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    Rules 8-3-20
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I'm going
to call the Rules Committee to order. Mike,
do you want to call the roll.
MR. PULITZER: Thank you. Rules
Committee roll call. Legislator Siela Bynoe.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Delia
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Here.
MR. PULITZER: Ranking member
Kevan Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Laura
Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Steven
Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
MR. PULITZER: Vice Chairman
Howard Kopel.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Chairman Richard
Nicolello.

Rules 8-3-20
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.
MR. PULITZER: We have a quorum sir.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I'm going to be calling all the items at the same time and then have presentations individually except for two. I'm going to call E-120 separately and E-53 of '20 separately. Later on we have recusals on those two items.

But for the rest A-20 and A29-2020, a resolution authorizing the commissioner of shared services to award and execute or approve additional funds for a blanket purchase order between the county and Idemia Identity and Security USA as well as Long Island FQHC.

$$
\text { A-32 of } 2020 \text {, a resolution }
$$

ratifying the commissioner of shared services award and execution of a purchase order between the county of Nassau and Fastenal Company .

$$
B-21, B-24, B-28 \text { of } 2020 \text { are }
$$

resolutions authorizing the county executive to award and execute contracts between the
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county and Eldor Contracting Corp., Welsbach Electric Corp., Posillico Civil, Inc.

Next batch is E-87, E-88, E-101
E-102, E-103, E-104 -- I'm holding 100. We're not calling E-102. Let's go back to the beginning. E-87, E-88, E-101, E-103, E-104, $E-105, E-106, E-107, E-109, E-110, E-111$, $E-112, E-113, E-114, E-115, E-116$.

These are resolutions authorizing
the county executive to execute personal services agreements or amendments to personal services agreements between the county and Anthony Perri, Inc., Anthony Perri, Esquire, Excel Reporting, Inc., Aelixt Group L.L.C., Long Island Veterinary Specialists, Motorola Solutions, Vendrite Vending Corporation, American Record Management, Inc., Peter M. Farmer, MD, H2M Architects, De Bruin Engineering, Rainbow Sound, $N$ and $P$ Engineering, Louis K. McLean and Associates, Hagerty Consulting, CG-3PL Engineering DPC and Arthur Gallagher Risk Management Services, Inc.
Moved by Legislator Schaefer.

Rules 8-3-20
Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Those items are before us. While we are doing that, I'm going to also move to untable three other items so we can consider them altogether as well. A-30, 2020 is a resolution authorizing the commissioner of shared services to award and execute a purchase order between the county and Cogsdale Corporation.

E-90 and E-93 are resolutions authorizing the county executive to execute personal services agreements or amendments to personal services agreements between the county and Gannett Fleming Engineers.

Motion by Legislator Bynoe.
Seconded by Legislator Kopel. That's a motion to untable those items. All in favor of untabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? They are untabled. Let's start with the police department contracts. A-2 of 2020. MR. FIELD: Good afternoon. William Field, deputy inspector Nassau County Police Department. First item is A-2, 2020. This is a request to authorize a blanket purchase order for hardware and software
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maintenance for the Nassau County Police Department's automated fingerprint system, AFIS. This blanket purchase order will be between the police department and Idemia Identity Security L.L.C.

This is a sole source purchase. The police department previously purchased AFIS equipment that was manufactured in combination with commercial off-the-shelf products as well as proprietary hardware and software. By this nature, only Idemia is authorized to perform maintenance services on our AFIS equipment.

The blanket purchase order has a five-year term unless sooner terminated by the county. The maximum amounts authorized under this blanket purchase order are for this year, for the first year, $\$ 438,412.06$. And then for each annual period after the cost shall be subject to a five percent increase, which is to account for increases in maintenance, labor and parts. And the maximum total amount for the contract is $\$ 2.5$ million. It is a little late having to do with the fact that the
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vendor did change names. They were formerly known as Morphotrac and are now known as Idemia.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions on this contract? Go to the second one, Motorola, 104.

MR. FIELD: Item E-104-20 is an amendment to an existing personal services contract between the police department and Motorola Solutions. The existing contract is for the police department's record management system and all the records processing system. This entails all of our arrest processing, auto accident and traffic ticket entries as well as data input for police case reports. Internally the program is called Premier One. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the contract price for two reasons. The first being the integration of Premier One records management with the Nassau County District Attorney's Justware system.

The second reason is the purchase of annual maintenance and support for Premier One. The interface between the Justware
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system and Premier One will assist in the line of communication between the district attorney's office and the police department and be able to further to increase the ability to transfer information back and forth and therefore remain in compliance with discovery requirements.

The purchase of the maintenance and support is required because the system has been implemented by the county and has acknowledged acceptance and that there's beneficial use to the system. It was originally purchased under a New York State Office of General Services. The original amount is for $\$ 4.2$ million. This has been increased by $\$ 3,507,262$. With the maximum amount of the contract now at $\$ 7,707,262$. It is a four-year term ending in 2023.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is this related to New York State's new discovery reforms?

MR. FIELD: Yes, sir. My
understanding is the integration component of this contract is to assist the district
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attorney office's and the police department to exchange information better in order to continue to be compliant with new discovery laws.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any of the cost, is that cost eligible for reimbursement by the state?

MR. FIELD: That would be
something $I$ would have to look into.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, let's go to the third contract which is Cogsdale Corp., A-30. I guess that's not under your department.

MR. FIELD: Let me check on the Cogsdale.

MS. STANTON: Good afternoon. A-30, 2020. Nancy Stanton from IT. Cogsdale Corporation. This is our annual renewal for maintenance and support. The county's data warehouse software supporting our county's financial system. This request is for $\$ 118,925$. The term is January 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021. This is a sole source contract
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and we appreciate your consideration.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? I think we're good. Next two are emergency management and the first one is A-29, 2020, a contract with Long Island FQHC.

MR. DELANEY: Tom Delaney, Office of Emergency Management. Item A-29 is for a blanket order to cover the procurement, the services from Long Island FQHC, a health care provider, partnered with NUMC that is providing COVID-19 testing for us in underserved communities that include Westbury, Hempstead, Elmont and Freeport.

The cap on this purchase order,
this blanket purchase order is $\$ 483,405$. Just as a side note, as of Friday $F Q H C$ has moved their testing to indoors and not outdoors. So it looks like they're downsizing a little bit as far as the number of tests being administered.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I may have missed this but have you used all of the test kits that were provided? Have you used all the test kits that were obtained through this

Rules 8-3-20
contract?
MR. DELANEY: No. This is still an ongoing operation at this point. As we all know, the governor is still pushing for COVID-19 testing in our communities to help with contact tracing and try to keep the disease under control as much as possible.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else have any questions on this contract? Why don't you move on to A-32, Fastenal Company.

MR. DELANEY: This is a purchase order with Fastenal for the procurement of 200,000 three-ply blue, they call them surgical but they're really not surgical masks. But these are the ones you most commonly see people wearing. They're not near as expensive as and $\mathrm{N}-95$ mask or as constricting. A lot easier to wear and they certainly perform the function. As part of again our governor's initiative we are making sure that we have a sufficient stockpile in Nassau County in OEM's warehouse to ensure the ongoing continuity of operations for the county.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions on this? Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Presiding Officer. I actually want to let Tom off the hook and I want to ask the questions to our IG.

MS. FRANZESE: Jodi Franzese, attorney general.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Good evening. On this particular item there was something was revealed in their backup history, the business history, and it was something stating that there was some discrimination. A case was filed against this entity for discrimination.

MS. FRANZESE: I'm sorry
Legislator Bynoe, are we at A-32-20?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs announced a settlement with this entity in the amount of $\$ 1.2$ million, 1.2 plus million dollars, regarding the termination of black employees and female employees. Also it looks like they were denying them full-time work or
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something to that effect.
The long and short of it is we saw a contract come down here that had similar allegations against an entity but there was an oversight entity, another federal agency, that was monitoring that company to ensure that they were in compliance. I don't see any mention of that here in this particular item and probably what troubles me in combination of not seeing that in this item, is also that Fastenal vehemently denies the accusation and saying it was justified and legitimate reasons for not hiring these folks. Then they say that they made several enhancements to ensure it doesn't happen in the future.

So I find those two things to be contradictory. If one is not able to see their fault have they really made the necessary adjustments? Without me seeing any kind of additional oversight I'm left to question whether you were able to review this. If you have any additional information for me to make me more comfortable with this contract.

Rules 8-3-20
MS. FRANZESE: Legislator Bynoe I
have not. We have a process. We looked at this. We look at all the contracts that go before the leg. We didn't choose to go deeper on this particular matter. However, if you would like us to talk a little bit more cogently about the enhancements and the strange, you know, we vehemently deny but we are enhancing. But one of my defendants when I was an ADA I'm guilty but $I$ will certainly go on probation. We would be happy to do that in order to make you more comfortable.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This item is
before the Rules Committee and whatever
happens today would ratify it. It would either pass or we would have to table it. I don't know what the appetite is for tabling the item until we can get that information. I will actually make a motion to table the item.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Motion to
table and seconded is not debatable but did you want to ask Delaney if there's any urgency to this? Do we ask him that before we consider the motion to table?

Rules 8-3-20
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Am I correct, Mr. Delaney, did we already purchase these items?

MR. DELANEY: During our crisis, during our response to COVID-19, we were trying to scramble as much as possible for the procurement of needed PPEs. To answer the question yes, these have already been purchased.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: That's the only reason $I$ didn't ask about the urgency.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We have a motion to table and a second on this. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The item is tabled.

MS. FRANZESE: I would just like to note to the legislature that this doesn't end this discussion. If you'd like us to go further we're happy to do it.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: You made some points there that you would go back and find out what those enhancements were. If you could just delve a little deeper into this issue and see if there has been any follow-up
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with an oversight or third party that can confirm there's been no future claims of discrimination or open litigation against them regarding this issue.

MS. FRANZESE: We would be happy to.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you very much.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Next
contracts we have are with public works. We have a number. First one would be the contract with Eldor Contracting Corporation, B-21.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken Arnold, Public
Works. B-21 is a construction contract
related to improvements of the plant's electrical system at Cedar Creek. There were six bids. Eldor was below the engineer's estimate. MWBE is at one percent. Should I just continue to the next item?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do we have any questions on this one? I guess you can move on.

MR. ARNOLD: Next item is B-24.
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This contract is for our on-call traffic signal contract. This contract installs, modifies and rehabilitates traffic signals and associated equipment. We had four bids and Welsbach was the lowest responsible bidder. The bid was higher than the engineer's estimate. We did an analysis and we found that our engineer's estimate was high for a number -- was low for a number of items historically. So when we went back and looked at it we don't feel that if we rebid this we would do any better than the bid we received in this proposal. Welsbach is proposing 5.6 percent MWBE.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on the Welsbach contract? Move on to the next one.

MR. ARNOLD: $B-28$ is a
construction contract phase 66 resurfacing. It contains 21 lane miles of road. We received four bids. The lowest bid was Posillico. It was at the engineer's estimate. MWBE participation's at 15.8 percent.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? Keep going.
MR. ARNOLD: Next item E-108-20
is a design contract associated with the hot and chill piping network at Bay Park. This piping heats and cools the facility's buildings. This is 100 percent funded through the Bay Park 428 program. We had two bidders. H2M was the highest technically ranked but also the lowest cost firm. MWBE was set at 20 percent.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO:
Questions? Next 109.
MR. ARNOLD: E-109. This is a construction management contract for the rehab and hardening of the East Avenue ejector station. This is also 100 percent funded through our Bay Park 428 program. There were nine proposers. De Bruin was considered as the highest technically ranked proposer. The cost was not the least expensive. However, when we went through and looked at the proposal De Bruin was supplying a full-time inspector and resident engineer which the
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department felt was critical in the successful completion of the project. Their MWBE percentage is at 13 percent.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? Thank you. 111.
MR. ARNOLD: E-111. This is an amendment to the design contract for the replacement of the bulkhead at the Glen Cove waste water treatment facility. This is a retroactive contract. It had expired in April. This is for an increase of $\$ 54,000$ and extension time to match the construction contract. The increase in funds is required because there was contamination found by the bulkheading that required some redesign and some rework by the engineer. That is that item.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? E-112.
MR. ARNOLD: E-112. This is a
design contract for the review and installation of traffic safety devices on uncontrolled crosswalks throughout the county. We received four proposals. Nelson
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Pope being the highest technically ranked and lowest cost proposal. This is a grant-funded project. Their DBE is at four percent. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions on this item? 113. MR. ARNOLD: E-113. This is an amendment to our on-call civil site design contract. We had a number of these come to this body. This is for a cap increase of $\$ 4$ million under the same time as the original contract.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? 114, Hagerty.
MR. ARNOLD: That's not me but I do have two untabled ones. Do you want me to cover those?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Why don't you do the two untabled while you're there. 90 and 93, Gannett Fleming.

MR. ARNOLD: E-90 is a
construction management contract for pump station mitigation for Morgan Park Shore Road pump stations and Roslyn also. This is part of the Bay Park 428 program which means it's
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100 percent reimbursable. There were eight firms submitted. Gannett Fleming was the highest technically and also the best value. MWBE at 20 percent.

E-93, the last item I have today, is a construction management contract for raw sewage pumps at Bay Park. Again, this is part of the Bay Park 428 program. 100 percent reimbursed. Eight firms proposed. Gannett Fleming is the highest technically ranked firm and their MWBE is at 22 percent.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on that? Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Would it be okay if I went back to E-109 just real quick?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes. We haven't voted on any.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
know there was a question with CSEA wanting to do this work in-house. Did you speak with them or has that been resolved?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. CSEA did
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propose an alternate. We met with them, could not come to a conclusion and I recommended we proceed without their concurrence because this is the type of work that our guys would not have done historically in-house. We don't do this type of design with our in-house engineering staff.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So we wouldn't do this type -- we haven't done this type of design --

MR. ARNOLD: We don't do waste water designs in-house.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I apologize. Mr. Arnold, you said that they suggested an alternative?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Could you
elaborate?
MR. ARNOLD: They wanted me to hire staff.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: They wanted you to hire CSEA staff?
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MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Was that objection resolved? CSEA's objection to that?

MR. ARNOLD: No. What typically happens when we don't come to a conclusion I write a recommendation on how we're going to proceed. In this case we're proceeding with bringing on Gannett Fleming. Not Gannett Fleming. This case was De Bruin to do the work and we will resolve it. They take it to a grievance hearing.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: What's the urgency on 109?

MR. ARNOLD: 109 I believe it's part of a consent order work that we need to address. Pump station if not protected currently from hurricanes. One of the last ones we're doing. One of the smaller ones. And like I said, I believe it's also included in our Bay Park agreement with the state on timely addressing some last minute items.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The RFP was issued in March of 2019 according to the
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backup. That's been around for quite a while. MR. ARNOLD: Yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is a month going to change anything?

MR. ARNOLD: No. We talked to the union. The union believes in this case we should bring on expertise staff to do this work. That's not the department's belief. We have not done this type of work in the past. I think we are going to be at the same point. We can have that conversation. I'm okay with that.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I'll tell

you what. Why don't we give it to the next batch of committee hearings which will be in probably mid September and see if we can work something out. It's worked out in the past and let's do that.

We have a motion by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton to table 109 of 2020. Second by Legislator Bynoe to table that. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Aye. Those opposed? The item is tabled.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: With
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your permission Presiding Officer can I have the inspector general come back for a quick question?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes. All
these items are still open. Anything that needs to be addressed can be addressed.

MS. FRANZESE: Hello.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Did
you have an opportunity to review, I know you review all the contracts, but E-112-20, Nelson Pope?

## MS. FRANZESE: We triage the

 agenda every cycle. We looked at this, the Nelson and Pope disclosure forms pretty extensively in their prior contract, I forget the number, and we looked at this and we didn't decide to delve deeper into this one. But we are very aware of their disclosure because we did a full look.LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So
in your opinion you felt comfortable -- we didn't get any type of report or anything on this item. Is that for us to assume that you're okay with it?
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MS. FRANZESE: Our process is we do the first look. We do the initial like informal risk assessment. We look at different things to kind of get us to the next level. This particular contract, the only thing that we would have looked at is the disclosures and we had looked at them already. We had done a full review of their disclosures. So we were comfortable with the disclosures. We read obviously the staff summary and discussed the procurement itself and we didn't have any concerns about that as well.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: When
you look at a contract and you consider it do you also consider past situations with the county?

MS. FRANZESE: I mean, obviously
we keep that in mind for sure. With respect to this contract, we were just reviewing the -- we start to look at certain things like, you know, does it justify the expenditure? You know, does it justify the basis of the award kind of thing. And we got
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to the end of it deciding not to do the deeper dive. At that point we were comfortable as we could be at that point.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Thank you for your clarification.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? We're good Ken. I had called up 114 and 115. Why don't we do those now. MS. PARK: I'm Susan Park. Director of Recovery at the Office of Emergency Management. Items E-114-20 and E-115-20 are contracts with Hagerty Consulting and CG-3PL respectfully to provide on-call disaster management services to the county to assist our various departments, offices and agencies in recovery planning and management.

The scope of services specifies the management and administration of funding streams including but not limited to programs such as FEMA public assistance and the CARES Act to help the county recover from the COVID-19 disaster and other future disasters. The county's current on-call disaster management services contract
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terminates at the end of this month and the contract with Hagerty and CG-3PL start on September 1ST.

Items E-114-20 and E-115-20 are the result of a competitive RFP process by which the county received 24 proposals. The RFP evaluation committee selected Hagerty, CG-3PL and one other vendor as the most responsible and cost effective consultants for the county. The committee selected more than one vendor in case the county will need to respond to two or more disasters at one time. The third vendor's contract is currently being finalized and OEM is aiming to present it at next month's Rules Committee meeting.

Each time an on-call disaster management services consultant is needed by the county OEM will issue a task order to the three contracted vendors and the task order proposal evaluation committee will select which vendor to award the task order to. The current three selected vendors for the on-call disaster management services were provided a COVID-19 task order for the
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management and administrative support of state and federal grant programs through which the county can optimally secure funding to recover from the COVID-19 disaster.

The task order proposal evaluation committee selected CG-3PL as the consultant best fit for the county for this initiative. That's why item E-115-20, the contract with CG-3PL, has the cost of $\$ 527,300$. The county is planning for this cost to be covered by FEMA public assistance category C, indirect and direct administrative cost and/or other COVID-19 recovery funding streams.

Items E-115-20 and E-114-20 each are five-year contracts and they each have a maximum cost of $\$ 3.75$ million. OEM anticipates that the cost of any task order that comes up through the on-call disaster management services contract would be covered by the state and/or federal recovery funding stream. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? Legislature DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: The
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last sentence you just stated you anticipate the funding to be covered by the federal cost. Is that 100 percent?

MS. PARK: By state and federal
recovery funding stream such as FEMA public assistance and other -- like for the COVID-19?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Yes.
MS. PARK: Public assistance, CARES Act and others.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: What
percentage do you anticipate to be covered?
MS. PARK: We are looking for
100.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else? Thank you. Consumer Affairs, E-87, E-88.

MR. MAY: Good afternoon
everyone. E-87 is a contract amendment for Judge Anthony Perri, who is our judicial hearing officer. We are increasing the amount of the contract by about $\$ 10,000$. This is not an increase in the rate of pay for Judge Perri. This is an increase in the number of
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days that we are able to use him. When we had originally contemplated the contract we were figuring on about three days a month and due to the volume number of violations we have due to the some of the outstanding consumer complaints we've been working on it was determined we need to have the judge more days in a month than we originally planned.

And E-88-20 is for the court reporter and that has been increased by about $\$ 5,000$ for the same reason that we need to have them available for more days.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you
have any other judicial hearing officers that you use besides Mr. Perri?

MR. MAY: No. Right now it's
just Judge Perri.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Hearing none, thank you. The next contracts are with the corrections, sheriffs. 103 of 2020, Long Island Veterinary Specialists, Ophthalmology Surgery Internal Medicine.

MR. GOLIO: Michael Golio with
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the sheriff's department. Actually 103 is an amendment to an existing contract. It's calling for additional funding and to broaden the scope of the contract to include the fire marshal's office and the police department under the correctional center contract for canine services.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any

questions on this? The other one you have is 100, correct? That the minority leader is going to be recusing himself on that specific contract. He will not be participating in any debate or discussion or vote on that item. I'm going to call that separately right now. It's a resolution authorizing the county executive to execute a personal services agreement or amendments to a personal services agreement between the county and Nassau Health Care Corporation.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. That one is before us now.

MR. GOLIO: This is an extension
to the existing contract for an additional
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six-month period. As we stated the last time we were here, we were in the midst of discussions with the hospital about a more formal agreement. They had a change in administration at the hospital and shortly thereafter the pandemic struck. The purpose of this amendment and extension is to maintain the status quo at this time and get us to February 28th of next year.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That's when you anticipate having a new agreement in place?

MR. GOLIO: Hopefully so, yes.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on this item, 100-2020? Legislator Bynoe.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Again, I'm going to ask if it would be okay if the IG, Ms. Franzese, approach to answer some questions. On the disclosures for NHCC they have not disclosed any open suits or anything to that extent. However, in Newsday articles the then president of the hospital indicates that there were subpoenas that were served
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from the federal, state and the county enforcement agencies but we don't see any mention of that in their disclosures.

MS. FRANZESE: This is a matter
that we had been talking about and if someone is served with a subpoena, just in my experience, it doesn't necessarily mean they're the target. Perhaps it's a legal form of getting documents and other things.

However, just based on what I know from this, I do think, and I understand that this is kind of -- it's a six-month extension. Whether the legislature chooses to table that today or even if the legislature does not my office is endeavoring to drill down on that to determine whether they actually are the target or one of their affiliates is.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: It's my
understanding that whether it's one of their affiliates or the actual entity there's a requirement to disclose.

MS. FRANZESE: That's correct. That's what it says on our forms.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I understand
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about what you're saying about receiving a subpoena doesn't necessarily --

MS. FRANZESE: Right.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But in one of articles it indicates that they went to outside counsel to try and get, to have some level of representation. So they received an additional -- they boosted their spending authorization by an additional $\$ 200,000$ in order to make sure that they were properly represented in I guess handling the subpoena or responding to the subpoena. That's probably a good part of what's raising some level of concern for me.

MS. FRANZESE: I understand completely the nature of your concern certainly. It is typical for them if you get a subpoena to get people to kind of help you manage how to respond. But again --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So you're fine with there not being a disclosure at this point and you feel that you can monitor it moving forward?

MS. FRANZESE: To be honest with
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you, it's completely on our radar at this point.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: It's
completely on your radar is that what $I$ hear you saying?

MS. FRANZESE: Yes. On our radar at this point for sure. It's definitely something that we would be interested in kind of keeping an eye on at this point.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I guess that
would include speaking to folks that are currently affiliated with the affiliates as well as those that may no longer be directly connected to the affiliates?

MS. FRANZESE: It may need to be looked at. I'm not certain what our strategy would be.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I don't think you should, so I'm going to leave that there. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you want to address anything?

MR. GOLIO: Just on that one
issue. The county is also aware of the
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Newsday article and people from the county did reach out to the general counsel at the hospital and we were informed that the NHCC is not the subject of any criminal investigation at this time and that the disclosures are accurate and do not need to be amended.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes, I saw
that, but it still prompted me to ask because they would still be responsible to disclose whether any of their affiliates in fact were the center of any investigations surrounding those subpoenas. It doesn't necessarily let NHCC off the hook if in fact one of the affiliates was and that's why I asked the question.

MR. GOLIO: Understood
completely. Just wanted to make sure that everybody had the full story. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Captain Golio. I appreciate it. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you. Any other questions? Mr. Cleary. MR. CLEARY: Robert Cleary, chief procurement officer. I just want to clarify
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one part of this. In the conduct of reviewing this issue with NHCC I spoke to the general counsel myself. She made clear, yes, we get subpoenas frequently. We weren't the target of any investigation. There were no investigations to disclose. We did not specifically talk about every affiliate and subsidiary, but I did specifically ask in writing review your answers to questions 12 , 13 and others specifically on the business history form and also the principal questionnaires regarding all investigations.

And the written answer we got from the general counsel of NHCC, which the question clearly states "and affiliates" the written answer we got was that these forms are good -- and you heard Captain Golio read it -these forms are good and the answer should not be amended. And I also did not find any evidence elsewhere that there were investigations that needed to be disclosed.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I thank you for that Mr. Cleary. So, I think it behooves me to ask the question because my comfort
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level is going to lie closer with what you're saying, with what Captain Golio is saying and most certainly with what our IG is saying as opposed to what the general counsel of NHCC is saying. Our direct relationship is with you and so we need to hear that from you. I can't take that as word and as confirmation from NHCC because as far as I'm concerned they're a third party.

MR. CLEARY: I understand.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Since this
one the minority leader will be recusing himself we're going to vote on this one separately right now. All in favor of $\mathrm{E}-100$ signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Any abstentions? It passes by a vote of six to nothing.

Let's move on to the next one is under human resources, which would be E-101 of 2020.
MS. HOWARD: Good afternoon.

Marissa Howard, Human Services. E-101 of 2020 represents the county contract with the Aelixt Group who is the county's antisexual
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harassment training consultant. This is the first amendment contract at the cost --

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO:
Unfortunately, we were only getting every other word there. So is it possible to try to do that again?

MS. HOWARD: Item E-101-20 is a one-year extension for the county's contract with $H R$ training within the county's HR antisexual harassment training consultant. They provide online and live sexual harassment prevention training for all county employees. This is the first amendment and the cost is $\$ 42,000$.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? We're good, thank you.
E-102 we're going to have a recusal
by Legislator Rhoads. He is leaving the building. Leaving the chambers. He won't be participating in any debate, discussion or vote on this item. I don't think I called that before so I will have to call it now. It's a resolution authorizing the county executive to execute personal services
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agreements or amendments between the county and Sokoloff and Stern.

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer
Kopel. Seconded by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. You're good to go.
MR. LIBERT: Good afternoon
legislators. Deputy county attorney Brian Libert from the county attorney's office. This is a contract with the law firm of Sokoloff Stern for their representation of one particular officer in the matter of Dolores Sharp against Nassau County and several named officers. This representation is being made pursuant to a conflict and Sokoloff Stern is representing, as I said, one of the officers due to a conflict. If you have any questions happy to answer those.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions? I think we're good. Thank you.

MR. LIBERT: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Again, since Steve is recusing himself we'll have a vote on this one separately. All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Passes
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by a vote of six to nothing.
Move on to 105, 2020. A contract
with shared services. Vendrite Vending
Services.
MS. MALHAME: Good afternoon.
This is Allison Malhame, deputy commissioner of shared services. This contract is to provide vending machines at various county buildings. The vendor was selected by an RFP issued in January with four proposals received. The evaluation committee selected Vendrite Vending as the vendor offering the best value for the county.

This is a revenue contract.
Vendrite offered the highest annual guaranteed flat fee commission payment as well as the highest commission percentage of gross sales being 25 percent. Commission revenue will be the greater of either the flat fee amount or 25 percent of gross receipts. The duration of the contract is for six years with the option to renew for four additional one year periods.
Prior to the installation of the
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vending machines the county will approve all vending machine plans and pricing. The vending machines will be cleaned and disinfected during every restocking or service call. They will accept contactless payment such as Apple Pay and Google Wallet in addition to credit cards and cash.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: How many vendors responded to the request for proposal?

MS. MALHAME: Four vendors
responded.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Vendrite
was chosen because of experience or because of price? What was the reason?

MS. MALHAME: They offered the highest flat fee guaranteed annual payment. They also offered the highest percentage of sales. Also they have a fantastic reputation. Yes, they've been in the vending business a long time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else have any questions for this? We're good. Thank you.
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MS. MALHAME: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Next
contract is with social services E-106, 2020 American Record Management.

MR. RUSSELL: This is Doug
Russell to speaking on the social services contract.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you
want to tell us what the contract with
American Records Management System is.
MR. RUSSELL: Yes. The American
Records Management System are the people who collect and store our excess documentation.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Let me ask
you this. It's expensive to store paper
documents. Has social services been looking at digitizing your records, storing your records that way? If so, why do you have to go with the additional storage system?

MR. RUSSELL: Because the state mandates that we keep original records. We have to keep the originals.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions for him?
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LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Yes. I just
want to follow-up on that answer that you just provided. Are you certain that the state doesn't allow digitized copies, scanned copies because that would be surprising. It requires only original of every paper?

MR. RUSSELL: In certain
circumstances yes. And not everything that we have would be something that would be imaged at this time.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What the presiding officer asked is why don't we do it that way instead of this, instead of storing all this paper indefinitely? Actually, what are the state requirements? How long must you keep some documents and you haven't said which documents?

MR. RUSSELL: It depends. For examples, in our services for children we have to actually keep it until they turn 18. Then we have to expunge certain documents. When they're 18 then we have to expunge those documents. Or take a child protective services case. An allegation is made, becomes
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as an unfounded allegation. After a certain period of time that needs to be expunged.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Once again, are you quite certain that those requirements are for originals only? I quite understand expunging these things at a certain point. That makes sense. But it would make equal sense -- it's not really response as to whether or not these documents must be original or digitized. It would seem to me that the digitized ones would be just as good and easier to get rid of when you need to. MR. RUSSELL: Let me respond by saying this. With our client information, our client record, they are by and large already digitized.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Go on, sorry, thank you,.

MR. RUSSELL: This other
documentation is documentation for let's say we do an RFP and what the ratings are. Of if we have certain records about how we spent funds that the state gave us and they can come in four years later, five years later and say
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I want to see all that original documentation because we're doing an audit.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: With all due respect, $I$ don't think you're really answering the question. It's okay to say you don't know and come back. It really is. Do you know which documents the state requires to keep originals for those things? Can you answer that question? And if you don't as I say -MR. RUSSELL: No. I would have to get back to you on which particular documents must be saved.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And in what
form. Which documents must be saved I heard you and then in what form. Because I know from business, from experience in business, that the tendency is to just keep everything forever. Especially if you're a pack rat such as I am generally. I like to keep things. But it will choke you and cost you a fortune and it's usually unnecessary. I would suggest that you come back to us at the next meeting and just get that information and let us know. I would move to table it until then.

Rules 8-3-20
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Motion to
table. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All
in favor of tabling this item signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. Thank you sir. We will be in touch.

E-107 it's a contract with Peter
Farmer, the medical examiner's office.
MR. CROMWELL: Good afternoon
legislators. Keith Cromwell deputy medical examiner for administration at the ME. This contract is with Dr. Farmer to provide forensic neuropathology services. It is a five year term at $\$ 175,000$ totality. Each year it's $\$ 30,000$. Not to exceed $\$ 35,000$ excuse me. His work consists of gross examinations of brains and/or spinal cords to assist with cause of death manner and all that stuff.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone

 else have any questions? I think you covered it. Thanks. That's the only way we were going to understand.E-110 is with parks department and
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Rainbow Sound Inc.
MS. KASO: Tori Kaso from the parks department. E-110-20 is an amendment for Rainbow Sound extending the term through April 30th of next year. It's for production, consulting and sound equipment for our concerts and events at Lakeside Theater and it's for a maximum of up to $\$ 17,000$. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Are there any events going on at the Lakeside Theater? MS. KASO: There are some in the works. I don't know if they would require the use of Rainbow Sound. But no events, no services have been provided from them since at least May 1st but probably before then.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Two
questions. They don't get paid unless they are actually providing the service, correct? MS. KASO: Correct. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So if there's no event going on we're not paying them?

MS. KASO: Correct. And we don't necessarily use them for every single event
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anyways.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: In the event that there is something that can be held or is being held or scheduled we have them on board in terms of their sound equipment, their engineering services, correct?

MS. KASO: Correct. Just in case we need them.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else have any questions? Thank you.

Next one is 116, contract between budget office and Arthur Gallagher Risk Management.

MR. PERSICH: Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget. The contract before you is another extension for Arthur Gallagher. The RFP is getting ready to be put out and will be done before the October renewal. We have a couple of policies that were outstanding that we have to pay and we need to extend the contract.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So the
question is $I$ guess is this extension long
enough? If you're telling me --
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MR. PERSICH: It will be. I have been working with the county attorney's office personally in getting the RFP out and we have it all drafted and ready to go. COVID hit unfortunately. Due to my delinquency it didn't happen.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So then the RFP has to go out yet and you have to get the responses but you think you're going to have this lined up?

MR. PERSICH: We're ready to go.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So we will
have something in October in other words?
MR. PERSICH: Whoever we choose. The selection committee will have it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Thank you.

MR. PERSICH: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We're going to vote on these items and then I'm going to call Triad. We have a recusal on that one as well. All of these items that were not tabled or previously voted upon including $A-2, E-104, B-21, B-24, B-28, E-108$,
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E-111, E-112, E-113, E-114, E-115, E-90 and
$\mathrm{E}-93, \mathrm{E}-87, \mathrm{E}-88, \mathrm{E}-103, \mathrm{E}-101, \mathrm{E}-105, \mathrm{E}-107$, E-110 and E-116.

Any further debate or discussion?
Any public comment? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Legislator Rhoads can leave the chambers. He is leaving the chambers and will not be participating in the debate or discussion or vote on the next item which is E-53, a resolution authorizing the county executive to execute an amendment to a personal services agreement between the county and The Triad Group L.L.C.

Moved by Legislator Bynoe.
Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. We need a motion to untable. That was a motion to untable. All in favor of untabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Passes in terms of untabling by a vote of six to nothing. Now it's before us.

MR. PERSICH: This is a contract
for our third-party service provider for
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worker's comp claims. There were questions some questions that were raised by the IG that I think have been answered and satisfied. So I think we fulfilled all the requirements for the extension.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions, discussion, debate?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Do
you mind if we have the IG?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Why don't you come up just to maybe verify that.

MS. FRANZESE: Yes. We actually
had sent a form to the leg at one point saying that we were reviewing this matter. We did review the matter and we have gotten to the end of it. At this point we feel that the matter is ready for your consideration.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Any questions, debate or discussion? Any public comment? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. Katy, did you have something to say.

```
                                    MS. HORST: Just a quick
```

```
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question. Did you all vote on \(A-30\) ? And the clerk's office is asking A-29.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Did I not
say \(A-30\) before? Maybe I missed that. I guess I didn't include it in the items I mentioned but let's do it now. All in favor of \(A-30\) of 2020 signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
Need a motion to adjourn. Moved by
Legislator Schaefer. Seconded by Deputy
Presiding Officer Kopel. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye. Those opposed? We are adjourned.
(Committee was adjourned at 4:36
p.m.)
                            Committee was adjourned at 4:36
```
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