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    LEGISLATOR FORD: Call the Public
    Safety Committee to order.
    MR. PULITZER: Thank you. Public
    Safety Committee roll call. Legislator Debra
    Mule.
            LEGISLATOR MULE: Here.
            MR. PULITZER: Legislator Siela
    Bynoe.
    LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
    MR. PULITZER: Ranking Member
    Delia DeRiggi-Whitton.
    LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
    Here.
    MR. PULITZER: Legislator John
    Ferretti.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here.
    MR. PULITZER: Legislator Vincent
Muscarella.
    LEGISLATOR MUSCARELLA: Here.
    MR. PULITZER: Vice Chairman
    Steven Rhoads.
    LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
    MR. PULITZER: Chairwoman Denise
    Ford.
```

Public Safety - 4-12-21
LEGISLATOR FORD: Here.
MR. PULITZER: We have quorum ma'am.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very
much sir. There are ten items on the agenda today which are clerk item numbers 97-21, 99-21, 113-21, 114-21, 115-21, 116-21, 127-21 132-21, 133-21 and 135-21.

Clerk item number $97-21$ is an ordinance supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Management and Budget.

May I have a motion? Moved by
Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. This item is before us. Good afternoon.

MR. PERSICH: Good afternoon.
Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget. This item is appropriating $\$ 3$ million into the FEMA fund for additional funding that we're going to need that we hope to get reimbursed for for the vaccination sites and a few other things as a result of the pandemic.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So, since this
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money, as you said, is going to be used for COVID related I guess with the sites that we're setting up --

MR. PERSICH: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FORD: -- I think that we would get reimbursed but we can't just always be so sure, correct?

MR. PERSICH: Keep in mind this
is the FEMA side of it not the other coming in. This is what we deem is reimbursable for the vaccination sites that are coming up. It provides funding for all these additional pop-up sites that are coming up.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Which are very
important. I have to hand it to all the people who work there because $I$ know people here have gone there and then I know many residents of mine who have gone to even the county run sites and they only have praises.

MR. PERSICH: My personal experience is well organized and well run when I went.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I talked to them. Thank you. Any debate or discussion?
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Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
just have a quick question. So, this is a transfer into this?

MR. PERSICH: No. We have a separate fund segregated out for these COVIDs. We had a CARES funding and this is the FEMA side of that. That's what this is. LEGISLATOR FORD: Anyone else? Any public comment? I see none. All those in favor of passing this please signify by saying aye. Any opposed? It passes unanimously. Thank you.

Clerk item numbers 99-21, 113-21, 114-21, 132-21, 133-21 and 135-21 are ordinances supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the police department. May I have a motion. Moved by Legislator Bynoe and seconded by Legislator Rhoads. The items are before us. Good afternoon.

MR. FIELD: Good afternoon. William Field, deputy inspector with the police department.

Public Safety - 4-12-21
Item 99-21 is a supplemental
appropriation to appropriate $\$ 50,000$ in funds received from state forfeiture district attorney's office. These funds all assist in purchasing things such as new uniforms for the police department's color guard. These uniforms also have equipment that will provide with superior weapon retention.

LEGISLATOR FORD: You can keep on going. If anyone has any question on anything just signify.

MR. FIELD: Item 113-21 is supplemental appropriation for $\$ 50,000$ in funds received from the New York State Department of Homeland Security used to offset staffing and overtime costs related to enforcing applicable statutes on Memorial Day, Independence Day and Labor Day weekends. The primary focus of these funds is to ensure waterway safety and security.

Item 114-21 is a supplemental
appropriation to appropriate $\$ 796,601.60$ in funds received from the Department of Health and Human Services. These funds will be used
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to offset overtime expenses for the police department's Emergency Ambulance Bureau for their response to COVID-19.

Item 132-21 is a supplemental
appropriation of $\$ 202,000$ in funds from the United States Department of Justice. This is a pass-through from Suffolk County. It's a partnership with Suffolk County. The funds are used to support personnel and overtime fringe related to as well as some equipment aimed at reducing violent crime within Nassau and Suffolk County.

Item 133-21 is a supplemental appropriation to appropriate $\$ 150,000$ from the district attorney's -- from forfeiture through the district attorney's office. Items that these funds can help to purchase are for something such as the Police Athletic Leagues which will help facilitate the new PALs being opened in Roosevelt, Elmont, Lawrence and Inwood.

Item 135-21 this is supplemental appropriation for $\$ 81,464$ in funds received from the United States Department of Justice.
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This will be related to police officer overtime as well as plain clothes officer patrols. JAG, the purpose of JAG is to reduce and investigate violent crime based on intelligence-led policing.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Are there any questions or comments from any of the legislators? Anyone remotely? Anyone in the public? All in favor of passing these items please signify by saying aye. The items are approved unanimously. Thank you very much.

Clerk item numbers 115-21 and 116-21 are ordinances supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the probation department.

May I have a motion. Moved by
Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. These items are before us. Good afternoon.

MR. LANSMAN: Good afternoon.
Doug Lansman, Nassau Probation. Good
afternoon Chairwoman Ford, Vice Chairman Rhoads, members. First of all, I'm very happy to be back after one year absence.
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The item before you, I have two items, the first item is 115-21. This is a renewal and a mandatory grant for New York State DCJS. This is supplemental appropriation for one year pretrial service and defendant-based advocacy. The main objective of these grants is to operate programs that divert offenders from costly local incarceration and to provide pretrial release reporting to the courts.

We had received this application approximately seven months after it was due. That explains the delay.

The second item we have is 116-21. It is our STSJP appropriation. It's also a one year grant from October of ' 20 to September of '21. It has two parts to the grant. One is our regular STP program. One is also our RTA program.

This is our 10th year of operation for this grant. This grant provides funding for -- also for community-based vendor to be determined in a working amount of money for probation.
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The supervision treatment program
for juveniles is part of the governor's initiative for juvenile justice reform. It seeks to increase the number of juvenile delinquents referred to and successfully adjust their probation intake and reduce the number of secured and nonsecured detention care days and establishes viable alternatives to residential placement.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Welcome back first of all. Any comments from any of the legislators? Any from the public? I see none. All those in favor of passing these items please signify by saying aye. Nay? Item passes unanimously. Thank you very much.

You might be the next one too, right? Clerk item 127-21 is a resolution authorizing the county executive to execute an agreement with the Capital District Youth Center, Incorporated in relation to the use of a regional secure detention facility.

May I have a motion. Moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator
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Ferretti. This item is before us.
MR. SCHIRILLO: Joe Schirillo,
fiscal officer for the Nassau County Department of Probation. MS. REYER: Also appearing virtually, Arianne Reyer from the Department of Probation.

MR. SCHIRILLO: This contract is with the Capital District Youth Center, Incorporated located in Albany. It allows us to place individuals when necessary when they cannot be placed in any of the other four facilities within New York State.

The placement for youth there or for RTA adolescent offenders who fall under the RTA law they need to be placed in a specialized secure detention center facility. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Ms. Reyer your microphone is open.

MS. REYER: I apologize.
MR. SCHIRILLO: There are only five centers within the state that can accept adolescent offenders and thereby, we need to have the contract in place with Capital
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District.
As it stands now, facilities are all at capacity and in the event that we can't place a resident anyplace else we need to have the capacity to do so.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you. So this s with Raise the Age I guess.

MR. SCHIRILLO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FORD: So we're not going to incarcerate these young people in our normal facilities, jails. So, do we have any place here in Nassau County where they can go?

MR. SCHIRILLO: No. The closest facility is Westchester followed by Albany and then three other facilities Onondaga County, Monroe County and --

LEGISLATOR FORD: Is it up by Plattsburgh or something?

MR. SCHIRILLO: Yes. And Erie County.

LEGISLATOR FORD: There's only five. How many residents can they take each one? When you say they're full.
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MR. SCHIRILLO: They have
capacity OF I think in total 22 adolescent offenders. I believe it's 22.

MS. REYER: This is Arianne Reyer again. Each facility has a different capacity. Currently each facility in the state is at capacity. Westchester, Onondaga and Erie have the largest capacity and Albany, the capital district, the facility that we're speaking of here today, will only even consider Nassau County youth if this contract is in place.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I understand. Currently we're not sending any of our young people to Albany?

MR. SCHIRILLO: We have not had anybody there to date.

LEGISLATOR FORD: When you say
that they're at capacity, what happens if every place is filled? What do we do that with these young people?

MR. SCHIRILLO: We got that exact situation this weekend. We had two adolescent offenders in custody this weekend. The option
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in one of them was to have them sit at the police precinct supervised by two sheriff deputies. An alternative arrangement was made and agreed upon by OFCS to bring them into the facility in Westbury and have a one-on-one supervision by a probation officer from Saturday night until -- Arianne is he still there?

MS. REYER: He's still there,
yes, because all of the facilities remain full as we look for alternatives.

MR. SCHIRILLO: We've had a probation officer supervising or multiple probation officers supervising that one resident on a one-to-one basis on overtime since Saturday. And there's a second one that was brought into custody. I don't know if he's still in court or not. Arianne, has that one been placed yet?

MS. REYER: No. The second one was actually a juvenile offender. So, he can stay in our juvenile detention center. This is only for purpose of adolescent offenders.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So then the
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adolescent offenders cannot stay with the juveniles and they cannot stay with the adults, correct?

MR. SCHIRILLO: It's in the same facility but kept segregated.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Is there any way of expanding the juvenile center?

MR. SCHIRILLO: It's been on the table for the last four years or so. It's been proposed for the last four years. It was part of the original RTA plan that had been proposed. That portion of the plan was stripped out so that the rest of the plan could proceed. It was about a $\$ 4$ million option to build a new facility. And currently there's a project underway to combine Nassau and Suffolk in a separate facility to be newly built in Suffolk County. But we're several years off from that. That's in the planning stages at this time point.

So, that plan has been underway for about the last six months or so. There are biweekly meetings scheduled for the parties involved to participate in and make plans for
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it. We are nowhere near.
LEGISLATOR FORD: How many adolescents offenders do we currently have in Nassau County?

MR. SCHIRILLO: In Nassau County adolescent offenders $I$ think we have, if I'm not mistaken, it's about ten at this point.

MS. REYER: Adolescent offenders
overall we probably more like 25. But in custody we have I believe it's five in specialized secured detention facilities. In order to place them anywhere but one of these specialized secured detention facilities we need to wait for permission from the Office of Children and Family Services and from state corrections SCOC. And it's that joint permission that has been a huge impediment to us moving forward with any of our plans to have a specialized secured detention facility in place in Nassau or Suffolk County. We continue to explore options but where we are right now only leaves us with the five specialized secured detention facilities in consideration.
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MR. SCHIRILLO: I believe we have 3 AOs currently housed in the correctional facility.

LEGISLATOR FORD: This is something that $I$ think that we have to pay attention to because $I$ just feel bad. I mean, if they get sent away to Albany or to Erie or Monroe or all the way up by the Canadian border, I mean, they'll be separated from their family. It's going to be very hard for any family members to visit them. Am I correct?

MR. SCHIRILLO: Yes.
MS. REYER: Absolutely. It continues to be an ongoing problem that these beds have been so incredibly limited. Westchester is at capacity and they are our closest facility. And the parents really cannot visit with their children who are housed in Syracuse or Erie. And it also poses an impediment for counsel. And these are all things that we have discussed with the state in our effort to try to keep these kids closer to home.
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Albany, the Capital District
contract that is before the legislature today, is one of the closest facilities, which is why we consider it so crucial to have it as a viable option.

MR. SCHIRILLO: Adolescent offenders are 16 and 17 year old charged felons.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I know the age. They're vulnerable. So, when we transport these young people is it two sheriffs at a time, right?

MR. SCHIRILLO: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FORD: They may have to stay overnight or whatever.

MR. REYER: Frequently they do stay overnight.

LEGISLATOR FORD: It would make common sense in many ways to get this other location established on Long Island.

MR. SCHIRILLO: Right.
MS. REYER: Absolutely.
MR. SCHIRILLO: Again, it's been budgetary plan. It was a component of the
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original plan. That was four plus million dollars that was included in the original RTA plan going back three or four year ago. The state could not agree on the budget for that, for the facility, and so our plan, the Nassau County's plan was approved stripping that component out of it so that we could proceed with the rest of the plan.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Even if we came
up with another location, like, say for
argument's sake, we identified a floor at the Nassau University Medical Center, I'm just doing a whatever, we would still have to wait for the state and federal permission to be able to pursue something like that, correct?

MS. REYER: Absolutely. It would have to be approved jointly by the Office of Children and Family Services and SCOC and we have brought up that floor at NUMC as a possible option and that has been rejected. Along with several other things that we have considered as alternatives in an attempt to keep these kids on Long Island.

MR. SCHIRILLO: And the space
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would also -- I presume you're saying for that space to be retrofitted to accommodate specialized secured. Again, it's a budgetary process and an approval process with OCFS and DCJS.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you. Any questions or any comments from any of the legislators? Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you
Madam Chair. Greetings. I'm not going to belabor the point but I echo the sentiments and the questioning of the chairwoman. This was an issue that was very hard for me to vote on earlier when it was presented in previous years because of the distance to counsel, which I would argue impacts the young persons' ability to defend themselves in these cases appropriately and the parents being able to have access to the children.

You mentioned, sir, that there are five AOs being housed here at the jail locally?

MR. SCHIRILLO: Three.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: What are the
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circumstances?
MR. SCHIRILLO: Arianne can you answer that?

MS. REYER: Yes. One is 18 years old. So, the Office of Children and Family Services and SCOC allowed for him to be held at the jail because of his age, he's 18, even those he's an adolescent offender.

The other is held on a parole hold. That hold is separate and apart from the fact that he is an adolescent offender.

And the third one I believe, if there is a third one, $I$ believe that it's also someone who is 18. It may only be two.

MR. SCHIRILLO: I believe so.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So based on age and circumstances it's okay to have them at the jail?

MS. REYER: I think because of the limitations on the availability of beds, once an adolescent offender turns 18 they will consider allowing them to be housed at the correction center even though technically they are an adolescent offender.
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LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And they're
being housed separate and apart from general population, the inmates and general population?

MS. REYER: They are not.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: They're just in with the rest of the general population inmates?

MS. REYER: That's my understanding. Especially the one who is on a parole hold because, again, that's a separate hold than it is from us. But my understanding is for that adolescent offender once he turned 18 they allowed him to go back into general population. I would need for the jail to confirm that 100 percent but that's my understanding.

> LEGISLATOR BYNOE: It's less
about the restrictions based on available beds in the area and more so based on his age?

MS. REYER: I think it's a
combination of both. Because of the restrictions, due to the lack of availability, they are looking at the 18 year olds to see if
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they can move them and then free up some of those beds for the 16 and 17 year olds. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So, if it's based on the restriction, if it's based on the available beds that's being restricted, then I would think that maybe we have a responsibility to house those young people separate. I would like us to look at that. And not just --

MS. REYER: In the first
instances where it was a 16 or 17 year old they were absolutely housed separate. In a separate facility with a separate guard. Again, $I$ would need the jail to confirm this 100 percent, but my understanding is that state corrections gave permission for them to be housed in the general population. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I would like to receive documentation that supports that the state Department of Corrections allowed for that appointment for the housing in general population. And I'd like some level of clarity in regards to what the jail's stance is, what's the sheriff's stance is on
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this. Because the whole idea --
MS. REYER: Absolutely. I'll reach out to them and get back to you.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Hopefully expeditiously because I'm concerned that we are not upholding the spirit of the RTA.

I'd also like to understand better what are the impediments or what kind of barriers are we facing with the state agencies with not allowing us to move forward in the joint venture shared service relationship with Suffolk County.

MR. SCHIRILLO: We are moving
forward with that.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But I'm
hearing that we'll delayed.
MR. SCHIRILLO: We have biweekly
meetings.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I heard you
said that you were six months in.
MR. SCHIRILLO: It's an
exploratory process.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I did hear
that but I also heard--
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MR. SCHIRILLO: It's a design process.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you.
But I also heard that there was some level of barriers and it was stated that there was some delay. And I tried to write down the names of the entities but there were state entities that were prohibiting us from being able to find alternatives, inclusive of Nassau University Medical Center.

MR. SCHIRILLO: Approvals by DCJS and OCFS if we were to go that route.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: We're only six months in. I understood it and maybe I misunderstood. Let's start from with respect to I may have misunderstood. Why are we only six months into a process working with Suffolk County?

MR. SCHIRILLO: This was
initiated by Office of Children and Family Services.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm sorry?
MR. SCHIRILLO: This was
initiated by the Office of Children and Family
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Services.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: What was
initiated?
MR. SCHIRILLO: The joint project
for Nassau and Suffolk.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This is a
joint project that was talked about earlier on when we talked about RTA?

MR. SCHIRILLO: No. This was a
new project that came --
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: No. It was
suggested and discussed. I was part of several offshoot meetings that happened separate and apart from this legislature.

MR. SCHIRILLO: I only became aware of the joint process --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Arianne should be aware of the request.

MS. REYER: If I could speak to
that. We've obviously been exploring several different options jointly with Suffolk County since before implementation of Raise the Age. That included retrofitting the juvenile detention center and several different
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options.
What Mr. Schrillo from my office is speaking of is a discussion of a joint facility in Suffolk County that has been brought to our attention within the past six months as another alternative. It's not that we have been exploring a place for the past six months. It's that this one particular option was brought to our attention within the past six months. But it's only one of many options that we have considered.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I know we explored -- I even took the tour of the jail and the whole process. And immediately thereafter there was a meeting held and we discussed exploring connecting in with Suffolk County because they had more space and the like to potentially use that county to situate a shared site. That was part of many discussions. That's not something that just started six months ago.

MS. REYER: No, absolutely not. They have even looked into sites, and I believe that Suffolk has discussed possible
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funding streams for it. This is a different facility that OCFS was closing in Brentwood. I believe that's what Mr. Schirillo is speaking of. That was brought to our attention as a possible -- another alternative. But now OCFS is not closing that site.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: They are now --

MS. REYER: We continue to search for alternatives. I've spent all day trying to find a specialized secured detention facility bed for this young man who was arrested on Saturday. And I personally spoke to every facility in the state and have been turned down.

> I even called Albany knowing that we didn't have this contract in place in hopes that they would maybe consider one of our youth but they are at capacity, as is every other facility in the state. At least having something in place so that when a bed is available we will at least be considered as an option in some place that's not eight hours
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away is really crucial to being able to make this, you know, process a little bit more simple.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Do we know whether Suffolk County is facing the same issues?

MS. REYER: They absolutely are.
In fact, I was told by OCFS over the weekend that one of the SSC facilities called Suffolk County to move all of their kids out but there's really no place else for them to go.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm a bit
frustrated because we knew Raise the Age was coming. We knew back in 2016 and '17 that this was an issue and I find ourselves some four and five years later we're still trying to figure out a way forward. All right.

MS. REYER: Legislator Bynoe we join in your frustrations.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I would say thank you but it doesn't help. I will be in touch. Be well. Thank you for your answers. MS. REYER: Thank you. LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you. I
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think I share your frustration Legislator Bynoe because we knew that this was coming. And I understand the efforts that you're trying on behalf of these adolescent offenders and all the road blocks that have been thrown your way in trying to find a solution. Because even when you had mentioned about the youth detention center, which is here in Nassau County, that the thought that we were going to expand it and build upon that to put these adolescents I guess close to youth. But all of a sudden boom, everything gets stopped, you can't do it. I just think it's crazy and I just think we're playing games with a lot of these young people's lives.

I would think that we are going to pass this because it is important, but I will let you know that we will be reaching out to you because we're going to have a Public Safety hearing on this. Because I think I'd like to try to bring in the right people from the state and all parties involved so we can get to the bottom of this. And maybe, hopefully, give you some support in the

Public Safety - 4-12-21
efforts that you're trying to do, find out why if we thought it would in Brentwood and now it's not.

But this really is something that goes beyond comprehension that this young man, this young child I guess, is probably handcuffed somewhere without a bed without any comforts or whatever. And if you have more young people that are committing crimes and then we're going to make a decision maybe if they're 17 and a half we can send them into the Nassau correctional facility into general population. So this is something that $I$ think we really have to start doing our due diligence on. But thank you very much for your testimony and we will be in touch.

MS. REYER: We would welcome the opportunity to continue to work with you in that way.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Perfect. We will be looking forward to speaking with you so that you can help us get in touch with the people that we need to have at this hearing. And I anticipate it will be done within three
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weeks. You have that promise from us.
Any other legislators? Any
public? All those in favor of passing this item please signify by saying aye. Any opposed? The item passes. Thank you very much sir. Thank you very much ma'am.

## There is an addendum to this

 agenda. May I have a motion to suspend the rules? Moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. All those in favor of suspending the rules signify by saying aye. The rules are suspended.There are two items on the addendum
today, item 143-21 and 144-21. Clerk item 143-21 is a local law to prohibit the smoking or vaping of cannabis in all county-owned properties. May I have a motion. Moved by Legislator Ferretti. Seconded by Legislator Rhoads. The item is before us. I will hand it over to Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you Madam Chairwoman. For the last 40 years we have been telling three generations of kids to say no to drugs and the state legislature in
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its infinite wisdom has now deemed to say yes. At least with respect to marijuana.

Two years ago this legislature stood firm when this proposal was first looked like it was going to pass and we preemptively opted out of the sale of recreational marijuana and the revenue that it would potentially generate.

This year, in addition to passing this legislation and opting for the revenue over public safety, the state legislature has taken the ability of counties to opt out away, giving that to towns. This legislation is prevented from opting out. But we are able to place some restrictions as to where cannabis can be used and how it can be -- where cannabis can be used.

Clerk item 143-21 is a local law that prohibits the smoking or vaping of cannabis or concentrated cannabis on county-owned property. Which would include sidewalks adjourning county property, parking lots, playgrounds, beaches, campgrounds and other local spaces.
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This again is a direct result of
the Marijuana Tax and Reform Act which permits the recreational use and sale of cannabis products. Pursuant to this law, individuals age 21 and under -- I'm sorry -- 21 and over cannot smoke or vape where ever it is prohibited pursuant to the Clean Indoor Act. This is the Marijuana and Tax Reform Act. However, the Act does not prohibit smoking or vaping in outdoor spaces.

In recent years the smell of
marijuana has become more prevalent and with passage of the Marijuana Tax and Reform Act there's a danger that it will become commonplace, negatively impacting the lives of adults and children. Accordingly, this local law prohibits the smoking and vaping of cannabis on outdoor county properties.

## LEGISLATOR FORD: I know

Legislator Mule has comments.
LEGISLATOR MULE: Yes. I have some questions actually. I fully support this legislation but $I$ have a question about enforcement. It's my understanding that the
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vaping of cannabis products doesn't smell. And I thought that that was true and then I checked with Jeff Reynolds just to verify that and he concurs and he is, by the way, ready to answer questions if necessary. He's on this meeting.

So, my question is this. How are you going to enforce the vaping of cannabis since it's not possible to smell it? Are you going to give citations to everyone who vapes? If that's the case, then I suggest you incorporate the legislation that I proposed two years ago which would prevent vaping in county-owned properties in general.

Or, if you're not going to do that, then this legislation really doesn't have any teeth because people will still be consuming cannabis on county-owned properties by virtue of vaping. It will stop the smoking of and of course I applaud that as well. But I think that you really need to consider that you can't smell cannabis when it's vaped.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's our
understanding based on the research that we've
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done, that cannabis does put out when it's vaped, does put out, albeit a faint odor, does put out an odor which is detectable. So, I would disagree with the assessment that it doesn't, at least based upon the research that we have. I would rather err on the side of caution and prohibit it as opposed to just simply making the assumption that we're not going to be able to tell.

> With respect to your vaping
legislation, Ms. Mule, I am certainly aware of that. My understanding is that the Parks Department actually already has a rule in place prohibiting vaping. The reason why this legislation becomes necessary is that we not only expand -- that obviously only applies to parks, but we actually expand this to preserves, to playgrounds, beaches, campgrounds and other open spaces including sidewalks adjourning county property.

Additionally, the existing law that we have contains a fine for $\$ 500$. However, the state has capped the fine that we're able
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to put in place at $\$ 200$. So, this new
legislation makes the penalty portion of it consistent with state law.

LEGISLATOR MULE: So, a couple of
things. I would state that a parks rule is certainly not the same thing as an ordinance and it doesn't hold the same weight. Also, since we have Jeff Reynolds here and he's certainly would I think be considered by all of us as an expert, I think we should hear from him to hear what he has to say.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Absolutely.
It's up to the chairwoman but I have no problem with that.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Perfectly fine with me.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Mr. Reynolds
are you on the phone?
DR. REYNOLDS: I'm here. Can you hear me?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I can.
DR. REYNOLDS: Excellent. Let me start by saying that I fully concur with your comments about MRTA. As you know, Family and
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Children's Association has raised a number of concerns related to MRTA in terms of underage access, pregnant and breast feeding women, folks with mental health conditions and driving. Particularly on Long Island where we rely heavily on cars. Those are not all of our concerns but those are some of our concerns and we expressed them to state lawmakers during the debate.

We also advocated heavily for large scale public information campaign if they were going to move ahead with the law. Which obviously they did not fund, which I think is a profound statement.

The fact that all acted in a
bipartisan way to pass this law means that -on a somewhat bipartisan way -- means that its localities that will now have to deal with the damage and the potential downsides in organizations like my own that have been forced to clean up the mess created by opioid manufacturers, liquor manufacturers, tobacco purveyors and vaping manufacturers and this will yet another thing that we will have to
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clean up. And quite frankly, we will come to the county to fund.

As far as the issue of vaping, I just want to speak specifically to the conversion between the role of vaping and marijuana use. I spend a fair amount of time with young people who have encountered issues at school or have been driven into one of our treatment centers in Hicksville or Hempstead. And I can tell you all of them understand vaping is a way of using marijuana in the school, on buses, at home and any other place they can wholly undetected.

The vaping industry took a huge hit just before COVID and, as you recall, there was a number of significant breakouts of lung diseases among young people and adults for that matter and the industry took a major, major hit when you're talking about a pandemic that primarily impacts the lungs. Anybody could have predicted that. Many of the stores closed down. The online shops closed down.

I will tell you that they have found marijuana and the legalization of
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marijuana to be their gateway directly back into our kids and a way of gaining back market share.

I will tell you that the amount of odor that comes from a vaping device depends largely on the strain of marijuana being used. THC concentration. But increasingly we're seeing highly prepared and highly THC-laden oils being used in vaping devices which have almost no smell. And every school superintendent will tell you this is one of their most vexing problems right now.

I think when you a look at what
happens outside the likelihood of anyone being able to detect that odor is going to be limited at best.

So, I agreed with your comments. I agree with the bill. I do see some issues with enforcement. I just want to be really clear in terms of the convergence of vaping practices and devices and the use of marijuana especially among young people.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: We certainly
appreciate that input Mr. Reynolds. Thank you
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so much.
DR. REYNOLDS: Any time. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I said mister. It's doctor, isn't it? I apologize. DR. REYNOLDS: I'm not a formal guy. It's all good.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Legislator
Mule, did you have other questions?
LEGISLATOR MULE: No. I'm sorry those are the only questions. But Dr. Reynolds does essentially agree with what I'm saying in terms of enforcement will be very, very difficult. And so I think that this law needs to be reconsidered in light of that.

Again, $I$ just want to state I'm in favor of it but $I$ want to make sure we're doing something that's really meaningful.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I appreciate
that and I believe that -- and correct me if I'm wrong Dr. Reynolds -- it would be challenging at best but it is still detectable. So there is still some benefit to the prohibition, would you not agree?
Public Safety - 4-12-21

DR. REYNOLDS: I don't know.
It's possible that I'm going to win the lottery today too. Anything is possible. I don't think it's good policy, and, quite frankly, I would say to you and with every ounce of respect, people shouldn't be vaping in parks either. These are two behaviors that have conferred. They are incredibly dangerous. The science is really clear on. And it's an industry behind this that is taking health and taking the lives of kids that impact people on a daily basis. I do think it's going to be really hard to enforce, and I think sometimes when things are crafted imperfectly nothing happens whatsoever, and I think that would be a missed opportunity. LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I don't know if you happen to hear the earlier portion of the conversation that the commissioner of parks has already issued regulations banning vaping from county parks. What we are simply doing here is attempting to clarify some of the misconceptions that may have been put out by the state legislation because the
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perception now is you can use marijuana in whatever form where ever you want and it's completely legal. This legislation is trying to reinforce the message with respect to our parks but expand that message to preserves, to playgrounds, to beaches, campgrounds and other open spaces that are owned by the county that it's not permitted on county property.

DR. REYNOLDS: I get that and again $I$ fully concur. I guess my question would be, do those regulations have a fine attached to them?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Yes.
DR. REYNOLDS: Is the fine the same and does it have the same force as a local law?

> LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You're asking
about the violation?
DR. REYNOLDS: Just vaping.
Vaping any substance in a park. It's a regulation that says $I$ can't do it. But if somebody catches me at Eisenhower Park am I stopped and fined and issued a ticket?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It is a
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violation. Actually, the fine is $\$ 500$ or imprisonment up to 15 days. But we can't do that with respect to marijuana because we're capped as per the state legislation at $\$ 200$.

DR. REYNOLDS: Then if I'm vaping
in the park and an officer stops me, I guess he or she would have to determine, I don't know how they do that, whether or not I was vaping a nicotine product or a THC-based product. I think that would probably be hard.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: In theory, if they were able to make that distinction if it's a tobacco product the fine could be $\$ 500$ or imprisonment up to 15 days. If it was not a tobacco product and was simple a marijuana product we're capped as far as the $\$ 200$ fine.

DR. REYNOLDS: It's way above my pay grade but I would imagine it would be hard for an officer on the scene to make that determination and figure out what to do. I don't know that it's going to be enforceable.

Again, I'm not a lawyer but $I$ know that there was lots of debate in the legislature and the MRTA does address the
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issue of the smell of marijuana being a
condition for which officers can stop somebody and question them. There was a lot of debate when it came to the social justice implications in those conversations. I don't know to what extent that marijuana odor may play in with what you want to do. You may be in a scenario where you have to consider regardless. I'm just not sure about that but there was a lot of conversation.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: We will have to follow-up on those conversations obviously with our police department. But I appreciate it Dr. Reynolds.

DR. REYNOLDS: Of course. Any time.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you Dr. Reynolds for your input and testimony. We appreciate it. Legislator Mule anything else?

LEGISLATOR MULE: Not at this
time. Thank you.
LEGISLATOR FORD: We'll keep
looking at this. We'll pass this today but
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we'll just do our due diligence and follow through just to make sure that we have the fines and we have the means to stop the vaping and whatever in the parks and county-owned properties. Okay?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Legislator Ford, can $I$ just make a comment?

LEGISLATOR FORD: Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I'm not really sure I understand where -- look, obviously a huge concern the legalization of cannabis is for our kids. But I'm not sure where that comes into play in terms of this legislation just because, you know, they can't smoke cannabis or vape cannabis legally anyway, recreational cannabis, in the state of New York. So I don't see how that has any impact on this legislation.

Aside from that, I also don't know what the suggestion is. If enforcement is a concern, which I understand it's a concern, what's the alternative? Not to pass this and to not have this law on the books? Where
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hopefully the law in and of itself will deter the use of vaping cannabis or smoking cannabis on county properties? I guess I'm not sure what the downside of passing this would be. LEGISLATOR FORD: I think we're all in favor of passing it. I just think Legislator Mule was bringing up the fact that she didn't know whether or not for like nicotine vaping, I hope I'm saying this right, if nicotine vaping, since $I$ guess we were under the assumption that when you vape marijuana there is an odor that is associated with it that would be detectable. But now as we heard from Dr. Reynolds, that there can be no odor with a marijuana-based vape.

So, Legislator Mule, from what I understand, $I$ think she wants to know what about the people who do nicotine vaping and how do we make sure that they don't do it? It seems that now when we pass this that there will be no vaping allowed in any county-owned park or property. And I hope --

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I have an overall concern about enforcement of this. Of
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illegal use of cannabis. Which I assume Dr. Reynolds and Legislator Mule agree. That there's an overall concern. Whether it be intoxicated from marijuana while driving or whatever. But $I$ don't see how that differs. In other words, the argument for legalization as well. If someone is driving while intoxicated on marijuana the police officer will be able to see based on the behavior of the driver that they're high. How would that not be the case if someone is smoking in the park? If an officer sees somebody vaping and their actions and their behavior are an indication that they are high wouldn't that be a reason to believe that they're smoking marijuana? If their eyes are bloodshot. Whatever the symptoms of being high off of cannabis, I'm not a smoker, but whatever they are, I would assume they are the same signs as if you're driving a vehicle high.

LEGISLATOR MULE: Could Dr.
Reynolds respond to that?
DR. REYNOLDS: I would say even
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the police department, if you talk to Patty Ryder, they're in the process now of retraining all of the DREs, the drug recognition experts, to do roadside tests for cannabis impairment. The notion that your folks working in the parks should be put in that position or would be trained to do that really is a big question mark.

I will say generally officers, and
Patty Ryder can speak more eloquently on this, they go away for weeks to learn this in a way that will not subject themselves to litigation and challenges and everything else and asking your guy or woman driving around Eisenhower Park to do that puts them in an untenable position. Honestly, I think the solution is to say there's no smoking there's no vaping in any county park at any time for any reason by anyone.

I think the issue is around adolescent and use for folks under the age of 21 is significant because all of our kids are being exposed in parks to marijuana smoke. Seeing people vaping to all sorts of unhealthy
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behavior. I think we use our parks and I personally use Eisenhower Park a couple of times a week. I think our parks are places that are supposed to be safe for families. They're supposed to be healthy places that we shouldn't have to wade through marijuana smoke or people vaping in order to use what we pay for in taxes.

So, Legislator Ferretti, I don't know if you heard my comments at the outset about legalization in general and where I stand on that but I've been pretty outspoken about it. So I'm in agreement with you in terms of the myriad of problems raised by legalizing cannabis.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I agree with all of your sentiments. I agree with your concerns over the legalization by the state. I guess my position is more just about this bill in particular. Personally, I do see a big distinction between vaping cannabis and vaping tobacco. But that's not really the issue on this bill. Generally I agree with your position. Like I said, I think that this
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bill enhances our position rather than inhibit it. That's why I'm in favor of it and I hope it passes.

LEGISLATOR MULE: Madam Chair, if I may? Again, $I$ just want to state I'm in favor of absolutely the sentiment. I just want to make sure that we're making the best possible law that has the best possible chance of success and doing what we actually want it to do.

> LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you

Legislator Mule. Legislator Rhoads, did you have anything?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: We did happen to reach out to the Parks Department, and I don't believe Eileen Kreeb is on the call, but the indication was the legislation actually gives her the ability now to call in police to enforce the law. So, now both park personnel and public safety will have the ability to actually have the police department come to the park if they suspect that somebody is using cannabis, vaping cannabis, in addition to using cannabis as it would normally would
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be used.
I do also want to clarify to make sure there's no confusion, this law applies to everyone regardless of age. Obviously it's illegal for anyone under 21 already to possess or consume. But anyone over 21, under or over 21, certainly cannot use in a county park or outdoor county property, preserve, playgrounds beaches, campgrounds and other open spaces. LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you Dr. Reynolds. I know that you had mention about even with the school superintendents dealing with the students that do vape and they get away with it and they hide it and whatever. I'm hoping that there's a way that we'll be able to detect any type of vaping in any of our county-owned parks to make sure that we can stop it and keep our parks clean with fresh air for everybody to enjoy healthfully.

And we will have to keep looking at this to see whether or not we're achieving the goals that we think that we are. Whether or not it's vaping marijuana products and/or nicotine products.
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Thank you very much everybody for all your input. Any public comment? All those in favor of passing this item please signify by saying aye. The item passes unanimously.

Clerk item number 144-21 is a local law to amend Title 64 of the miscellaneous laws of Nassau County to prevent the consumption of cannabis by minors in private homes.

May I have a motion. Moved by Legislator Mule and seconded by Legislator Rhoads. This item is before us.

This proposed local law is also in response to the enactment of the Marijuana Tax and Reform Act by New York State. The state law removes marijuana from schedule one of the New York State Public Health Law. As a result, the county's existing Social Host law no longer applies to marijuana usage by a minor under age 21. Therefore, a person who would have been guilty of violating the Social Host law for allowing marijuana use by a minor is no longer guilty of violating the law for
Public Safety - 4-12-21
this same reason.
This proposed local law amends the Social Host law's definition of drugs to remove marijuana and add cannabis and concentrated cannabis as defined by Section 222-00 of the New York State penal law which is added by the New York State Marijuana Tax and Reform Act.

If this proposed local law is enacted a person who allows marijuana to be consumed at his or her residence by a minor will once again be in violation of the Social Host law.

I'm sure Dr. Reynolds remembers trying to past social host laws way back when everybody felt that it would be too much for them when young people are in their houses and sometimes they would give the argument that it's safer for young people to be drinking at somebody's house rather than out in the street. We realize that it was all and all dangerous regardless.

I'm very proud for my group down in Long Beach, Long Beach Aware, headed by Judy
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Vining, who helped champion this legislation. And for me $I$ think it is important that we recognize this and that we add cannabis to the Social Host law.

Any other legislators? Any public comment? All those in favor of passing this item please signify by saying aye. Opposed? The item passes unanimously.

We have no other items before us.
So may I have a motion to adjourn. Moved by Legislator Rhoads. Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor? This committee is now adjourned. Thank you everyone.

1
2
3

CERTIFICATION

I, FRANK GRAY, a Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby certify: THAT the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 19th day of April 2021

FRANK GRAY

