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Full - 12-14-20
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I would
like to call this session of the Nassau County
Legislature to order. Legislator Rose Walker would you lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mike, would you call the call.
MR. PULITZER: Yes. Thank you.
Roll call. Presiding Officer Howard Kopel. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here thanks for the promotion.

MR. PULITZER: That's Deputy
Presiding Officer Howard Kopel. Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer Denise Ford.

Legislator Siela Bynoe.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Carrie Solages.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Debra
Mule.
LEGISLATOR MULE: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator C.
William Gaylor the third.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Present.

Full - 12-14-20
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Vincent
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.

Regal Reporting Service
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LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Rose
Marie Walker.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Joshua
Lafazan.
MR. LAFAZAN: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Steven
Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
MR. PULITZER: Minority Leader
Kevan Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Let me come back
to Alternate Presiding Officer Denise Ford.
Is not present? And Presiding Officer Richard Nicolello.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.
MR. PULITZER: We have a quorum
sir.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you very much. We are going to do the legislative calendar first today. So those of you from the administration who are here for the Rules
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Committee it's going to be a while. Just to let you know. If there's something that you can do in the interim.

First order of business is a point of personal privilege. Turn things over to Legislator Walker.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you
Presiding Officer. It gives me great pleasure today to honor one of our staff members here in the county exec building, Maureen Smyth. Maureen, if you would stand please. Maureen has worked for us for 40 years. She celebrated her 40th anniversary here in the county.

Maureen started here right after high school. She graduated from Hicksville High School. She's a lifelong resident of Hicksville, just like me Maureen, and started right here after high school. She's worked over these past 40 years with tremendous dedication and caring and kindness. And she actually goes to every one of our offices. Many of the legislators might not get to see her that often but certainly their aides do.
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She brings mail, brings important information to us in our offices.

Maureen, we can't thank you enough for that and for your kindness and for always having a smile. For many times just saying the right words to us to make us feel good and have a great day. We just wanted to commemorate your 40 years by giving you a citation and it's signed by every one of the legislators here. I get to do the personal privilege because you live in my district but it's really from all of us.

We want to say thank you for all your time and dedication to Nassau County and to each and every one of us. So, thank you and congratulations. I don't know if you want to say anything. You don't have to but if you would like to you can say something.

MS. SMYTH: I just want to say
thank you to everyone. This is very special and I can't thank people enough for doing this for me today. I work with a lot of different bosses but Ratania is my special boss and I just want to say thank you very much again.
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LEGISLATOR WALKER: Maureen has members of her department who are here to join her, her supervisor and head of department and her family. So I thank them for being here and spending this time with her also.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Congratulations again. Well deserved.

Now we have the public comment portion of our meeting. I have two slips. If anyone else from the public would like to say anything or make remarks we have slips that should be filled out at the clerk's table right here. First speaker is Mary Yvonne Perno.

MS. PERNO: Good afternoon. My name is Mary Yvonne Perno. I'm here today as a resident and also a member of the board of directors for the Seasons at Seaford. They're condominiums located in Seaford, New York. I'm sure that by now most of you know that the Seasons is a senior community. Residents are 62 and over. We're paying our full school taxes while unable to utilize the schools.

We all just got recently slammed
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with a school tax bill that saw an increase of anywhere from $\$ 3,000$ to over $\$ 5,100$. It's outrageous. Our community has written numerous letters to many legislators as well as our state senator, our governor, county executive, the receiver of taxes, the assessment office and many more. We even, actually I personally emailed Scott Eiler of Newsday, and the only replies we received were from State Senator Brooks, Legislator Steve Rhoads and the receiver of taxes, Jeannine Driscoll.

One member of the community received an email from Mr. Mills. I believe he's the deputy assessor. He said that there was going to be a meeting today and that the Department of Assessment has submitted correction of error petitions to correct errors regarding the condo community. I hope this is true.

When I woke up this morning and I
saw the spread in Newsday I was actually shaken to see that Scott Eiler, who did not even answer our emails, reported information
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that was both slanted and inaccurate. He wrote that people saw increases of up to $\$ 2,000$. That's totally wrong. The people in our senior citizen development saw increases of over $\$ 5,100$. Something has to be done to fix this.

I felt it necessary to come here today to ask, to actually beg you to please pass a resolution that will correct the taxable value placed on our condominiums that will alleviate the burden that has been placed on the senior community.

I thank you for your time, and I
look forward to your help in this matter. Our senior residents can certainly use some uplifting news regarding this. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. There is an item on the calendar for correction of errors. I'm going to have Legislator Steve Rhoads give you more information.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: First of all
I want to thank you for coming down. You and
I had the opportunity to speak at the tail end
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of last week regarding today's correction of errors petition. I wanted to thank actually the receiver of taxes, Jeannine Driscoll, and also all of the residents of the Seasons in Seaford.

After attending the press conference, we discovered that the reason that you received the bills that you received was because of yet another error that was made by the Department of Assessment in considering the Seasons at Seaford as new construction as opposed to existing construction. New construction wound up being taxed at a higher value, at a higher assessed value thank you were supposed to because you were built prior to 2018. So, that error was identified and is being corrected today in the correction of errors petition that's before us.

So, I want to thank all of the residents of the Seasons for bringing this to our attention and I want to thank Jeannine Driscoll as a partner in making sure that that condition was remedied.

Quite honestly, this is yet the
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latest example and it turns out there's a second complex up on the north shore that was actually treated the same way as the Seasons. We are actually fixing both of those today.

But this is another example of, in my opinion, of just sloppy work that was done by our Department of Assessment that is having real financial consequences for individual residents. And in this case, while we're able to fix the errors today, the reality is that those bills were due on Thursday. That residents that don't have the money and weren't expecting those huge increases had to pay those increases and now we're going to have to wait for some accommodation to be made for them to get their money back.

We'll fix the mistake for the second half but it's unfortunate that a mistake was made in the first place. And had the Department of Assessment simply done a better job and spent 30 seconds to look at the property card and see when that was actually constructed we could have avoided that mistake in the first place and it's unfortunate.
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Again I want to thank you for bringing that to our attention and it will be addressed today.

MS. PERNO: And I want to thank you for your support and Jeannine. We really, really appreciated it. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Not a problem. Thanks.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. I should have mentioned this before, when speakers come to the microphone we just ask that they have their masks on because obviously you have multiple people coming up and speaking to the mic.

Next speaker is John Budnick.
MR. BUDNICK: John Joseph Budnick, 122 Van Huenfeld Street. I'm here to talk about several issues. One is about number six on the calendar. The public hearing about the age of 65. One might also consider studying number one, whether we need a better form of government in this county. Perhaps an elected county assessor. I know it failed four years ago but it is still a
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necessity for the benefit of our taxpayers. Particularly seniors and people on fixed income.

Another thing I wanted to talk about is about our various courthouses and particularly we have one that's hopefully going to be finished soon and there are other ones that might be considered for being named perhaps after the Gulotta family which has served Nassau County many times in many different modalities. Also served New York State.

I want to bring you holiday greetings from us all. Every holiday that exists. I hope that you folks will consider making sure that with regard to the police department's contracts that are coming through that we don't try to penalize these people for doing their job. They're out there having people trying to roll over them, attack them, assault them. They need our support.

Also, I have a quick question for everybody and that's merely this. Have all of you elected officials complied with New York
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State executive law designating three alternates to replace you during emergencies?

Also, I understand Legislator Gaylor's family has been experiencing some difficulties and $I$ hope we are all praying for some help to he and his family.

Also, a large number of months ago this body passed a demand that criminal justice statistics be provided to this body from the police department. Particularly with regard to those released in their own custody and the appearances that they made or didn't make. I hope that data will be made public for everyone to know about.

Thank you very much for your putting up with me for all these many years. God bless you. Let's have a happier and healthier new year. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you
John. You too. Is there any other public comments? Hearing none, we are going to get into the calendar. First item we have is a procedural resolution to establish a calendar for meetings for the legislature of the county
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of Nassau for the calendar year 2021 pursuant to county government law of Nassau County.

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. Any debate or discussion on this calendar item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? That carries unanimously.

Here is what we're going to do. We have a consent calendar. Items that went through committees. It has been agreed by the Majority and Minority that these items require no further debate or discussion. I will be calling those in a moment. After that I'm going to be calling a couple of items out of order. Since Ms. Perno is still here we're going to call that item next after the consent calendar so we can have you on your way.

This is the consent calendar. Item 18, Ordinance 127. 19, Ordinance 128. 20, Ordinance 129. 21, Ordinance 130. 22, Ordinance 131. 23, Ordinance 132. 24, Ordinance 133. 25, Ordinance 134. 26, Ordinance 135. 27, Ordinance 136. 28,
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Ordinance 137. 29, Ordinance 138. 30, Ordinance 139. 31, Ordinance 140. 33, Ordinance 142. 36, Resolution 171. 39, Resolution 174. 40, Resolution 175. 41, Resolution 176. 42, Resolution 177. 43, Resolution 178. 44, Resolution 179. 45, Resolution 180. 46, Resolution 181. 47, Resolution 182. 48, Resolution 183. 49, Resolution 184. 50, Resolution 185. 52, Resolution 187. 53, Resolution 188. 54, Resolution 189. 55, Resolution 190. 56, Resolution 191. 57, Resolution 192. 58, Resolution 193. 59, Resolution 194. That's it for the consent calendar. Motion by Legislator Arnie Drucker. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none -LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, our counsel was unaware of the consent calendar. Can we just have a couple of minutes just to make sure all the items are called we actually consented?

| LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: | Sure. |
| :--- | :--- |
| LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: | Presiding |
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Officer, Pete needs about five minutes to review everything that you had called. Do you want to wait or do you want to table these items and then pick them back up as soon as he reviews them?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We will
table them and bring them back when you're ready.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I
appreciate it.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Motion to table by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Those items are all tabled.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sure.
Next we're going to jump to calendar items 60 to 64. That's Resolution 195, Resolution 196, Resolution 197, Resolution 198, Resolution 199. These are all resolutions to authorize the county assessor and/or the county treasurer and/or the receivers of taxes of the Town of Hempstead, North Hempstead, Oyster Bay
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to partially exempt certain real properties situated in certain school districts as well as to -- that's it. Partially exempt real property situated in various school districts assessed to designated owners appearing on the assessment rolls for the specified school and/or county years pursuant to this resolution; pursuant to the Real Property Tax Law as well as the county government law of Nassau County.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Drucker. These are corrections that we just spoke about relating specifically to a number of developments including the Seasons at Seaford. Is there any debate or discussion on these items? Legislator Rhoads.

## LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Is anyone

 here from the Department of Assessment?MR. MILES: Robert Miles, deputy assessor.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thanks for
coming Mr. Miles. Item 402 and 403 are multiresidential properties, one of which is
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the Seasons in Seaford. I don't know if you heard Ms. Perno speak in public comment as a resident of Seasons in Seaford. Can you explain for us how exactly this error happened? My understanding is that they were assessed as new construction, this complex, as well as one other up on the north shore in Port Washington was assessed as new construction erroneously?

MR. MILES: No. The Seasons had a new construction issue and that is what we are correcting with that item. The Mill Pond was a lot number issue, changed lot number, and that is being corrected in the other correction of error petition.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: With respect
to the Seasons in Seaford, the reason I'm asking this question is because I want to understand how the Department of Assessment actually goes through this process to avoid these errors in the future. It took me about 30 seconds online to see when the Seasons in Seaford was constructed. It was constructed between 2015 and 2017 which clearly takes it
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out of that category. Why was the Department of Assessment not able to do the same thing? MR. MILES: I believe the Seasons was done in several phases and there's just an error I guess in the latest phase and that was corrected. So, I can't tell you what happened with the previous phases versus this phase. The Seasons has been -- the prospectuses have changed several times over the years. So, that might have been an issue. But this last phase it was put on us physical and then it was corrected. From my understanding, I don't believe that was the latest phase. There might have been some additional construction towards the end of '17 and '18. So that also is a consideration.

But at this point $I$ can't tell you what the difference was in the analysis of the different phases but the latest phase caused a technical issue and it's being corrected on this legislation.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: What does the analysis consist of Mr. Miles? MR. MILES: Can you be more
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specific as to the question you're asking? LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You're saying that there's was a mistake in the analysis. What is the actual analysis by the Department of Assessment? Are we checking property cards or is this something simply done by computer? Why isn't someone checking to make sure this is accurate before we start charging people thousands of dollars in tax increases? MR. MILES: When you do large scale buildings you do a combination of reviewing prospectuses and trying to review photos, overhead pictures. So, it's not as simple and basic as pulling up property record cards because the developers tend to adjust their prospectuses several times before the final prospectus is submitted to the attorney general and then delivered to the Department of Assessment. So, there's more complexity to the condominium units than you would have with your run of the mill day-to-day residential home.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Isn't it the case that a property record within the
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individual township's building department would have a completion date?

MR. MILES: I'm sorry legislator, there's a some lack of clarity on the vocals. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Wouldn't the property card within the individual building department in that jurisdiction have a completion date for the construction project? Why can't we look at that?

MR. MILES: The property record card is based on what we develop internally in the system and based on what our systems show and based on what the prospectuses are. For this situation the prospectuses changed so often and the review of the physical increases and changes in the building caused the issue with the latest phase. The property record card is developed internally.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So we don't
look at the building department's records from the individual townships?

MR. MILES: The department looks at all different types of information. Like I said, the condominium units are significantly
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more complex due to the apportionment of the single property into several properties.

Because you cannot build a single building, so you would separate it out and apportion the property into several parcels or many severals of parcels.

At the same time you're in the middle of trying to deal with prospectuses that continue to change and you try to keep up with the physical changes as best as you could with physical inspections and with overhead photos. That's the difference between trying to place value on a roll for a condominium unit versus a single family home. It's more difficult to track because of the constant changes and adjustments in the tax lots and the adjustments in the physical value of the condominium units. So, the latest phase had an issue with it and that's why we're here to make the adjustments necessary.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: To correct
the error, right?
MR. MILES: It's a correction of error resolution, that's in the title.
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LEGISLATOR RHOADS: This error by the way, since these bills have already been paid presumably by the residents since the tax deadline was on December 10th this falls under the county guarantee, does it not?

MR. MILES: Yes.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: These residents would only be made whole as a result of Nassau County and Nassau County taxpayers having to pay for this mistake, correct?

MR. MILES: The county will be paying for the refund.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Right. So
the money that these residents had to overpay is money that ultimately county taxpayers are going to foot the bill for?

MR. MILES: The method of payment is what I -- my job duty is making sure that the treasurer is aware of the resolution and performs the tasks of making a refund.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You do understand when there is a refund that refund has to be paid out of county dollars, correct?
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MR. MILES: That is the county guarantee.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Our
recognition of this error is going to cost county taxpayers between Port Washington and Seaford approximately $\$ 2$ million.

MR. MILES: The county will be covering the cost of the increase in value and then the implementation of the exemption.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Which is
going to cost county taxpayers about $\$ 2$ million because you couldn't get it right the first time, right?

MR. MILES: The number of the refund liability is on the legislation, and I believe it's separated out between the five different correction of error resolutions. There is a sum of money that has to be paid and the Department of Assessment is committed to making sure that the taxpayers get corrected second half bills and the refunds that they deserve.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: How quickly
is the Department of Assessment going to issue
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to the receiver of taxes the information that they can use to produce those corrected bills?

MR. MILES: This week.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: When can our residents expect to get the money back that we've overcharged them?

MR. MILES: I'm not sure. It's up to the treasurer's office but I'm sure the treasurer is also committed to sending out refunds as soon as they can.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Do you know
if this is going to be a refund or are we going to simply reduce the seconded half bill that's due and owing and play that game?

MR. MILES: It's dependent upon
the town receiver but more likely a refund. But it's up to the receiver of taxes. I'm pretty sure it will be a refund liability.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The receiver of taxes doesn't issue the refund, right? the treasurer issues the refund. So it's not town issue it's a county issue.

MR. MILES: I believe you can
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create a credit for the second half but I'm not sure if all of the town receivers are able to do that. So, more likely than not it would be a refund and then corrected second half. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I'm sure the residents would prefer to have the money in their pocket rather than wait for a credit on the second half tax bill. So we want to make sure that that takes place. Do you have any idea if in fact it is a refund when the county anticipates mailing out those refunds?

MR. MILES: Like I said, I'm not an employee of the treasurer but I believe the treasurer is committed to working as quickly as they can to send out these refunds.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: As a result of these mistakes has there been any review within the Department of Assessment of your procedures and systems to insure that this doesn't occur again?

MR. MILES: We continue to try to work on the condominium units. It's a complex valuation process. For many, many years prior to this administration and prior to the
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administration before that, it's difficult to try to evaluate parcels when the prospectuses continue to change. But we continue to try to have a good relationship with the developers in the area and try to continue to communicate with them as the phases are completed, as the prospectuses are adjusted, amended and sent into the Department of Assessment.

So, I think this is just something that's just a long term goal for the department is just to continue to have good relations with our developers and try to make sure that they send us prospectuses in a timely fashion and send us adjustments as soon as they can.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: We're putting the onus on the developers?

MR. MILES: No. I'm not putting the onus on anyone. I'm just telling you what the process is. That's my job here today, to tell you how the system works and it's been a problem in previous administrations and administrations before that. And we just want to continue to work on building the department
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and continue to improve processes that were issues in the past.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I just wanted
to know if some review is taking place within the Department of Assessment to try and fix whatever broke down in this particular situation?

MR. MILES: We're reviewing the
condominiums. We have been and we will
continue and we try to hone in on that process.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Do we know
whether these five correction of error
petitions are going to be the last mistakes that we have to fix or do we know that there are more coming down the pipeline?

MR. MILES: These are the corrections we have right now. I don't foresee more. Although there's always the one-off corrections. A fire damaged parcel, a change in a lot. There's always these one-off petitions. We did that for the 1920 roll. There's a record of that. There's these one-offs. Especially fire damage. We want to
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make sure the individual, although we don't get evidence of fire damaged parcels or their permits prior to the tax status date, when they give us that information we try to correct them and try to make sure they get the values that they deserve before the tax bills goes out. This is just a normal process correction of errors. I don't see a large number of petitions like you see in front of you today. But there's always one-offs just due to information coming in in real time. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I just wanted to make sure the Department of Assessment understands that the errors that are being corrected today have affected hundreds of families who are being charged real dollars more than what they owe, more than they deserve to pay and that the errors that the Department of Assessment makes cost real people money, time and aggravation and that everything needs to be put into fixing the process so that it works better. You would agree with that right Mr. Miles? MR. MILES: We have been
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committed to improving the Department of Assessment since the new administration came in. You guys heard me before. I testified in the past how it was a department that had a frozen roll and --

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Mr. Miles I don't want to get into a debate.

MR. MILES: -- and a smaller staff and we continue to try.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Mr. Miles, all I want to know is that there's a recognition on behalf of the Department of Assessment that we need to do better. You would agree with that, right?

MR. MILES: I'm here to tell you what the process is on the correction of error resolutions and that is what I've given you today.

## LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thanks

Mr. Miles.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Note for
the record that Legislator Ford has joined us remotely and is participating in this meeting. I have Legislator Walker and

Full - 12-14-20
Legislator Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you Presiding Officer. Mr. Miles, I know this is addressing these two condo units, one up in Glen Cove and one here in Seaford. This does not address residential streets that half of the street had major problems with that you are well aware of.

MR. MILES: Coronation Drive is one of the five resolutions.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Coronation is on here?

MR. MILES: Yes.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: The same goes for them. They obviously had to pay the money outright and somehow they will be reimbursed for that and it will be corrected by the next time the taxes are due?

MR. MILES: Yes. Correct
legislator.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you.
MR. MILES: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Ferretti.
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LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you
Presiding Officer. This is an outrageous scenario that we are dealing with here. The failed reassessment it's failed on multiple levels. If you read Newsday you've seen one level. But just the nonchalant attitude Mr. Miles that you seem to have about an issue like this it's really, really concerning to me.

I spoke to Ms. Perno just a few minutes ago. She has dozens of outstanding phone calls to the Department of Assessment, dozen of outstanding phone calls to the county executive's office. All unanswered. Every single one of them. For a community of seniors to have go to elected lawmakers to resolve this problem, not the Department of Assessment who didn't bother to return their phone call, it's just an extrapolation of the attitude you're showing today. Which is a lack of caring of the pain that these residents are going through.

This is the holiday season. These are seniors who over the course of their lives
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have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars towards Nassau County property taxes. This is the way they're being treated? This is outrageous. You should -- Mr. Moog is not here, I understand that, but he should be calling these people back, each one of them, and apologizing for this disaster. These people have to lay all this money during the holiday season, most likely have to sacrifice spending during the holidays as a result of that on their families and nobody even had the respect enough to call them back and explain to them what's going on. They needed to go to elected lawmakers to resolve this? That's a disgrace. If there was ever an example of why we need an elected assessor this is it because no elected official would treat their constituents like this. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Does
anyone else want to be heard on this? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. We're going to untable all of the items that are on the consent calendar. Those
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are calendar numbers 18 through $33,36,39$ through 50. 50 to 59. Motion to untable by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Legislator Drucker. All in favor of untabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The matters are untabled.

Again, any debate or discussion among the legislators? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

I'm going to jump to calendar item number 38 which involves the MOU between the college and the federation of teachers. Let me find that and I'll call it. 38, Resolution 173 is a resolution ratifying the memorandum of agreement making certain amendments to the collective bargaining agreement between the county of Nassau and Nassau Community College as joint employers and the Nassau Community College Federation of Teachers.

Moved by Legislator McKevitt.
Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. So that is before us and we have somebody from the college to present? I believe we do.
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MR. GROSS: John Gross. I'm
outside counsel to the Nassau Community College and I will be addressing the proposed settlement that's before you. I believe also here is president of the NCCFT, Donna Hope, and our vice president for finance Julio Corsic.

The negotiations began some time ago and unfortunately during the course of the negotiations it became quite apparent to the college that anticipated tuition revenue was not going to meet what had been anticipated. I'm sure, as the legislature knows, there are three revenue streams, county contribution, state contribution and the third of course is tuition.

Because of the COVID crisis and also some history of a decline in enrollment it became quite apparent during our negotiations that a typical increase, which has been running certainly in educational circles of two percent plus increment, in that neighborhood, an increment in this instance cost two percent, I will explain that in a
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moment, could not be reached by the college because of this diminution in tuition revenue.

At the same time while not a causation of this more circumscript position, financial circumscript position, we also have the course of threat of state aid reductions. Although that has not quite yet occurred pending what happens in Washington with aid to the states.

The primary cause of a change in our position at the bargaining table was the recognition of this reduction in student enrollment and tuition.

As a result we had extensive discussions with the leadership of NCCFT who were working with us and we focused on a different financial approach.

I mentioned before increment. In just about every community college in the state of New York which mimics a bit in what occurs in $K-12$ in the school districts compensation systems, there is an incremental structure where professors, and in the case of
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Nassau Community College everybody is hired at an instructor rate before they move into the professorial ranks, they're hired at what might be considered somewhat depressed salaries for someone with a master's degree and/or Ph.D. somewhere in the 70 or $\$ 80,000$. It takes 20 years for them to reach the maximum step. When step is granted at Nassau Community College it essentially equates to approximately two percent of base payroll. While the Nassau Community College Federation of Teachers contract does not require automatic payment, that is in the contract, that is always a critical item of negotiations. And the college has always been able to negotiate somewhat limited across the board increases by reference to that high cost of two percent.

In this instance we discussed with the association first with a notion that we would only grant increments. That was not acceptable because that would leave many of the senior professors without even a modest increase. So the agreement we struck to keep
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and frankly to reduce by half what could have been anticipated to be the settlement.

What we did was we negotiated an increase of only one percent for each of two years but increment only one half of the increment would be granted. So, in essence, someone who's in the incremental structure it's two years to move one step as opposed to one. That cost us only one percent per annum.

The net result is two percent for each of two years of the two year contract. That, in essence, if one assumes and in just about every year -- and I've represented the college for quite some time -- every year increment ultimately is negotiated as part of the package with an across the board COLA increase. By approaching it with only half a step the cost is essentially the same as merely granting increment with no COLA. In essence, the persons within the incremental structure they're getting only one half of a step. Giving up step for two years gives us some flexibility then to give the
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more senior professors who are on top step a one percent increase.

We were very pleased with the cooperation of the association. They fully recognized the financial extremist which continues. We're still now negotiating other issues regarding potential layoffs and alternatives to layoffs. But we were very pleased to achieve this.

At the same time there are several items that we did obtain by way of what one might characterize as traditional employer concessions. Concessions to the employer. One is the attendance law requires that any change in attendance reporting is a fully negotiable item. The county has switched to a different recordation system which may not sound to be very important but it is and the association has agreed to shift to that new one.

Secondly, with the advent of COVID
and various health-related issues that are prevalent every day now at the college, per contract only permits the college to require a
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sick note after 20 consecutive days. That has now been reduced to five.

Very important because we have moved now to remote instruction there's an obligation of any employer to make certain that the quality of instruction offered by faculty is up to par. Also is an obligation of the employer in terms of promotional situations. Make sure that accurate evaluations occur of the staff.

You can understand that moving to a remote setting presents enormous difficulties as opposed to a department chairperson opening a door and observing a class. We've worked out a procedure that will permit utilization of observation based on remote attendance. There's a process that we've worked out. Advanced notice. If there's a deficiency in the actual remote observation then we are permitted even to do drop observations remote. So that was a concession.

Next item, there are two cohorts within the faculty union. One is the classroom faculty. We're all familiar with
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having -- those of us who have had the privilege of attending college and being taught by professors. But we also have a very large cohort of nonclassroom faculty. Who, for example, counseling faculty, students. And then there are other groups within that classification.

But some of them the college sought to establish criteria for promotions as opposed to them being automatic which they currently are and the association has agreed to the establishment a committee to come up with that appropriate criteria for those promotions. So that is done on a much more subjective albeit formed basis relative to performance as opposed to mere service.

We have another program called the Link program, which is a second language intensive program. With the advent of COVID and the lack of travel and attendance by many of the instructors who are in that special program, both sides have agreed to form a committee to review the viability of the program.
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Finally, we have to establish a certain number of what are called temporary lines which back up absences by, long-term absences, or other needs of the college. Right now when somebody gets appointed to a temporary line, and it's a seven year period roughly, you get to professorship so to speak. Right now service in the temporary line counts towards the acquisition of service credit towards tenure.

Because of the uncertain nature of funding, forgive me for characterizing it as funding, due to the difficulties we are anticipating relative to revenue stream from students' tuition the union has agreed that any of the temporary lines that we do this year, which are approximately 15 and are needed, will only be one year and will not have that additional problematic obligation of having that count towards the acquisition of permanent status. That is --

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You have giving a lot of information to the legislators. Thank you for the comprehensive
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presentation. Maybe we'll just now turn it over to the legislators for any questions they may have. Is that okay? Anyone have any questions for Mr. Gross? I think you've covered everything. I don't know if anyone else from the college would want to add anything? I think the legislators have as much information as we need.

It does appear to be an excellent contract for the college and the numbers are very impressive in terms of the wage increases and the step increases. I think those obviously are the two major things we look at. I know Legislator Drucker did you want to add anything? I know you served on the board at one time.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: No. I wholeheartedly echo your statements Presiding Officer.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you
John. Any other debate or discussion from the legislators? Mr. Budnick, there's no public comment on items. So if you can save your comments until after the meeting we will
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invite you back up. Thank you. No. Basically no.

MR. BUDNICK: It's terrible because it's not doing anything to find out how much more it's going to cost the students.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank

you. Anyway, any further debate or
discussion? All in favor of the item signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. Thank you very much for the presentation.

MR. GROSS: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Next item
I'm going to call is calendar number 65. Sorry for jumping around. We will get back to the beginning of the calendar in a moment.

65 is Resolution 200. It is a resolution directing the Nassau County Department of Health to comply with the New York State Department of Health interim guidance on mandatory COVID-19 testing in public and nonpublic schools located in areas designated as yellow zones under New York
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State Cluster Action Initiative as issued on October 9, 2020 and updated November 12, 2020.

That is moved by Legislator
Ferretti. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. Our commissioner, Dr. Eisenstein, is here. I don't know if he wanted to say a few words about this. We had an extensive briefing with Dr. Eisenstein in our caucus with respect to this initiative and certain issues that are there with respect to them. DR. EISENSTEIN: Good afternoon legislators. It's nice to see you all. Jerry Giuliano, Nassau County public health attorney with me.

## Thank you for the opportunity to

 brief you earlier. I want to say that we are very proud of the work that we've done at the health department with our school districts. We've had so many superintendent calls, principal calls. We have been able to keep our schools mostly open since the start of the school year.If a school zone were to become
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yellow they do have a requirement to test 20 percent of their students within two weeks. We've discussed this situation with many of our superintendents. There are numerous different ways that they can go about achieving the testing and we've helped them go through the options. We don't know how many school districts may become yellow at any time.

I'm happy to say that during this proceeding Governor Cuomo came out with new zones and there were none in Nassau County. So for this week it doesn't look like there's any new yellow zones. That was as of about ten minutes ago. But that's good news for us.

We are concerned and I want to share the concerns. We are the only non-Article 28 health department in New York State. We are a clinical health department because in 1998 our clinics were contracted to then Nassau County Medical Center. And as such, we are not allowed to do diagnostic treatment. Which leaves us in the situation
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where I am the only full-time physician at the health department. We have nurses who do communicable disease and a few nurses doing other disease control things such as lead prevention. But we are not equipped to take on clinical oversight in any kind of large scale whatsoever.

We feel that we have communicated with our school districts any time they have reached out. I myself have spoken with many superintendents. I have a team led by Dr. Tavora Buckman who have worked seven days a week. She and I very often are on the phone 10, 11, 12 o'clock at night, even on the weekends, trying to help schools make a smart decision and protect the students and the faculty.

The situation is that schools have the option of applying for and acquiring their own limited services laboratories -- LSL as it's written -- permit. So let me be clear because the naming is a little confusing. Being an LSL, limited service laboratory, does not mean you are a lab. In fact, what this is
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is this is a permission, a permit to do testing without a lab. And there's only certain tests that are allowed. Those little tests that can happen outside of a lab where it's just a swab or another thing and maybe there's one stripe for yes positive or two for negative or something like that.

We do have a limited services
laboratory. We use it for two tests. One is for HIV swabs if people were to come to our office. Although most people go to the STD clinics that are contracted to NUMC.

As you know, we have WIC centers. In order for a women to be enrolled as a WIC member we have to follow their serum iron levels. So we do finger sticks just in the little kit. So you don't need a laboratory for that.

Every school district is required to have a medical director. Every medical director can apply for their own permit to do this testing in the schools. The permit process is not complicated and it does require a $\$ 200$ check.
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I can tell you we work with a few of our school districts, including Wantagh and Island Trees, who have secured their own to do the testing on their own. They will have oversight of it. They have relationships with their parents. Any school district can do this. And in helping our school districts, which is what the main purpose of the executive order was for local health departments to help school districts, I called New York State Department of Health, explained the situation. It's about a two-week turnaround time to get these limited service laboratory permits done. But they assured me that if a school district were to turn yellow they would put them at the front of the line and get it done within a day. Which would still leave 13 days for them to do the testing.

We are able to provide kits free of charge, the testing supplies, free of charge to any school that asks. We have stood up numerous testing sites all around the county, including the one that's on Community Drive,
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including the one in the Five Towns which is relocated for the winter because of weather concerns with the equipment to a heated tent on the grounds of South Nassau Hospital.

I'm happy to say that we are hopefully going to be announcing many more sites in the next few days. I'm just waiting for the final contractual pieces. So that there will be geographic locations for people to get to free testing basically across the county. And we've asked our hospitals to expand what they're doing with that and many of our hospitals have agreed and we're in the process of expanding sites.

We feel in the spirit of this we have done everything we can to help the schools get through this. We've coached them on how to get their own testing ability. We've stood up testing sites. On Friday 19,000 test results were recorded in one day in Nassau County residents. That's about one and a half percent of the entire county in one day. We feel that there is adequate testing availability. There are very few places in
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the world that have that kind of rate of testing available.

And most importantly, as a nonclinical health department we couldn't go into a school and take over the process. The owner of the LSL is responsible. The responsibility is not just to have that permit and say to whatever entity it is, a school or any other place, okay, you can use our LSL, go. There is a responsibility when you are the owner -- and in this case it's under my own personal medical license -- there is a responsibility and the county of course, as your health commissioner, there is a responsibility for the schools -- for whoever owns the LSL from start to finish on the process. That includes obtaining an informed consent. That includes making sure that training is adequate. Making sure that the testing is being done in a quality manner. Making sure that all the test results are submitted into the state system -- which is a large clerical amount of work -- in a reasonable amount of time.
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If we even had two or three school districts go yellow, which could be six, eight, ten schools in each, that responsibility of overseeing that testing, if this resolution passes, would be fully under the department of health. We don't have the resources to do that. I'm the only doctor. There's no way I could oversee this in eight, ten, 12,14 different schools.

And we work very hard to help with alternatives. We don't feel that we've hung any of our school districts out. A few superintendents who've reached out to me, I've worked with them, we've come up with solutions and I'm willing to do that with any school district.

We've asked in some cases hospital partners to help. They've been willing. We've helped people get -- and school districts have come up with other solutions. In some school districts they said we're going to tell the parents it's on them because many parents, not all of them, many parents indicated they would be more comfortable with
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their own pediatrician if they have to do it. That's what some school districts are doing, saying to parents you have to get your kids tested and bring us the result.

There's so many different ways this can be done and we want you to know that we have worked around the clock to help our schools. We've been incredibly supportive of our schools. We have a great relationship with our schools. So many of our superintendents and our staff, I have eight people working as school liaisons every day lead by Dr. Buckman. The feedback I'm getting from schools is incredible. We just don't want to be in a position where we can't meet what you're asking us to do. That's our feeling on this.

I know there was a rumor that I've heard a couple of superintendents brought up that I want to address. That we're the only county not doing this. That is absolutely not true. There are many other counties in the state that have mandated other ways of doing it or have chosen not to do it.
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What is true is that we are the only nonclinical one. There isn't even a staff $I$ could pull from a clinic to send them to a school. That doesn't exist. I'm the only doctor.

Lastly, as you know, vaccination hopefully will be starting in the very near future for beyond hospitals which started today thankfully. Between testing and focusing on making sure we can as many people vaccinated as quickly as possible that's really where our focus is. So, we are concerned -- any time you've given us an ask or regulation we've done everything we can to comply and we've always done it well. This is just one that we don't want to be in a position where we couldn't succeed. That's my concern.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Let me just say in response, the requirements with respect to the LSL and the school districts came in a guidance from the state. As with much of the guidance that we have been getting from the governor's office they're not crystal
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clear let's put it that way. Either there's some vagaries, some gray areas. Sometimes it's difficult to operate with that. Trying to do what's required and what's allowed but there are questions that are asked.

Your comment that there are now no yellow zones in the Nassau County as of this week combined with the fact that schools are breaking early next week means that this is really not an issue that has to be addressed at this point. I think what we're going to seek from the state is some clarification on this issue. Of course, all your concerns with respect to being a medical doctor, holding the LSL and the county not being a -- having a clinical practice we understand. So we are going to try to work this out. Legislator Ferretti.

## LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you

Rich. Dr. Eisenstein, I see Jerry back there too. I want to just thank you for all of your hard work throughout this pandemic. You and your staff, Dr. Eisenstein, have been exemplary. You've been there for us. We call
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you 24 hours a day. I know you're working 24 hours a day and doing a great job. Thank you both.

With this issue in particular, you indicated you're the only doctor in the county but we do have NUMC as well, correct? Their doctors there they could be contracted in order to fulfill this requirement, right?

DR. EISENSTEIN: Absolutely. And some school districts have contracted with other hospitals in order to fulfill this, yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: In terms of the LSL license, could we use NUMC doctors -if we were to give the LSL license could we use the NUMC doctors to expand the amount of doctors that we have in the county overseeing the testing?

DR. EISENSTEIN: I'll ask the lawyer I don't know the answer.

MR. GIULIANO: Gerald Giuliano, attorney Nassau County Department of Health. I think the answer to that is since they already have a lab license any work that they do from the hospital would happen under their
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lab license.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Is that a yes or no?

MR. GIULIANO: I believe they would have to use their lab license. I do not believe they could use our lab license. They would have to use their own.

DR. EISENSTEIN: But they could do that, they could use their own if a school district were to set that arrangement up.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: NOW, I
know, Dr. Eisenstein, I believe you had asked for an opinion on this from the county attorney. Have you gotten any opinion in terms of --

MR. GIULIANO: Of course I would always defer any legal opinion for this county to the county attorney. We don't have a specific legal opinion that's been issued on this. However, it's been discussed amongst many county attorneys from the point of view that this information came down in guidance, a guidance document. It didn't come down in state law. It didn't come down in a state
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executive order. It came down as general guidance. It came as a great surprise.

And within two days after it came down an additional addendum came down from the state on the same issue where it seemed to walk that language back. Spoke about what local health departments could do to assist. It gave a website at the state for schools to go to if they needed to find a partner. But it took out that language which had appeared earlier in guidance.

It's also my legal opinion that any requirement such as a mandate in a piece of guidance is not holding. It's not a mandate upon a local health department. But that guidance looks like it's been walked back by the state already in subsequent guidance that's come down.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I know, Dr. Eisenstein, you spoke about some of the other options that schools have such as sending the parents to have their kids tested or get their own LSL license, and I think that that's part of the concern that $I$ have in that those other

Full - 12-14-20
options, although they are there in the guidance, I read the guidance, I saw that those were other options I don't think that they are always practical.

For example, I have a three year old and an eight year old. My understanding is if I was told to go get them tested it would be very difficult for me to keep them in line at City MD for three hours and a half hours in the rain all with the happy ending of getting a Q-tip up their nose. I don't know that that's a practical option. And I know that the superintendents that I spoke that option wasn't really one that most of them were considering.

And just to be clear, I respect your opinion Mr. Giuliano that guidance is guidance, it's not an executive order. But just going to what something the presiding officer said in that it's not always crystal clear this guidance coming down from the governor, this did seem to be pretty clear. It explicitly said -- it didn't give any latitude -- the county was required to give
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the ability to schools to use the LSL unless, quote, unable to do so. That doesn't seem fuzzy to me. It seems pretty clear.

DR. EISENSTEIN: But the next sentence also says "unless unable to do so." Then there was a comment that followed up -- I don't have it in front of me -- about assisting them with community partners. That's what we've done by standing up so many different sites. I do think that we are unable to do so. To allow them to have it would put the burden of making sure that it's being done safely and appropriately on us and we don't have the staff for that capacity. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The problem, Dr. Eisenstein, from my perspective, the guidance contemplates that option within the guidance. If you take that option away the question is then well, would you then change the guidance elsewhere because that option no longer exists? Obviously our chief concern here, all of us, is to keep people safe. One of my top concerns and I'm sure I share the same thing with a lot of the

Full - 12-14-20
legislators up here is to keep in-school education option open. We need to do that. DR. EISENSTEIN: I fully agree. My staff has worked around the clock toward that. We are in agreement, absolutely. Certainly other counties have handled it very differently and school districts have all felt very differently about it. As I have spoken to superintendents, each of them has a school board with different view on it and different ways of handling it. I've heard so many differing opinions on it and my concern simple is $I$ just want the opportunity to be successful with whatever we're given and I'm concerned about it in this case.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you again both of you for all the work you've put in.

DR. EISENSTEIN: Thank you for the consideration and the time to discuss this.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Dr.
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Eisenstein just a quick question. I know you said we have plenty of kits. If a school district gets a kit and then they send it to get the result is there a cost involved at that point?

DR. EISENSTEIN: The kits that we have give you an answer on the spot in a few minutes. If a school district had their own LSL under their medical director then the school nurse or whoever in the building was trained to do the testing would do it, the results would be done in five minutes, ten minutes and it's right there and it's a swab. So there's no laboratory involvement.

And the test kits themselves from the state $I$ can give to whatever school would request it. As we have to some of our stand up testing sites to help control the cost of testing. So like as we're working on a new contract with our FQHC we're going to be providing tests for free so that we don't have to pay for that because we have them.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
That's terrific. In other words, other than
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applying for the special permit and the fee there shouldn't be any other cost to the school district; is that correct?

DR. EISENSTEIN: Just the cost of doing the work. The time to upload the data. The time to do the swabs. Then they do have send -- they just have put the percentage of results into the state dashboard so that the state knows the results. If they're under 20 percent, if a school district turns yellow and they do testing and they're under the percentage of the community at large it's a one-time deal. So far, $I$ think as of last week, every single school district in the state the school testing had been under the community at large. Hopefully it would be, whatever method they choose, it would be a one-time deal.

## LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:

Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other
legislators? Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Dr.
Eisenstein again I want to echo Legislator
Full - 12-14-20

Ferretti's comments and what a wonderful job our health department has done. It's been outstanding. The information we have received has been timely, accurate and has been refreshing from some of the information that we hear in media outlets and sometimes from other elected officials in other levels of government.

I want to be sure that $I$ understand what the issues are though with respect to this particular piece of legislation. It seems as though obviously one of the concerns is individual liability, correct?

DR. EISENSTEIN: That's one of the concerns, yes.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The other concern is logistics but it seems as though under logistics if we did have a contract with an outside vendor that would take care of the logistics part of it, correct?

DR. EISENSTEIN: If the outside vendor was able to appropriately oversee the process, yes.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So, in terms
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of -- you had indicated I believe you had conversations with about 50 of the 56 school districts?

DR. EISENSTEIN: I don't myself but my staff has spoken to most of them.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Is it
possible to compile for us -- can we identify the districts with which we don't have a plan?

DR. EISENSTEIN: Each school is doing it on their own. When we say we speak to them some of them just consult with us and come up with there own plan. I don't know what each of them is doing but we certainly can ask through BOCES are there any that don't have a plan and I can compile that. I know when this issue was brought to you I don't know upfront who the specific school districts are. So I could ask around sure, absolutely. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Because the one concern, as Legislator Ferretti mentioned, is that we want to make sure that one, kids are safe but two, kids continue to learn in school.
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DR. EISENSTEIN: I fully support that 100 percent.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Which I know
that you do. The purpose for this legislation
is to make it easier for school districts to have available to them, as the guidance suggested, the option of the county's LDL in order for them to be able to accomplish the testing requirements that the governor has established, right?

That's guidance. The guidance is the LDL. One thing that isn't guidance and actually is part of the executive order is the fact that they have to test if they're in a yellow zone, right? So we know there is an identifiable problem. There's is an absolute requirement that they have to do testing. And then guidance on what the best way to do that might be. We just want to make sure that we're part of the solution which I know you want to be part of the solution as well, right?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DR. EISENSTEIN: Absolutely. } \\
& \text { LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Perhaps what }
\end{aligned}
$$
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we can do isn't necessarily scuttling this legislation or even major revisions to legislation. I think there's a benefit to it as an option for school districts to use as a last resort. You seem to be confident that if you were able identify the remaining districts that don't already have a plan then we can work on a plan with them so that this might be almost academic and would be that last resort. DR. EISENSTEIN: Yes. We've tried to do that. And, for example, I don't know why a school district, and I haven't spoken to each of them so they may have a reason that $I$ don't know, but $I$ don't know why a school district wouldn't just apply for their own and oversee their own LSL and oversee their own process. But by all means I'm open and amenable to anything that helps them stay open.

## LEGISLATOR RHOADS: If there were

 a scenario where a school district had no other option, and I can't conceive of one and it sounds as though at this point you can't conceive of one either, but if it was possibleFull - 12-14-20
that a district had no other option the county's LDL could be a fail safe for them, right?

DR. EISENSTEIN: It could. Of course we would want to make sure that the proper protective measures would be in place before we would allow that. But could it, sure.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And there are ways that we can work around some of the other issues that you've identified with respect to staffing and even with respect to potential liability, right?

DR. EISENSTEIN: The liability piece I would leave up to Jerry and the county attorney. As far as staffing, if you're referring to say contracting somebody then by all means, sure.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: By the way,
to your knowledge, has anybody from the administration reached out to the governor's office? Because the governor obviously through his executive orders has exempted hospitals, has exempted nursing homes with
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respect to liability as it pertains to COVID. Has anyone from the administration reached out to the governor's office specifically with respect to this issue and whether you can be insulated as the holder of that license? Where you be insulated for potential liability as well.

DR. EISENSTEIN: I don't know about anybody from the administration speaking to the governor's office but I will tell you, you know, many health commissioners and directors through the state have discussed this with the state health department which is my chain up the line and many county health departments feel in a similar position. But to answer your question, I don't know the answer to your specific question.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Really I'm asking the question as a suggestion perhaps that the county executive and the executive's office perhaps reach up to Albany and speak to the governor's people and see if that's something that can be done. Because I don't want that to be what's standing in the way
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between people being able to send their kids to school where we know students learn best.

DR. EISENSTEIN: I do want to just clarify and correct one thing. There is the governor's regional control call to have raised the issue on it. So hopefully that's not-- I don't know if that matches what you're saying. But our concern as the health department we're not the only one. Most health departments feel the same way. And we have certainly expressed this through various channels.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: We just want to see if we can get to top of the food chain on it and get a decision on it sooner rather than later. It might require a phone call from the county executive or somebody on the county executive's staff up to somebody in the governor's office to get them that. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you
Presiding Officer. Good afternoon
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Commissioner. I'd first like to echo the sentiments of Legislator Ferretti and Rhoads in thanking you for all that you have been doing throughout the pandemic. I know personally myself I've reached out to you on weekends. We've been on the phone as late as like almost 10 o'clock on a Sunday night. I really appreciate that. It was centered around questions for the school district. So, I just have a couple of questions because you have talked about this extensively.

The county has created some kind of relationships between other entities to supplement whatever the school would have in place, am I correct? Like by way of the Catholic Health Centers. Could you talk a little bit about that?

DR. EISENSTEIN: We've stood up numerous sites. Northwell is a partner. They have a test site opening on Community Drive that originally started a little bit further north in Great Neck on the school grounds but because of traffic and other concerns it moved a little bit down.
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South Nassau has been a contracted partner from the Five Towns way back when they were the only color zone that we had. It was orange and yellow at the time. That has relocated and continued through -- terms have changed and pieces have changed but they still are up and running the site. We send them test kits. That is in a heated tent so the technology can stay useful on the drive-through, it's fascinating, on the grounds of South Nassau.

If you remember when we were in the peak we started testing sites in the FQHCs and I'm happy to say we're working on extending that and expanding it so that schools in the areas would have access to free testing. We're working even on -- we're not ready to reveal all the details but things like making sure it's open in the evening when parents can take kids is an important piece. We are continuing that and on weekends as well.

County Executive Curran hosted a call with hospital CEOs asking for an increase presence and help and we certainly have more
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that we will be announcing soon. They have been very responsive. Our hospitals have been great partners. They understand the position we're in. I just don't want to say anything while we are still negotiating before it comes out. You will be hearing of more sites that the county is partnering with. We have gotten great response so far with our partners and being willing to do this. And this has worked and it requires people and I'm very grateful that they have all been able to participate.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you. So the $F Q H C$ we already know that if you go there they don't ask you about insurance. If you have it you present it. They can charge it. But if you don't then it's no problem. They don't ask you about immigration status and the like. What about when you go to the one of the Catholic Hospital Centers in terms of insurance?

DR. EISENSTEIN: Anything that we are partnering in, that we have a piece of providing test kits or paying for it all, part of the deal is there is no charge.
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LEGISLATOR BYNOE: None
whatsoever?
DR. EISENSTEIN: None
whatsoever. There may be partners who we just say there's a site that's open, they'll take insurance if you have it. But we're not going to be involved in anything that people are going to have to be charged in order to participate. We feel strongly about that and there is no charge at any of the sites that we are contractually partnering with at all.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: A school
district that has to test upwards of 1200 kids they could potentially do some of the testing in the school. It could be a hybrid approach where they do some of the testing and then some might go to their own pediatrician or the like and then some might take advantage of some of the sites that we will make them aware of, correct?

DR. EISENSTEIN: Correct. And
the 20 percent is not only students. It includes the faculty and all other employees. It's 20 percent of people and however they get
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the testing done as long as the school district meets that 20 percent of the population that satisfies the requirement. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: In terms of malpractice insurance, can the county get you additional -- because $I$ know we're still going to offer this, right? From what I understood, we'd still be offering this with some provision that the school district would do an indemnification $I$ guess to protect the county and protect your license, right?

DR. EISENSTEIN: Yes. And
certainly when $I$ came to the county from clinical practice there was -- and we're a nonclinical health department -- there was no reason for me to maintain my outside clinical malpractice insurance. Personally I don't want to take too much time up on this. Certainly we would probably need to do that and could. But my concern is even if there's a settlement and I'm financially secured, I'm still going to be the doctor named on anything that's called. And even if there's a settlement that's going to be on my license
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even if I didn't pay anything for it. But I don't want to get into my personal concerns. That's not what's guiding it. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I appreciate
the answer. I'm just talking about malpractice. I wanted to tie that up. I just have one other question. Are other departments of health in the region similarly situated as we are in terms of only having one doctor?

DR. EISENSTEIN: We're the only nonclinical health department. The answer is no. Most of them have clinical programs so they have full medical teams. But even in some of those counties, including Orange and Rockland and some of the other larger ones, they've taken the same position that this is not something that they feel their health department can do. Especially as we're now refocusing into -- we're going to soon have to be seeing that there is adequate testing and adequate vaccination going on at the same time.
But as Legislator Nicolello said,
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there are no new yellow zones in Nassau. So thankfully, we have a few days to sort it all out at least. Hopefully more.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you very much.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other
legislators? Legislator Walker.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Dr.
Eisenstein, thank you again. I know it's been said by many of the legislators and I know we all feel that way. You have been wonderful, your entire department. You've worked tirelessly and again on this issue you answered many questions, taken many phone calls.

I think at this time I'm going to ask that we table this and seek to reach out to those school districts that might not have a plan yet and see, as we move forward, the direction that we definitely need to go in and perhaps get some additional answers from the state. And hopefully we don't go into the yellow zone at all and some of our schools will be closing even as of going full remote
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as of next week. It will give us some time, and I'm sure it will take some worries off of you personally.

And I know you work for us in the department and you take that job very seriously, but your medical license certainly is very, very important too. And it's Hanukkah and Christmastime and you don't need to be worrying about that on top of all the other worries that we have to worry about right now. So I'm going to motion that we do table this.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That
motion to table is seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. No debate or discussion on the motion to table. All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed?

Okay. The item is tabled by a vote of 17
votes to table, two votes against by
Legislators Rhoads and Ferretti. Thank you Dr. Eisenstein.

DR. EISENSTEIN: Thank you and if there's any specific scenario with school superintendents that you would like me to
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contact just reach out to me. I'd be happy to do it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just real quickly. You mentioned this in our caucus. In terms of the vaccine, $I$ know that we've gotten small amounts. So, some of the first responders are contacting us now and want to know what to expect in the next few weeks or next few days.

DR. EISENSTEIN: The formal long
term guidance is not out. But what I can tell
you that I know is, some hospitals have
started receiving shipments. The very first group to be vaccinated will be front line hospital workers. And the state gave the hospitals the definition of what that is. It's not every hospital worker. It's people in emergency rooms, doctors, nurses, laboratory techs, radiation, phlebotomists. Anybody that might be in that facility and are around patients that's going to be the very first group with the first very limited doses. We're very hopeful that by the end of this week the second product, the Moderna
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vaccine, will also be approved and that will increase the number of vaccines.

We anticipate -- New York State has announced that they opted into the federal vaccination program of nursing homes. And that is by opting in some our of our chain pharmacies, including CVS and Walgreens that I'm aware of, will be going to the nursing homes directly. This isn't going to happen this week. I don't think there's enough vaccine yet but maybe as early as next week. And they will be vaccinating in the nursing homes patients and staff. Those are the immediate first two groups with EMS also in group one to be followed as soon as there is adequate supply but that's my guess. I haven't heard that formally. I'm guessing. That's what makes sense. We've heard over and over that EMS will be in phase one.

So even though hospital workers and nursing homes and EMS responders are phase one there's still very limited supply. So they have created such groups. And just the fact that people are being vaccinated right now as
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we speak it's day one of vaccine. It starts a new era. And I remember presenting to you I believe in March when I said -- somebody had asked, I don't remember who, where are we on the curve. I said you're at the very, very beginning. Finally we're towards the back end and it's just a couple of more months we have to get through.

The timing has been as we've
expected. Hopefully the next month will be very exciting and we're ready. We're ready if we were asked that a shipment was coming and we need to stand up to vaccinate whether it's our county employees, our police, our first responders, whatever, with our medical reserve corp volunteers we did a training this weekend, the flu, and that was partially a training for what we would do in the big picture. We could be up and ready to vaccinate within hours, two, three hours if we received vaccines. I don't think we're there yet. I think we're still a few weeks away from that. Hospital personnel is going to go first. But I just want you to know we are
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ready --
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Real quickly, those first responders, for example our fire fighters.

DR. EISENSTEIN: I haven't seen the formal plan on where that is certainly. I think all first responders are a priority and should be and so we will advocate for that as well. For right now $I$ just know it's high risk hospital employees to be followed by nursing homes. The hospitals themselves will be vaccinating their own hospital employees. Like I said, the chain pharmacies will be doing the nursing homes. Nobody else is vaccinating yet. Just hospitals and the chain pharmacies and that's still not yet.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you very much Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Sorry about that. I know you said that first responders you're not exactly sure where they fall in the priority. A particular concern obviously particular immediate concern is ambulance personnel, EMS workers that are transporting
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active COVID patients. There's been no guidance with respect to that?

DR. EISENSTEIN: We were told
that they're in group one and we advocate that they're in group one. But group one now, the initial number of doses is so small that they've created sub groups within group one. I don't know this is a fact. I don't have that knowledge yet. I suspect right now with the very limited dose they have they're just going to do high risk hospital workers. Next week the nursing homes. As soon as there's enough I think that's what's next. That's what makes sense to me.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you.
DR. EISENSTEIN: Have a good day.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You too.
Go back to the beginning of the calendar. Number one is a local law to amend the county government law of Nassau County to require public notification of the meetings and agendas for the Nassau County Planning Commission.

Legislator McKevitt makes that
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motion. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. That's a motion to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is now open.

This is a majority-introduced legislation. Essentially it's a transparency measure. Currently the agendas for the Nassau County Planning Commission, which considers both subdivisions and certain zoning matters, is produced maybe two days before events which creates difficulty in terms of events from two days before these meetings are to be held, which creates difficulties with respect to communicating to the residents who may want to comment on a particular matter because it simply is not enough time.

What this does is require the planning commission to publish its agenda one week prior to a meeting. They must establish and maintain an email notification system on the official website so that individuals can request to be received and be emailed agendas for specific items and/or meetings.

Lastly, the planning commission
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must send its agendas to elected officials, your legislators, your mayors, your town supervisors for subdivisions or zoning within that jurisdiction.

Again, this is a transparency measure just intended to provide additional notice of action that the planning commission may be considering so that various stakeholders may have an opportunity to comment.

Any debate or discussion on this item? No. A motion to close the hearing by Legislator McKevitt. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is closed.

Number eight is a vote on a local law to amend the county government law of Nassau County to require public notification of meetings and agendas for the Nassau County Planning Commission.

Again, we will have Legislator McKevitt move that. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. Any further debate or discussion on
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this item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Item two is a hearing on a local
law to amend Chapter 12 of the Nassau County administrative code in relation to the Department of Public Works' approval of building permits and curb cuts pursuant to Section 239-F of the New York State General Municipal Law.

Motion to open the hearing by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. The hearing is open. Legislator Kopel would you like to say something?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you Presiding Officer. This legislation would relate to the county's approval of various curb cuts and other features of new building applications or other developments in the county.

Right now we are experiencing delays of many, many months. Sometimes
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stretching into years for the county to respond to the applications for these permits.

Now, the proposed legislation would go some way, although not all the way, towards getting the county into compliance with the state law 239-F of the general municipal law. What it would provide is a period of 30 days after filing of the application within which the county would be required to respond to the permit application. The permit application I should note is made in the first instance to a different municipality be it a town or sometimes a village or the city. The county does not maintain building departments.

The county would have 30 days within which to respond, file objections or request for changes. Should the county not respond within the 30 day period, the fee that was payable to the county in connection with this application would be reduced 25 percent. Additional 25 percent reduction would apply every ten days thereafter during which the county does not respond. And at the time fees
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reach zero the application would be deemed approved so that the municipality could go ahead and issue the permit at its discretion.

During any period for which the county is waiting for answers, for information which it requests from an applicant the relevant period would be extended for an equal number of days.

I'd be very happy if anybody wants to speak about this for the administration.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken Arnold, public works. The department has received this local law. We passed it off to the blue ribbon panel and had a series of discussions last week which accumulated in a report going back to your body on our thoughts on the legislation. The panel believes that this is not necessary at this time. We are still implementing all the requirements of the panel. We've looked at our review process. We've looked at our complying of data and we've looked at our personnel and staffing. We'd like to meet with you before this local law is voted on.
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LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. That would be fine. I believe we're not going to actually go ahead with the vote on it today. We'd be certainly very happy to have discussions on it. I do have some questions, Mr. Arnold, and thank you for coming here today. What are the items that you look at when you look at these applications? What specific types of issues do you look at?

MR. ARNOLD: We look at four different groupings of items. We look at traffic impacts of the curb cut to the county road. As part of that my traffic engineers look at impacts of pulling in and pulling out of the driveways on pedestrians and their parking and deliveries. Waste water of course is looked at. The availability of sewers. That's a fairly simple review.

Site development looks at on-site drainage and whether the proposed development will impact the surrounding county facilities. And we look at things that are in the county's right of way.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Isn't it true
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though that at this time there are people who are sitting out there who had applications in there for many months? Because $I$ know that people call me fairly often complaining that they're unable to get any response at all from the department when they submitted information. People say that they can't get a return phone call. They say they're not getting information back.

MR. ARNOLD: My staff works very hard in talking to people. COVID has limited our in person meetings but my staff is available to have discussions at all times. We looked at those numbers and it's in the report that we provided to you. We have 227 active, open or rejected plan submittals right now. Of the 227,140 of them were rejected and returned to the applicants. We are waiting for them to be returned to us.

Of the 227, there's also 62 that
are on hold, incomplete or withdrawn or already built. These are the problematic ones. We have to go through and find out what the issues are why we have not received

Full - 12-14-20
anything back to us. And we currently only have 25 applications that are under our review.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Would you be able to provide the details of those numbers to us please?

MR. ARNOLD: A lot of those details are in the report. We can, of course, sit down and go through them in more detail when we have our meeting.

I will tell you that the panel, in their discussion last week, that we do recognize that we have a challenge of why do we get so many rejections and we're looking at different options on dealing with the rejections including a mandatory meeting with applicants after their first submittal. That is part of our --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: How long would it take to set up such a meeting on the county's part?

MR. ARNOLD: We believe that could be something that could be done a week or ten days after a rejection. One thing that
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COVID has taught us is virtual meetings and sharing of plans virtually is something that the department has fully embraced. So instead of having applicants come in and go over plans on a desk that is something we're looking towards doing for rejections. Because rejection is the issue. We don't understand why we are seeing three, four, five rejections on certain sets of plans.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: You're aware, are you not, that Section $239-F$ provides actually that if the county doesn't respond within ten working days the county loses its rights to object. You're aware of that? MR. ARNOLD: Yes we are. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: We're way out of compliance with that. MR. ARNOLD: Also understand that 239 process has been combined with our permit process. So when the applicant leaves with an approval he now has a road opening permit to do all his work, not just the 239 that gets delegated to the town.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Perhaps that
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ought to be separated so that we can get closer to compliance with the state law.

MR. ARNOLD: That has been
discussed and we can discuss that in further when we meet about the pit bulls of that also.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Now, when you
say that it's not necessary I say that I would suggest to you that it certainly doesn't hurt. It's something that would hold the county's department's feet to fire. If it's something for which you're already you say close to compliance it doesn't hurt. It doesn't go all the way the same distance that the state already gives the -- as a matter of fact, I would imagine that the county would have a really hard time defending it if somebody brought a lawsuit saying that the county simply does not have the right to object, because that's the plain wording of the statute, after ten working days. So, this legislation actually gives the county quite a bit more time, this proposed legislation. MR. ARNOLD: One of my questions on the legislation that we can discuss at our
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meeting is, is the department required to make an action within 30 days in total or when something gets rejected and gets submitted? How does that clock work? Those are the times I need to understand.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: One more time please.

MR. ARNOLD: The way I read the legislation, if the department rejected an application on day ten and the applicant comes back with a revised set of plans are working off from day 11 or are we back to day one?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The actually legislation expressly provides that the time during which the department is waiting for additional information or a response from the applicant would be added to the time. So if the department asks for information on day nine and you don't get it back for two months that two months does not get counted against the county.

MR. ARNOLD: I understand that. But then when we do get the information back am I starting at day ten or am I starting at
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day one based on the legislation?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That's an interesting question.

MR. ARNOLD: Those are the things I need to talk through. If I'm starting at day one that fits within my turnaround. If every time a submittal gets rejected and the clock keeps sliding down $I$ have a concern about that.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I look forward to this meeting because the problems are fairly manifest. I mean, during the time that these things are delayed people, builders are incurring carrying costs whether it's interest and other major costs. Because of that developing building is more expensive. Because of that buildings are delayed. And when they're delayed the county and other taxing jurisdictions don't get to collect the increased taxes that would otherwise apply once a development is completed.

MR. ARNOLD: Legislator, we understand that. That's why the county executive put together the panel of all
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experts and we worked towards the solution and the panel and myself are more than -- would like to sit down and further enhance this along.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: We can set up a meeting. I guess whoever wants to be in it would be in it. Will you send out an invitation?

MR. ARNOLD: I can work on that with the panel, yes and I'll work through your office.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other
debate or discussion? Legislator Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi
Commissioner. How are you? I have a comment. I'm on that 239-F panel as you well know and I know how much work has gone into that and what the changes are that have already happened and what we are hoping for going forward. We all know it's going to make a huge difference when we have certain things in place.

I think we were all blindsided by
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COVID obviously in every where and every way. In that regard and especially with the impact that it's having on businesses. I know our goal was to move forward with this process and make it a lot more condensed and simpler and that's the direction we're all heading in.

I think Legislator Kopel having put forward this legislation has just really kind of I guess put it more on the table for us to discuss, especially during these difficult times for everybody.

In that regard $I$ think it's good that we are going to have this meeting and we're going to talk about it. But I do know that a lot of work has been put into it already by your department and I do want to say thank you for all that you have done. Because I know you have the best intentions in mind for the county and certainly for the residents and the businesses out there. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other debate or discussion? Hearing none, Deputy Presiding Officer makes a motion to close the
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hearing. Seconded by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. The hearing is closed.

Move on to calendar number three. Hearing on a local law to amend the Nassau County Administrative Code in relation to the collection of unpaid taxes, penalties and interest by the county treasurer.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Ferretti. That's a motion to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is open.

This is also a majority
legislation. With the pandemic, the governor has ordered a stay on any evictions of people who due to hardships are unable to pay their rent currently. I believe that applies to commercial as well.

But you have the building owners who are not receiving income. Obviously for the large building corporate entities it's not as big an issue. But for small owners it is a

Full - 12-14-20
major issue because they continue to have the cost, the overhead of operating a structure from utilities to taxes and all the costs are involved but the income is limited. So what this legislation is designed to do is give some small measure of relief to those owners, specifically with respect to staying tax lien enforcement. When would this take place? It would take place once a particular building owner came to the county and submitted a sworn affidavit indicating an inability to pay their taxes as a result of the directly connected to the orders staying enforcement of evictions and lack of rent coming in.

Basically they have to submit that sworn affidavit and the county, although it will have the lead, will not be enforcing it until such time as the order staying with respect to rents is lifted by the governor.

Again, it's designed to give some relief to those small business owners who are also struggling with this pandemic.

Anyone else want to discuss this?
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Anyone at home? No. Need a motion to close the hearing. Moved by Legislator Bynoe. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. We have to go to item ten, which is the vote on the local law to amend Nassau County Administrative Code in relation to collection of unpaid taxes, penalties and interest by the county treasurer.

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

Back to item four. Item four is a hearing on a local law to create a special revenue fund to assist in the finance or payment of tax certiorari settlements and judgements in Nassau County.

That is moved by Legislator
McKevitt. Seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. A motion to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by
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saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is open.

This is designed to provide a safety valve and to provide a fund which will assist in paying off the county's existing tax refund liability. There were discussions about expanding that reserve fund but those discussions haven't been completed yet. Again, the county has hundreds of millions of dollars it owes in tax refund liability to residents and commercial entities much of which is generating interest. Especially in this pandemic we should be looking for ways to get that money back into the community and into the hands of our business owners.

Currently, the county executive's budget does have $\$ 30$ million set aside in operating funds for 2021 but does not intend to finance the payment in terms of borrowing for the finance of this outstanding refund liability for two years basically. Basically we would be treading water.

The idea is this, there was much discussion specifically about sales taxes,
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whether the county's projections are overly pessimistic. The idea is to the extent that in the adopted budget the revenues come in above what those sales tax projections are the money gets put aside into this fund which then can be used to pay these tax certiorari and potentially other purposes that, again, we are negotiating.

Also, monies that get freed up in the budget as a result of CARES Act, in other words, federal relief money, can potentially go into the fund as well. This is a good government initiative creating a dedicated fund for a purpose that is something that needs to be addressed and that is the idea behind it.

Again, there are some negotiations going on with respect some particulars of the fund so we will not be voting at this point but I wanted to have the hearing out of the way. Any other legislators want to discuss this item? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can I just ask that, I mean, we can have the
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hearing out of the way, once we get the final details maybe we should talk about it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes. At
that point we will have the -- once we call the item for a vote we will have a full opportunity to debate this.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: It won't be a hearing but we will be able to debate it?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes. Absolutely. Since it's a hearing, any public comment? Hearing none, motion to close the hearing by Legislator Bynoe. Seconded by Legislator Drucker. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. The hearing is closed.

Again, we will not be calling the vote for the item right now.

Item five is a hearing on a local
law to amend Section 21-10.2(2)(c) of the Nassau County Administrative Code with respect to due process for trade practice violations.

We need a motion to open the hearing. Motion by Legislator Walker.
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Seconded by Legislator McKevitt. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Let me just talk about this. This is a majority initiative. There are obviously and of course unfortunately unscrupulous retail businesses that engage in price gouging during times of crisis. Again, unfortunately, we have seen this during our pandemic. These businesses should be prosecuted and punished to the utmost.

However, there are also upstanding businesses that are compelled and forced to raise prices due to factors outside of their control. Most importantly because the cost of the wholesale goods have gone up. Automatically hitting a business with a violation because of a higher price potentially penalizes a business for something they have no control over. We should at least give these businesses an opportunity to explain the basis for the price they are charging.

My office and a number of my colleagues, maybe all of my colleagues, have
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received calls during the pandemic from distressed business owners with respect to this issue. One in particular had to raise the price of a good that his store was selling. I don't recall exactly what it was. I think it was hand sanitizers. But he did that because the cost to him had gone up. The people who were providing those hand sanitizers to him were charging more. So therefore, he raised the price to accommodate.

He was hit with multiple violations by the Department of Consumer Affairs. Even though he had the receipts from the wholesaler showing his expenses were increasing he was still hit with violations.
The information about this store, not the name but the type of store and the community, was released to the newspapers. Because this was the only store of its kind in that community everybody reading those local newspapers understood that it was this store owners he was accused of price gouging in the middle of a pandemic.
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Now, you can imagine the uproar that came about. And again, here's a store owner who was hit with higher prices and passed those along to the consumer, which they had to do, was charged with price gouging, released to the community and became somewhat of a pariah in the community.

Again, we have to come down hard on those that are price gouging but there has to be some element of fairness in how we treat our local businesses. They should be provided an opportunity when an inspector is in the store to provide the books or receipts showing that there was no price gouging but it was due to the increased cost or other reasons on their behalf. This should be done before the violation is issued.

Why would you want it before the violation is issued? Because once the violation is issued, quite frankly, it goes into the process and then each store owner is pressured somewhere along the line to settle the matter before they have to spend for an attorney go to a hearing and potentially face
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those costs. You have to give them an opportunity before they get the violation.

Our small businesses are
struggling. We don't want our small businesses to stop selling these goods in a pandemic. Again, by doing this, if we are eliminating the availability of things that people need in the community then we should not be doing it.

So, the local law requires the Department of Consumer Affairs to post its rules and regulations on its county website. More importantly, prior to issuing a summons regarding price gouging on fair trade practices, the individual from the Department of Consumer Affairs must provide the business owner a reasonable opportunity to explain why the prices went up. Including receipts, books, records showing that the increase in price was due to increased costs outside of his control.

Prior to the issuance of the summons, again, the business owner must be provided reasonable opportunity to provide
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exculpatory evidence.
Lastly, when the violation reaches the Department of Assessment stage and it's going to go to a hearing, which is by an individual that's appointed by the county who will hear that hearing, the department must provide a written explanation of the charges in its evidence with respect to the violation before the hearing. This is the standard due process.

Again, this is intended to give business owners an opportunity to explain and prepare for a hearing so that if there is a reason they have increased prices they can explain that, not be hit with a violation and that's it.

Failure to do this on the first offense leads to an adjournment of the case. Failure to do this meaning providing the due process leads to an adjournment of the case. If it's done repeatedly it will lead to a dismissal by the Department of Consumer Affairs.

That's what the legislation
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provides. Anyone else want to discuss this item? Legislator Bynoe then Legislator Drucker.

```
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you
Presiding Officer. I have a couple of questions I guess \(I\) will pose it to you? Should I pose it to you?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Sure.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Have we checked to verify that the individual who would be going into the store to investigate the allegations that they are actually working within title to then render a decision? Because I suspect that the way it worked earlier on, how it works currently I should say, the individual who goes into the store is not required to render a decision. They render a decision that there was a violation. They go in, they determine that the cost for the item is higher than it should be and they decide that there should be a violation.
I'm not sure that someone in that class would also have within their charge to make a determination that the individual was
```
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not in fact price gouging by way of authenticating whatever documentation they provide. The store owner provides. I'm not sure that that person is properly trained to go in and render that type -- have that level of discretion and render that kind of $a$ decision.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think what the person who is issuing the violation does is simply not issue the violation. Takes the information. If there's any question brings it back to his supervisors, to even the commissioner of consumer affairs, and says this is what's represented, do I go ahead or not?

I think if the issue is authority I think it's simply a matter of just at that matter not issuing the violation. In this era of technology, take a picture of the receipts, send it back to the office and have somebody up the supervisory chain make that decision.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This policy

```
allows for that?
```

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes.
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Basically, once presented with evidence of why the prices were increased which shows it wasn't price gouging $I$ think they have to step back and say okay, let's look at this evidence and if it's compelling then they don't issue the violation.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I may have missed that step when you explained it. I didn't hear that that step was actually taking. That they were not required to render a decision on the spot. That they could in fact push it up the food chain for someone else who is in a position to render that type of decision or have that level of discretion to make a decision.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Look, there are unscrupulous business owners who may be presenting false information and that's something that the Department of Consumer Affairs would have to take into consideration. Look, if somebody has a history of doing this and hit him repeatedly for violations I think you take their evidence take their evidence with a grain of salt. But
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if you're a business owner and haven't really not in the system ever before $I$ think you give them a little credibility.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So the idea is they are then going to push it up the food chain?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It's very
easy. Take a look. This is what business owner Y gave to me. Should I go ahead and issue a violation or do $I$ hold off?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Then have we conferred with the commissioner to determine whether -- what level of impact this would have on his office in terms of because before -- currently they go out, they look, they determine whether the price is in excess of what they should be charging. They issue the summons or the complaint against the store and they move on. In this case now we could potentially be touching items twice. Have we conferred to determine whether this would have a high level of impact to his staffing?

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: No, I

 personally have not spoken to him with respectFull - 12-14-20
to that. I know after we introduced this they indicated that they were also looking at amendments to the legislation which we can certainly consider once assuming it ever comes to us. No, I have not discussed with him in terms of staffing.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Some of the amendments that they were talking about, presiding officer, were they relative to what will actually define price gouging so that there wouldn't be such a subjective view to what exactly is price gouging?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I don't
know if their amendments will address that. That's certainly that we would interested in doing. You're 100 percent right. A lot of subjectivity in this.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you Presiding Officer. Let me just say I commend you and the Majority. I think this is a good bill. As legislators, we are tasked with
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providing legislation that is fair and balanced. And although as we are all consumers, none of us want to be price gouged or charged more than what is reasonable at any given moment.

But we do have to be mindful that the scales of justice require us to pay attention to some of the local merchants who are fighting for their lives right now.

I did read the commissioner's memo about the legislation that they're looking to do, and I would like to see some mechanism that can be instituted to go after the wholesalers. Because I think they're the ones who are really the culprits here. They charge the merchant an exorbitant amount and he has no choice but to raise the price. I'll mark it up a certain way and although the percentage of the markup may be the same that is customary done on any product because of the expense they may occur. I think the commissioner had raised it but if there's some way that we can find or explore a mechanism to go after these wholesalers I would really be
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happy about that too.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I agree.
Something that maybe we can consider going forward in January. Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I agree with that as well. I think though an investigation into that is necessary also, right, because they could be getting get hit with material fees to cost that are more expensive for them as well. That's a good idea.

I'm glad I just see the commissioner coming up here because I was going to ask him a couple of questions if that's okay Mr. May?

MR. MAY: Good afternoon legislators.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: So I'm wondering what is your policy with regard to this?

MR. MAY: It could be a long
answer and I apologize. Our enforcement against price gouging is not just against the idea of price gouging. It's the unfair trade
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practice. So it's easier to describe it as price gouging. Most people when they go to a store they see prices that appear out of whack they think it's price gouging they let us know. So we've adopted that nomenclature. We call it price gouging.

Under the unfair trade practice violation it's not just price gouging. Most of the violations that we've issued weren't necessarily for price gouging per se. They were merchants who were taking boxes of the medical masks, the three-ply surgeon masks that everyone one was mostly wearing until we got our cloth masks, our reusable masks, opening them and selling them individually for two and $\$ 3$ when the piece cost per item 25 cents, 12 cents. Taking the $\mathrm{N}-95$ masks, breaking those open, selling them individually, handling them. We encountered merchants who were opening up $\mathrm{N}-95$ boxes and wrapping each individual $N-95$ mask in Saran Wrap, having no idea who was handling the product, if they were sick, if they were wearing any kind of medical equipment.
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So, it's not just this idea of price gouging. Oh, this item cost more than it was last week when I came in. It sort of runs the gamut.

So now specifically about price gouging what happens? We have been monitoring to the best of our ability the prices for the different items. Like I said, I know now that a three-ply mask was between 12 and 25 cents per item because we had to like really track this stuff down, do the math on it. We've spoken to manufacturers. We've spoken to representatives from 3M. We've spoken to representatives of $R B$, who are the makers of Lysol. They've indicated to us that they have not raised their prices to their wholesalers.

Again, as $I$ think Legislator Drucker had pointed it out, based on the information that we have available to us, we believe that if there are bad actors in the stream here, the bad actors appear to be the wholesaler.

You had mentioned material cost. We've at least run down with a few of these
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manufacturers that they haven't changed their prices at all to their wholesalers. In fact, they're looking to boot wholesalers that are taking advantage of retailers and the public from their distribution chains entirely. So, there's a lot going on here.

I don't know if that answered your question or raised more questions by bringing it up.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I'm wondering so is there a process by which you determine you are going to investigate? How do you investigate if you do that? Like how does it go? If somebody reports to you that they believe a certain vendor is price gouging what do you do?

MR. MAY: We've received about 1,000 complaints from consumers at this point dealing with price gouging. Again, it sort of runs the gamut of these things for price gouging. We've issued about 300,350 violations. The investigators we've trained and worked with them to go over what items we are seeing in the field. What the typical per
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unit cost is for those units. And if they see that based on a report from a consumer to go ahead and issue a violation. Most of that activity has died down since May, June when the cloth masks came out because most of the price gouging was occurring with the masks.

What we have seen recently and what we're seeing retailers putting out there is cans of Lysol, the 19 ounce can of Lysol, that typically retails for $\$ 5$ for $\$ 15$. When we see something like that, the product is available, maybe not in sufficient quantities but the product is out there. Last I checked you can get it at Walmart I think at the Westbury location for $\$ 5$. I'm not advertising for that but they had in-store pickup available. I'd be interested to see what the availability of the product is.

So, we have a pretty robust idea of what the product normally costs both prepandemic, postpandemic. Again, we saw prices settle down when the production of the cloth masks increased.

So that's the process. We get a
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complaint from a consumer. It's detailed out to an investigator. An investigator goes to the location. Confirms that the prices that we are being told is being charged are being charged. If we know that that price indicates that there's some price gouging on, if it's the price gouging issue per se, issue a violation.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Is that before you even take a step and find out if that particular store is being overcharged or being charged more by their distributor? Do you even go there or you didn't do that? It didn't sound like from what you just explained to me that that's not the way that it goes. You're just talking about if you see a higher price and you know it's available less somewhere else you're just assuming that they're price gouging rather than maybe -- I'm just thinking as you're speaking if it's Lysol everybody in the world wanted it or some sort of cleanser. Do they have time to go find another distributor? Probably not. I'm just saying maybe that's one of the reasons things
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were or in some stores were higher priced than others. But I don't know without an investigation.

MR. MAY: We don't typically accept evidence in the field in that manner. We want evidence submitted to us as part of the investigatory and due process part of this. If the violation is issued, the owner of the store, if it's a local store, which I understand is sort of the impetus of all of this, has an opportunity to reach out to us. They can contact us at any time up to the prehearing settlement conference date, which is the return of the violation. We are all cognizant of the challenges of the pandemic. Nobody is getting penalized if they miss a prehearing settlement date. We're looking to work with all of the local businesses and even national businesses as much as we can.

As long as they have evidence that they can submit to us, assuming it's the appropriate evidence, we can go ahead and dismiss the violation or offer reduction as appropriate. It's not really the purpose of
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the investigator in the field issuing the violation to also make a determination of whether or not there's sufficient evidence if they've determined a violation should be issued.

The standard procedure of the office is someone other than the issuing officer, or investigator in this case, not officer, not sworn officers, takes a look at the evidence that's presented. Also takes a look at what the investigator provides to them. So that there is a check within the office that one specific investigator isn't necessarily taking on any particular retailer or isn't cutting somebody that maybe they know a break. So there's a check and balance within the office.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: You said you had about 350 cases; is that right?

MR. MAY: We had over 1,000 complaints and about 350 violations issued.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: And what percentage would you say resulted in some sort of discussion before and a change in whether
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or not they're fined? How many of them were just fines were paid and that was it, if you can remember.

MR. MAY: I would have to take a look at the numbers. It's not that many. I think we've probably had about 20 where we've had a settlement conference or administrative hearing. But everyone has an opportunity to present whatever evidence that they have. And we have dismissed a number of violations once we information that their wholesaler, for lack of a better term, is ripping them off.

I think that's the challenge with the law as it's currently written, not the law that we're debating here, that the department is prevented from going after the wholesaler. You can only do consumer goods and retail. If there's an opportunity to work with the body here to deal with this, $I$ think that's one of the key things that we should be looking to address. We don't want to be hitting local businesses, even national businesses, anymore than any of you do. We want to find out who the real culprit is.
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During the height of the pandemic how is a shoe store able to get three-ply masks when hospitals couldn't get them? What is that wholesaler doing? How are they getting that material to sell to somebody who may not necessarily have been in that business a week prior. So, having now unfortunately been through whatever it is, nine months of the pandemic, we have a better idea of what we're looking at one. And two, things that we can change to move forward to address the concerns.

I actually want to thank the Presiding Officer. We had an opportunity to discuss this, I've lost all track of time, I apologize, it might have been May, it might have been June, but you brought your concerns to me about the individual business that you were speaking about in the beginning. I took your concerns immediately to heart. I don't know if anybody maybe realized or not, but we stopped reporting the type of businesses and the specific town that they're in. We moved to much broader numbers at the town and city
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level.
Understanding that while we thought that we were masking the identities of businesses that had not been fully adjudicated, obviously you, as the legislators, know your communities better than I do. I did not realize that what we were giving out was pretty significantly identifiable to the store in question and we changed our practice immediately thereafter. Again, if there's an opportunity here to work with everybody I think there are changes that need to be made. So, that's the complete answer to question. I might have gone on too long and I apologize.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: That's
okay. How much did you collect in total from the businesses?

MR. MAY: I think it's around $\$ 50,000$ we've collected in total so far.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: When was
the first fine issued, if you recall?
MR. MAY: The first fine issued I think it was the week of March 9. One of the
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legislators had reached out to us regarding -again, $I$ don't want to unmask any of the stores that haven't been fully adjudicated yet, but they were selling boxes of masks for I think it was $\$ 50$ ? $A$ box of ten-year old three-ply masks that the manufacturer essentially forswore any knowledge of. They hadn't been manufactured in ten years. They didn't know what condition that they were stored in. And the location was selling them for 50 or $\$ 60$. I forget the exact time. Starting that first week in March before everything got sideways.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I think
that's it. Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions for Mr. May? Yes, Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you Presiding Officer. Commissioner, thank you very much. Under your current system, as you explained, this is one of the reasons why I think the Majority's bill is good because it provides the merchant with an opportunity to
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present their proof before a violation is issued.

Under your current system your investigator goes there, makes an investigation about the price and the product and issues a violation. Now, what you're saying is your process does allow for the merchant to dispute it, present proof and if they present the proof according to what you're saying and the criteria about their supply chain they're going to be found not guilty of it. But the point is, is that once that violation is issued you're now forcing the merchant to go hire an attorney, spend money trying to defend a violation that may have been wrongly issued in the first place. What I'm saying as far as due process goes, if you can allow a merchant an opportunity to demonstrate through documentary evidence ahead of time, before having to go through the adjudication process, I think that makes more sense. That's all I'm trying to say.
I understand that your
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investigators do a very good job in
determining if this particular product is being overpriced or other unfair trade practices are being employed. But why not give the merchant an opportunity to explain before he's issued the violation?

MR. MAY: Legislator, part of the problem there is the way that the department is operating, the individual issuing violation really is not supposed to be the one making a determination as to the facts afterwards. In other words, we have investigator ones who are in the field. The investigators twos are the ones who are doing at least the presettlement conference and taking the information that the merchant, in this case it's a merchant, in other cases it could be based on a consumer complaint.
I think one of the things, again if we have the opportunity to work on with this bill as it's written, the bill as written affects the unfair trade practice sort of entirely. It doesn't take it out of the realm of the unfair trade practice and focus on the
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issue of price gouging, which I think we would like to see. But again, that's not up to us. There are internal controls in the department so that the investigators are not -- I'm not casting aspersions on any of my staff here but it's also to protect them from anybody coming in and saying why is store A getting a deal and store $B$ isn't? Or investigator A comes in and everything's fine but investigator $B$ comes in and I got all these problems. What's going on here?

The point is to have a standard operating procedure that everybody including between the investigators, the store owners, consumers, everyone understands what the process is.

So, this fundamentally changes how the department operates and I don't that it's necessarily for the better. But I think there is an opportunity, as I said, to address what I think are inadequacies in the law as it currently stands. I don't disagree with the Majority's thrust here with the legislation. I think we really ought to change how the
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department is able to handle the complaints of price gouging.

I don't know if it was Legislator Bynoe or somebody said there's no definition of price gouging in the admin code. You've all seen the memo I presented over the weekend. That's one of the changes we want to make. We want to make it very clear for the merchants what the rules of the road are so to speak. So that everybody has an opportunity to play by those rules equally and fairly. Again, I don't know if I answered your question and gone on too far.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: You answered it and I agree with the concept and the ideal that you're saying is that you want to give every merchant on opportunity. But what you're forcing them to do is to now be on the defensive. They now have to go through the court process to defend themselves. They now have to present you with proof in an adjudication process in order to be vindicated from it.

All I'm saying is what the
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Majority's bill from what $I$ understand it is they can alert the merchant and the retailer that there is a complaint, there is a potential for a violation here. Unless you demonstrate how you've arrived at this pricing we're going to issue a violation and then you'll have to answer it in a judicial forum.

But I just think that the opportunity before you slap him with a violation and now they have to go and hire a lawyer and defend it and spend all this money when in fact they had a very plausible reason why they charged this price is the better way to go that's all I'm saying.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I have a number of legislators who'd like to speak. Legislator Walker, Legislator Birnbaum, Legislator Rhoads and Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Hello
Commissioner. I want to thank you too for addressing all the issues $I$ had early on in COVID. I did have several of those businesses that were selling individual face masks that came out of a package and I thought the same
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thing. Why would anyone even consider buying those when they were obviously -- you couldn't even say they were put in a baggy. They were just whatever. Of course, added to that and whether it was called price gouging or whatever but they were selling those individual masks for a large amount of money.

I think we do all understand that
like small little businesses, like the deli isn't going to get the best deal on goods compared to like a Target or a Walmart or whatever. Normally their expenses are a little bit higher and I thank you for addressing them.

In those circumstances where people were selling individual items or whatever, were they immediately given some kind of violation? Obviously I would hope that they were made to stop doing -- continuing to do that because you did have people who were buying them like that. I don't know how -did you address those immediately?

MR. MAY: Those are all addressed immediately, yes. I guess the challenge for
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our department during the pandemic is to apply as evenhandedly as we can the same processes and procedures for everybody that we're notified that price gouging is occurring.

I do want to emphasize the point here with the exception of that first week where everything was kind of weird but not sideways, right, my staff and I, we could all ride around in cars together not wearing face masks, did go around to stores that we were aware of that were selling the individual masks. Masks in boxes for $\$ 60$. Again, almost an unknown providence. And that was probably the last time that we issued a violation under UTP related to price gouging. That was not the direct result of a consumer complaint. We are not out there looking to hammer retail stores during a pandemic. We are all very sensitive to the unfortunately changed business climate for everybody. We understand that costs have gone up for everybody. We understand it's not in Nassau County. You look at New York City with the closure of the indoor dining for the
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restaurants. You read the New York Times. And all of these small businesses, family-owned businesses, are under incredible pressure in unprecedented times. We are not out there looking to crush local businesses.

And that's again why we circulated the memo over the weekend that based on our experiences there are changes that need to be made. I don't know that the bill that we are debating now accomplishes everything that I think that we want to do here. Again, also, I think I have gone on too long and I lost the thread myself. I don't know if I answered your question or not. I think that's how I'm going to end every question that I'm answering I don't know if I answered the question or not. I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Just one
added piece to that. I know you said I guess you said about 350 violations were given?

MR. MAY: Yes.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Do you know how many you have outstanding?

MR. MAY: The bulk of them are
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outstanding. Again, just because we had a return date on a violation doesn't mean that if somebody couldn't make it for whatever reason that we were immediately punishing them. We were happy to adjourn violations. Adjourn administrative hearings. The department was essentially closed to the public until the summer. So we're not out again looking to hammer or seriously inconvenience any of the local businesses. One point that I wanted to raise and I thank you for the opportunity here is, the people who receive violations don't even have to come to the department at this point. We can do adjudications over the phone, then can email whatever information they have. We have Zoom available. Teams. I don't think we use Skype. Methods available to be as convenient as possible for all of the businesses. If they want to hire a lawyer that's certainly their right. Most of this they can handle themselves on their own. The underlying purpose of having the Department of Consumer Affairs in the
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first place is to offer a low cost venue for people to adjudicate these kinds of complaints. So, there's an opportunity there for everyone to be heard and be heard as conveniently as possible for lack of a better term.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you.
And I have to tell you I think it's important obviously the department doesn't let on what businesses or the exact type of business, especially if it's the only business like that in a community. But $I$ can tell you, early on social media let everybody know. Pretty much people in the neighborhoods knew what stores were doing things wrong. And hopefully those stores got the message also even if it wasn't right away from you that they got it from the residents and people were aware of what was happening.

MR. MAY: I think that that's
true. And the department has seen a pretty steep decline in complaints about price gouging of any kind. Like I said at the beginning, the product that we seem to be
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seeing the most about is the cans of Lysol again retailing for $\$ 5$. Some stores are selling them for $\$ 15$. That's the bulk of the complaints. I think most of the merchants, for lack of a better term, received the message as you are saying. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Legislator Birnbaum.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Thank you.
I know many of you spoke for a while already commissioner, so you answered many of my questions. But how would you categorize the amount of cases that stores, amount of stores that need to or use attorneys I should say in defending themselves when they get these violation notices? You said anybody can do it on their own but how often do people incur expenses for hiring an attorney? MR. MAY: I'm going to have Dawn O'Brien, the department counsel, answer that question. My experience has been not many have required attorneys but she's been handling it directly. MS. O'BRIEN: Good afternoon
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legislator. For most of the cases that I've handled the stores have been representing themselves. We make it really easy for them. I will accept their evidence via email. They can scan it into me. We do a calculation and we determine that if their gross profit margin is at or below what it was prior to the pandemic or at a reasonable level then we will dismiss the ticket without them ever coming in. And we are happy to do that for them. LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: What's the time period between the time they were initially issued the violation and the case could be settled?

MS. O'BRIEN: What's the return date that we usually give them? Like how many weeks, do you know? If it's ten days, if they call us I can do it even before then. Either Ken or I typically look at most of them and we make that determination -- we can make that determination basically on the spot with them. We've seen so many of them at this point.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: You gave
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the number before. I wasn't sure. How many have been settled with no penalty at all during the pandemic?

MS. O'BRIEN: I don't have that number. Do you have it Greg?

MR. MAY: I don't have it on me. We can certainly get that for you.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Would you say less than half?

MS. O'BRIEN: Most of the ones that are settled immediately are the ones that are dismissable because it's very easy to determine that the vendor didn't do anything wrong and we are able to make that calculation. If we then make them an offer and they don't want to take that offer that's what's getting put off. Because now we have to wait until a time we can have a hearing and we only just starting having our hearings maybe about a month ago.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: What evidence do they need? Do they just have to show you receipts? What do they have to show to prove how much they paid? Is it just their
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orders or how do you do it?
MS. O'BRIEN: Their invoices from their wholesaler. And it is nice if we can have one prior to the pandemic. Often times they're not able to show that. But yeah, the invoices from the wholesalers.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: I'm just a little concerned that that -- you said it's inspector ones who go to the store, right? So the person in the store probably wouldn't show it to them unless it's a very small store but if the owner wasn't there that's not something that can be produced on the spot I would imagine.

MS. O'BRIEN: I've never been on the scene. You've been on the scene for some of them, correct?

MR. MAY: Right. For some of them they're not able to produce it on the scene. Some of them I suppose can. I haven't seen any. I shouldn't say that. We've had retailers show us handwritten notes that, again, are sort of an unknown providence. But as long as the store is willing to submit it
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to the department and have it be on file and, for lack of a better term, auditable we'll take it. And if the attorneys and the investigators twos are satisfied with the investigation we can go ahead and dismiss the violation. Like Dawn said, we're set up in such a way that the store owner doesn't have to come into the department at this point. LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: In terms of publicity, because $I$ know that there was a lot of bad press for certain stores, does the department give out any information to the press?

MR. MAY: No. The information
that's released -- let me be very clear about this. Certain information is FOILable. At the end of the day if there's a fully adjudicated violation it is a public document that can be FOILed. I don't recall seeing any FOILs from the press. Although Dawn is the FOIL officer for the department.

To the extent that a mistake may have been made, certainly I thought that I had been properly masking the location or the
Full - 12-14-20
identities of some of the stores receiving the violations at the beginning of the pandemic. Again, although I've said it already, I do want to thank the presiding officer for bringing it to my attention that through the best of intentions was not really doing what $I$ had set out to do and changed the practice so that when we were reporting to the press we were just reporting the number of locations in a township. Obviously the three towns, two cities. Because the way that I had been doing it before was not adequately protecting the people who had not been fully adjudicated. LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: During this pandemic it was the masks, the cleaning solutions. If something else comes along, I can't even imagine right now, but do you believe that this legislation strengthens the department? Makes it better for I guess it's aimed towards the merchants but what's your view of this?

MR. MAY: My concern is that the legislation is focused on the unfair trade practice violations broadly and changing them
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in a broader sense that there may be, I don't want to say it was intended because I don't want to say it because we didn't draft the bill here, $I$ think a better solution would be to specifically carve out price gouging. Define price gouging and then wall off price gouging from the department. Unless there's a declared emergency by the president, the governor, the county executive.

Excuse me, I understand from having done this now for nine months and working with some of the stores, obviously speaking with many of you, that the way that we have been operating, although I think it is perfectly appropriate, could be changed to offer some protection to the vendors as well. I think there needs to be some clarity in the law. Which again is purpose of the memo I sent around prior to the weekend.

The bill as written $I$ think does change some of the broader powers of the department. We do use the unfair trade practice violation as part of our enforcement against entities that are not licensed by the
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department. So if you have a car dealership for example. Somebody comes in saying they're being ripped off by a car dealership. Catering halls. The tool of the department is the unfair trade practice. This legislation as written $I$ think sort of more broadly affects that than might have been warranted.

So again, if there's an opportunity to work with this body here, I think there's a broad agreement on both sides, not of the aisle here, whatever this divider is, that some change needs to be made and if there's an opportunity to work with all of you and come back to this in the new year I think that we would have something that everyone would be happy and proud to have out there.

> LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Thank you. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Mr. Rhoads. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Commissioner May, I understand the argument that you're making. I'm just a little bit concerned that this turns somewhat into a shoot first and ask questions later process. Which might look good for a press conference but it doesn't
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really get us to the point where we're solving any kind of issue. I mean, you're essentially filling out an accusatory instrument. With any other scenario you would wind up having to have probable cause to be able to do that. It would be sort of like me accusing you of murder without giving you the opportunity to tell me whether or not you had an alibi, right.

So, I don't see where it creates an issue for the department. And if it is a substantial change in the procedure maybe it is a procedure that needs to be changed to give the business owner the opportunity of demonstrating to the person that's there to conduct an investigation, right? An investigation is not just one side. It's listening to both sides. Conduct an investigation and see what exculpatory information there is before they make a decision to charge.

Because as Legislator Drucker made the point and as the presiding officer made the point, you are, as soon as that ticket is
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issued, exposing potentially that business to negative press, to negative attention and forcing them to incur substantial bills to fight this out through an adjudicative process when they don't necessarily have to. As, I apologize, $I$ didn't catch your name ma'am. I would address you by name.

MR. MAY: Dawn O'Brien, assigned counsel for the department.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you
counselor. Thank you Ms. O'Brien.
As you indicated, quite often these are things that wind up getting resolved right away because there really is no basis for it. But in the mean time a ticket has been issued, they had to occur an expense. That's an expense that can be avoided simply by asking a few simple and necessary questions at the point of where the investigator is in the store and has the opportunity to be presented with information explaining why it is that a particular price is being charged.

Nobody is looking to protect people who are truly engaging in price gouging. But
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by the same token we shouldn't be placing the burden of establishing someone's innocence on business owners. It's supposed to be that you're innocent until proven guilty not the other way around. I think this bill goes a long way in correcting that.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Ms. Bynoe.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you
Legislator Kopel. Commissioner, I'm not going to go over some of the questions that I asked earlier because there's been some agreement we will be working together to try to hammer this out in a way that would be appropriate. But I do want to note if whether you have confidence that we as a county would have an ability to issue violations for wholesalers that are not seated here in county. Who are not doing business here in the county. They might be doing business in Wyoming, Utah, California and the like.

MR. MAY: We've worked up a draft
legislation through the county attorney's legal counsel bureau. We're confident that the solution that we have will allow us to go
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off some of the wholesalers like you're saying who are headquartered elsewhere. I believe most if not all corporations operating in state of New York have to be registered with the State Department of State for the issuance of service. Or process of service. I'm not a lawyer. Obviously I screwed that up.

I don't think there's any issue with going after the wholesalers in that case. Like I said at the beginning, I think that's for most of the violations that we've issued that would probably be the appropriate party to receive the violation.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I 100 percent agree.

## LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Legislator

 Walker moves to close the hearing. Legislator Bynoe seconds the motion. All those in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Forget it. I'm sorry. Check that. Public comment.MR. BUDNICK: Department of
Consumer Affairs my highest compliments and to Mr. Nicolello for bringing it before you. I'm
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a former practicing attorney. Retired now. Former assistant district attorney.

There are two particulars where this idea of having a screening process before there is an actual prosecution where a person is in jeopardy. One is of course is the criminal justice system where we have a screening process first in between the prosecutor and the defendant. That is one model.

The other model is with building departments and New York State building code violations where the state code mandates a 30 day notice of violation, it doesn't have to be 30 days but it is, before an accusatory instrument can be filed in order to give a homeowner, a resident, a renter, even a trespasser the right to submit why have permits for this stuff? Why are you bothering me? Or whatever the situation may be.

I think the public policy of this state should be followed by this county in terms of the hearings that are being run by the Nassau County Department of Consumer
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Affairs.
At one point I had a number of them many moons ago. I found out that the administrative judges wouldn't allow business records of a businessman to be considered.

Also, there is no procedure or existence of an appellate procedure within the department other than $a$, quote unquote, appeal to the commissioner. Which is effectively a nonexistent appeal because the commissioner just doesn't have a staff or ability or a function of actually reviewing all the transcripts of all the proceedings that take place if there are appeals.

I think also there is a lack here because there is not a preponderance -- it's a mere preponderance of the evidence, not guilt shown by clear and convincing evidence which is a higher standard.

I haven't read this proposed local law. I asked for a copy last week. I was told to try and find it on the Internet, which turned out to be an impossibility for me. So, I'm suggesting that Mr. Nicolello's proposal
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be very, very seriously considered because it provides for the protection of human rights. People who own stores are human beings too. We have to come to.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Mr. Budnick just wrap it up,.

MR. BUDNICK: -- come to an agreement as to what we can do for everybody's sake ultimately.

Thank you and thank you for putting up with me. Happy holidays. God bless you.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you.
Any other public comment? In that case, once again Legislator Walker moves to close the hearing and Legislator Bynoe seconds the motion. All those in favor of closing hearing signify by saying aye. Any opposed? The hearing is closed. The presiding officer will be back very shortly.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We are going now to a vote on this proposed local law to amend Section 21-10.2(2)(c) of the county administrative code with respect to due process for trade practice violation.
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We need a motion on that.
Legislator Schaefer moves it. Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel seconds it. And further debate or discussion on this matter? All in favor signify by saying aye. Passes unanimously.

We are going to do the next hearing and next vote and then we'll take a short break after that.

Number six is a hearing on a local law to amend Title A of Chapter 6 of the Nassau County Administrative Code in relation to the renewal of the exemption for persons 65 years of age or over pursuant to Section $467(6)(B)$ of the real property tax law.

Moved by Legislator Bynoe. Seconded by Legislator Walker. That's a motion to open the hearing. All those in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is open. Does anyone want to speak to this legislation?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This bill would protect our senior citizens who are
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opine to the county. It came to the mind especially during COVID and our desire to reduce the requirements for senior citizens to come out and be public facing to request this exemption that those that would have applied for an exemption five years in a row would enjoy the exemption, move forward without filing any additional paperwork.

Yes, they have to file an affidavit with their local town when they pay their tax bill. That would be the only additional requirement.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It helps the seniors because it can be a cumbersome process qualifying for this tax exemption and all the paperwork that they have to gather. It will allow them to avoid that by simply filing an affidavit with their tax payment $I$ believe, right?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: With their tax payment to the town. Rich, I don't know about you, or Presiding Officer, I get calls from senior citizens where they forgot and it's lapsed and it's fallen off. This really would
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allow for them, once they have the five years, they don't even have to worry about it. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just file an affidavit. Any other debate or discussion? Motion to close the hearing. Moved by Legislator Kennedy. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The hearing is closed.

And we will go to calendar item 13. A local law to amend Title A of Chapter 6 of the Nassau County administrative code in relation to the renewal of the exemption for persons 65 years of age or over pursuant to Section $467(6)(B)$ of the real property tax law.

Motion by Legislator Drucker. Seconded by Legislator Walker. Any further debate or discussion on the local law? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

With respect to the hearing on the capital plan we're going to open that hearing and then recess it. Some additional work has
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to be done on that before it's ready to go. Let me read the item.

Number seven is a hearing on an ordinance to adopt the capital budget for the county of Nassau for the first year of the four-year capital plan to commence on January 1, 2021 pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the county government law of Nassau County.

Motion to open the hearing by
Legislator McKevitt. Seconded by Legislator Ferretti. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye. Those opposed? I think we need a motion to recess the hearing at this point? We are going to place that in recess and we are going to take a brief break and come right back. Thank you.
(Meeting was recessed at 4:34 p.m.)
(Meeting reconvened at 5:14 p.m.)
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We are out
of recess. Next two items to be called are 34 and 35. These are settlements. 34 is a resolution -- actually 34 and 35 are resolutions authorizing the county attorney to
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compromise and settle the claims of the plaintiffs as set forth in the action entitled Duarte versus the County of Nassau. As well as plaintiffs in the action entitled HVAC, Inc. versus County of Nassau pursuant to the county law, the county government law of Nassau County and the Nassau County administrative code.

Moved by Legislator Drucker.
Seconded by Legislator Walker. These two are before us. Were there any questions? I think a request was made to call these separately. I don't know if anyone remotely has questions this. Any recusals or anything like that? Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? They carry unanimously.

$$
\text { 37, Resolution } 172 \text { is a resolution }
$$ authorizing the county executive to execute an agreement with the Nassau County Interim Finance Authority in relation to the return to the New York State comptroller the amount of sales tax revenue necessary to enable the state comptroller to make the distressed
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provider assistance account payments.
Moved by Legislator Walker.
Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. That item is before us. Is there somebody from -I see Andy Persich.

MR. PERSICH: Andy Persich,
Office of Management and Budget. This is just memorializing an agreement because similar to what we had to do with AIM last year, because we have a control board with NIFA, the money can't be remitted back to the state without an agreement placed. We're hoping that next year the legislation will be fixed in the state and we won't have this issue with the distressed hospital payments.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: How much is this?

MR. PERSICH: Roughly around \$7.4 million depending upon the calendared year with the state and everything else. But the number we have is 7.4 for this year.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This money comes out of our sales tax revenue?

MR. PERSICH: It's taken out of
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our share of the sales tax. Similar to what the AIM did last year.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: How much was taken out for AIM?

MR. PERSICH: $\$ 11$ million.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions? Thank you Andy. Any debate or discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Next item is 51, Resolution 186 to
require the assessor to restore to the Official website of the county the total value of the exemption granted and the estimated tax impact to individual homeowners pursuant to real property tax law 485-u.

Moved by Legislator Ferretti. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. That's before us. Anyone want to speak about this? Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you Presiding Officer. What this would do when the property tax bills, the school property tax bills first posted back in early November there was a line at the bottom of the My
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Nassau Property web page which had the full impact of the reassessment, the increases listed as an exemption. The full amount. Unfortunately, that amount has since been removed from the county website. I couldn't really tell you why, $I$ have my suspicions, but it has been removed from the county website. So, residents have been calling my office, I'm sure many other offices from my colleagues here in the legislature, asking what the reassessment is going to bring in the future. What's it going to bring in the next four years. This exemption number that was listed at the bottom of that web page, although not precise, gives residents an idea of what the impact would have been this year and thus able to predict what it will be over the next four years, the remaining four years of the phase-in. So this is another instance of lack of transparency in this process. It's another instance of a Majority proposal that will bring some level of transparency back to the process. I certainly hope that I'm joined by my colleagues up here
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in supporting it and that this number gets restored to the county website. Thank you. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else want to speak? Legislator Rhoads. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you Presiding Officer. Even worse than -- even as bad as what Legislator Ferretti alluded to is the fact that this isn't something that information for the benefit of taxpayers that was never provided. It's the active decision to take information that was provided to them that would have given them an idea of what their projection was over the course of the next four years. A tool that they could use and deliberately taking that tool away from them.

So, not only do we have the case where perhaps you can make the excuse that somehow maybe they didn't think about providing this information to taxpayers. This is information that they had and was taken away, in my opinion, in a deliberate attempt to hide the true impact of reassessment so that homeowners wouldn't be able to understand
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it. Which makes this legislation even more necessary.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
else want to speak?
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Can I add
one extra thing? Just going back to what Legislator Rhoads just pointed out which of course is completely accurate. It was only a couple of weeks ago that the county was ordered by a court to be more transparent. Which is a very unfortunate situation that Nassau County had to be ordered by a court, by a judge, to be more transparent. And it's costing Nassau County residents, the lack of transparency, cost them not just from a personal perspective not knowing what's going for many residents, but also it costs us in real dollars and cents. We were ordered to pay attorneys' fees of almost $\$ 600,000$. Nassau County residents are on the hook for the lack of a transparency.

So, this is just another attempt to bring some level of transparency to this process and really the assessment department
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and the administration needs to learn from prior mistakes and fix these issues and we're trying to help with that. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
further debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? That carries unanimously. We have two items on an emergency
agenda, clerk item -- two items on the emergency calendar. Mike, you want to call the emergencies? Do the first one first.

MR. PULITZER: Call emergency
Resolution 33-2020. Emergency resolution number 33-2020. An emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon an ordinance to require the waiver of fees related to the modification of deeds containing covenants that discriminate on the basis of race or religion.

Shall I read the next one?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: No. We'll
hold off on that. This emergency has been read. We need a motion to establish the emergency. Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
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Seconded by Legislator Drucker. Any debate or discussion on the emergency? Hearing none, all in favor of the emergency signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Now call the item for
consideration. An ordinance to require the waiver of fees related to the modification of deeds containing covenants that discriminate on the basis of race or religion.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator Drucker.
Briefly this went through
committees earlier. Waive fees for
individuals to the extent that there remains these offensive covenants in deeds. Initially the proposal was that it would pertain to restrictions based on race but we have expanded that to religion as well. These covenants are illegal for generations actually but there may be still homeowners dating back to the '50s that still have this language in their deeds who may seek to get it out basically.
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Anyone else want to discuss it?
Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The only thing I would add to the presiding officer's explanation is that as a county we want to take an active role in encouraging people to do it. Not only does this certainly provide an opportunity which they wouldn't otherwise have, but we want to make sure that opportunity can be taken free of county fees as a way of encouraging that language to be removed.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other debate or discussion? Legislator Solages.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: To what
extent will there be an effort to record all of the homeowners who request that language be removed from their deed? Legislator Drucker and I initiated legislation in July that had in it to record this information because there were universities such as Molloy and Adelphi that had interest in recording this information and using it for evidence-based research to learn from the past. I applaud
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the effort of the Majority to initiate this bill but would also ask that there be a component to record this. Would someone able to FOIL the county clerk's office to actually request this language to be removed from their deed?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You were going in and out. Could you just restate what you just said right now?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Is it possible for someone to FOIL the county clerk's office to discover who in fact may have requested this language to be removed from their deed? Because Legislator Drucker and I initiated legislation that we had a component where we would record that information.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I mean, I don't think it's possible to FOIL that from the county clerk's office what we're talking about. 400,000 parcels in the county and they would have to go through each one to identify whether a deed still, current deed has clause in it. I don't think that's something that
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can be done. We're looking at people proactively who want to make this change and Legislator Rhoads said we encourage people to do that but that's the purpose of the bill. LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: It's
available to the public as to what clauses did have this language.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I didn't
catch that either.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Will that
information be made available to the public as to which clauses have this language.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I don't
think you can, for the same reason you can't expect the county clerk to go through 400 something thousand deeds and try to identify which ones have and which ones don't. I think you could, however, have a general -- we could provide general information to the public saying this is now available.

And to be honest with you, there's still cost involved in doing that. To actually try to get this out of the deed to file new instruments there's still state tax
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costs and if somebody' going to use an attorney there's cost there as well. But if someone is eagerly anticipating and would like to do this there's not going to be a charge in the county portion which is what we hope will encourage people to do so to the extent they still exist.

Any other debate or discussion?
Legislator Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I would just add that the county clerk's office is a public office that is completely open to the public. Any resident or nonresident for that matter can go into the county clerk's office and go through the land records there. This information is freely accessible. From 1993 forward it's actually accessible online. Any resident can go through any deed back to the beginning of the formation of Nassau County and conduct a search.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
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Last item is 410 of 2020. Can we waive the reading of this entire paragraph? I think it's pretty clear as to what it is. With the consent of the Minority I would like to do that. No reason to have to read every word here. It's an ordinance amending Ordinance 101-2020 fixing the tax rates and levying taxes for the 12 month 2021 fiscal year etcetera.

Do we have a motion to establish an emergency? Moved by Legislator Drucker. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. Any debate or discussion on the emergency? Hearing none -actually Andy, why don't you come up and tell us briefly what this is.

MR. PERSICH: This is the annual
tax warrant that's usually done at this session of the legislature. It was a little delayed again this year but being that it may with COVID and everything else. But it's here before you as it comes in every year at the same time and does the exact same thing. It's the exact same resolution every year with different numbers in there.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Tax bills
can't go out unless they have this information?

MR. PERSICH: Exactly. These
have to be submitted to the towns. The towns have to take it and then submit it for their tax penalties and if it gets delayed creates problems with cash for towns.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Which is the nature of the emergency because if we don't do it today then we're into the new year.

MR. PERSICH: The problem is when we get the information back and forth between the tax receivers and everything else it has to be done in December on this meeting. And the delay is that there's information going back and forth up until Friday at 4:45 I can tell you that we finally got final numbers from one of the townships. Unfortunately, we tried to streamline the process and we've gotten it closer. The turnaround time on this is going to be this way as far as $I$ see it. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
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questions for Andy? Thank you. All in favor of establishing the emergencies signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The emergency is established. I will call the item 410 of 2020. An ordinance amending Ordinance 101 of 2020 fixing the tax rates and levying taxes for 12 month 2021 fiscal year.

Motion by Legislator Bynoe.
Seconded by Legislator McKevitt. Any further debate or discussion on the item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

So, we are going to put the legislature in recess. We expect that there will be two additional emergencies to call this afternoon. This evening. While we are waiting for those to be ready we will have the Rules Committee take care of its business.
(Meeting recessed at 5:25 p.m.)
(Meeting reconvened at 5:38 p.m.)
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We are out
of recess. We have two more emergencies for tonight. Clerk item 411 of 2020 is a local law to create a special revenue fund to assist in the financing or payment of tax certiorari settlements and judgements and the payment of other expenses in Nassau County.

We need to motion to establish an emergency. Moved by Legislator Schaefer. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. Any discussion on the emergency? Hearing none, all in favor of establishing the emergency signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Now for the actual item. 411 of 2020, a proposed local law to create a special revenue fund to assist in the finance of payments of tax certiorari settlements and judgements and the payment of other expenses in Nassau County.

Moved by Legislator McKevitt.
Seconded by Legislator Ferretti. The item is before us.

This is a special revenue fund that
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we had proposed at the time of the budget. It's been slightly altered to encompass additional reasons for which the money can be spent. But basically, with what we believe to be excessively pessimistic viewpoint of sales taxes, to the extent that the sales taxes actually outpace what the projections were, additional monies will flow into this reserve fund which can then be spent for various good government purposes including payment of tax refunds as well as other expenses. Anyone want to say anything else?

Anyone remotely? All right. All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. We are going to have another recess and come back and get the last item done.
(Committee recessed at 5:45 p.m.)
(Committee reconvened at 7:01 p.m.)
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Back from
recess. The last item of business for today is 240 of 2020. We need to establish an emergency with respect to an ordinance making certain determinations pursuant to SEQRA
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approving a declaration of need for financing of county purposes by the Nassau County Interim Finance Authority.

Motion by Minority Leader
Abrahams. Seconded by Legislator Debra Mule. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, we need to actually vote on the emergency first.

All in favor of the emergency signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The emergency is passed.

Now we can consider the item which
is 240 of 2020. An ordinance making certain determinations pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act approving a declaration of need for financing of county purposes by the County Interim Finance Authority.

Again, we need a motion. Minority
Leader Abrahams. Legislator Mule makes that motion. The item is before us. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Motion to adjourn? Unanimous
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motion to adjourn and seconded by Legislator McKevitt. All in favor signify by saying aye. We are adjourned. (Meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m)
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