

MR. ARNOLD: The preceding
contract was expired. We're currently using my central maintenance contract to fill on this operation while we wait for this contract to get approved.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi
Ken. Do you think it would be possible to get county employees to do this task in the future?
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MR. ARNOLD: This is very
specialized work. I don't believe it would be an easy undertaking to get county employees that can do this work and keep up with the technology and the training that's required to manage this equipment.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Most of this contract is for labor, right? It's a minimal amount for material?

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. Most of it is the operation, inspection and repair of our field equipment to the TMC which includes cameras, modems, all kinds of computer-related items.

> LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: All
right.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator

 Schaefer.
## LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi

commissioner. Why was CSEA opposing it or why were they speaking up about it? Is this not a job they do now?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. It is not a job they do now. They've opposed
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most of my contracts recently and this is one of them along with the Pederson contract, the other contract. Historically they have never done this work. The TMC has only been open I think a little less than ten years and it's always been contracted out.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Is it something they fought to try to get the work for in the past?

MR. ARNOLD: No. This is the first time they have opposed it to my knowledge.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: From my
end, I think we need to hear from the CSEA. Just get their perspective on this item. Provided there's no emergency nature to it and the services are being provided to the county.

MR. ARNOLD: It's being provided
but it's being provided at the expense of other work that we want to do. The work that is being provided currently cannot be reimbursed.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Can
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Welsbach, somebody given the contract, can that be reimbursed?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. This contract
is reimbursed at 80 percent.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: How much
work do you have slated for the next three weeks that would go within the scope of this contract?

MR. ARNOLD: It's probably
minor. I want to let you know it's not reimbursed as is current.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think we
need to do our due diligence and find out what their position is. We can agree and perhaps there's a way that we can -- if this is becoming an ongoing issue with public works contracts maybe there's a way we can sit down and figure out a way to go forward.

MR. ARNOLD: I'm not sure they gave any feedback on the other item.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I don't believe they have yet. We will pursue that. We have a meeting in three weeks. Hopefully we can go forward.
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Motion to table? Legislator
Schaefer. Seconded by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Tabled.

Next three are with the district attorney's office. I see Mr. McManus up on the screen. With A-70.

MR. MCMANUS: Bob McManus. Sorry about the problems. Item $E-70$ is an agreement between the district attorney's office and the Aciss Systems, Incorporated. This is a continuing agreement with Aciss. They provide software support and upgrade services for 32 concurrent users on four servers that include modules or various electronic surveillance systems.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions for Mr. McManus? Let's go to the second one.

MR. MCMANUS: E-71 is an agreement between the office and Adelphi University. The goal of the partnership is to reduce recidivism and prevent intergenerational involvement in the criminal
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justice system by advancing an initiative which seeks to support healthy environment and provide services to children whose parents and guardians have been arrested and/or incarcerated.

E-72 is an agreement with the Hispanic Counseling Center for the Batterers Intervention Program which is intended to help families who have experienced domestic violence.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
have any questions?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi.
I know the technology is difficult but I just want to make a note that all three contracts are anywhere from I believe eight months to 12 months late. Just going forward if we could try to address that issue.

MR. MCMANUS: The two agreements, Hispanic Counseling and the Adelphi University were delayed because the state has added restrictions in how forfeiture funds can be used. Due to our unfamiliarity with the new restrictions, these contracts were sent to the

Rules 6-8-20
state Division of Criminal Justice Services for review and it took quite a while to receive a response.

In terms of Aciss the delay -- I also -- let me go back and say that Adelphi was also very slow in submitting the required disclosure forms due to the number of principals at the university who are required to submit principal questionnaire.

Aciss Systems' delay was due to protracted discussions regarding technical requirements resulting from newly installed equipment and discovered software in our office.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
appreciate it. I know it's going to be difficult with all the issues that we're going through now also, but try to keep the contracts as timely as possible. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions for Mr. McManus? We're good. Thank you Bob.

Next items are with social
services. E-73 is a contract with
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Mercyfirst.
MS. LAURIE: Maria Laurie.
The Mercyfirst contract is to
provide not-secured description services to JD youth that are placed briefly by the court prior to disposition. I know it was very late. It was done timely by social services but it was delayed by Mercyfirst. It was sent back to the department in part.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions, debate or discussion? Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The next item, which is E-74, it's a contract with Liro.

MS. STANTON: Nancy Stanton, IT.
E-74-20 Liro GIS. The ceiling is $\$ 950,000$. Original contract was submitted in 2015 for $\$ 500,000$. There was a subsequent request for an additional $\$ 300,000$ in 2018. This contract expires November 2020. New supplemental staffing contract in it's final stages of completion. We currently do with this contract one, specialized supplemental staffing in assessment that works on tax
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mapping, verifying boundaries, apportionments, group lots together.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is that it?

MS. STANTON: Yes. Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions, debate or discussion? Thank you Nancy.

Next item is with the county attorney's office. Contract with Ken Maguire and Associates.

MR. LIBERT: Good afternoon legislators. Brian Libert from the county attorney's office.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Go ahead.
MR. LIBERT: This is a contract with Ken Maguire for legal services related to the Valhar against Nassau County case. It also covers services that were performed under what's known as ASIE litigation. However, the firm is no longer handling that litigation and this is to close out that case and only move forward on the Rawla case. This will only be a single matter on this contract going
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forward.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions or discussion? I think we're good. Thank you.

Next contract is with the county clerk's office, E-76. It's with Avenu Enterprise Solutions.

MR. BUTLER: Good afternoon. John Butler fiscal officer of Nassau County Clerk Maureen O'Connell's office.

E-76-20 is an amendment to the existing county contract for document management software services utilized by the county clerk's office. The amendment triggers the final optional one-year extension of all faucets of the electronic document management system software, as well as for a license for property fraud alert monitoring, hardware and maintenance and recognizes several business changes since inception of a contract with the original vendor.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: John, can you tell us how much of the contract is going to the property fraud alert function?
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MR. BUTLER: It's a very
de minimis amount. It's about approximately \$10,000. It's a very small add-on license. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Otherwise, this is a contract that allows the clerk's office to have electronic filing for all litigation that takes place in Nassau County; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: That is correct.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else have any questions on this contract? Do you know how many people have signed up for the fraud protection?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. As of today we have about approximately 2500.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: What's the capacity? Is there a limit to how much you can handle?

MR. BUTLER: I don't believe that
there is. I can look into that and submit it back to you guys separately.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think it might be something that we would all like our constituents to know about. It's an
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additional area of protection for them.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I have a question.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Go ahead.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Are you
talking to me? I don't know.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: My question
very simply is, how difficult would it be to expand this at the routine type of protection to pretty much every block and lot in the county? In other words, have a flag which would trigger an alert to anyone any time a document was recorded improperly? Would this be a tremendously big expensive deal to do that?

MR. BUTLER: I would have to get back to you with further details on that, but I believe not honestly. It's a pretty simple, straight software license. But I will take a look to see if there's a ceiling as to what the system can deliver or handle and I will get back to you guys on that.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: If we can as a
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matter of routine extend this to all of our residents that would be a tremendous service. And right now I think nobody knows about it. 2500 people signed up out of how many properties? It's minuscule.

MR. BUTLER: Good point. Yeah. We can take a look into it. I believe the total parcels in the county are somewhere between 400,000 and 500,000 . So if we have 2500 people on board that's certainly a tip of the iceberg there. Your point is understood and taken.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other debate or discussion on this? Thank you. We are going to move on to the last contract which is with Parks and the Historic Hudson Valley. Do we have a speaker from Parks?

MS. CASO: Tori Caso from Parks.
E-78-20 is a use and occupancy permit to produce the Great Jack'O Lantern Glaze event. Which is a concept fully owned by Historic Hudson Valley. It will be held at OBVR. The terms of this contract are July 1st of this
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year through December 31 of 2024. It is a revenue-producing contract. In the first year they will pay a permit fee to the county of $\$ 50,000$. And then in further years when the event is produced it will be $\$ 145,000$ and then the people will also receive royalties from ticket sales over 50,000 tickets.

I wanted to -- in the current state of the COVID pandemic, so the ticket sales will be all through timed reservations to ensure social distancing and everybody will be required to wear masks. In the event that we see a resurgence, which we all hope we don't, and we need to cancel the event, since it's a multiyear contract, we won't need to terminate it we'll just suspend it for the year and that is allowed for in the contract under Section 10.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Actually

you anticipated my questions. The only question $I$ have is, in terms of suspending it, how much lead time do you have to give the vendor if you need to suspend?

MS. CASO: We would just freeze
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it and roll to the next.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The vendor would be all right with that in terms of -MS. CASO: Yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else have any questions on this? Thank you very much. We are going to call all of these items for a vote. These are all the contracts that I called before with the exception of $B-8$ which was tabled. So, with respect to all the rest of the contracts that were before us, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

We do have an addendum. We need a motion to suspend. Moved by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of suspending the rules signify by saying aye. Passes unanimously.

Only one item on the addendum which is 145 of 2020. An ordinance to authorize the county executive to execute an amendment to a contract with Transdev Services, Inc. for the management, operation and maintenance of a
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Nassau County bus system.
Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. MR. ARNOLD: Good afternoon. 145-20 is an ordinance to authorize the county executive to execute the seventh amendment to the contract with Transdev services for the management, operation and maintenance of the county bus system. The amendment provides for temporary reduction in service and related changes due to the COVID-19 pandemic including a temporary adjustment to the variable rate as eligible expenses under the CARES Act. It also includes an extension of the current contract for an additional two years to afford the county ample time to stabilize bus operation and ridership resulting in the pandemic and conduct a new procurement.

Specifically for the period of March 1st through June 7th the county has requested a reduction of service of 25 percent of the fixed route service due to the emergency. Transdev has operated on Saturday
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plus service, lengthening service intervals on most lines and adjusting for high demand or crowding with supplemental runs. This reductions has allowed Transdev to meet the reduced levels of demand while maintaining social distancing and accommodating the needed COVID-related cleaning and disinfectant requirements. Service has returned to pre-Covid levels as of yesterday.

The county is also requesting that Transdev suspend fare collection effective March $23 r d$ as part of the effect to reduce the spread of the virus. Fare collection is expected to be reinstated sometime towards June 27th.

Related temporary adjustment to
Transdev's variable rate for fix route services included in the amendment to allow the county to pay Transdev the full amount in accordance with the rates and hours anticipated in the 2020 annual budget and plan. The county will be receiving $\$ 33$ million in CARES Act which will help supplement -- will take care of this shortfall
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of revenue.
The contract extension, the current contract expires $12-31$ of'21. This agreement put forth a two-year extension to the contract with a new expiration date of $12-31-23$. An RFP was initiated to solicit a new operator. We have tolled that solicitation during the emergency to see where we are and we will be either reinstating that same solicitation or putting out a separate new one.

Part of the two-year extension is for the procurement plus the transition period if for a new operator is chosen, which typically takes 12 months to fully integrate a new operation.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Bynoe.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you
Presiding Officer. Good afternoon Mr. Arnold. I have some questions and I'm going to start with the time line for the RFP. MR. ARNOLD: Yes. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: You state that it would take 12 months to do a transition?
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MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: You know that based on previous experience?

MR. ARNOLD: Talking to my technical staff and previous experience, yes, it takes about 12 months if a new operator was chosen to get him up and running.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So we think that we need 12 months to transition and we would need how long for the procurement process?

MR. ARNOLD: Another 12 months.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So it would be
two years. So the reason that you are asking for the extension is because we believe that right now wouldn't be a good time to go out and we don't think there's enough time on the contract, is that what you're saying?

MR. ARNOLD: Right now is not a good time to go out. Transit operations are in flux. We don't know what ridership will look like. It's hard for anybody to propose on a system in the middle of a pandemic. In addition, most of the staff associated with
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putting together a proposal are probably in the midst of running their current operations with all the different requirements and needs that they have.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Because based on the time line you provided, the 24 months, means you should have gone out long before COVID was even an issue.

MR. ARNOLD: We did go out before COVID. We tolled the procurement. We paused it.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: The bid was out?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And there was no response at all?

MR. ARNOLD: It was in the process of gathering information. We had not received it back yet. It was out to the vendors to put together a proposal package. We had not received any proposals.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: When did that go out I'm sorry?

MR. ARNOLD: I believe around
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January.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So this
extension, even if we were to say, if you said you need 24 months to do this, wouldn't a one-year extension be enough?

MR. ARNOLD: Any contract from start to finish right now is taking between nine and 11 months. This would probably be more complicated one because of the type of contract that it is to negotiate. You're talking a minimum a year of the procurement process alone once we initiate to put the RFP back out. I don't think we're looking to put the RFP back out until probably we know where we are sometime towards the end of the year.

Then we have a one year phase in if there's a new operator. Alone, I believe what I have been told, is just to register the vehicles properly is a three-month operation working with DOT and the FHWA. I mean FTA. We feel one year is a sufficient amount of time to put the operation up if we see a new operator come on.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This
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extension, $I$ don't feel that we didn't have a lot of time built in anyway. If you went out in January still cutting it kind of close. But in any event --

MR. ARNOLD: January that would have given me two years, wouldn't it?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: No. Because you were only getting responses, right? You weren't even getting responses at that point. They still had the package.

MR. ARNOLD: It would have given me two years. All of '20 and'21 to get the project done because it expired at the end of '21.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So when did you pull the package back?

MR. ARNOLD: I think we tolled it sometime early March.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And you still didn't have responses. So you didn't have the whole of '20. You were already in the first quarter, basically finishing the first quarter of '20. So I disagree that you had the full '20 and '21.
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But nonetheless, I want to move on to a part of this extension. I know for a fact it says that we were going to continue payments to Transdev in full for the NICE power transit service. That's correct?

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Do we know how the service is currently running right now?

MR. ARNOLD: I have Jack Khzouz the president and CEO on the call. He can answer that specifically. I invite him to answer that.

MR. KHZOUZ: Legislator can you hear me.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes.
MR. KHZOUZ: Can you repeat the question please? The connection is a little rough.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm just
inquiring as to how the paratransit service is currently running?

MR. KHZOUZ: How the paratransit service is currently run?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Right now. I
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guess we're out of the COVID time line.
MR. KHZOUZ: Thank you legislator for the question. Prior to COVID we were operating about 1500 trips a day. About 90 percent on time with a customer satisfaction rating of about 96 percent. Currently we are operating less than 90 percent of that. So, currently we're operating at about 100 trips a day, 125 trips a day on a peak side. So about 90 percent decrease in our service. It's literally one passenger per trip. So we're keeping everybody safe. Everybody is required to wear masks. The drivers are issued PPE, including shields. But we're still operating service as requested.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: With the
opening of phase one you saw I guess a little bit of an increase and I suspect phase two we will see more of an increase on the paratransit?

MR. KHZOUZ: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I would
suspect that based on that -- how many drivers -- let me back up. How many drivers
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on paratransit?
MR. KHZOUZ: Previously the COVID crisis we had about 115 drivers. That was current. Currently we're running to cover all of our service we are running about 40 drivers.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Say again the last part.

MR. KHZOUZ: Previous to COVID we had about 115 drivers in our employ.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: In your agreement for this extension it's stated that you would not be cutting any of those drivers. Am I accurate? I believe it read Transdev will not place any employees on an unpaid status or implement a reduction in force for the duration of the COVID-related service change period. The COVID-related service period I guess would have been June 7th, right? Is that correct? That was yesterday.

MR. KHZOUZ: That's correct, yes.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: You are
already having a problem because I have a
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letter that indicates that you in fact did reduce staff and that letter is dated May 27 th .

MR. KHZOUZ: Right. So that was really a miscommunication on my behalf. This extension $I$ assumed was going to be done earlier than it is currently now being done, which is great. So our drivers that were given -- there were 16 drivers that were part-time drivers that were given layoffs. They were paid last week. So they haven't missed a paycheck. Assuming we can move forward we can certainly bring those drivers back now and keep them on salary until demand allows us to fully put them behind the wheel again.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: The letter actually it doesn't say layoff. It says that your position has been eliminated and as of May 30th you're terminated. So there was nothing that was communicated to these employees that this was a layoff.

MR. KHZOUZ: They were on
furlough for a while. Many of the drivers,
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again, we have 115 drivers on the paratransit side. Only 40 are actually working currently because of demand. As more and more trips come back those drivers that are on what we call paid leave would continue to service the demand as it grows. Part-time drivers, based on what we see as demand, may take a long time to come back.

Again a miscommunication. My
fault. Letters went out early. Again, these drivers have not lost a paycheck. We can certainly bring them back on to paid status starting today. We did also give drivers the option, this is paratransit, the option to come to the fixed route side, train as a fixed route operator and fill in some of the holes we have on the fixed route side.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I don't know how you say it's a misunderstanding or miscommunication. It's a pretty big issue to have miscommunicated on. You have 16 people that were informed via letter that they didn't receive at their homes in many cases I'm hearing until June 3rd. Some of them showed
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up on June 1st for shifts. They were coming to work and they were told they were terminated. And you're getting paid for the service from the county. I'm really at a lost as to why this even occurred. It's not sitting well with me.

And then to have a contract, an extension request come through where you specifically say that you are not going to terminate staffers and then we learn -- if that person hadn't call my office on Friday we potentially never would have known that this occurred. That there was a reduction.

MR. KHZOUZ: Yeah. I'm not sure that that's the case legislator. I will tell you this is a very fluid situation currently. We're trying to stay ahead of everything. There's a lot of moving parts with the governor's office and working with our union. Again, $I$ think this is a matter of poor timing on my behalf.

Obviously, like I said, none of these drivers missed a paycheck. And as far as I'm concerned we can bring them back today

Rules 6-8-20
if the county is agreeable to that. We'll bring them back today and nothing will be missed.

The drivers, $I$ don't know of any drivers that actually showed up for shift because we're not calling drivers in because there's no work. So I would have a hard time understanding that.

But again, with the fluid situation, I think we handled it as well as we could. Could there have been things done better, probably, and again that's my fault. I don't believe to be perfect in this situation. It's certainly a situation that none of us have been through before.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So I'm hearing, I just want to clarify, I want to reiterate so I'm sure I heard you correctly, you are going to bring those drivers back effective today?

MR. KHZOUZ: Exactly. We would bring the drivers back ideally right away. Literally they won't miss a paycheck at all. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Okay. We are
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going to make sure that we honor that clause in that contract which is that you will not reduce staff moving forward.

MR. KHZOUZ: I understand that, yes ma'am.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I have no more questions. Thank you Presiding Officer.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thanks for the information Commissioner Arnold. Along the same lines as the questions of Legislator Bynoe. I don't understand the need for an additional two year addition to the time frame. You've laid out that you need 24 months to do it. It seems as though the extension is one year more than is absolutely necessary. I have many questions about the service that Transdev has provided, and I don't simply want to give a pass on being able to ask those questions as part of the new RFP process for another two years.

So, I would be much for comfortable with it being only a one-year extension as
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opposed to a two-year extension. And I would suggest to the administration, and I know as the county executive made perfectly clear, we are only part-time legislators so she may or may not have to listen to us. But I would ask you take back to the administration that I certainly have no intention -- she still needs my vote -- I have no intention of supporting it if it's a two-year extension. I would suggest that they consider a one-year extension instead.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER:
Commissioner hi. I just wanted to clarify again, if you were to say get one year that is sufficient? You're comfortable with that?

MR. ARNOLD: One-year extension?
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Yes.
MR. ARNOLD: We need one year for
the procurement and then if we have a new operator we feel you need a year to transition the new operator in.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Are you
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saying you wouldn't be putting the RFP out again until January of 2021 if we were to give you a one-year extension. Or either way, when are you anticipating putting it out?

MR. ARNOLD: If we only had a one-year extension and this contract expired at the end of ' 22 we would have to put out the procurement earlier than we wanted to in this changing economy of transit. Which we don't think that's a good idea at this time. We feel that waiting until the end of the year to reissue the RFP we'll have a better understanding of where transit is headed and also where the COVID disease or vaccination, whatever happens, will give us a better understanding of the world we live in on this. LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: The current contract ends when? The end 2021?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I
understand what you're saying. You'd have that full year if you were to say put the RFP out beginning of next year or end of this year and then if it was extended another year you'd
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have until the end of 2022 , correct?
MR. ARNOLD: You need a full year
for procurement and a full year of transition. Two additional years.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Couldn't 2021 be your full year of procurement and be your 2022 -- with a one year extension you have 31 months.

Regardless, is there any way to utilize the time -- I understand things are right now changing and you're not sure where everything is going. But is there any way to utilize the time now in that process somehow, whether it's putting the RFP out sooner rather than later knowing that things aren't going to really start until everything is secure and stable out here in COVID land?

MR. ARNOLD: Again, it's a changing environment. Right now we are backloading the buses to keep the operators away from the passengers. Will that be something we have to do again in the winter? Are we going to see changing bus routes because of the emergency. Is the railroad
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going to lose service and be transitioning to the bus service? All that stuff is in transition. That's why we're not looking to put the procurement out this second. We want to see where everything lays and move forward from that.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: I don't know
if I'm just not understanding the math or whatever, but if you need a year for the procurement and you put it out -- even if you waited and put it out at the end of December or January you have all of '21. An extension would give you all of '22 to whatever happened in '21. If you needed some type of training or whatever you would have all of ' 22 . Somehow I don't know.

MR. ARNOLD: I could have
misspoke. I have to go back and talk to my team. The thought process wait until the spring to reprocur it once the winter's passed. I might have misspoken saying January. They might thinking more of the spring when we get past another winter of an
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operation to see where we sit. I have to go back to my team. I have to confirm that that's what their thinking was.

I see your confusion because if we go back out January I have the year. I think it's more that we wait until the spring to get past where we are with the vaccination protection of people and all that stuff. I apologize if $I$ caused some confusion on that.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: If that is what you, you know, there was misunderstanding there then you really wouldn't put that out until this time next year and then they would have until -- a year would be this time in 2022. Then you would only have six months. MR. ARNOLD: And this contract needs to be on calendar year for it to work with our budget. To do 18 months makes no sense. It would confuse all the economics of running this contract. Again, I apologize.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Why again
does the procurement take a whole year?
MR. ARNOLD: It's the fact of the matter. Most of my procurements take a
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minimum of nine months. This is a more complicated procurement, so I assume it's going to take a little bit longer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: We've done
it before though, right? Is there some history that it's based on?

MR. ARNOLD: On why it takes nine months?

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: No. I
guess I'm just looking for some way for it to be a little more efficient and not take that long.

MR. ARNOLD: I try to move
contracts as fast as $I$ can. At the end of the day nine months is where $I$ end up in most cases.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else have any questions?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just a quick question Presiding Officer. I totally understand the procurement taking a year. I remember when the county moved from Long Island Bus to NICE to where we are now with
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Transdev. I just have a question because I don't think I heard clearly from Mr. Arnold as it pertains to why the RFP was pulled back earlier this year which was done pre-COVID. I just want to make sure that $I$ understand that explanation correctly. And then $I$ have a question just to piggyback on Legislator Bynoe's concerns regarding the 16 paratransit drivers that were laid off.

MR. ARNOLD: To answer the first question, it was not pulled back pre-COVID it was pulled back during COVID. We put the procurement out before COVID started. When the COVID emergency came to be we then tolled the procurement because we were not going to get any feedback and interaction with the entities that would be bidding on this to get them engaged.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: It was pulled back -- I'm sorry. My understanding now is it was pulled back during COVID?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Now, and this you may not be able to answer this
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Ken, as it pertains to the paratransit workers, my understanding is they would be hired back effective today even though this agreement will not be approved until the full legislature three weeks from now?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. And how will you be able to validate that in the coming days? You're going to reach out to Transdev? I believe Jack is still on the call. You're going to reach out to Transdev in that interim to insure that's the case?

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. My planning supervisor will deal directly with staff at Transdev to make sure that happens.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Assuming the legislature did decide to move forward with this today, you would be able to talk to us in three weeks in terms of how that actually progressed?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Hearing none, I suggest we move
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this forward today and continue discussions with the administration and Transdev over the next three weeks to resolve the issues that have been raised by various legislators today. Anyone have an idea of doing it differently or is everyone acceptable with that?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, I'm going to recommend to our side that we abstain on this vote mainly for the purposes that were bought out regarding the two-year extension. I still think there needs to be clarity. We are not going to stand in the way of the vote going forward today. However, there needs to be more clarity on this extension being two years versus one year.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I will make a motion to table.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do we have a second?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The question becomes that you're going to abstain from the vote over those concerns. I want those
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concerns to be addressed too just like you do. So I have no problem moving it forward and then getting answers to those questions in the next three weeks. But if it's important enough for everyone to abstain then we may as well just table it and get those answers before we consider it. I didn't want to delay the other piece.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Legislator
Rhoads, it's not my desire to delay it either. But unless I'm hearing something differently, $I$ still haven't heard a justification on why this is here today. And also I haven't heard any response in regards to why it's been two years. Especially since the agreement is going to expire at the end of 2021. If the agreement is going to expire at the end of 2021 by my calculation that's giving us close to 18 months from this point to be able to send out the RFP. Now I understand the pandemic is still here. That 2020 to send out that proposal would not be appropriate. However, to extend it to 2023 I would have to have a stronger understanding of
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why 2021 and 2022 are being created as a wash.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You and I are in complete agreement.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That's what I was going to say. I think we can bring the gap between tabling and having part of us abstain. We can table this today and still have it put on the calendar for the 29 th full leg. I don't know if it even requires an emergency. We can have a committee that same day, put it on the committee, then put it on the calendar. It will already be calendared. So we can do it on the 29th.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: My motion
stands. I don't know if there's a second.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I will second the motion then.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, before we vote on the motion, if I may, can we also have the county attorney provide -- I know there's a transit committee that's associated with this particular agreement. If we were to pass this through
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today, I'm not indicating I'm reversing my position, but if this were to pass today can the transit committee take action on that particular item even though it's been passed through a Rules Committee? If they wanted to basically change the agreement to a one-year extender do they have to actually take action or is this something that can be done unilaterally with the county executive and the legislature without the transit committee? Can anyone answer that in regards to the transit committee?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I don't
know if there's anyone here from the county attorney's office. It would take some specialized knowledge.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm assuming the transit committee voted on this extender? Did they take action on this particular item or maybe this is not in their purview.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Ken, I don't know if you have the answer to that question.
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MR. ARNOLD: I don't believe they
have any purview in this. But I think Dan Grippo might be on the call. I know there were questions from minority counsel on this same issue that he's been responding to.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I don't necessarily know that the transit committee would have to wait upon the Rules Committee action. It's a proposal that's before the legislature. Whether or not we act today I would assume the transit committee can review it and make their recommendation. Do whatever vote they have to do.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I guess
what I'm asking is, does the transit committee have to take action if we decide that you would like to see it be a one-year extender, does the transit committee need to take an action prior to the June 29 th meeting? I guess that's what I'm ultimately asking.

MR. GRIPPO: This is Dan Grippo.
Can you hear me? So, I was asked a question whether the transit committee had to approve the temporary service changes, and I looked
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into that question. And it was clear to me that the contract provided that with respect to temporary changes no transit committee approval was required. That was on the question of the service changes temporary during the three-month period.

Now I am hearing a question about whether the transit committee would need to approve a legislative extension of the contract for two years. That is a new question that I have just heard. I will need to think about it. I will need to review contract, the charter and get back to you. Unfortunately I don't want to give an answer from the seat of my pants.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I
understand Dan. Let me make sure if I'm understanding you clearly. The transit committee did vote on the extender before that proposal was reached to the legislature or not?
MR. GRIPPO: I do not believe
that this amendment was submitted for transit committee consideration.
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LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Thank you Dan.

MR. GRIPPO: I'm not sure an extension of the contract is operational. Whereas route changes, fares and things of those nature operational, which under the charter when they're permitted changes require transit committee review. This is a contract question and again $I$ need to think about it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I
understand.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: All right. Clearly with the county attorney about to render an opinion the fact that we can proceed to consider this at the end of this month if we so choose, whether we table this now or not. I would also mention that part of a piece of this is really not contested or questioned, which is negotiated level of service adjustments. So in any event, we want to do those.

But I would say with all those things up in the air tabling would be the correct way to proceed. Once we have a
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resolution, put in on the committee, have it before the full legislature on the 29th. So we accomplish the same thing.

We have a motion to table on the floor that's been seconded. All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. Motion by Legislator Schaefer to adjourn. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. (Committee was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.)
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