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        Rules - 3-8-21
    LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Call the
    Rules Committee to order. Mike, just call the
    roll.
    MR. PULITZER: Thank you Rich.
    Rules Committee roll call. Legislator Siela
    Bynoe.
    LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
    MR. PULITZER: Legislator Delia
    DeRiggi-Whitton.
    LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
    Here.
        MR. PULITZER: Ranking Member
    Kevan Abrahams.
    LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
        MR. PULITZER: Legislator Laura
    Schaefer.
    LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
        MR. PULITZER: Legislator Steven
    Rhoads.
    LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
    MR. PULITZER: Vice Chairman
    Howard Kopel.
    LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
    MR. PULITZER: Chairman Richard
    Regal Reporting Service
        516-747-7353
```
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Nicolello.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.
MR. PULITZER: We have a quorum sir.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you. We had the Pledge of Allegiance before our hearing this morning. We will forego that at the moment.

The first things we do in Rules are the committees and call all of the contracts together starting with $A-3, A-4, A-5, A-8$, A-9, A-11, A-15 of 2021.

These are resolutions authorizing the commissioner of shared services to award or approve additional funds or funding for blanket purchase orders between the county and Long Island FQHC, DF Stone Contracting, Winter Brothers Hauling, Enecon Northeast, Attenti US, Taub's Carpet and Tile and NPA Computers.
A-13-21, A-20-21. These are
resolutions authorizing the commissioner of shared services to award and execute purchase orders between the county and Better Air Quality and General Audio Visual.
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B-2 and B-8 2021. Resolution authorizing the county executive to award and execute contracts between the county and Palace Electrical Contractors and Eldor Contracting Corp.

E-25, E-26. Let me correct at record. In terms of the last two, I'm not calling $B-2$ of '21 at this time which involves Palace Electrical Contractors. We'll call that later. One of our members has to recuse himself.

So this is just $B-8$ of '21. A resolution authorizing the county executive to award and execute a contract between the county and Eldor Contracting Corp.
$E-25, E-26, E-27, E-28, E-29, E-30$,
E-31, E-32, E-33, E-34, E-35. Resolution authorizing the county executive to execute personal services agreements or amendments to personal service agreements between the county and Precise Court Reporting, De Bruin

Engineering, Robert J. Bishop, James Lytle, Belmont Child Care Association, Adopt a Highway Maintenance Corporation, Village of
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Freeport, Hispanic Counseling Center and Liro GIS.

Motion by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Minority Leader Kevan Abrahams. Those contracts are before us. I'm also going to take a motion to untable the following. A-32, A-67, E-162.

A-32 is a resolution ratifying the commissioner of shared services award and execute a purchase order between the county and Fastenal Company.

> A-67 is a resolution ratifying the commissioner of shared services award and execution of a purchase order between the county and Castle Transit Mix.

Lastly, E-162 is a resolution authorizing the county executive to execute a personal services agreement between the county and WSP USA.

Motion to untable by Legislator
Bynoe. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. For those three contracts all in favor of untabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The matters are untabled. Carries
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unanimously.
Start off with A-3 of 2021. It's a contract with the county and Long Island FQHC.

MR. BRODERICK: Legislators, good afternoon. Paul Broderick, Department of Social Services. The item before you is a request to increase the blanket purchase order between the county and federally qualified health centers to increase the contract amount from $\$ 483,000$ to $\$ 2.5$ million.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Paul, this
morning you were identified as the deputy commissioner of health.

MR. BRODERICK: That's incorrect.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That was
incorrect on the agenda.
MR. BRODERICK: Yes sir.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I was
wondering when you had made the transfer. MR. BRODERICK: I didn't see that.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It was on
the agenda.
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MR. BRODERICK: My apologies. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions on this item? No. I think we're good. There's a second one with emergency services that we just untabled. I don't know if you're handling that or not.

MR. BRODERICK: I'm not familiar with that.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That's
with Fastenal Company. Is that public works?
MS. HORST: It's an OEM item with
Tom Delaney on the line.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Why don't we do it now under emergency management.

MS. HORST: Go ahead Tom.
MR. DELANEY: The Fastenal item
is for a mask purchase that we had. They supplied us with $\$ 196,000$ worth of masks. We've already made a partial payment to them, under $\$ 100,000$, to try to get them some funding for this. We've already accepted delivery and we'd just like to see this move forward.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
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have any questions on either of these two contracts? We're good. Thank you Tom.

Move on to the purchasing contracts starting with A-4 of 2021 with DF Stone Contracting Limited.

MR. ARNOLD: Good afternoon. Ken
Arnold, Public Works. A-4 is a blanket order stone and gravel. It includes our stand that we use for ice control. We had seven bids received. DF Stone was the selected vendor. Contract cap is $\$ 975,000$.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Obviously
we're at the end of the season. We have special supplies for this last --

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, we have plenty material on stock.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And that
carries over from year to year obviously?
MR. ARNOLD: Yes. We keep a
stockpile.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions from the legislators. Next contract is A-8 with Enecon Northeast.

MR. ARNOLD: A-5 Winter
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Brothers?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We had A-8 under this, under purchasing. Is that actually with you or somebody else?

MR. ARNOLD: I have A-8 also.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Why don't you go with that.

MR. ARNOLD: A-8, this is a contract for concrete, metal and tank repairs. This was bid in 2019. This is a cap extension from $\$ 4$ million, which was $\$ 800,000$ per year, to $\$ 11$ million, which $I$ think is 1.6 million per year.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator
Kopel.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Ken, question
I have is many of these contracts go from four million to 11 million, things like that. Why is this not a new contract? Why is this not going out to be rebid instead of doing this kind of job?

MR. ARNOLD: I would want to
speak to purchasing, but $I$ believe this contract had duration on it and we're just
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increasing the cap for the different types of work. I guess in the past the cap was not always -- it was required to be increased so we were able to do additional work.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I get what it is that's happening over here.

MR. ARNOLD: That's a question for procurement. They make the decisions what goes out to bid and what doesn't go out to bid. Especially in the purchasing world.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Do you think we can get somebody from procurement here or somebody who can answer that question. It's not an isolated question. In other words, you can have a contract that's several years old and they just keep on increasing the amount instead of rebidding it and we might very well get better bids now several years down the road. This doesn't seem appropriate. I'm not questioning you.

MR. ARNOLD: I understand. I just don't know the answer. I wasn't part of that decision making.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay.

> Rules - 3-8-21

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think we have someone approaching the mic. Don't go too far Ken.

MR. BANKS: Good afternoon. My name is Vaughn Banks, deputy commissioner with Department of Purchasing.

In regards to your question, the original contract was not that old before DPW got into this and found that they needed to actually do more work, along with other agencies that utilize this particular contract. Normally when contract is near its conclusion we will actually rebid. We didn't feel the need -- because we're pretty much in the middle of this, we didn't see the need to rebid this.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I get it when you have a contract for let's say engineering services where it's not really practical to go ahead, or construction for that matter, you can't really change horses in midstream. That makes a lot of sense. But when you're doing a procurement for materials or something of the like I'd like to understand the guidelines.
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Do you have guidelines that you can provide for us?

MR. ARNOLD: Just real quick
legislator. This is not just for materials. This is actually a service. They actually apply the material, the coatings on the items also. So we're not just buying cans of this material.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: But my point would apply, none the less, since you're not talking about switching somebody in the middle of a discreet project. You're talking about many different projects.

MR. ARNOLD: I just wanted to clarify that it wasn't just material.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you. But my point $I$ think would still be valid. Do you have guidelines? Are there guidelines or is this just decisions made on an ad hoc basis?

MR. BANKS: This is not an ad hoc type decision. This is an ongoing contract that's not at its conclusion.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I understand
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but you're really not responding to my question. I'm talking -- let's not even -while $I$ might be able to disagree with what your point is on this contract, my question is really more general in nature. And this is not an isolated type of thing that comes before us. This happens fairly often.

So, once again, I would like to understand how these contracts are -- how these decisions are made. We'd like to get some clarity. Perhaps you can provide that for this committee soon as to what the guidelines are as to when a contract needs to be rebid and when it doesn't need to be rebid. Do you even have guidelines for that matter?

MR. BANKS: A contract gets rebid when it meets its conclusion. These contracts are bid at five year terms with one-year renewals. When a contract concludes we rebid. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: But this way there could be internal contracts because you just keep renewing it. Look, I don't really care to debate the point. We're not getting

Rules - 3-8-21
anywhere. My question specifically now is, does the department have guidelines and can you get those to us?

MR. BANKS: Sure. We can explain
it at another time. Sure.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Do you have guidelines that people are using?

MR. BANKS: Yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Can you get
those written guidelines to us?
MR. BANKS: As far as a
contract's length? What in particular --
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What I'm
asking you is, what are the decision points that are utilized in extending a contract or increasing the cap on a contract as opposed to going out for bids on additional supplies or materials or whatever it is that we're doing. Services. What are those guidelines? We'd like to see that. That would be useful for this committee I think.

MR. BANKS: I don't have that with me.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I understand.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: But you'll
provide it to us, right?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Maybe over the next week or so you can perhaps provide it. MR. BANKS: Absolutely. But whenever we do this we do this after speaking with the requesting agency. If it's something that we may have to terminate a contract for whatever reason, it's no longer good for the county or it's something that would --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Again, with
all due respect, it's not really responsive. Just go ahead please and provide it to the Majority counsel and Minority counsel if you would. Then we can have the discussion further if it's warranted. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Ken, in
terms of what's being provided for this contract it's very general terms. It says concrete, metal and tank repairs. I assume it's a tank repair and concrete and metal work?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. A good example, legislator, is Sixth Precinct. A lot
Rules - 3-8-21
of the interior of that building was resealed. Remember the concrete block walls that we walked around and saw. A lot of that was done by Enecon. Especially the exterior of the building. That's one way we use it. We use it in bathrooms. We don't tile bathrooms anymore. Most bathrooms when they're redone they're stripped down to the concrete and then they're sealed using this product. It saves us lot of time and much easier to maintain.

The pools are painted with this product. Instead of using just regular paint, we find that we're getting better lasting with painting with this product. A lot of different applications on the concrete side. On the tank side, yes, we have some fiberglass and metal tanks that we do coat using this contract also.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Is this product they're talking about unique to Enecon?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, it is.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Meaning
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that whatever it is that's being sealed in sealant or whatever it is that's being applied that's something that they are solely capable of producing as opposed to DPW itself purchasing it?

MR. ARNOLD: I know when they apply they supply a warranty for the length of the material. I'm not sure if we'd have that if we applied the material. I'm not sure if we could apply it and if we have the warranty that they provide when they put the material on.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I guess the follow-up question is, why can't county employees do this work? Why isn't civil service --

MR. ARNOLD: I'd have to look at the MSDS. What health and safety requirements to apply the materials. Are our guys trained properly to apply the material. I always like to look for the warranty that comes along with applying the material. If I know that if I have an issue with it $I$ can have the vendor take care of the issue and not have to do it
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myself. Those would be the major concerns I would have by us applying it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Can you
guarantee this committee that this is not taking the work away from the county workforce? Away from the county workforce that could be done in-house?

MR. ARNOLD: It's a little bit of
a loaded question because my guys can tile. If $I$ choose not to tile and use this product instead what is the correct answer? So, there's alternative things that could be done that would not use this product that my guys have done historically. This is a new product. For the last five or six years we've been using it in a lot of locations. That's why I don't want to say yes or no on that answer. I hope you understand that.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I
appreciate that. So, the key here is that this is a unique product that the county itself, county workforce is not itself using so that there are advantages over say for example tiling, advantages to using this

```
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    service to apply the sealant as opposed to
    doing a tiling, correct?
    MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
    LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: And it's
    been determined that that's in the best
    interest of the county to continue doing this
    type of work?
    MR. ARNOLD: Yes. Speaking with
    facilities team they all like the way the
    product performs and it's a much better
    alternative.
    LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: But as we
    sit here today, the county workforce could not
    be itself, to your knowledge, be itself could
    be applying this sealant?
    MR. ARNOLD: To my knowledge not
    applying the sealant.
    LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other
    questions? Ken, you want to move on to the
    next one.
    MR. ARNOLD: A-11?
    LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes.
    That's yours as well?
    MR. ARNOLD: A-11 is blanket
```
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order for furnish and install carpeting and vinyl floor tile. We had three bids. Taub's was determined to be the lowest responsible bidder. The cap for this contract is $\$ 3.275$ million.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions on this contract? Let's go on to the next one. Now we're going to A-5.

MR. ARNOLD: A-5 is a blanket
service contract used for the disposal of nonemergency storm drain debris. Three bids were received. Winter Brothers was determined to be the lowest responsible bidder. The contract cap is $\$ 15$ million. This is the contract that we use to get rid of our road sweepings, anything we pick up in the right of way. Anything road maintenance picks up that's not during the emergency storm. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This one also goes to Howard's point. This is a contract that apparently the previous maximum amount was $\$ 1,700,000$. Now it's being raised to $\$ 15$ million.

MR. ARNOLD: This was rebid.
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on this contract? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi

Ken. I think we all know that unfortunately Eric Winter passed away. Do you know that this company is still going to be in existence?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. This company
was vetted after that sad event.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other
questions? Go on to the next one which is A-13, Better Air Quality.

MR. ARNOLD: A-13 is a HVAC duct work cleaning contract. Two bids were received. Better Air Quality was determined to be the lowest responsible bidder. The contract cap is $\$ 2.5$ million.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on this one? Hearing none, we're going to skip Palace Electrical Contracting. We will discuss that at the end of your presentation and make a separate vote on that one.

Rules - 3-8-21
MR. ARNOLD: There are two Palace
contracts, $\mathrm{B}-2$ and $\mathrm{B}-3$ ?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do we have a B-3. Just B-2. Again, we're skipping that one and coming back. $B-8$ is an Eldor contract.

MR. ARNOLD: $B-8$ is the construction contract for what we call E4 at Bay Park. E4 is the contractor is that is bringing outside power feeders into the plant so we can get off the on-site power generation facilities. PSEG has their phase of work and then the county has a certain phase of work that we need to do on the plant property to make this project viable.

So, Eldor is the lowest responsible bidder for the work associated with it. It's all funded through our 428 Program. The FEMA money that we have.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Are you finished with that part of your presentation? MR. ARNOLD: Yeah.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions or discussions? Let's go to E-26,
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De Bruin Engineering.
MR. ARNOLD: E-26 is for
professional services related to on-call environmental construction management services. We had 13 firms submit this on-call request. De Bruin is one of eight that will be selected. The contract cap for this work will be $\$ 1$ million.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on E-26? No. E-30.
MR. ARNOLD: $E-30$ is the Adopt a Highway maintenance program. So, the county reprocured the Adopt a Highway program. We had two bidders. Firm of Adopt a Highway Maintenance Corporation of New York was the selected vendor. We did vet the vendor based on the past issues we've had and they have been performing since we changed our management structure surrounding them and we are confident that they can do the work and provide the service.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This one is troublesome to me and to others. There was an extensive investigation by one of our local
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reporters, one of the New York City reporters, who uncovered that they were not doing what they were supposed to do. In fact, garbage was remaining in locations month after month after month.

It's also been disclosed that the 2003 contract -- I'm sorry, after the contract expired the vendor was still selling sponsorships. That there were similar news stories for Adopt a Highway programs in Pennsylvania as well as Colorado. Why wouldn't this vendor be taken off the list? And why would we want to go back to Adopt a Highway with that as the background?

MR. ARNOLD: After that issue was brought to light we changed the management structure and had a different group of people overseeing them. Since that point they've been performing the work that's been requested along our service road and Peninsula Boulevard, the two roads that they manage.

I understand the concerns but the department felt that once we had the right oversite on the firm that they've been
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performing as required. I believe that they have been operating under a month to month since the contract expired. I have to speak to my real estate people about that.

And in looking at the options that we had it was a better choice of vendors. There's not many people that do this type of work in the state.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: With that history, with the issues being uncovered and was documented, I mean, the reporter went back on a monthly basis, tagged certain debris and went back the following month and it was there. And then added additional tagged debris and it was still there.

MR. ARNOLD: I understand the problem we had back $I$ think it was two and a half years ago. When I first became commissioner $I$ know we dealt with that. We've been tracking the amount of debris that they've been picking up ever since. My road maintenance people are now in charge of this operation. Have said they've been very successful in doing the work. If there was an
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issue that came up we would follow our
procurement policies and deal with it accordingly in the future.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The fact that we had to put more supervision in place doesn't excuse their lack of performance and their complete disregard for the health, welfare and safety of residents by allowing this condition to exist.

Does anyone else have any questions on this contract?

Kevan, we didn't pick up exactly what you said.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You asked if anybody else had any questions.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you.
Ken, our concerns are tied to the same concerns that Rich brought up. Can you provide to the committee how the two firm that responded were scored? I can't believe with the history that we know and what we've heard again today from the floor regarding this one particular company that someone can score
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lower than them with the history we know about this existing company that is before us today. MR. ARNOLD: Give me one second. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sure. MR. ARNOLD: Understand I'm not on the selection committee so I have to go back and look at the notes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I
understand.
MR. ARNOLD: One of the
requirements of the $R F P$ was an annual fee per sign that they put up. The selected vendor is supplying that fee. The second vendor was not and that was one of the major issues that we had in reviewing of the proposals.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, I'm guessing that issue received some high priority?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The issues
that were identified by news reports doesn't carry the same level of priority?

MR. ARNOLD: I will say that
since we put the corrective measures put in
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place by the department after the news report came up, we felt they made the corrections they had to make and we will continue to monitor them to make sure that they perform as per the contract.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I can tell
you though, not to give you a hard time on this, I don't think you need to monitor them at all. Honestly, we see it every day when $I$ drive down our streets and roads. I can monitor it for you. The bottom line is, from our standpoint, we shouldn't have to spend this level of county resources to monitor a contract that everyone in the public can see. I mean, I would have liked to have seen a different vendor be selected in this process.

But I think in the interim, we would need to see some level of competence that what you guys have in place can assure that this doesn't happen again.

So, I suggest, if it's okay with you presiding officer, that we table this matter for today and then we have both of our staffs go over the protocols in regards to how
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to monitor this contract going forward. Which honestly, I think if we're spending ten minutes today on monitoring this contract we're spending too much. We shouldn't have to do that. Especially with the history that this vendor had. I'm perplex as to how they'd have a second chance.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I agree with the tabling. I've been told also that the inspector general is still investigating this matter.

MR. ARNOLD: I wasn't expecting
it to be called today. So, I was a little hesitant with my answers. I didn't really prep because I heard she was also still reviewing it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We need some additional time at the very minimum. Minority Leader makes a motion to table. I'll will second that motion. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The item is tabled. E-32 --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Brian Schneider, deputy county executive. Presiding Officer,
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the administration would offer, when you're ready, that we can make a briefing to both sides to go over the procurement and the checks that were put in place since the illuminating news report came out.

I also did want to just make a note that as part of this contract the only road that this firm is working on is the service road to the expressway. If there are other county roads that are viewed as garbage strewn that's not part of the work that this contractor is supposed to be taking care of. So, I just wanted to make that matter known.

Also, we followed up with CBS TV regarding their story that was done in 2018 and the reporter offered to do a follow-up before this item was going to be called who will indicate that the level of effort that this contractor has been making since that correction was made in 2018 has been phenomenal. I just wanted to put that on the record.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO:
appreciate that and we will take you up on
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your offer to do a briefing. Did we actually vote on that or no? All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The item is tabled.

E-32 of 2021 is a contract with De Bruin Engineering.

MR. ARNOLD: I'm also covering 31
today, the traffic safety item for the
department. Typically it's an item Chris
Mistron would have covered.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Traffic
Safety Board. You want to do that?
MR. ARNOLD: Sure. E-31 is a
contract with the Village of Freeport to provide funding for the DWI enforcement for the period of 2021 to 2025. The contract has $\$ 11,000$ being authorized annually for that period.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on E-31? Ken or Katy, going forward maybe if the administration would let us know which speakers are going to be speaking on which contract. We try to organize -MR. ARNOLD: It was a last minute
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decision we made on Friday.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We try to organize it so that if it's Public Works related contracts you come up for a block of time instead of jumping back and forth.

MR. ARNOLD: Understood.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: E-32.
MR. ARNOLD: E-32 is a contract
amendment for De Bruin Engineering associated with our Cedar Creek digester rehabilitation project. It's an extension only amendment. Adequate funding in the contract.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions or discussion? You have an item on the calendar that was a tabled item, right?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. I have two I believe. A-67 and E-162.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Since you're here let's do those as well. They've already been untabled and they're before us.

MR. ARNOLD: A-67 is a service contract to provide concrete ready mix for the department's projects. It has a cap of $\$ 2.5$ million and Castle Transit was the lowest
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responsible bidder. There were two bidders on that project contract.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions or discussion on $A-67$ ? All right. Then go to E-162.

MR. ARNOLD: E-162 is a
professional services contract with WSP USA, Inc. as far as shared mobility management plan. We had five proposers for this project and WSP was the selected and highest technically ranked firm. They're providing 14 percent WBE utilization and we will be using this contract to do a shared mobility study which will also include looking at the future bus ridership.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Tell us just briefly what a shared mobility plan is. Shared mobile management plan is.

MR. ARNOLD: You have -- it's the shared use of bicycles, pedestrians, e-bikes. Looking at the future for the use of our roadways and what's the best way to approach this. We have a grant for this work. I think it's UPWP. So it's partially funded through a
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grant. It's just looking at all the other uses of the roadways for the future.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: This is
obviously a good purpose. When do you anticipate the study will be done?

MR. ARNOLD: I don't have that in
front of me. I know it has time frames. The first part of the work is the bus work.

That's critical for the bus RFP. We want to get some data from them as part of that. That was the initial encumbrance. That's why it's a two-piece encumbrance on the contract. I can get you a better schedule.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions on this one? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi
Ken. It says here that the Nassau County Legislature will be part of this advisory committee. Do you know any of the details of that?

MR. ARNOLD: If that's what it says that's what we will be doing. Sean Sallie will be heading this up. Any type of
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project that has a planning component we usually look to get stakeholders input as we go through the process.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm sorry. Is
the Jodi Franzese here.
MS. FRANZESE: I'm here
legislator. Jodi Franzese, Office of the
Inspector General. How are you?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Did you have any concerns regarding this contract?

MS. FRANZESE: I'm sorry, are we talking about the WSP contract?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes.
MS. FRANZESE: We have had some disclosure issues initially. Both issues have been cured through the administration and/or the vendor. And that's the lion's share of what we were concerned about.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: There were no other issues that popped up regarding OSHA or anything like that?

MS. FRANZESE: I'm sorry, my mic
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is not so great. You said regarding what?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: OSHA. Did you
have any OSHA issues on this?
MS. FRANZESE: We read the OSHA report and we were made aware that one of the companies that $I$ think was purchased by WSP was involved in an OSHA investigation. From the reading of the report it did seem that they were -- they weren't contracted for what they probably should have been doing. And there was, as I'm sure you know, a calamity that happened in Florida.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes. So we don't have any concerns and you're fine with the contract as stated in any of these? For the issue regarding OSHA has been resolved and no longer an issue for us, for Nassau, correct?

MS. FRANZESE: Yes. In the sense that the OSHA report made it clear that the affiliate of $W$ SP was just one small piece of otherwise a really bad situation. Their performance didn't directly cause anything. It was more that their actions had they been
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more robust may have helped a little bit. But it didn't place the blame on that particular company. At this point we don't have any concerns beyond that.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I appreciate
it. Thank you very much.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Did we cover E-32 yet? That's also an agreement with De Bruin.

MR. ARNOLD: I believe we did both, yes.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: B-2 with
Palace Electrical Contractors, I think we'll do that now. I didn't call it so I'm going to call it now. A resolution authorizing the county executive to award and execute a contract between the county and Palace Electrical Contractors. B-2 of 2021.

Moved by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator
Schaefer. Note for the record that Legislator
Rhoads has left the chambers. Is not
participating in any debate, discussion or vote on this contract. You want to tell us
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what this contract with Palace Electrical Contractors is.

MR. ARNOLD: $B-2$ is a bid
contract to replace the fire alarms, the emergency lights at the following facilities. Garvey's Point Preserve, Tackapusha Preserve, North Woodmere Park admin buildings, Nassau Hall and Milanin House and Milanin Parish House in Eisenhower Park.

Three bids were received. Palace was the lowest responsible bidder. \$474,000. There is no MWBE as the are doing all the work in-house self-performing.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions or debate? Hearing none, let's vote on this specific contract which is B-2. All in favor signify by aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Next contract is with probation. A-9 is a contract with Attenti US, Inc. Someone here from probation?

MR. SCHILIRO: Joe Schiliro, fiscal officer.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Tell us
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about the contract with Attenti.
MR. SCHILIRO: This is to
increase the funding on the blanket purchase order for Attenti USA for electronic
monitoring. The previous blanket had been for $\$ 100,000$. This is increasing the blanket $\$ 250,000$ based on the increase need for electronic monitoring arising from bail reform. Pretrial bail reform. Our cost has increased from this vendor from $\$ 5400$ January of 2020. We're now running up to $\$ 30,000$ a month.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Just the same question applies over here. If you were tuned in before the increase is multiples of -- the new amount is multiples of the new amount. What was the original contract?

MR. SCHILIRO: The previous was $\$ 100,000$.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: When was the original contract? MR. SCHILIRO: This is going back, this is a blanket that's going back several years.
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LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Why is this
not being rebid?
MR. SCHILIRO: I'm sorry, what
was the question?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I asked why is this not being rebid as opposed to being extended and enlarged?

MR. SCHILIRO: I'm sorry but I'm still unable to hear the question.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What I asked you is why is this contract not being rebid as opposed to being enlarged and extended?

MR. SCHILIRO: I'm sorry
legislator, why is it not being what?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Rebid.
MR. SCHILIRO: It was rebid. It was rebid I believe this was rebid about a year ago. But we did not know what the extent of the impact of electronic monitoring and bail reform was going to be.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I'm sorry.
The original --
MR. SCHILIRO: It was rebid in
July of 2020.
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LEGISLATOR KOPEL: July of 2020
it was rebid?
MR. SCHILIRO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What was the
amount at that time?
MR. SCHILIRO: At that time we were running $\$ 6,000$ a month.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And now the new amount?

MR. SCHILIRO: The bail reform went into effect in February of 2020. Our costs increased -- actually, I'm sorry, that $\$ 6,000$ a month was just for pretrial. But our Attenti invoices were averaging 8,000, $\$ 12,000, \$ 10,000, \$ 10,000$. We did not have a real good read on what the impact of bail reform was going to be until we got into late fall where COVID restrictions were starting to be lifted and we could get a better read on what to come back to for additional funding.

Our funding on pretrial bail reform went from zero in January, $\$ 4,300$ in February, increased to again the $\$ 6,000$ range over the summer months and then in October increased to
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\$14,000. Again in November. \$15,000 in December. And currently for just pretrial we're at $\$ 17,000$ a month.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Fine. So at the time that it was bid in July of 2020, I think that's when you said, you anticipated and probably projected in your bid package a cost or contract amount of something like $\$ 6,000$ a month if $I$ understood you correctly. MR. SCHILIRO: At the time it was rebid what?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: You
anticipated a monthly cost of approximately $\$ 6,000$ a month at that time?

MR. SCHILIRO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That was the amount specified $I$ presume in the bid package?

MR. SCHILIRO: We wanted to have
a better read on what we thought we were going to have to come back for additional funding rather than to overreach prior to having any kind of track record on this.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Look, my
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question was, and we're probably going to have to go ahead with this, my question was, if we're now proposing to spend several multiples of what we originally anticipated would it not be appropriate to rebid this contract at this time?

MR. SCHILIRO: Based on the -- I think this was the only, if I'm not mistaken, I don't think there were any other bids received other than Attenti at the time that this was rebid. I'm not 100 percent sure but I think there were no other bids received that met the specifications at least.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any other questions or discussion? Thank you. Next several contracts with information technology starting with A-15 with NPA Computers, Inc.

MS. STANTON: Good afternoon.
Nancy Stanton. A-15-21. This is to authorize and award a blanket purchase order for comprehensive computer repair and preventative
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maintenances to NPA computers, Inc. NPA was the lowest responsible bidder meeting the county's expectations. The selected vendor will maintain older IT equipment that is off warranty for the county, county clerk, comptroller, DA and DSS. These maintenance services allow IT to extend the useful life of this equipment eliminating the need to purchase equipment on a more frequent basis. The blanket is for a period five years maximum 1.5.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions on this one or discussion? No. I think we have two contracts that follow with Liro.

MS STANTON: E-34-21. The term of this contract is November 24, 2015 until November 24, 2020. This amendment extends the contract three additional months to February 24, 2021 to allow time for the new agreement with Liro to be approved. The new agreement was fully executed on February 10th. This amendment also increases funds by $\$ 100,000$. We currently use this vendor for supplemental
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staffing doing GIS tax mapping in the assessment department.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The obvious question is, if you knew that it was going to take some time to sign off and execute E-35 why wasn't the extension of E-34 given to us earlier? In other words, we're giving an extension that's already expired.

MS. HORST: Presiding Officer,
Katy Horst from the administration.
Commissioner Stanton has been here a number of time and you have all requested that she provide you with her staffing plan. We held this because you made it very clear that this supplemental staffing and contracts weren't going to move forward until you were provided that plan. So that plan has been provided and we at that time felt we could move this forward to you for your approval.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Okay. All right. Anyone have any other questions for this? Did you cover $\mathrm{E}-35$ or not? MS. STANTON: We're going to do E-35-21 now? LiRo GIS Inc. This new contract
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for GIS services. Contract term is March 1, 2021 to February 29, 2024 with two one-year renewals for a total of five years. We're asking to encumber $\$ 400,000$ at this time. We use this vendor for monthly GIS data maintenance, GIS data maintenance for police CAD system and tax map tool migrations for assessment.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions or debate?
MS. STANTON: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Next
contract was with the Nassau County Police Department, A-20-21, General Audio-Visual. No pressure Inspector Field. Just note that the commissioner and some of the top brass are behind you.

MR. FIELD: Thank you very much. Good afternoon. William Field, deputy inspector with the police department.

Item A-20-21 is a direct purchase order between the county and General Audio-Visual Incorporated. This vendor is going to provide and install an audio visual
Rules - 3-8-21
system at the new police academy. It will including projectors, projection TVs, cable, speakers and other visual education aids at the new academy. 33 vendors viewed the bid. Only four made bids. The maximum amount authorized under this purchase order is \$1,191,796.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any
questions or debate? Thank you.
The next one is with the district attorney's office, E-25, with Precise Court Reporting.

MS. HORST: Bob, are you
available? I will do my best. Katy Horst from the administration. This is a contract with Precise Court Reporting for $\$ 352,000$. It's says the district attorney's office is required by law to furnish transcripts of grand jury proceedings upon request to defendants and their counsel.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions or discussion? I think we're good.

The next one is E-33, Hispanic Counseling Center. I need a motion to table
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as the inspector general is still
investigating this item. So Legislator Rhoads makes a motion to table. Seconded by

Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of tabling it signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously. E-33 is tabled.

Next two are with the county
attorney's office. They are E-27 with Robert Bishop. E-28 with James Lytle.

MR. LIBERT: Good afternoon
legislators. Brian Libert from the county attorney's office. These are amendments to existing contracts with the county's lobbyist Robert Bishop at Manatt Phelps. If you have any questions happy to answer the same.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I just want to put some things on the record which will record, actually an agreement between us and the county executive. These two lobbyists will provide the county attorney, county, presiding officer and minority leader with written monthly progress reports on county legislation and other legislation that may
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affect the interest of the county.
They will establish meetings with key legislators and their staff to advance legislation of county interest and concern.

It will notify the presiding officer and minority leader of legislation to be advanced at the request or on behalf of the county prior to taking any action with respect to such legislation. And they will timely
respond to inquiries from the presiding officer and minority leader and their respective counsel as to any actions taken or proposed to be taken by the lobbyist; to clarify existing legislation and to explain proposed bills and the impact that they may have on the county and its residents.

This also will require them to have meetings at the request of the minority leader and myself.

So those terms have been incorporated into the contract. We wanted to make sure that the legislature has access to the lobbyists who are in Albany advocating and promoting legislation on behalf of the
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county. Anyone want to add anything or discuss anything? That's good.

MR. LIBERT: Thank you. Have a great day.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Last one for today will be with Human Services E-29 of 2021 with the Belmont Child Care Association.

MS. HORST: This is a contract
with Belmont Child Care Association. The Child Care Association consists of a comprehensive program entitled by BCCA Arts and Cultural Programs. Students will participate in dance, music and art classes virtually and all supplies shall be provided by the program. This is a contract it will serve 54 youths at a per capita of 389 per student.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Any debate or discussion on this contract? Hearing none, let's sum up the contracts that are before us and be voted on at this time. They include the following; $A-3, A-4, A-8, A-11, A-5, B-8, B-26, E-32$,
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$A-9, A-15, E-34, E-35, A-20, E-25, E-27, E-28$, E-29, E-31, E-32 A-67 and E-162.

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

We will put Rules into recess.
A-32. All in favor of $A-32$ signify
by saying aye. Those opposed? That carries unanimously as well.

We will put the committee in recess and move on to the other committees.
(Committee recessed at 2:42 p.m.)
(Committee reconvened at 5:01 p.m.)
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LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Call the
Rules Committee back into session. So, we need a motion to suspend the rules by Legislator Schaefer. Seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. All in favor of suspending the rules signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Rules are suspended.

Going to call the consent calendar which are items that just went through other committees and it's been determined that no further debate or discussion is needed at this point. They will be moved on to full legislature.

Clerk item 39 of 2021. 58, 59, 60, 65 of 2021. 66, 67, 68, 69, 70. Go all the way to 80. 81, 82, 83, 86, 87. Now to the addendum. 88 and 91. Those are the consent items. We need a motion by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. Any debate or discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? They carry unanimously.

Item 55 of 2021 is a resolution to ceremonially designate a portion of the county
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road known as Uniondale Avenue between Nassau Road and Jerusalem Avenue in Uniondale as Catanese Way and directing the Department of Public Works to install conspicuous signage along said roadway.

Moved by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. Any debate or discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

57 is a resolution changing the official name of the community room in the administration building in North Woodmere Park to the Sylvia Kaminetsky room.

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. Any debate or discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Any nays? No. Passes unanimously.

64 is not being called. Jumping to 72.

MS. HORST: Presiding Officer,
may I make a quick statement about 64-21?
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Yes.
MS. HORST: I know there's been
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some confusion. I want to clarify that the administration had hoped that today that 64-21 would have passed with the understanding that changes would need to be made. We look forward to working with this body to make those changes and having the item pass as soon as possible.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. We will be meeting next Monday at two p.m. the Public Safety Committee to consider that item after the commissioner said that changes were in the works as early as this Thursday we thought it better to hear the item as changed on Monday.

72 of 2021 is a resolution to ceremonially designate a portion of the county road known as Forest Avenue between Birch Hill Road and Birch Street as Sergeant Robert Hendriks Way and directing the Department of Public Works to install conspicuous signage along said roadway.

Moved by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator
Schaefer. Any debate or discussion? All in
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favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
82. I'm sorry, 84 of 2021. A resolution to accept a gift offered by Nancy Lieberman Charities to the Nassau County Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums and to enter into an agreement in relation to such gift.

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

We have two appointments to the Civil Service Commission. We'll call them both together. 26, 27. A resolution to confirm the county executive's appointments of Michael DeLuca and Steven Markowitz to the Civil Service Commission.

Moved by Minority Leader Abrahams. Seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Any debate or discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
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85 of 2021, a resolution confirming the appointment by the county executive of David I. Levine as a judge of the district court for the Tenth Judicial District pursuant to Section $21(\mathrm{D})$ of Article 6 of the constitution of the state of New York.

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

89 of 2021 is a resolution changing the name of the African-American Museum of Nassau County located in Hempstead, New York to the Joysetta and Julius Pearse African-American Museum of Nassau County. Moved by Legislator Bynoe. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. Any debate or discussion on this item? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Passes unanimously.

Item 90 of 2021 is a resolution to establish a memorial at Eisenhower Park to honor those that have lost their lives due to
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the COVID-19 pandemic.
Moved by Legislator Schaefer. Seconded by Legislator Kopel. Any debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Last item is 92. A local law to amend the county government law of Nassau County to expand disclosure requirements to permitees under use and occupancy permits for the county property.

The legislature has previously --
I'm sorry, before I do that -- moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer.

The legislature has previously enacted laws regarding disclosures for individuals who enter into contracts with the county. However, there are individuals who reside on county property under a use and occupancy permit who, pursuant to the existing law, are not required to disclose such information, including things such as principals, lobbyists and campaign
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contributions.
This law changes that by creating new forms that must be completed by future and existing individuals on county property pursuant to a use and occupancy agreement.

Essentially, this is in response to the use and occupancy permit regarding a residence located at the Sands Point

Preserve. On the same date that it was considered by this legislature a $\$ 20,000$ contribution was made to the county executive. We were not aware of the contributions and certainly it would have been something that we would have -- there was a history of contributions actually -- we certainly would have considered in the global sense of looking at the use and occupancy permit.

So, it is essentially a loophole because there was a disclosure form submitted but that was for the realty company that assists the county in placing these permitees.

So, just as every other vendor and
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entity that does business with the county has to disclose certain information pursuant to the reforms we adopted several years ago, rightly so, those who have use an occupancy permits should also disclose the same so we have all the relevant information that we need.

Does anyone else want to discuss
this? Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I think
obviously it's an important piece of
legislation. We've been trying to increase transparency. It is a loophole unfortunately that was exposed in item $146-20$ which was considered by the legislature last month with regard to Sands Point, the Mills Floyd property.

It came to light shortly after our vote on that that not only was there a $\$ 20,000$ contribution made to the county executive's campaign on the day that the item was considered by the legislature, but in fact it appears as though there had been approximately $\$ 119,000$ in contributions that were made in
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the four years up until that point.
So, that's something obviously the legislature should have known about at the time we were considering that because obviously, whether there is any correlation between the two, you know, it's certainly probably has to be checked. But I certainly have no idea whether there is. But that's certainly something that we should have been, we would have asked about certainly if we had known about that at the time this was before us for consideration. This legislation will afford us the opportunity to do that in the future.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone else want to add anything to this? Again, the whole concept and the whole purpose behind the legislation several years ago to require greater disclosures was to avoid conflicts, number one. And number two, to ensure that the legislature had full information about each and every vendor and make sure that there was nothing that we considered untowards. This closes a loophole. I mean, the fact that

```
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the contribution occurred the same day as the use and occupancy permit certainly should raise red flags regardless of who was involved with this.
Anyway, any further debate or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? It carries unanimously.
I need a motion to adjourn by
Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
(Committee was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.)
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