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Rules 8-3-20
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I'd like to call this meeting to order and ask that Legislator Arnie Drucker lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance and please remain standing afterwards for a moment of silence.

We can have a moment of silence for civil rights leader congressman John Lewis, for the marines and sailors who passed away this weekend in the tragic accident and for Judge Sam Levine. May they rest in peace. Thank you.

Welcome to the meeting of the
Nassau County Legislature. Couple of words about the facility now. We've made some changes. I want to thank the department of public works who put this together late last week in terms of the separations between legislators and in terms of the plexiglass et cetera out in the audience. The removal of chairs as well.

This is a temporary solution as far as I can see it, especially with respect to the dais. I think it can be somewhat difficult to see my fellow members of the
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legislature. I'm sure they're having the same difficulty and in particular for recognizing members of the legislature it's going to be somewhat difficult. So we are going to be continuing to explore options how to continue to have these separations but do to them perhaps in a way less obtrusive. I have seen in different places, different bodies, governmental bodies, they have the plexiglass without the borders and perhaps that can be helpful. So we will be pursuing that.

The limitation on the number of people in this room pursuant to state law is 50. So, we have our legislators who are here present. We have some participating by video connection and we have staff. So, although members of the public are invited today, unfortunately the numbers who will be allowed in the room will be relatively small. Because between staff, legislators we are over 40 people in the room right now. But we will do the best we can under the circumstance to continue -- we will continue with the public's business but we will do the best we can to

Rules 8-3-20
accommodate the public in as many ways as we can.


LEGISLATOR MULE: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator C.
William Gaylor the third.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Present.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Vincent
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Muscarella.
LEGISLATOR MUSCARELLA: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Ellen
Birnbaum.
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Delia
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator James
Kennedy.
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Thomas
McKevitt.
LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Laura
Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator John
Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Arnold
Drucker.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.
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MR. PULITZER: Legislator Rose
Marie Walker.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Steven
Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
MR. PULITZER: Minority Leader
Kevan Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Presiding Officer
Richard Nicolello.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here. MR. PULITZER: We have a quorum sir.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. We are going to have the emergency calendar first. Could you read the first emergency?

MR. PULITZER: Emergency
Resolution 21-2020. An emergency resolution
declaring an emergency for immediate action upon an ordinance making certain
determinations pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act and
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authorizing the county executive of the county of Nassau to execute an easement and all pertinent documents in connection therewith between the county of Nassau and the United States of America, acting by and through the naval facilities engineering command, mid-Atlantic, for certain premises being Nassau County storm water basin 213 known and designated as Section 51, Block 465, Lot 15, Nassau County storm water basin number 210 known and designated as Section 52, Block 440, Lot 7, Nassau County storm water basin number 477 known and designated as Section 52, Block 376, Lot 60, along an area of the right of way at Union Avenue and Seamans Neck Road six feet wide by 4,200 totaling 25,200 square feet, and along an area of the right of way at Stewart Avenue and the Boundary Avenue tie-in six feet wide by 50 feet totaling 300 square feet, county of Nassau, state of New York. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you. Legislator Walker makes a motion to establish the emergency. Seconded by the Legislator Ferretti. We have our speakers on
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the emergency.
MR. PAVEL: Craig Pavel, deputy county attorney here with the Office of Real Estate Services.

This item is for the transfer of an easement over three Nassau County storm water basins, basin number 210, 213 and 477 and over two areas of the Nassau County right of way along Seamans Neck Road and Union Avenue and along Stewart Avenue at the Boundary Avenue tie-in.

The Navy presented this effort to the Department of Public Works in 2019 and the item was presented at OSPAC on January 8, 2020 and following that the item was also before the Nassau County Planning Commission for their consideration as well.

The Navy has coordinated door-to-door outreach and advertised in multiple newspapers to inform the public of the project.

Virtually attending we have Christy Chester, real estate specialist from the Department of the Navy, as well as Dave
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Brayack from Tetra Tech, lead contractor for the Department of the Navy and lead contractor for this item.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just let
the record reflect that Legislator Lafazan is here.

I guess we can do both since they are connected in description of the item in terms of substance of what it is. You gave us a little bit of meats and bounds but the substance of the item and the need for an emergency.

MR. PAVEL: The substance of the item is just transferring real estate. It's an easement. I believe Christy Chester and Dave Brayack would like to tune in for the need for the emergency and the justification for it. Christy are you on?

MS. CHESTER: My name is Christy
Chester, a real estate specialist with the Department of Navy as Craig just stated. Also have with me to support this effort Dave Brayack. He's with Tetra Tech which is our lead contractor for this action.
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MR. BRAYACK: My name is Dave
Brayack. I'm with Tetra Tech. We're doing the consulting work for the Navy on this project.

MS. CHESTER: So I'm here to
answer any questions the legislative body may have with this real estate transaction. Dave is on board for any technically driven questions that may arise. So I will turn it back over to you Craig to see what questions any of legislators have at this time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Could we just get a description of what this easement is for, what the need is and why it's an emergency?

## MS. CHESTER: The Navy is

constructing a water treatment facility plant for what we deem as RE-108 hot spots phase two. That water treatment facility plant will be erected on a property that we purchased on 11 Union Avenue. Part of that overarching remediation action will be drilling recovery wells about five to 700 foot down. If you have any technical questions about that Dave
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can touch on that.
Drilling recovery wells
approximately 5 to 700 feet down to fully contaminated water and then piping it to the water treatment facility plant through right of way, treating the water to drinking water standards, not chlorinated but to drinking water standards, and then piping the clean water into discharge basins, two of which are on Nassau County property that we are here today.

So, essentially the parcels that we are looking to acquire easement over three basins for recovery mode and discharge and the two right of ways would be piping.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just
briefly what makes this an emergency to be considered today?

MS. CHESTER: I would say this is an emergency not in the sense that this just came about and Nassau County is just being aware it. This is something we've been working with Nassau County and the department of public works, being presented to OSPAC and
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the planning commission as well earlier this year. This has been something we have been in communication with them and presenting and having multiple public meetings in the impacted areas as well over the last year, a little over a year in fact at this point.

So it's not an emergency in the truest sense that this just came about. But an emergency nonetheless as it relates to being heard on your legislative session today. We attempted to get on the 13th of July agenda. That did not happen because it was too late. Then we had draft notification to get the emergency voted on. We have a number of -- there are a number of impacts that happen beyond this date of getting this approval process. This is the last of the three major ones for Nassau County should they act to move forward.

Then once you draft a resolution there are a number of administrative things that have to happen when it comes to parcels like this. Not only obviously for Nassau County but for the Department of the Navy as
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well. (Inaudible) federal government ending September 30. So there's a number of fiscal restraints when it comes to funding for acquisitions that we're up against. This would have been heard in April but COVID took that over, so we have now found ourselves at the end of our FY ' 20 year for acquisitions. That will impact funding. That will impact our ability to acquire the property in an expedited fashion.

And ultimately it will impact -honestly, had we not put it on, since we did vote it only in April there's already been a significant impact to the overall construction effort.

We presented this, we had a public
forum back in February as well as back in December and we stated our timelines to the impacted area, the residents, that our construction was going to begin in April to expect that. Obviously because of COVID we were unable to do that. Our timeline was impacted overall because this is obviously a larger remediation effort as I mentioned with
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the water treatment facility plant. Other property owners involved, other right of ways that have to be dealt with as well. Pipeline construction obviously. The recovery well construction. We can't do any of that until we acquire the easement with Nassau County and be able to start drilling a profile and be able to get that data. To be able drill the recovery well with the pipeline.

But essentially the emergency comes with our impacted timeline it's been judgementally impacted already because of COVID. Now for our FY '20 that's going to affect our ability for acquisitions as well. So, there's a number of impacts that I can speak. Typically I'm not the subject matter expert when it comes to developing our timeline for contracts in our environmental programs. The manager is. But certainly it impacted none the less. Emergency not in the truest of the word like I stated at the start but not so much that this is just about (inaudible). At this point we need it to be voted on for acquisition and
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utilization of our contract.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Hello
Christy, how are you? With the positioning of these basins is that based on where the plume is currently located? Are the basins at the southern portion of the plume?

MS. CHESTER: It's meant to
capture the outer edge of it. But I'm not the subject matter expert from a technical perspective. I will definitely turn this over to Dave to speak to that. But essentially this comes from a lot of data that's been pulled to strategically place where the recovery wells are going to be as well as the piping. Typically 100 yards this way to left or to the right we risk not capturing the plume in its entirety. Excuse me, to the extent that it's necessary. I will let Dave speak to that if you will.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Dave, before you start, the point I'm getting at and maybe you can incorporate this into your
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responses, is the plume moving and how much does it move on a daily basis?

MS. CHESTER: I think Dave can potentially incorporate that as well.

MR. BRAYACK: And let me explain this project is multiphased. What we are talking about here is the phase two. And the intent of this is to intercept a lot of the mass of the plume. That's the groundwater with the high enough levels of contamination that as it continues to move south it would have a very bad impact or effect on the aquifer to the south.

So this basin that we're targeting, these current well locations, are right near the leading edge of the plume. They are intended to intercept the plume, the hot spot plume. The plume is actually much bigger. But the hot spot plume where it will be in the year 2022. Which is why we are running into schedule constraints at this point.

The plume does move about 300 feet a year. So every year that we delay getting this system up and running the plume moves
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another 300 feet and it cuts down on the effectiveness of this action.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So Dave, every day that you can't do work essentially the plume is moving a foot south and we're losing that opportunity to get the hot zone within these extraction points, correct?

MR. BRAYACK: That's correct.
Our target is to have these wells up and running by the end of 2022 , and that's where we're targeting -- the wells do have a capture zone that extends to the south several hundred feet. But the locations that we have picked here we have been working with for a few years. And like I said, those are targeted to intercept the plume fairly effectively, as long as we get them up and running, by the end of 2022 .

## MS. CHESTER: I just want to kind

 of speak to that and expand on it a little bit Mr. Ferretti. When you're asking about every day that we are not mobilizing the answer to that is essentially yes. Because there's other property owners -- like Dave said, thisRules 8-3-20
is a phase program. This is not just one phase. It's not just one property owner as well. We've drilled other recovery wells in the same manner on other property but ultimately have no piping to attach to it. They are not functional right now. They are waiting for this phase two, this RE-108 hot spot phase two plan, to actually be operatable.

So we have other recovery wells drilled in other locations on other parcels that potentially if we do not execute and mobilize the construction of this phase two Nassau County impacted parcels then ultimately they don't necessarily become obsolete but they stop doing their job. The very reason we acquired those properties, the easements for those properties and drilled those wells, to begin vertical profile boring ahead of that to capture the data to know that we needed another recovery well on a different parcel of land and we've acquired that and we drilled that.
Now it's sitting there and it's
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awaiting pipeline. It's awaiting easement acquisition for other property owners such Nassau County. Nassau County happens to be the largest property owner in this space too.

Every day that we are held up on mobilizing with the data that we can pull from the vertical profile borings that will be the first thing that we do in say since 2013, that helps model the overarching groundwater that were designed that we're working with that Dave I'm sure can speak to as well. But there's a lot of moving parts in the construction of this phase two, the phase one and ultimately phase three.

But at this moment, Mr. Ferretti, yes, the answer is absolutely. Every day that we do not move on this and have the ability to mobilize our contractors and retrieve that data from the vertical profile borings and then drill the recovery wells and then the pipelines and then build up the construction in the basin for discharge, yeah, every day that we're not able to do that moves the timeline to actually start treating this water
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pushes it back for sure.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Walker then Legislator Birnbaum.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: First of all, Legislator Nicolello, I can understand why we need to make this different because I thought I was going to have throw something over to let you know I wanted to speak.

Obviously this has been an issue in my district for a very, very long time, and we really had hoped that this work would have started. In one way it was a positive because the residents didn't have the work being done in the spring and into the summer. But this is something that tremendously affects those people who are drastically affected by the Grumman-Navy plume.

I understand like when you said it's an emergency, not necessarily the emergency that God forbid something didn't happen today but it's something that we do need to move on quickly and get the process going.
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And we did have several meetings. We met, Legislator Ferretti and myself, met with the Navy and went over things. We made sure that the residents in the area knew. Unfortunately the residents in Legislator Ferretti's district really didn't know in the beginning what was taking place and they're not happy about it but they understand the importance about it. So thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Birnbaum.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Hi. We've been hearing a lot about 1,4-Dioxane and I was just wondering under this proposal does the Navy have an enforceable contractual obligation to meet the New York State maximum contaminant levels for 1,4-Dioxane and other contaminants?

MS. CHESTER: Dave, as far as the water treatment facility plant and its capacity $I$ will let you speak about that. As far as what we are mandated to clean up I would have to have our environmental project manager speak to that. He's not on the call
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currently but $I$ think Dave can potentially address that with respect to 1,4-Dioxane. MR. BRAYACK: We do anticipate 1,4-Dioxane in our water. The design which is currently in progress as a specific treatment for 1,4-Dioxane it's called advanced oxidation process. Bethpage Water District I believe is currently operating one of these. Suffolk County has one in operation as well. Our current goal is to, at a maximum, is to achieve about one half the MCL and we expect to do much better than that. Meaning like perhaps as low as -- and this is the proposed New York State MCL -- we were targeting -that MCL is about one part per billion. Our maximum that we are shooting for is zero point five parts per billion and we expect to routinely achieve zero point one part per billion or one-tenth that value.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Great. Why didn't the Navy agree though to restore the property once all this decontamination is complete as recommended by the planning commission? Would the Navy agree to be bound
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to maintain the basins once they're not used so they don't become a community problem?

MS. CHESTER: Would you repeat that one more time? I apologize.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Why didn't the Navy agree to restore the property once the decontamination is complete as recommended by the Nassau Planning Commission? Would the Navy agree to be bound to maintain the basins once they're not used so they don't become a community problem with overgrown plants into these kinds of basins?

MS. CHESTER: It's still
interrupted. But I believe that if I heard your question correctly it was why the Navy could not agree to -- just repeat the last part.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: To restore the property after the decontamination is complete.

MS. CHESTER: I apologize. The connection is really bad currently. Yes, to speak to that, we cannot necessary stay over and above what we have in the easement

Rules 8-3-20
language that we've already agreed to. But as far as how it's addressed in paragraph eight of the easement, the language, while the Department of Navy would plan to abandon in place any underground piping. Essentially what we are doing is abandoning the piping underground, remove subsurface, remove above ground service structures followed by any other upgrades.

In the future the problem is the Department of Navy their plan may differ over the lifetime of this easement. We can't really necessarily tell for the future like federal, legal, environmental requirements, things of that nature. So we can't -- the Navy is unable to change those terminations in a way that would restrict future Department of the Navy decision making.

Right now the plan is to abandon in place underground piping and remove any subsurface, followed by filling in recovery and replace the property to what it was before. So that is our plan. But as far as termination language
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and the easement we can't differ from that just based on the requirements and the lifetime of this actual easement made from a technological -- technology, like I said, federal, legal environmental requirements and things of that nature. So we have to keep it as such. But we certainly acknowledge what our plan is currently when it comes to buried pipeline that's typically an abandon in place and then the rest is removing subsurface and above ground improvements. Hopefully that addresses what your question was.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Presiding Officer. I have just one remaining question, and I'm not sure whether you covered it because the connection is kind of distorted. But the expenditure deadline for the Navy to actually be able -- for this money not to be in jeopardy to capture from the Congress what's the deadline for that?

MS. CHESTER: The answer to that is we surpassed that deadline but now we are

Rules 8-3-20
approaching critical. It was over a year ago we approached Nassau County with this effort and once we went to OSPAC and then the first time we went to planning we realized that Mr. Ferretti and Ms. Walker, the representatives in the impacted area, they wanted to make sure we notified them properly. We held a public forum meeting in December. We did another one in February as well. We had a really great turnout for that. And door-to-door effort. Advertising in multiple newspapers as well.

But in order to ensure that the residents were informed as they needed to be not just from the remediation stand point but from a basic construction standpoint as well further delayed this effort. And then COVID happened as well.

We, in our timelines, we put in what I will refer to as a buffer so to speak when it comes to potential delays in acquisition. Potential delays in weather. There's a lot things built into that time. But what was not built in was over a year's
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worth of efforts to acquire the interest. Obviously COVID-19 had an impact on that.

But now we are approaching a very critical stage. We have a lot of -- obviously you understand there's a lot of moving parts. Such as construct the water treatment facility plants, acquire easements for other parcels, for pipeline construction, drilling recovery wells and the BBPs that have to be drilled ahead of that for the data to be able to move forward. But there's also contract, RFPs, that we have to send out. There's a number of things that have to be satisfied every step of the way for this to not only be functional but operational cleaning contaminated water by the end of 2022. We are approaching a critical, critical deadline at this point and delaying any further we have no justification for delaying any further when it comes to answering the call of being operational by the time that we promised the state of New York. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you. My concern is that this body has only become aware of this, the full body, $I$ understand
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that you've been working with some of the legislators that are representing the most impacted areas, but we've just been aware of this less than four or five days. So this is a lot of information for us to have to upload and then be able to trust it. We are going to be dealing with such an important issue under an emergency type of process. It's concerning for me.

But this is a very big issue. It's an issue that $I$ am happy that the Navy is taking responsibility to rectify. I just would have loved a lot more time to be able to have looked at this agreement a little closer. There are certain things that you're agreeing to or that's been stated in this meeting that $I$ don't necessarily see in the agreement. But I guess we're going to have to trust that this is the right way forward. It is concerning for me and $I$ just want to put that on the record. I really wish that this body would have collectively had a lot more time to look at this agreement to ensure that we are doing the right thing for such an
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important and critical issue. Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Just
in a quick answer, who oversees the work that the Navy is doing? Who do you report to? Is it going to be the DEC that gives the sign off? How do we know what the progress is?

MS. CHESTER: Sure. That's an
understandable question. In the record of decision that was put into place in 2013 that basically placed the Navy -- the responsibility of this cleanup effort. It also placed us as the lead federal agency. We work collaboratively with the DEC. All of our finalized data for design plans as well as the date we pull from the vertical profile borings and the water treatment facility plants. And obviously Dave can I'm sure speak far more eloquently about that.

We submit all of our finalized data to DEC. We work hand-in-hand with DEC. The plan that they rolled out about $a$ year and a half or so ago they will tell you very
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candidly that the Navy's efforts in this RE-108 hot spot the treatment of this goes hand-in-hand with their overarching effort for cleanup as well. The program that they rolled out about a year and a half ago.

So the plan, they will tell you quite frankly our effort is up and running operational and it's moving forward in a capacity that we are on for today.

But we have been maintaining the lead federal agency for this. We coordinate and collaborate with DEC constantly and we provide them all of our finalized data as well as our finalized design plans as well.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: In layman's terms, before the Navy can complete this task you're going to have to get an okay from the DEC that the work is completed in the standards in which they require?

MS. CHESTER: Dave, perhaps you can speak to this. There's some nuances about that. We do not have to seek conferment from DEC but it's far more complex than that. We collaborate with them with all of our efforts
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from the most basic of designs to the finalized data from the contaminated water, to the treated water and so on and so forth. Dave, maybe you speak to that a little bit better.

MR. BRAYACK: The New York State DEC is involved with all of our plans. They review the documents, the design, the work plans that implement. They provide comments on those and we look at and review those comments. Generally we are 100 percent agreement on all technical issues. They are an integral part of this whole process. But as Christy was saying, the Navy is the lead agency on this and then they use for consultation purposes.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: The Navy is sort of self-ruling in this situation? Would you say the DEC has oversight or really no?

MS. CHESTER: I would say that we have transparency in all of our work with New York DEC as well as all of the property owners, municipalities. Whether it be a
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courtesy or indeed a requirement we provide all our finalized data to property owners. We do frequently for the Nassau County engineers currently for other projects and we will moving forward with this one as well. I wouldn't say that we provide our own oversight but rather I would say we provide transparency to all property owners as well as the state of New York every step of the way.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Should a problem incur with the DEC should they not be happy with something what would happen?

MS. CHESTER: I couldn't ascertain what necessarily would happen. If the DEC is not happy with our performance or data that is presented to them I'm sure they will address the Navy accordingly.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
have to say $I$ find that a little concerning because a few of these questions I find we are not really getting the answer to. We wanted to know exactly what the funding was going to be available and we're hearing September
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15th. But from what you've said I just couldn't get a clear answer on that. I can't get a clear answer on this question because I think there might be some foreseeable situation that the DEC might not be happy with something and I don't where that would go. Which makes me a little concerned.

And also the last thing which Legislator Birnbaum asked, it sounds like we would like it to be more of an event to be put in writing. With all due respect, I'm finding this a little frustrating as a legislator. We really needs like clear, concise answers on something so important and I don't feel that we're getting them.

Again, we would like to know the exact date that the funding is in jeopardy. We'd like to know what oversight the DEC or any other agency has should there be an issue? I'd also like to know what Ellen Birnbaum asked, clear concise answers as to what will be done after the use of this property is complete. How it's going to be left for our residents. So, I don't know if
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there's a way to get those answers. Just one or two word answers really for all three.

MS. CHESTER: I will attempt to the best of my ability to answer those questions. As far as the DEC they provide oversight, absolutely. However, they do not have to concur with our plans but we have to collaborate with them. I understand that it's not a clear, concise answer but the Navy is lead federal agency for this. That task is not only with the responsibility of this but to report with a plan. But we work hand-and-hand with DEC and we are absolutely transparent in every step of the way and they are supportive of this action.

We sat down with Legislator
Ferretti and Legislator Walker with the DEC representative with their support of the Navy's remediation effort in this acquisition.

I can't really speak on behalf of the DEC as to how they would manage if they did not like data or something we presented to them. But we create nothing but transparency
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to the property owners as well as the state of New York and we collaborate with them hand-and-hand constantly with this effort.

Like I said, this is a phased effort. This is one part of a much bigger picture. But we absolutely work hand-in-hand with them but can't really speak for DEC as to how it's going to handle or manage a situation from a state level if they did not like information that we submitted to them.

Regarding the easement and how we leave the property we're not leaving a treatment facility plant on any of the county's parcels. We have two parcels that are right-of-way. We will be creating pipelines that go to the water treatment facility plant.

Then the other three parcels are three basins and will have a recovery well which will be roughly a six by ten structure above ground. It will have an electrical panel. Mr. Brayack can kind of give you a little more details with that. But it will not be a building so to speak. It will be
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somewhat of a small structure. But what we will do is, what the agreement is now, what we typically do is abandon in place underground piping and we remove any subsurface and above ground surface structure and put property back to what it was before.

As far as the way basin is
concerned, we have discussed at great length with Nassau County various agencies and Department of Public Work as far as adhering to the basic requirement as far as upkeeping.

Hopefully that speaks to your
question. I wish it was clear and concise one word answer. It's more complex than that when it comes to this.

As far as us removing abandon in place we have to keep general terms because as I was saying previously, technology, federal, legal, environmental requirement things of that nature protect us over the life of the easement. So putting specifics in there as to what we will do today perhaps won't work a year from now is not something that we feel we can do at the Department of the Navy.
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As far as our fiscal restraint, to speak to that, our fiscal year ends September 30th. There's an approval process that goes into funding an acquisition. But we have to wait on this vote to take place first. Then the administrative comment takes for an order or resolution to be drafted and submitted back for funding.

There is no finite date that $I$ can give you but from that $I$ have seen you guys are convening one time in September as well and that would be towards the end of the middle of it, and that certainly would not allow enough time for us to fund an acquisition prior to September 30th.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I think we made some progress there. So September 30 th is the date that we need to pass our agreement now. So September 30th is the date that we might have an issue with funding; is that correct?

MS. CHESTER: Yes but -LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: That's good. Okay, okay. That's good. Now
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the next question that I have, before the Navy is done and packs it in and leaves does any local agency have to approve the work that you completed?

MS. CHESTER: No. We --
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
That's okay. That's good.
The last thing, which is what I think I heard, you are working with our own Nassau County DPW, maybe Ken Arnold, that you are going to be working with DPW to leave the property in a certain way. Ken, I don't know if you feel comfortable commenting on that. Ken Arnold. Yes or no?

MS. CHESTER: Was that a question
for me?
MR. ARNOLD: What's the question again?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I'm
sorry to put you on the spot. Have you had any contact with the Navy as far as how the property will be left when the work is complete?
MR. ARNOLD: My staff has. I
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don't know the details of what they
discussed. In discussions with what they can do, what they can't do in the property but I'm not sure on what the final restitution of the property will look like.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can we request that you work with them to attempt to make sure that the property is left in the best condition as possible after this is done?

MR. ARNOLD: Sure.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I'm done. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Ferretti has a couple more.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I will try
to be brief. Christy, in terms of the schedule, $I$ know prior to COVID your goal was, assuming these easements passed this body, to start work sometime in April. What is your hopeful start time or date for the work?

MS. CHESTER: If we were to
receive the approval vote and you guys draft an ordinance for us to begin work after this
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legislative body meeting convening, then what we would hope to do is go ahead and start mobilizing, clearing utilities, that aspect, as well as drilling notices and things of that nature. That's a door-to-door effort as well. And we would hope to mobilize as early as the first of October.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: First of
October you said?
MS. CHESTER: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The work
would occur on weekdays. Would it occur weekends as well?

MS. CHESTER: Typically we try to
stay into the parameters of Monday through Friday and normal business hours. Dave, if you want to speak to that you certainly can clarify.

MR. BRAYACK: Normal work hours are Monday through Friday during normal time hours. Periodically on Saturday or Sunday we will have some minor activities mostly to maintain the stability of the bore hole that's being drilled. But there are more minor
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activities such as topping off the mud and such. But no, the normal work hours are Monday through Friday.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When you say minor activities, the drilling obviously makes noise and one of the basins we're talking about is smack in the middle of a residential community. So that drilling would not be occurring on weekends, correct?

MR. BRAYACK: That's correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I've heard a couple of times concern from my colleagues about how the property will be left once this is complete. This entire process takes over a century, correct?

MR. BRAYACK: Our target is
between 50 and 100 years right now.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Let's put aside when this project is complete for a second and let's talk about the next 50 to 100 years. Will the Navy be maintaining these basins, vegetation specifically, during the course of this project?

MR. BRAYACK: Christy, I'm going
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to let you answer that because it's in the agreement. But what we've done in other basins is had variable agreements between the basin owner and the Navy. In some cases we maintain the basin. In other cases the government compensates the county for that basin maintenance. I defer that to Christy.

MS. CHESTER: We've spoken to
Nassau County, one of their engineers, and went over in great depth the basin requirements. That's something that typically our Navy contractors work out with the municipality or the property owner. Typically has been Nassau County. We have a number of agreements with other basins as well and they have been very pleased with the upkeep and the maintenance of those basins. We intend to specifically keep the basins the way that we need them to be. Keep them pristine and vegetation cleared back in and of itself. They're typically in better shape after we're there then they were before.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: It sounds like that's a yes, that the Navy will be
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maintaining the basins during the course of this project, correct?

MS. CHESTER: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: In terms of water levels, obviously there's a basin where the treated water is going to be dumped into the basin, correct?

MS. CHESTER: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: In that
basin in particular $I$ would assume that during storms there will be a propensity for that basin to fill. Will the Navy be monitoring that basin for water levels to ensure that when storms occur there won't be any overflow into residential communities of water?

MS. CHESTER: Absolutely. And if you want to expound on what that process is Dave I'm sure you can do that.

MR. BRAYACK: Let me explain.
The basins are designed to hold a certain volume of water. We do anticipate having some small level, one to two feet, of water in the basin as a result of our actions. What we will do is we're going to actually dig the
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basins a couple of feet deeper so that our water -- the volume that we're taking up with our water will be displaced by the amount of water we're excavating.

In addition to that we will have level sensors, automatic level sensors, in the basin monitoring for the water. It's a rain gauge in essence is what it is. But if we get a significant precipitation of that, usually about two inches per hour, the system will automatically shut off. If the level in the basin reaches some predetermined level that would be unexpected that could cause it to increase, we would shut off.

If we are projecting a major storm coming through, like this current tropical storm coming through, we would typically shut our system off a day or two in advance.

We have three levels of protection. And not to mention that we do have our operators go to the basin on a regular basis as well.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you for that answer. Last couple of questions.
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The piping that's going to go through the roadway, it's going to go through town roads, for this project at least, town roads and county roads, the county road being Seamans Neck Road, correct?

MS. CHESTER: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Will there
be notice to residents on both the town roads
and the county road in advance that this
construction is going to be done to the
roadway to install the piping?
MS. CHESTER: Yes, there will be.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: That
piping, some of which is going to carry
treated water to that final basin but the other half of the piping will be contaminated water being pulled up from one of the basins; is that's correct?

MS. CHESTER: That's correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So there
will be some contaminated water traveling
through pipes underground, correct?
MS. CHESTER: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What
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assurances do we have if there was a leak in one of those pipes that that contaminated water would not leak into ground underneath people's houses or whatever?

MS. CHESTER: I will let Dave speak to that from a technical perspective as well.

## MR. BRAYACK: You are correct

 that some of the water coming out of our wells will be contaminated and it will be pumped from those well locations back to our treatment plant. What we're going to do is we will be using something called double wall pipe. The water with the contamination in it will be flowing through the inner pipe and this will be roughly an eight inch diameter pipe. Outside of that we will have a 12 inch diameter pipe. That's the second wall of double contaminant.So if the inner pipe leaks it flows into the outer pipe. The outer pipe has a leak detection system built into it. We will have several manholes along the way. If those manholes, if they see any water, there will a
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level switch that says we have a leak in our piping somewhere and it will basically tell everything to shut down and sound an alarm. At which point we have a series of steps to locate the leak and repair it as such. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The roadways which are being taken up in order to place these pipes down what is the procedure going to be in terms of putting the asphalt back? Is it going to be resurfacing? Patching? What is it going to be? MR. BRAYACK: Currently we are looking at the conditions of the roads and what's been typically done. Our current plan is to patch the road to match the existing. However, when we get into cases where we have newer roads then we would be look at repaving a lane.

## LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Just one

last question. Seamans Neck Road has an elementary school on it, East Broadway Elementary School, obviously there is during the school year which we are now going to be approaching, originally we thought the
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majority, a lot of this was going to happen in the summer. Now it's going to happen in the middle of the school year. There will be advanced notice and you will work with the school and the school district to ensure that any bus routes, parent drop-offs, assuming we have in person school, that you will work with the school district, correct, in advance and make sure that they are accommodated?

```
MS. CHESTER: Yes. To the extent
``` Nassau County wants to communicate with the school we are amenable to working with them, absolutely. We submit to Nassau County traffic plans and things of that nature ahead of construction and we absolutely will consider bus routes, parent pick-up, drop-offs in the area in the location.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I can
certainly tell you I absolutely want to make sure that we sit down with the school district and work that out well in advance, as far as in advance as we can. Please let's get together after this and make sure we put something down. Thank you.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Are there any other questions? Legislator Birnbaum. LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Thank you for giving all these answers. Yet \(I\) find it little bit troublesome that we don't have a lot of this in writing, especially since many of these questions had been submitted to you prior to this meeting, and we never saw them in writing. So I truly hope that putting it on the record here will be an indication that you're giving us assurances that you will do all that we have asked you to do.

That's why I am troubled about the restoration of the property after the decontamination. And we don't know how long it will take, whether it's 20, 50 years, 75 years. We don't know. But it's still property that is in the midst of our residents and we certainly expect it to be left in good shape and in a sensible completion. So I'm troubled about why any of this couldn't be put in writing.

And my last question is, can the county attorney's office explain the valuation
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process for the property?
MR. PAVEL: The valuation process Christy if you can weigh in on it it's actually a federal valuation process called waiver valuation as \(I\) understand it. I do have an email from the Navy on that from Amanda. And as I understand it, the Navy makes a determination of value, in this case nominal valuation, and it allows the Navy the greatest degree of flexibility in negotiating. Christy, can you expound perhaps on the waiver valuation process and if there are any other questions I can gladly answer them.

MS. CHESTER: Certainly. We've discussed in great depth with Nassau County the valuation the parcels. Ultimately, without getting into technical terms, the Uniform Act describes the use of a waiver valuation when the agency determines that an appraisal is unnecessary because the valuation is uncomplicated and it's anticipated proposed acquisition is estimated to be \(\$ 10,000\) or less. Ultimately the standard was written
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primarily for federal acquisitions from private land owners. Can you guys hear me? Can you hear me?

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Yes.
MS. CHESTER: The screen went blank. I wasn't quite sure you guys could hear me. Ultimately we have to adhere to what we sustain as (inaudible) standards. It was primary for federal acquisitions from private landowners to not only protect the landowner from the government unjustly compensating them but also protecting taxpayers whose is ultimately paying for it.

Because (inaudible) which is the
federal standard evaluation differs from USPAP, which is the private sector standard for appraisals. In this respect, UASFLA does not allow for speculative highest and best use and undersubmits comments easier.

In fact, UASFLA assumes that the property's highest and best use is ordinarily its existing use. And the property owner will typically put their property to its maximum use. In this case right of ways and basins.
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Storm water basin.
Ultimately given the direction
found within the Uniform Act and useful of the element standards the Navy made the determination that an appraisal would be unnecessary and opted for a waiver valuation procedure making a nominal value determination via a waiver valuation under the Uniform Act. We discussed this with Nassau County at great length. It gives us a great deal of latitude for us to execute expeditiously.
MR. PAVEL: I will just follow
up. We did seek the advice of John Guest on the Navy's determination regarding the waiver valuation determination and our appraiser on staff sent us a very precise memo explaining the situation and that he would concur in essence and that otherwise it's appropriate. LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: What was the last line. MR. PAVEL: Appropriate. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Legislator Walker.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Really not a
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question just a comment. As far as the sumps go, the majority of our sumps are in pretty poor shape to begin with. Actually these sumps will be cleared out. A lot of the trees and shrubs and brush that's in there they have to be maintained far better than they are being maintained presently. So those sumps will end up being in better condition than many of our other sumps throughout the county.

My concern is the roadways. I want to make sure the roadways are back to where they should be. Some of those roadways have had recent work on them. I don't want them to just be patch jobs. Legislator Ferretti and I had discussed that and had gone over that with the Navy and said we want them to be in excellent shape when they're finished.

Again, making sure our residents, our school districts that they are aware as each step is happening. Not just days before. Well in advance.

\section*{LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone}
else? Thank you. Let's have a vote on the
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emergency. All in favor of establishing the emergency signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

With the consent of the Minority we will waive the reading of this again and just simply call the item for a vote. It will be 198 of 2020. Actually I should call any public comment. Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Passes unanimously.

Thank you all who participated in that.

The other item for an emergency is 106 of 2020. I will just call the emergency. A resolution authorizing the county executive to execute an intermunicipal agreement with the Town of Hempstead in relation to a streetscape project on a section of Uniondale Avenue in Uniondale.

The motion to establish the emergency is made by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. Ken, do you want to speak to the
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emergency?
MR. ARNOLD: Good afternoon. Ken
Arnold, public works.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Cover the substance of it too.

MR. ARNOLD: This is an IMA with the Town of Hempstead. The department has a capital project on its books for streetscape work on Uniondale Avenue. We completed phase one about a year ago. We were looking to do phase two. And then in talking with the town they were undergoing a similar project in another portion of Uniondale Avenue. It was best felt that we combine our efforts and have a single contract out there and not to disturb the community with multiple contractors.

So, we did the design and we brought the design to the town. They put together the IMA and they bid the contract and are ready to proceed. They're just waiting for the county to act on the IMA which is what is in front of you today. The IMA is for \(\$ 1\) million. It will cover all the county's previous obligated phase for phase two.

Rules 8-3-20
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: As to the emergency, my understanding is that we need to move as quickly as possible on this in order to get the work done before the paving season ends; is that correct?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. The town is
looking to start the work as soon as possible and this type of work would usually end somewhere around December. So moving this forwarded today would give them a chance to get this work done before that point.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone have any questions for Mr. Arnold? Did we lose connection here? We were considering the intermunicipal agreement between the Town of Hempstead in relation to the streetscape project on Uniondale Avenue. Kevan, did you want to add anything to that or say anything about that project? Kevan, I don't know if you wanted to add anything about the streetscape project president.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry.
I don't want to belabor. I want to say that the Uniondale community has been very patience
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as we approach the first phase and I'm glad to see and I want to support going forward it's going to be a shot in the arm for the Uniondale community. And some of you have seen phase one, the crosswalk. It's going to continue to transform. This partnership with the IMA that is before us today and working the Town of Hempstead is going to continue that. Hopefully it bodes well for more things to come. I'm thankful that it's on the calendar today and I will be giving it obviously my 100 percent support.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Any other legislator want to weigh in on this? Hearing none, any public comment on the emergency? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. That establishes the emergency. On the item itself, 106, any other discussion on the item? Any public comments? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? That carries unanimously.

That's the end of the emergency portion of our meeting. Go to the regular
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calendar and there are a number of items that have been agreed to between the Minority and Majority that can go by way of consent calendar. These items were on committees several weeks ago and have been vetted and discussed and determined that no further discussion among us is required. So let me go to those items.

Item seven, Ordinance 52. Eight,
Ordinance 63. Nine, Ordinance 64. Ten, Ordinance 65. 11, Ordinance 66. 12

Resolution 54. 13, Resolution 55. 14, Resolution 56. 15, Resolution 57. 16, Resolution 58. 17, Resolution 59. 19, Resolution 61. 20, Resolution 62. 21, Resolution 63. 22, Resolution 64. 23, Resolution 65. 24, Resolution 66. 25, Resolution 67. 26, Resolution 68. 27, Resolution 69. 28, Resolution 70. 29, Resolution 71. 30, Resolution 72. 31, Resolution 73. 32, Resolution 74.

Motions are made by Legislator Bynoe and seconded by Legislator Ford. Any debate or discussion? Any public comment?
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Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. Going back to the start of the calendar. Number one is a hearing on a proposed local law to extend the deadline regarding penalties and interest for late payment of general taxes due July 1, 2020 on property owned by deceased health care workers and deceased first responders.

Moved by Legislator Drucker. Seconded by Legislator Ferretti. Do you want to say a few words about this?

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you
Presiding Officer. Once again, I would just like to thank Legislator Gaylor for his collaboration on this bill, and I want to thank the Majority and my caucus here for continuing to do whatever we can to show our appreciation to our front line workers and our first responders for the hero's work they do day in and day out during this COVID pandemic. And this is just one small way to show our appreciation to them and provide some sort of economic relief to their families for
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suffering the grievous loss of these heroes in fighting this pandemic.

So I just want to commend everyone, commend the legislature, the body entirely, and I'm just very gratifying by this. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you
Arnie. I neglected to do one thing which is a vote to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is open. Thank you Arnie. Any other legislators want to speak on this? Hearing none, any public comment?

Motion to close the hearing by Legislator Drucker. Seconded by Legislator Gaylor. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is closed.

Go to item four which is a vote on this local law which is to extend the deadline regarding penalties and interest for late payment of general taxes due July 1, 2020 on property owned by deceased health care workers
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and deceased first responders.
Again Legislator Drucker makes the motion. Legislator Drucker seconds it. Any discussion or debate on the item itself? Hearing none, any public comments? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Passes unanimously.

Item two is a hearing on a proposed local law to amend the Nassau County administrative code in relation to amending the Nassau County Human Rights Law to preclude discrimination based on certain visible characteristics.

Moved by Legislator McKevitt. Seconded by Legislator Kopel to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. The hearing is open.

This is a proposed law to expand the human rights law to prohibit discrimination against individual traits such as natural hair texture, protective hairstyles and the donning of religious garments or items.

> With respect to that latter
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category, the county has become and is extremely diverse specifically in the area of religious traditions, cultures, backgrounds and this makes sure that whether you are Hindu or a Sikhs or a Muslim or Christian or of the Jewish faith or any other faith and what you are wearing is part of your religious attire you cannot be discriminated against under our human rights law.

Just to add one other thing, these specific categories are not otherwise covered by the Human Rights law either specifically or by a general catchall provision. Anyone else? Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you Presiding Officer. I will be voting in favor of this amendment to Nassau County's Human Rights Law. However, I cannot help but feel that today's action is incomplete. Nearly a decade ago Judy Jacobs first carried legislation that would add simple language to our human right's law to make it unambiguously clear that transgender people are protected under county nondiscrimination laws. The
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legislature has not acted upon this amendment despite numerous opportunities. Since that time state legislation has since been enacted to mandate equal treatment under the law for transgender New Yorkers.

Mr. Presiding Officer, you argued on July 13th that this makes local action on behalf of transgender Nassau residents unnecessary. I respectfully submit that the actions of this legislature reveal this stance to be an unjust double standard.

Consider the amendment we are debating today. It will ensure that the people that form the beautiful cultural tapestry that we call Nassau County are protected from discrimination based on certain visible characteristics or traits such as natural hair texture and protective hairstyles.

However, Section 292 of the New York State Human Rights law was amended last year to prohibit exactly this same type of discrimination by expanding the definition of race to include traits historically associated
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with race including but not limited to hair texture and protective hairstyles such as braids, locks and twists. Why is this bill before us today, worthwhile and honorable as it is, being held to a different standard by this legislature than one for transgender people?

Furthermore, it is an established practice of this legislature to make certain protections explicit under county law notwithstanding the existence of similar protections under state or federal law.

The challenges faced by transgender
Nassau County and New York residents has not abated. Transgender people experience elevated levels of poverty, housing discrimination, workplace bias and a risk of suicide and mental health challenges as compared to the general population. They are also frequently the target of fatal violence.

According to the human rights campaign advocates track no fewer than 27 violent deaths of transgender or gender nonconforming Americans in 2019. Many were
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black transgender women. At least 21
transpeople have been killed in America this year alone.

It is now clear in 2020 that gender identity and racial equity are inseparable. I believe that in trying county level protection stemming from gender identity in our human rights law is not only morally and legally correct but consistent with the practices of this body. The transgender community is under attack as we speak and we have a duty to stand with them just as we seek to do with other marginalized groups. It is literally the least we can do. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just a
brief response. You mischaracterized my statements. My position has been and is now that transgender rights are covered and that the general statement with respect to perceived gender covers it completely. It was intended to do so back when we adopted it. It is sufficient to do so. So my position has also been and our position has always been they're already covered.
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Over the last ten years while the minority has raised this issue consistently in that ten years time, even go back farther, when we changed the human rights law there has never been one incident where it has been shown that the absence of the language that you're pushing for the human rights law has made a difference in one single case.

I understand your arguments in terms of philosophically and rationally, but the truth of the matter is, and I think if anyone really looked at this from a legal standpoint or otherwise, it's already covered. It has already been covered. And they specifically included perceived gender to cover it.

> I must also repeat something I said
last time which is that this area changes so quickly, that the descriptions that change so quickly, the terminology changes so quickly that it is better to have the catchall provision in place as opposed to specifically trying to capture something which will then have to be changed in a year or two.
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I think in New York State, New York City human rights laws and regulations cover some 290 something, that's an exaggeration, but multiple numbers of sexual genders. To go down the road of having to change this every the terminology changes is not a direction this county should be going in.

Secondly, I would just point out whereas natural hair texture, protective hairstyles you may be correct may be covered already, the donning of religious garments or items is not. It's important that we protect religious faiths and the diversity of this county.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'll just respectfully disagree Presiding Officer. My disagreement is not just philosophical. It is what I consider to be legal and I believe that we've had incidences on this body where we had made accommodations. We made accommodations last year for visually impaired and those who are hearing impaired. That was already covered under state and federal regulations and we did it then. So there is precedent
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here. So I'm just saying that the transgender population has not changed. It's not a moving target and gender identity and gender expression are something that it's here, it's relevant. It's intertwined with racial quality. I think we need to address it. It's the 800 pound gorilla in the room and by ignoring it \(I\) think we are doing an injustice as a legislative body. But I respectfully disagree.

\section*{LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: One}
response with respect to visual or hearing impaired, they may have been covered by state and federal regulations and laws they were not specifically covered in our code. As I said again, transgender are already covered which is why we're not addressing that at this time.

Again, with respect to donning of religious garments or items that is already not covered and it makes a statement that we believe should be made as opposed to something that is already covered.

Anyone else want to speak to this?
Legislator Solages.
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LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you very much Presiding Officer. Just in response to your argument, you mentioned that there hasn't been one instance of this in the county to your understanding. Again, I think it's a flawed argument. Just because there hasn't been a reported incident doesn't mean it doesn't occur. Perhaps they didn't report it because they were scared of retribution. Or perhaps they didn't report it because they thought that no one would care. So that's one comment I have.

Secondly, I have a question. If a Starbucks worker would shave Black Lives Matter in his hair would this law cover him? And he was fired for that. Would this law cover him?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That is an
answer that \(I\) do not have. Ultimately natural hair texture or protective hairstyles. The creation of a slogan in your hairstyle constitute protective hairstyles? I doubt it. Ultimately that's not where we're going with this. I think if you Google the term
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protective hairstyles it relates to a specific type of hairstyle that people wear.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Like corn rows, dreads?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It could be but it's defined. Again, it's not intended to cover political speech.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: That's a
human rights speech sir not a political speech.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: However
you want to characterize it, there are rights under the existing laws in terms of the first amendment and other things that would address something like that. This is more intended to prevent people from being discriminated because they're wearing a particular hairstyle not because they want to send a message particularly with respect to an issue in their hairstyle. That's my interpretation. Now if it goes to courts if might be something else.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you counselor.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
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else? Any public comment? Hearing none, all in favor of -- actually I'm getting ahead of myself. Motion to close the hearing? That will be moved by Legislator Ford. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is closed. Carries unanimously.

Now for the item which is item five. Again, a the local law to amend the Nassau County administrative code as described before. Motion by Legislator McKevitt. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. The item is before us. Any further debate or discussion? Hearing none, any public comment? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Last hearing for today is number
three. A local law amending Local Law 18-1984 as last amended by Local Law number 9-2017 and as incorporated in Chapter 4 of Title 9 of the miscellaneous laws of Nassau County in relation to imposing additional rates of sales and compensating use taxes authorized by
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Section 1210 of the tax law and continuing a local government assistance program authorized by Section 1262E of the tax law.

Moved by Legislator Mule. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. That is a motion to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously and the hearing is open.

Do we have anyone from the administration to speak on this item?

MR. PERSICH: Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget. This is just the renewal of the local government assistance program for sales tax. There's two components. The one piece goes to the towns and cities. The other piece goes to the villages. Budgetary-wise, up until the pandemic, it was approximately \(\$ 75\) million that we paid out. It's been revised as the sales tax numbers decline. Here to answer any questions that you may have.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The total
number has been revised downward, correct?
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MR. PERSICH: Yes, that's
correct. They are going to follow suit with the amount of collections we make.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: What about the specifics in terms of \(I\) know a certain amount is guaranteed to the villages. Has that been --

MR. PERSICH: Still in place.
\(\$ 1.25\) million annually.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: How are you
Mr. Persich? Good to see you. Has there been any discussion between the administration and any of the villages? Because \(I\) know that from my own communications with them that the split between the towns and villages has always been a bone of contention.

MR. PERSICH: I'm not aware of any ongoing involvement or conversations between the villages. I know everybody wants a little bit more take of the sales tax but it would require state legislation in order for that to happen I think. This is part of state
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law. Even if we wanted to enact it it would require an action by the state in order to change the split between the villages and the county.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: But that ultimately would wind up having a start with some sort of discussions at a local level, correct?

MR. PERSICH: Correct.
Unfortunately if times were a little more robust \(I\) would be more in favor of that. But where we're at right now \(I\) can't see giving away any additional sales tax proceeds that we may have.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The amount remains the same, does it not? In other words, the impact to the county doesn't change. It would be the split between the town and the villages would change.

MR. PERSICH: The village piece
is a fixed amount. The town piece is a percentage of the total amount. So it's a component of the reduction. Sales tax goes up they get a little bit more. Sales tax goes
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down they get a little bit less.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The money
that's received by the villages comes out of the town's portion, does it not?

MR. PERSICH: No, it doesn't. It comes out of the county's portion. Comes out of our pocket, that is correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: My
understanding is the argument for the villages
is that many of the services that are provided by the villages are services that the towns are receiving compensation for. That the villages don't necessarily --

MR. PERSICH: Correct. There's been some conversations with some villages that \(I\) know of that they didn't feel their portion of the town piece was not an equitable distribution. But again, it would require the state to make a change in the law to change the splits between even the town piece and the village piece.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I understand
there has to be state action. But again, if there's a conversation to be had that
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conversation should occur locally first I would assume, right?

MR. PERSICH: Yes. I don't have enough to give back to the villages. If the towns want to give some of the money of their take back then \(I\) think that's a conversation the villages could have with the individual townships. But we here in the county, I can't afford to split.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I certainly
understand the financial picture. My
understanding is that the current agreement does not expire until November 30th; is that correct?

MR. PERSICH: That I am not sure of. The reason that it was put on was in order to get it on the state calendar. So it's a timing issue that it had to be put on here because the state wanted it by September because they need our local law in order to renew the expiring law in the state.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: When is the legislature going back in session, do you know?
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MR. PERSICH: I can't answer that
legislator. I'm being honest with you.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You would
anticipate it being sometime in September otherwise this would be a pointless effort?

MR. PERSICH: September, October
I would think because that's when they specifically asked us to get it up to them to give them a little lead time.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Knowing the
issues that the villages have I'm just hesitant to considering this now knowing that there have been no conversations with the villages and the county. That I feel as though should have been something that was done before it was presented to us. Even if there's no change. Just know that those issues have been heard and that they have been taken into account.

MR. PERSICH: I can rewind you a
little bit to 2018 when there was a conversation with the president of the villages association from one of the villages and we discussed the issue. But again, the
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county's shaky financial position limits us of what we can give them. Even if we could do something. We don't have the funding in order to give them additional funds. We are in a control period. So I don't think to increase the piece to the villages is actually going to be something that \(I\) can sit here and tell you that it's going happen.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: At this pace we will be in a control period for the next 50 years. At some point in time the issue has to be addressed. I just feel as though it should be addressed now. Or at least the conversation should take place now. We can't rely on the conversation for you 2018. But the discussion hasn't been had and I appreciate that.

MR. PERSICH: Understand.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just for
clarification, the town's piece is established by state law, correct?

MR. PERSICH: Correct.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And you have a percentage of the overall sales tax
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collection?
MR. PERSICH: Correct.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: With
respect to the villages' piece, does that come out of the towns' piece or is it separate?

MR. PERSICH: Separate. Comes out of the county piece of it. It's the county portion of the sales tax that's also enacted by state law it's one-twelfth of one quarter of whatever the crazy denominator is.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Did you
have something you wanted to add?
MR. PERSICH: I misspoke. There
has been some conversations with the local villages on the split of the sales tax \(I\) just got from the administration. I wasn't privy to that. I'm on the financial side of this.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO:
Specifically with the state direction you're getting from the state legislature they want it by when?

MR. PERSICH: I think they wanted
it up to them because the meeting schedule that we had I think we had to do it for this

Rules 8-3-20
one because they wanted it in early September.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: All
right. Any other debate or discussion? Any public comment? Hearing none, a motion to close the hearing. Legislator Walker moves to close the hearing. Legislator Birnbaum seconds that motion. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Go to the item for a vote which is item 6, a local law we just heard about in the hearing. Motion by Legislator Ford. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. Any further debate or discussion on this item? Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thanks. I did have conversations with the Village of Freeport, specifically their counsel. Mayor Kennedy from the Village of Freeport is the head of the State Conference of Mayors. They expressed their dissatisfaction with the split that the villages would be receiving from the county. Communication to me was that there had been no outreach or no discussions with the administration and the village. Again,
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that's what I'm being told by the village.
I just feel as though those conversations should take place before this item was presented to the legislature. We're going to wind up taking a vote today because essentially we're being told that there's no opportunity for us to act because the state legislature is coming back into session before we would have our next meeting towards the end of September. And we certainly don't want to create a scenario where the villages would not be receiving any split because there's been no renewal in place and we don't know prior to the election whether the state legislature is going to come back into session.

Regardless of what action we take today, I think there does have to be a conversation between the villages and the administration to ensure that we can reach some sort of resolution to this. Obviously the plight of the villages and the pressures on their budget obviously is relevant to all of us as is our own. I just wanted to make that statement before we vote.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else? Katy, do you want to add something? MS. HORST: Sure. Just that the administration has spoken to the villages. I know that \(I\) have been in a meeting with Mayor Kennedy and he has absolutely expressed his displeasure with the breakdown. I know DC Santeramo has spoken to Howard Copeland and there have been ongoing conversations with the Village Officials Association on this topic. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else? Thank you. Any public comment? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

That is the end of the legislative calendar. We need a motion to adjourn. Moved by Legislator Lafazan. Seconded by --

Thank you for reminding me. Number 18 is a resolution to establish a committee to study alternative approaches to mental health response and intervention by law enforcement. There's a motion on that by Legislator Bynoe and it's seconded by Legislator Kopel. That is before us.
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There is an amendment which I guess we will take up at this time. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitution and adds two nonvoting members to the committee. One is appointed upon the recommendation of the presiding officer. One is appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader.

That motion is made by Legislator Walker. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. That's a motion to amend. Any debate or discussion on the amendment? Proposed amendment. Hearing none, all in favor of the proposed amendment signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Amendment carries unanimously.

Now the item as amended is before us. Is there anyone from the administration who wants to speak on this? Ultimately Legislator Bynoe I'm sure will speak to this but we had requested some members of the police department and human services to be able to speak.

MS. HORST: Katy Horst from the administration. I've got Dr. McCummings on
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the phone. She's having difficulty connecting via Microsoft Team. So she's on the phone. She's listening. If there are any questions for her I will be happy to put the phone up. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions for Dr. McCummings? Maybe put the phone up. My question is, is she prepared to move forward? What is her position with respect to the proposal?

MS. HORST: Go ahead Dr.
McCummings.
DR. MCCUMMINGS: Good afternoon. We are definitely ready to go ahead and proceed with the committee. There already is and it's already stated in the amendment that we already have a mechanism where we have mobile crisis teams available to go out on these calls with the police department if they are called to any kind of mental health or behavior health call.

What happens now is I understand most of the police department they do not call them to ask for their assistance. Rather usually call and ask for assistance. I think
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the amendment or the resolution would be a good way for us to establish a protocol for having both the mobile crisis team and police department work together in order to make sure that any of these calls are handled properly.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thanks.
Anyone else have any questions for Dr.
McCummings? I think we're good. Inspector, did you want to speak to that as well?

MR. FIELD: William Field, deputy
inspector Nassau County Police Department. If you have any questions in regards \(I\) would be more than happy.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Actually
the only question \(I\) had was what the position of the commissioner of the police department with respect to this proposal, support it, if he can work with it, what's your position?

MR. FIELD: Obviously the police department welcomes any improvement to the service of the residents of Nassau County. Especially in situations that can be quite serious related to mental illness or an individual in crisis.
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We are currently working with the governor's request to review police response to a number of items. Included in those items we proactively added response by the police to situations involving mental health as well as complaint investigations in relations to internal affairs. We hope to have this completed and submitted to the legislature in the late fall of 2020 and we continue to discuss with mental health experts we already have and continue to in regards to the governor's order at this time and hope to do more so in the future.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: So the commissioner will be supportive of this initiative?

MR. FIELD: I believe that we are supporting improving things. We are working on this simultaneously. It may be helpful to wait until we complete this portion of the governor's request. But we are here to -this is an urgent matter and obviously understand how important it is to address. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This
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creates the formation of a committee which I think will work over the course of time, so I think it can actually work hand in glove with what you're doing with response to the governor's mandate. MR. FIELD: Absolutely. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Ford.

\section*{LEGISLATOR FORD: Good}
afternoon. I don't know whether or not you can answer this or maybe this is something that maybe the committee can undertake. But considering the HIPAA laws in regard to people's health whether or not it's physical or mental, is it possible, I don't know if you do this already or not, if you have a situation where you know somebody is in a community and they may have some issues, the police have been there prior for different complaints or whatever, is that something that you're allowed do then -- do you pass it on to the other officers? So like you have those smart laptops or something where you may know at 32 Oakwood Line Denise always acts
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erratically. So that going forward if you're reporting to a call that you may know that somebody may not be completely stable. So
that before you go there then you can
always -- you don't know what the call would be but maybe you might be aware that you might need the crisis intervention or social worker there. Is that something you do already? MR. FIELD: So, with any 911 call
if it's a location that we have been to before the officers have access on their terminals in their computers they'll have access to previous call history there. And sometimes that's very helpful. It can describe a situation where maybe we have been there before for somebody that has had mental illness.

Many times officers work in the same areas and same locations so they're intimately familiar hopefully with the neighborhood and are able to perhaps already have had built rapport up with their residents.
We also can reach out to mobile
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crisis in situations where perhaps -- where we can't take the person into custody physically based on the law but we can reach out to them to further assist.

LEGISLATOR FORD: And maybe that they may be able to get social services to go and help them.

MR. FIELD: Absolutely. I have
done it myself.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very much.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Good
afternoon officer. I was just curious. I guess alluding to what Legislator Ford was just asking. Who makes that determination whether or not to call the mobile service unit to come? Is it the police officers that are responding? Is it the 911 operator? Who makes that determination?

MR. FIELD: As it is in the policy now we currently -- it could be the police officer at scene. Could be the police
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supervisor at the location. Usually that would be, in my experience, that would be the options, either the police officer at the scene or police supervisor at the scene.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Do you have any idea about how many mental health or mental aided calls you get a year basically? Is it very much?

MR. FIELD: I don't have the global number of mental illness, mental aided related calls. But in regards to what we have coded as violent mental aideds, which comes through 911, just in 2018 alone we responded to about 390 and in 2019 we were over 300 as well. Anyone of those situations automatically requires the response of our emergency services personnel who are highly trained and can assist the officers at scene. LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: So that's different from the mobile crisis unit?

MR. FIELD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: If it's a violent one or you anticipate it to be one based on whatever information you have do you
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automatically call the mobile crisis unit or you don't? I guess I'm just wondering when you do bring them in.

MR. FIELD: Generally, if it's a violent -- it depends on the circumstances. A lot of these situations are fact sensitive and it's dependent upon how the information is relayed to the 911 operators as well as how the information is relayed to the police officers at scene.

With that being the case, if the person is required under the Mental Hygiene Law to be brought in for a psychological evaluation often times the police officers make that determination in conjunction with the emergency services or their police supervisor.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Emergency services you said are highly trained in aiding mental health issues; is that correct? What's the difference in their training as to what a general police officer will get?

MR. FIELD: Under New York State Department -- excuse me, the Division of
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Criminal Justice Services mandates all police officers to receive 20 hour course related to behavioral science with emotional distress. How to communicate effectively with people under emotional stress and crisis. In addition to that, the police officers also receive another over 20 hours of training dealing with numerous items that can be helpful when in a situation involving somebody mental in illness which includes crisis intervention, de-escalation, professional communication, autism training is separate and also general verbal skills and communication with persons in crisis.

Emergency services unit actually has -- they go through a five-day training program. It's in-depth. Given by the doctors of Hofstra's psychology department. That's where they get additional training in some specific diagnosis that they may coming in contact with. Such as neurological disorders, depression, down syndrome, psychosis, personality disorders. That's on top of the tactical training that they receive in
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nonlethal and verbal communication.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Are there many instances where the mobile crisis unit is called first and then they end up calling the police? Does that ever happen? Or is it you're only handling when 911 takes the call and it goes straight to you? Probably asking like five questions at once. Do any homes generally, that you know of, get calls directly or do the homes directly call the mobile crisis unit to come out to help them?

MR. FIELD: I'm not sure off the top of my head. I do remember from my experience there have been situations where we have been notified by perhaps someone's mental health professional that takes care of them that there is an emergency and an urgent situation that needs our response. But as to specifics with mobile crisis I would have to really look into that more.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay. That's all.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else before we get to Legislator Bynoe?
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LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Presiding Officer. I will be very brief in my comments. We spent a lot of time on this in the committees. First I would like to start by thanking my colleague Josh Lafazan for working on this important issue with me. I think it's a piece of work that \(I\) been trying to advance since my time here at the legislature just surrounding mental health issues. I think it's very important that the county work diligently and utilize all resources available to them to ensure that we are servicing that population as best as possible.

I also would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee that was part of teeing this up so it got to the full legislature. I'm hopeful today that it will gain support form the legislature to be able to move forward. I think it's important to that we take the time to study such essential services that this county is required to provide to those would be mentally ill.

I likened this the last to somebody
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being medically ill, maybe somebody breaking a leg or falling down the stairs. Some level of a cardiac issue and only sending the police and not sending medical professionals to assist in aiding that individual. So I think it's similar if we don't have highly trained, highly skilled individuals to be able to look at -- to go to these scenes and respond and look for optimal outcomes once they're on scene. I think it's important to study it.

I think our police commissioner along with our commissioner of human services are perfectly steeped in experience and skilled in their craft to be able to review this process and identify an alternative approach or alternative approaches as we move forward.

I'd just like to in advance thank my colleagues or hopefully we can move this forward and look how we can look to work together in how we can serve this population of individuals who are so deserving of our assistance. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other
```
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legislators? Thank you inspector. Any public comment? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
Now we can recess or adjourn. Legislator Schaefer makes a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Legislator Drucker. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. (Meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.)
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legislators? Thank you inspector. Any public
comment? All in favor signify by saying aye.
Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
Now we can recess or adjourn.
(Meeting was adjourned at 3:12
p.m.)
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