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    Rules - 4-26-21
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Call the
Rules Committee to order. Mike could you
please call the roll for the Rules Committee.
MR. PULITZER: Thank you
Presiding Officer. 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: Thank you.
Legislator Laura Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Legislator Steven
Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Vice Chairman
Howard Kopel.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Chairman Richard
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Nicolello.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.
MR. PULITZER: We have a quorum sir.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you. Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel makes a motion to suspend the rules. Seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of suspending the rules signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.

Item E-77 of 2020 is a resolution
making certain determinations pursuant to SEQRA and authorizing the county executive, on behalf of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums, to execute a license and operating agreement with Nassau Equestrian Center at Old Mill.

Moved by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe.

MS. KASO: Victoria Kaso,
Department of Parks. Item E-77-20 is a nonexclusive license and operating agreement contract with the Nassau Equestrian Center at
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Old Mill located in Jericho. The horse farm is approximately 42 acres where the vendor offers riding lessons for sporting and leasing, trail riding, private events and a summer camp.

Just a quick background. The county purchased the farm in 2008 through the environmental bond act for open space purposes. In 2008 the county conducted an RFP seeking an entity to operate and renovate the property. In 2009 the county awarded a ten-year license with two five-year options and awarded to John Russo, who's the president of Nassau Equestrian Center. But just important to note, that agreement did not have any license fee paid to the county. It was mostly strictly capital investments.

In early 2019 the county chose to issue a new RFP and not exercise the option feeling it was important to reexamine the terms of many of our older agreements. And the decision not to exercise the option had no negative reflection on the existing operation of the at incumbent.
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The RFP was issued on April 9, 2019. A total of five proposals were received. The evaluation committee, which was compromised of four parks employees, two employees from the NCPD Mounted Unit and one employee from the Nassau County SPCA. Evaluated, scored and ranked the proposals and the highest ranking proposer was the Nassau Equestrian Center.

This is for a ten-year term with a five-year option. The operator will pay the county 9.5 percent of gross receipts or a guaranteed minimum license fee, the greater of the two, which will over the ten years will be a minimum of about $\$ 1.82$ million. He is also committed to $\$ 125,000$ of capital investment in the first two years and then an additional 50 if the agreement is extended with the option.

Couple of important things to note in the new agreement. There is a requirement to conduct various public programs, which was already a part of the previous agreement but it's stressed. He is making available the indoor rink to the NCPD Mounted Unit for
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training purposes. There will be a 20 percent discount to veterans and first responders on boarding lessons and camp. There will be Parks approval for the program calendar and the ability for the department to supplement, not supplement but work with the vendor to increase public programing if it's deemed necessary.

And an establishment of an oversight committee that will be an advisory board comprised of park staff, the SPCA and NCPD Mounted Unit as well as county staff to monitor the finances and compliance within the terms of the contract. Any questions?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We have
public comments here. We also have the inspector general whom I'm going to call up in a moment. In terms of the committee that selected the vendor who was on the committee? Do you know?

MS. KASO: I do. I believe it's listed on the comptroller's approval form. It should be if it's not. But $I$ was a voting member. We also had a deputy commissioner of
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the parks department and then the other park staff was Michael Buckowitz. So Deputy Commissioner Goldstein and Michael Buckowitz. Off the top of my head I can't remember the two mounted police names. And then Gary Rogers.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: There were four other proposals?

MS. KASO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: What was
it that was the deciding factor?
MS. KASO: I would say, without looking up my exact notes, I would say that it was after the first initial meeting and review of the evaluation of the proposals it was narrowed down to basically being between the incumbent and one other proposer. Their finance proposals were pretty similar. And the other three came basically nowhere close to it.

Both also had good experience with running an actual boarding facility. Whereas, a couple of other the proposers were trainers within other boarding facilities. So they

Rules - 4-26-21 didn't have that management component.

I would say one of the ultimately deciding factors was that the other proposer, part of their business plan was buying and selling horses and that is not something that Nassau Equestrian proposed or wants to do or plans to do and to the committee that was an important part. They didn't really think that the vendor on the county property should be engaging in that practice.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Does anyone have any questions? Legislator Bynoe. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Presiding Officer. I think a lot of my questions are going actually to be directed to the IG.

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Inspector

 general. I was going to call her in a minute. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But Tori I'll ask this in the immediate. When you talk about public programing, you mentioned public programing and then you mentioned Nassau County Mounted. I'd like to hear more about what they would be offering to the public. IRules - 4-26-21
would expect that our police would be able to use that space, but I'd like to hear more about the public programing there. I'd like to know what it has been in the past and what is projected.

MS. KASO: In the past they have offered summer camps. I don't know specifically which components of the summer camps. But they have worked with, I know, I believe disabled children to have the programs. The site is also open to the public. We haven't gotten the specific public programing calendar. They do also have -they have summer and vacation day camps, pony pal camps, horse and pony lease programs. They work with and will increase their work with local schools and colleges and organizations. And they also have clinics and expositions. But they are also offering the 20 percent discount to veterans and first responders.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Is there any benefit to young people who are going there from Nassau County? Any kind of discount
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offered to them?
MS. KASO: For specifically
residents?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: For young people, Nassau County residents from anywhere within the county.

MS. KASO: Not 100 percent sure.
Let me just go --
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: While
she's doing that $I$ know we have residents that will speak in a little bit, but we also have public comment that was submitted by some of those residents and we'll just make that part of the record. Jacqueline Peiffer, I'll call you up in a minute ma'am. And the other one was from Barbara Sternberg. Again, it will be annexed to the record as part of the record. MS. KASO: So, the answer is no. But as we will be working with him with the public programing we will suggest this to him and gear him in that direction to provide discount specifically to residents use. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: We saw that as a part of the Cornell Extension that we were
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going to require some level of a discount for Nassau County residents and I think it should be the same. And I think it should be not just nudging him in that direction. Making sure that that is requirement of this county that if they're going to lease our property that there will be some benefit to our taxpayers.

I have a whole host of different questions that we'll delve into later once the presiding officer introduces the IG to the podium. But $I$ think as a rule we should have required that in the agreement, and I know that makes me uncomfortable already to have to vote on an item that does not put our residents first. I will hold the rest of my questions for the IG.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi. How are you? I got a few different questions. I'm going to jump around a little bit. You mentioned the 20 percent discount. You said veterans, first responders. First responders
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and their family or just the first responders themselves?

MS. KASO: I believe it's and
their family. I believe. Yes.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: The revenue amount, you said it's the greater of nine percent of gross receipts. Is that standard in the industry or is it a special -- how did you come to that number, if you know?

MS. KASO: That is what he
proposed in his proposal. In terms of
industry standards --
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I mean, how did it compare to let's say the others that had submitted a proposal?

MS. KASO: It was higher. His financial proposal was the top. There may have been some different combinations between percentages and minimums but his combined was the highest.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: The staff
that you mentioned that were on the original, I guess the original panel that was making the decision, did they have any type of particular
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experience in making a decision like this or any type of expertise? Like, I know Gary Rogers. I know who he is. He obviously deals with animals. But you said park staff. So, I just wonder were they random park staff or were they people that actually have some information? I know the mounted police obviously have some knowledge as well in this field.
MS. KASO: No. I would say in terms of -- so Michael Buckowitz works with a lot of museums and preserves. I myself was new to the parks department but I like to think that I'm pretty confident. And then the Andrew Goldstein, the deputy, everybody has had basic experience not managing but like overseeing county property and they've also had experience on other RFP processes.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: So that was their reason for being on there?

MS. KASO: Yes. And also because
the agreement is through the parks
department. If we're going to be spearheading the oversight and the enforcement of it we
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needed input from the department.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: That segues
into my next question was about the oversight committee you mentioned. How many members will there be on that?

MS. KASO: Not sure the number was specified. But it will be a mixture of not the same people but experts from those similar departments.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: And what exactly can you tell me what their oversight involves?

MS. KASO: They will be in
charge -- they will be tasked with the oversight of finances. They will have the public programing calendar submitted to them. They will also be who will field and investigate complaints.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I guess how will people know that they can make a complaint or where to make it?

MS. KASO: We will have to make that information easily known.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Will they
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issue some sort of a report or will there be anything like that? When you say an oversight committee what will their end result be? MS. KASO: It hasn't been fully
formed yet obviously because the agreement hasn't been approved, and I'm sure that will be part of the discussion once it is formed. I would assume that there will be some sort of official way to intake the complaint and provide information on what their findings were.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: But also
like $I$ guess the panel itself their oversight will it include a yearly report or a -MS. KASO: Of the panel itself? LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Yeah. Whatever exactly they're overseeing specifically.

MS. KASO: I certainly think that makes sense.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I think that's all I have for me. I might have more later.

MS. KRIEB: Eileen Krieb,
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Commissioner of Parks. As part of this permitting process it will have on it clearly the contact avenue for the constituents to make their complaints. So it will be an email or a phone number or something that will be included on all these permits in writing so that anyone who is boarding there has any kind of a complaint it will be to their advantage that they will know who to contact as opposed to wondering who they can reach out to. It will be part of the stipulation on the permit.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: As well as obviously people just that are taking lessons there and doing something else I assume?

MS. KRIEB: Yes. Just to
follow-up on Legislator Bynoe's question on the cost. The parks department's enforcing resident versus nonresident fees all over the parks department to make sure that the taxpayers do have an advantageous position. So we will be doing the same as we review all these programs. We will make sure that there are incentives for taxpayers, Nassau County
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residents, versus non that are coming to use this facility.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: The way that
it was expressed in the Cornell Extension agreement I think should be also included in this agreement.

MS. KRIEB: You're talking about
their programs out in Suffolk County? Yes, we're familiar with that.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: To me, it
should be expressed in this contract clearly so that there would be no confusion. It appears that the operator had some confusion on some of the issues in the previous agreement, and I don't want to see that happen in this particular instance as it relates to our young people who I think should have access to that center.

MS. KRIEB: I agree.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I would
like to invite up the inspector general, Jodi
Franzese, thank you for coming here this afternoon and waiting through the full leg. MS. FRANZESE: Hi everyone.
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Thanks for having me here. Jodi Franzese, Office of the Inspector General.

So, Presiding Officer, how do you want me to do this? Just want me to give you a quick Cliff Notes version or do you have questions?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think we will have questions but $I$ think if you can give us a summary of your investigation and your findings.

MS. FRANZESE: As you know, there
are numerous allegations regarding the vendor's performance under the agreement and questions regarding the procurement process leading up to the agreement. There was a range of allegations, some overlapping, regarding the vendor's failure to comply with the provisions of the agreement.

So we conducted an investigation and we made findings and recommendations to the administration. They accepted those recommendations.

As far as the allegations there were several. Just some of the ones that we
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substantiated were, for example, failing to obtain Nassau County approval and failure to expend the required amount for advertising and promotions. That's true. That was not something that was complied with. There are several.
The county has no record regarding
a reserve fund which was required in the agreement. It was a very, very late establishment of a reserve fund. I think it was about eight years into the ten-year agreement that they established a reserve fund.

Also, failure to create a plan about the intention to make programs and services accessible for individuals with disabilities. That was required in the agreement. We found no evidence that that existed.

Also, another allegation that was substantiated was failure to obtain prior county approval for capital improvements. We didn't see any sort of written approval from the county regarding the capital
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improvements. We did see an email where one of the county employees did say that they went to the site and saw the capital improvements and perhaps that was some sort of tacit approval.

Also, I should also let you know that my office discovered an issue with fingerprinting because if you have staff who are going to be in close proximity to children you need to fingerprint those individuals and there was no evidence that the vendor did that.

Finally, also no notification of serious accidents. That was something that was required by the agreement that the vendor would notify the county for serious riding accidents that happened on the premises. We were aware of $I$ believe two serious accidents and there was no notification to the county. That's the lion's share of the substantiated allegations that we mentioned in the report. And we are, if need be, moving forward we will follow-up if we think it's necessary with the county's implementation of
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our recommendations.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Were there any allegations that were not substantiated?

MS. FRANZESE: Yes, there were
several of those as well. For example, substandard care of horses. Obviously that's important to everybody and it's pretty much a priority. We did not substantiate that allegation.

There was also allegations regarding failure of the vendor to submit financial records. When we requested those documents of the department we received them. So, they were on file at the department.

Also, no records of -- there was an allegation of no record of capital expenditures. However, those were also on file with the department.

There were several allegations regarding the procurement process. I just want to make you aware that my office was -we observed the entire selection process. I think we may have missed one meeting but everything else we went to. We did a
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walk-through with the prospective proposers. We also read the documents and there was allegations that this was somewhat of a done deal I believe it was called. We did not find evidence that this was a done deal.

Also, it was alleged that other proposers proposed more revenue to the county and we did find that one offered more in revenue and one offered more in capital expenditures but less gross receipts. But all in all, we witnessed the entirety of the process and it was a deliberative process. And revenue was really just one of the factors that the parks department was weighing in.

Also, there were some allegations of basically the incumbent having inside information. We did a lot of work on that and we did not find that that was something that our office could substantiate in terms of an allegation. That's pretty much the lion's share of that as well.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think
what we will do is if legislators have questions now we'll have them ask those
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questions and then we'll bring up some of the residents who are here and ask you and/or the parks department to respond once they raise whatever the issues that they are going to raise. I know Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you Presiding Officer. So, do we know whether -good evening to you Ms. IG. One question first regarding the fingerprinting because I found that really troubling. Do we know whether that's been cured to this point?

MS. FRANZESE: We know that's something that we are going to be following up on. We know that the department had accepted that recommendation as something they were planning to implement because that is an important issue. We will be following up on that.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So, we don't know whether it's been cured to this point?
MS. FRANZESE: I think you can
probably ask the parks department if we were going to do that directly but we can do that today if you'd like.
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LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes. Because
I would be concerned if we enter into a contract and they're still not in compliance with a very important aspect of having fingerprinted. I think it kind of puts the county in a precarious situation to do so.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you want to have the commissioner come up and maybe just --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I wouldn't mind. I'm sorry. If you wouldn't mind just one minute.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO:
Commissioner Krieb.
MS. KRIEB: So, Mr. Russo is on
notice to comply with all the findings that have been given to us by the IG's office. And additionally, in the new contract it clearly states that the personnel screening is required for all minors -- sorry -- all current and prospective personnel who is carrying out this agreement will have unsupervised or regular substantial contact with minors are fingerprinted by the Nassau
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County Police. So all these recommendations have been incorporated into our new contract and he is on notice on their findings to comply.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm troubled that this contract is down here without having any evidence that this deficiency has been cured and they are still conducting business. This is pretty serious that we don't have individuals fingerprinted that are engaging with our young people. I know that that's required here in the parks department. It's actually delayed some hires in the parks department because we did not have them fingerprinted.

MS. KRIEB: And its standard language in our contracts also.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Which is why I think it's important that we express that there be public use and discount to our young people in this agreement because even with things that were in this agreement they weren't in compliance. But nonetheless, thank you for answering the question that they're
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working toward curing it but you don't have any evidence at this time that's it's been cured?

MS. KRIEB: Correct.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you. I'm going to go back to the IG. The previous contract what was it predicated on? Was it just an annual fee, flat fee or was it also based on a percentage of the income?

MS. FRANZESE: I don't think I can answer that for you. Perhaps this might be a parks department question.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Okay. I don't
know if they can answer then. Tori, can you answer that question for me?

MS. KASO: The previous contract had no license fee paid to the county.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I would
suspect when they did some of these improvements, which included an indoor riding arena, which I suspect allowed them to operate year round there was some revenue that we did not capture there?

MS. KASO: In the agreement he
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was committed to $\$ 500,000$ worth of capital improvements and our records show that he actually over doubled that amount.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm not
arguing that he didn't make the investment I'm arguing that he made an investment that was definitely to his benefit. Then he failed to disclose that.

MS. KASO: We definitely agree which is why we didn't exercise the option to extend his contract for five years and did the RFP.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: With good
reason. Thank you. My questions are going to be -- the life safety I think we found out was just fire extinguishers that were just a couple of days out of compliance; is that correct IG?

MS. FRANZESE: Yes. We actually received an allegation regarding fire issues. We alerted the fire marshal and they went over for an inspection and there was a report appended to our -- sorry -- there was a report from the fire marshal appended to our report.
Rules - 4-26-21

And certain things that looked like violations or potential violations to us weren't actually violations of the fire code. But I think at this point the fire marshal was confident that it was a safe environment. I believe the Cornell Cooperative also mentioned something about it being a safe environment. That report is also appended.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I read both of those. I just wanted to confirm it and have it on the record.

In terms of -- you started to review an issue regarding prevailing wage and then you made mention that they are not required to adhere to prevailing wage.

MS. FRANZESE: Yes. We went to the county attorney's office on that because we just wanted to make sure we understood the law with respect to prevailing wage. And it was told to us and it's our understanding that the employees of the vendor were not -- the prevailing wage law wouldn't apply to them. We got that from the county attorney.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But it's
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something that we have to adhere to when we engage other contractors under different conditions, is that accurate?

MS. FRANZESE: Sorry, may I have a second. Because the county doesn't pay his employees, he pays his employees, and that was part of our discussion. That seems to be why it doesn't apply to the employees of the vendor.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And under other circumstances we are paying a contractor then ultimately pays their employees and that's why prevailing wage becomes an issue, correct?

MS. FRANZESE: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm not happy about that, and I wish there was something that we could do in this contract because this is not a not-for-profit organization. This is a private enterprise that is benefiting significantly based on some of the projected projections I've seen for revenue that we wouldn't be concerned whether someone that we're in contract with is paying their
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employees at a prevailing wage. That concerns me greatly.

I would not like to think that we have folks that aren't being paid by individuals that we're in business with at a prevailing wage, at a wage that would allow a, a living wage, a prevailing wage, to allow them to live here in this very expensive county or this region.

Sir, did you have something to add to that?

MR. MCDERMOTT: Thank you
Legislator, Presiding Officer. Dennis McDermott, deputy county attorney.

Just quickly addressing the prevailing wage. There is actually a court of appeals case Manual De la Cruz versus Cadel Dry Dock and Repair Company where the Court of Appeals set out a three-prong test to see if prevailing wages have to be paid. First, public agency must be a party to a contract involving the employment of laborers, workers or mechanics.

Second, and this is really the most
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important in this case, the contract must concern a project that primarily involves construction-like labor and is paid for by public funds. If it is completely paid for by private funds prevailing wage does not apply.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I think we had established that but I appreciate you expounding a little.

MR. MCDERMOTT: I missed part of the question so I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I appreciate you. Thank you. I just don't like the idea of it. Maybe we could have not gone for a prevailing wage but we could have encouraged a living wage or something to ensure that they were paying, this commercial enterprise was paying individuals who are in their employment as they derive a significant benefit from the county.

Then we get to public use and you state that larger signs identifying county -identifying the county, Nassau County Equestrian Center as opposed to the current signage. I think the current signage, I hear
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you, but I find that probably be the least of the issues. Probably more cultural that we have to deal -- we need to make sure they understand further that this is for public use and I think signage is great. So, the people then identify and say oh, maybe let me call the county and find out how $I$ can access this. I get the idea about the signage but I think we're going to have to do a little bit more. As I stated already, I think some of that has to be contractual so that they understand their public access.
MS. FRANZESE: That's in the
report because we visited the site and it wasn't clear to us. If $I$ was just driving by with my family I wouldn't believe that I could just hop out of the car with my kids and go have them ride a horse. It doesn't make it clear at all. There are other similarly situated kinds of farms that say in big letters, for example, Grossmans in Malverne it's big letters open to the public. I think it's important since this is a county-owned property that county residents know they can
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utilize it.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yes. Agree 100 percent. That needs to be cured as soon as possible.

The only other point that I'm going to make and it's -- I just want to confirm, sorry. I know that there's a reserve fund that's required for the capital improvement. You note in your report that the new agreement entirely removes the requirement for a reserve fund for public programs for any purposes. Is that accurate?

MS. FRANZESE: The reserve fund is not required in the new agreement. It was required in the old agreement. However, as I mentioned earlier, even regarding the old agreement it was not set up I think until well into the ten-year term. I believe there's something -- I'd have to ask the parks department to come up here to talk to you about that because there was definitely a situation regarding their reserve fund where it's not required anymore but I believe that the parks department had an explanation for
that.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I would love to hear it.

MR. MCDERMOTT: I hope you get
some sort of explanation Legislator. First, in the current agreement the reserve fund was being set up, and again, we're correct, it was set up very late, but the funds are to be used to be reinvested into the premises and the operations thereon. So, that's what the reserve fund was to be used for.

It included funding for public programs as an authorized use of the funds. This language does not compel use of these funds for public programs. Public programs are required under Section 6.1 but the funds themselves weren't. In this case, the reserve fund was actually started because this was purchased with open space funds. And the general concept is you cannot really take money from open space programs and that's why it gets reinvested back into the property. So the county gets some sort of return on it and we keep everything going.
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However, there is an exception. There's the five percent rule where if you do a calculation, and in this instance outside bond counsel did a calculation, they take the total bond amount, not just the amount that was used to purchase this but the whole bond, they apply the proposed income and if it's less than five percent overall, all income from all parts of the bond, if it's less than five percent the county can receive the money.

In every parks' contract the only time there is a reserve fund is when it's either we have bonds attached to it and no calculation has been done. And other than that, like at Morley tennis, there's no reserve account, they pay us. This was set up the same way because bond counsel said we can receive the money. They're still responsible to do the capital improvements, to do the maintenance, to do public programing. They still have all of those obligations. But because bond counsel said the county can actually accept the money as opposed to
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putting it into a reserve account that mostly would get put back into the premises. If some amount is put into programing or public programing a lot of it could be put into the premises because this is a standard county clause.

So, that is why parks did not require a reserve account because he's still required to have public programing and the county is now able to actually make some money on it.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So earlier I asked about young people having the discounted access. That's different. But the public programing --

MR. MCDERMOTT: Again, Section
6.1 --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Is there
anything --
MR. MCDERMOTT: I'm sorry -- does
require public programing and it actually gives a list of some of the things. And when

I happened to be looking at a lot of the support letters, there were letters against
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but there are a lot of support letters and I believe several of them were sent to the Presiding Officer and Legislator Abrahams, they listed many things like free pony rides and camps and other things where disadvantaged both physically and mentally children got programs that got use out of it and people who were not financially able to pay full price received it.

And there's a lot of letters and I know that they were sent to like both Majority and Minority and now it's probably a year ago. So, they actually have done that and part of the review process that Parks has to do of programing and pricing they can insist on a discount for county residents. And if they don't approve then he can't operate. If they approve his pricing he can't operate. So there is a mechanism. Is it specific? No.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: There's no minimum threshold that they have to meet so we can incentivize them to actually provide these public programs? Because while there have letters on both sides of the issue in support
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and then in opposition, you know, some of the concerns were that this was operating as a private type of center and that there was some exclusivity to access there. There were some allegations made like that. As a fiduciary and as a legislator whose responsibility is to ensure that people have direct access to programing, I feel compelled to ask whether there's a minimum. Because if somebody wants to operate as a -MR. MCDERMOTT: As it stands anyone can actually go in and use the facility. It's in the new contract. There are also many of the letters saying that this is an inclusive. Nonexclusive. This is coming from people who have been there well before the current operator took over. As a matter of fact, they said Mr. Russo was a God send for saving it, renovating it. But I'm just saying they're saying that it's an inclusive community. Not my words. I know none of them. I know nothing about horses. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: We have some comments that came in today that actually
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speak from a different perspective. Let's just say that. Without having the ability to vet some of those concerns, because I'm only getting them today, they were put on my desk earlier today, dated today, April 26, 2021, I have to ask the questions. So, that's what I'm doing now is asking the questions.

MR. MCDERMOTT: I understand. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And bringing these issues into the forefront. Thank you for your answer. I appreciate it.

I think I have one other in closing and it's related to the horses and the care of the animals. Cornell made some recommendations and they recommended that overall it sounded like the horses were treated very well. They just stated that there was some restlessness, which is not uncommon during the I guess the winter months and they suggested that the horses get a little more activity. And I think that that enclosed area that they created would allow the horses during the winter to get out and get some more recreation.
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So, I just wanted to know if that recommendation, and $I$ don't think this is for you, I'm sorry Ms. Franzese, I think it's for the parks department whether that recommendation has been accepted and is currently in practice?

MS. KRIEB: Again, I'm not a
horse owner but we had many unannounced visits from people with expertise in animal care and they all concluded that the animals were being treated well, they were being fed, they were being exercised and they always had water.

We have support letters from many veterinarians, many stables owners, the people who are in the stables. Cornell, Village of Brookville. The fire marshal went in and checked to make sure they were up to code. And DPW inspected the building and that had met code compliance as well as neighbors.

So again, although you're getting that comment, I don't believe that he is not exercising the horses. I think they're being treated properly. And I'm only going by the experts that stopped in to check unnoticed.
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LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Again, not my
words, reading directly from Cornell.
MS. KRIEB: I don't know what
letter you're reading. Cornell did say they could have more exercise but it wasn't a level that the animals weren't getting exercise.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm just
asking did he adhere to this recommendation? That's all I'm asking.

MS. KRIEB: Yes. He's aware of these recommendations.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Not just
aware. Is he adhering? Has he cured this concern that Cornell put forward?

MS. KRIEB: I know that Mr. Russo
spoke with Cornell when they were there. I don't know for a fact that he's increased the activities of the horses. I don't have that in writing from him. I know he met with them. He took their recommendations. I can assume that he has improved on it but I don't know that for a fact.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This is
something that I understood there was going to
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be some oversight committee at some point whenever if it does get approved, and I suggest that be one thing that we look at. We just want to make sure -- look, it was glowing assessment from Cornell with a recommendation for more turnout times. And I think given their expertise and our reliance on Cornell to have assessed the conditions there that we need to adhere to the recommendations. Thank you. I'm done.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton and
Legislator Schaefer have follow-up.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: My
colleague, Legislator Siela Bynoe, did an excellent job covering most of the questions I had.

> I've been aware of the situation for over a decade. I know there have been a lot of issues there. When I was in my district $I$ attempted to bridge the gap between Mr. Russo and many of the $I$ would say tenants there as well. I'm sorry that it's still going on because it's such a beautiful place.
Rules - 4-26-21

You all have such a beautiful hobby that you enjoy. The horses I know how important they are to you. I know this is an aspect of your life that you enjoy.

It really bothers me every time I speak with anyone or any time I read anything it's so negative. It's a situation that I tried to resolve myself, and I know that we're still -- sounds like we're still in this same position. I know when you meet with Mr. Russo he'll show you how far the place has come. All the improvements he's made over the years. The pictures of the dilapidated buildings when he first took over. It's amazing that they were still standing when he came in. I know his personality. He's kind of a no-nonsense person in the sense that $I$ think he tries to do the right thing but I don't know if he always is as careful as he should be.

And on a number of issues that
Legislator Bynoe brought up such as the fingerprinting and things like that he needs to have oversight. I'm glad that you're
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forming this committee. I think having Cornell look at the horses, making sure that the horses are safe with the fire marshal. Making sure that the food, I know the food was an issue sometimes. I want to ensure that we're doing everything that we can as a county to have oversight over Mr. Russo.

Can I ask Jodi if you don't mind? I know as an inspector general you did review the whole process. Is there anything glaring in your report other than the few recommendations that $I$ saw that would have you hesitate to grant this contract to Mr. Russo?

MS. FRANZESE: The thing that came up the most, and this is not -- it was more about the county's failure to oversee what is a long-term agreement for us and to make sure that the vendor complied with the terms of the agreement.

As far as what we learned in our findings, at this point it seems that with the new agreement and with an oversight committee, I don't like to opine because I'm not an elected official, you allow me to be here, my
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thought is that this is definitely a better, we're in a better state of affairs than with the prior agreement. But I don't have anything glaring that $I$ can tell you that $I$ think would be of significant concern at this point. Everything's written in the report and we stand by all our findings.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: This
is now in Legislator Lafazan's district, this facility. However, on that commission I do understand you have representatives from the parks department. But possibly, I don't know if Josh could be informed of any of the concerns. And I've been receiving emails for many years I'm happy to be on that too. I'm going to have the legislators have oversight as well.

So, it's unfortunate. I wish that we felt more positive about this whole situation because $I$ know there is a lot of funding involved, personal funding that these people pay to keep their horses there. It's a beautiful spot but it's always had kind of a black cloud over it in the sense that $I$ feel
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that it has not worked in the past. I understand we chose this vendor again. I happen to get along with him on a lot of levels. I respect a lot of the things that he does but $I$ do think there are a lot of improvements that have to be done. I appreciate you outlining them.

I know of many of the concerns of the public comments but $I$ want you to all know that you're not going on deaf ears. We really all try to take a personal interest in this facility and we will continue to do so.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I've got a question for the parks department and that is as to the selection process. I understand you had five bids on this and this one was selected as the best. Can you just simply explain why this was best in your opinion?

MS. KASO: So, when we issue RFPs we very clearly outline the selection process. Basically how we evaluate each proposal and we assign percentage values to each category. Off the top of my head I cannot remember exactly what they were for
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this RFP but it tends to include the, in a revenue contract case, the benefit to the county, financial benefit to the county. Along with experience, the overall profile of the vendor and the organization. Sort of the resumes of the principals.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I get your
general principals but you don't know --
MS. KASO: But why specifically
this one?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Yes.
MS. KASO: He obviously has
experience working with a municipality in
particular and operating this type of property. So, he had a little bit of a lead over some of the other proposers.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The number two
was there a tremendous discrepancy in preference between numbers one and two here?

MS. KASO: No. I would say for
the most part between the number two --
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: They're
close?
MS. KASO: They're close but I
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can't remember.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And number one has a documented history of noncompliance, right?

MS. KASO: I would say sure, yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That's what troubles me. Why would that not tip the balance? If you've got someone who we already know doesn't pay particularly good attention to the contractual provisions why wouldn't we want to move on?

> MS. KASO: I would say generally
speaking the committee felt that his noncompliance was not necessarily intentional and was perhaps -- the oversight from the county could have been better, which we're obviously trying to fix going forward.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Did the oversight account for the noncompliance in any way? In other words, was the oversight necessary for the operator to know what the provisions of the contract were and to comply?

```
MS. KASO: I mean, I'm presuming
```
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that he read the agreement and knew what was in it.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So, the answer is that they just did not comply. Knowing what the contractual provisions were they nevertheless did not comply, would that be fair?

MS. KRIEB: So, there's many aspects of the contract. The ones that we brought up today are his lack of public programing, which we know he did programing, maybe not to the extent others would like him to do but as far as the running of a boarding stable, investing over a million dollars in improving it to start with, it was in shambles when he took it over. He was asked to do $\$ 500,000$, he put in million dollars and he still wasn't done.

The people that board their horses there who have stayed with him are very happy with their horses being -- the way they're being kept and fed and exercised. To the extent that we did not, the parks department jointly with the real estate
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department that oversight was not there. But perhaps going forward with our involvement in enforcing and regulating the scheduling of programs that will improve. But basically the intent of him running a boarding stable he was very, very good at and we have found nothing that says that he wasn't.

The fact that he was a little bit
lax in running a program for young children or offering camp or putting our name on a sign that seems not incidental, it's an important, but the important part was that he improved the facility and he's running a boarding stable with many people very happy. There may be a handful that left or were asked to leave but that was not in the contract. That's him operating his business.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: SO, essentially you are saying then that the noncompliance was not central?
MS. KRIEB: A lot of
noncompliance we referred to today was his programing, giving it to the public, which is important because the taxpayers own that
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property but it can be improved.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: You're
satisfied that going forward this will indeed be improved?

MS. KRIEB: Yes, because that's something that we can wrap our hands around and enforce programing. We do it every day. As far as animal care, horse care -LEGISLATOR KOPEL: When you
pointed it out to them have they been responsive?

MS. KRIEB: Yes. And he's
willing to do it and he needs to improve it because it's part of his contract that he has it. And now with one department overseeing it it will be enforced. Especially with the oversight of an outside board.

Also, the people who came on the evaluation committee, of course it was parks people looking at it from an administrative or a business point of view, but the people who sat there from the mounted police and from the SPCA they've dealt all over the industry of horse buying and selling and care and they
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were 100 percent on board with this gentleman.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: As opposed to number two?

MS. KRIEB: He scored higher than number two, yes.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Significantly
so. Okay. Fine. Thank you.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I think
I'd like to call up some members of the public at this point. Christina Tabaco Weber.

MS. TABACO-WEBER: Christina
Tabaco-Weber. I would like Kathleen Kleinman to go first. She will kind of lay the groundwork and I'm happy to speak after her.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That's
fine. Kathleen Kleinman.
MS. KLEINMAN: Good afternoon legislators and thank you for taking the time to listen to our public comments.

I was going to just read my script here which I put together but I'm just going because other items have come up. My focus would be on the historical background of the acquisition and you'll see from my credentials
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where I'm coming from.
But there have been comments about why this operator versus the second ranked operator. There has been talk about oversight, and I just wanted to say that I have a copy here, and Ms. DeRiggi-Whitton was helpful back when we first bought things up, but I have something here from 2013 with standards and so forth that were developed by Suffolk County, which had great critical points for horse care, for operating a horse facility and so forth. Unfortunately, Suffolk County also lacked the appropriate oversight.

So, back three years ago that stable, West Hill Stable known as Sweet Hills in West Hills Park, was the site of a huge toxic dump and it took more than two years to clean it up. That was really due to lack of oversight from Suffolk County. Here we have problems at this particular venue from also lack of appropriate oversight.

So, one thing I want to talk about is the oversight. And oversight is only as good as who is making up that committee.
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While mounted police and Mr. Rogers from the SPCA are informed and good, there really needs to be somebody else. There needs to be somebody who is a boots on the ground person, at least two, perhaps from the stable facility. There needs to be probably somebody from Cornell that you have already tapped into. And there should definitely be a veterinarian.

When I sat in on the pet safe meetings below the county jail for major emergencies and how pets would be handled, Dr. Howard Flynn sat in on all of those and made recommendations and everyone felt pretty comfortable with what he would say.

So, I'm saying oversight is good. Committee members and who sits on them really puts the teeth and the knowledge into what information you're going to get. And it should happen on a pretty regular basis as well. So, I will proceed to my script.

So, I'm Kathleen Kleinman, past president of the Muttontown Horseman's Association. Founding board member of the

Rules - 4-26-21
Nassau Land Trust where I served for 13 years. I served on the Muttontown Preserve Master Plan Committee. I have attended conferences around the country representing the Horseman's Association and the Land Trust. A long-term member of the National Kentucky-based organization Equine Land Conservation Resource.

I'm a practitioner of natural horsemanship myself and over the years I visited and trained at numerous horse facilities ridden trails in various US parklands and foreign countries. These experiences gave me the knowledge of different styles of horse facilities, both public and private.

General industry standards of horsekeeping, health care, best practices, public safety standards, disaster preparedness procedures. Environmental best practices and trends within the equine community and threats to the equine industry. Nassau County has seen a decline in the number of horses living in the county due
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mostly to rapid land development and societal changes resulting in loss of stables and trails. The skyrocketing cost of horsekeeping in the remaining facilities over the last two decades have forced many owners to less costly areas of Suffolk County or give up their pastime entirely. Of course this leads to decreased revenue for Nassau County as well as lost jobs and opportunities for residents to enjoy a wonderful sport with a long history. There was considerable excitement within the equestrian community back in 2008 when the Discount family, with the help of the Nassau Land Trust, successfully navigated the environmental bond application process.

Old Mill was chosen to be purchased for preservation and it was publicly hailed as one of the best acquisitions of the program. In the open space acquisition description of the Old Mill purchase accessible public programs, reasonable boarding costs and close proximity to the Muttontown preserve trail were listed as prime factors in its purchase.
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Other assets were its location as part of the New York State map of underground aquifer recharge basin and the connection to other nearby historical Quaker properties.

That's the rundown, but historic stable was purchased and preserved by Nassau County is wonderful but it has failed to become a magnet for seasoned horsemen and draws very few potential new equestrians. Instead of a being a valuable boost to the waning equine industry of the county, it's being operated as a virtually private high cost show barn. Taxpayer dollars were paid for the bond property that preserved the land while offering little to the public.

And $I$ have to throw in that $I$ was a boarder there and I left about five years ago.

I have repeatedly pointed out that the remedy for this is fairly straightforward but despite extended dialogue with county officials has yet to be properly implemented.

A better industry specific RFP needs to be crafted. Now we talked about the
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improvements to the RFP and the contract and I'll say that there have been some changes. But it may not be as good as it should be without some of the input that I mentioned. Other people will get up and address some of the other items.

But during the last RFP process there was input from a couple of mounted unit members and so forth. We've spoken about that. Needs to be reformulated.

I want to say that the advisory committee having people from the local horse community is not out of the question in that Grossman Farms, now Crossroads Farm, Nassau Land Trust actually put in our RFP response that we would work with the Malverne community, the farm community group that was in existence and was really interested in helping pull the farm together.

And so, I don't see that there is any kind of a problem with having some kind of volunteer, couple of people to help with that.

Collaboration between county
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officials and volunteer advisory committee members could make certain the winning bidder was concerned for animal welfare, kept reasonable boarding costs, promoted opportunities for local trainers, offered multidiscipline levels, scheduled trail rides, partnered with community groups like scouts and first responders.

In addition, I've spoken twice at OSPAC board meetings about the RFP contract and operational issues at NEC. Now, we keep talking about things that need to be remedied. Mr. Russo came in initially in February of 2009. We are now in April of 2021. And there are so many things that we're still not in compliance. He had all that time to work on them. And my friends and I have been in contact with the county about those issues. Despite that, there's still a number of things outstanding. After Suffolk County --

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Ms.

 Kleinman, I would just ask you to wrap up. It's about five minutes per speaker.Rules - 4-26-21
MS. KLEINMAN: Thank you.
Why should you care? Because
Nassau County can and should do better. Please revamp, reissue the RFP, make the contract something that will stick and have something in there that the operator will be supervised by an oversight committee and that it's done on a scheduled basis that is outlined. I feel like soliciting information from qualified industry professionals is key and I don't mean just the mounted police and SPCA. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Now Ms. Tabaco-Weber.
MS. TABACO-WEBER: Hi. Thank
you. Good afternoon. Let me introduce myself. You know my name. I am the current president of the Nassau Suffolk Horseman Association. I'm the past president of the Long Island Dressage and Combine Training Association and I'm also a member of the New York State Horse Counsel. I've been a trainer for 27 years, which is a number I hate to state, here on Long Island. I have taught at
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many barns in Suffolk and Nassau County as the business required.

My question for you is, do you have any questions for me regarding how a training business is operated? Regarding how a boarding business is operated? I have been at many barns, and I can tell you the good and I can tell you the bad. We were talking about, Ms. Krieb was talking about how the horses are well cared for. The horses are well cared for at the majority -- the majority of horses at Nassau Equestrian Center are not directly under Mr. Russo's care.

How the operation works at many barns is a trainer rents a block of stalls, ten, 20, 30, from the owner or in this case from Mr. Russo. Then runs their business underneath. Like they run their business at Nassau Equestrian Center or another barn and that means that they hire the grooms, the people take care of the horses, clean the stalls, feed the horses, turn them out. It also means that they pay for their own hay, grain and shavings for the horses. So that
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the owner of the barn really has no direct need to be involved in the day-to-day care of the horses.

So when New York mounted, sorry, Nassau Mounted and the SPCA go in you're seeing very high-end show horses. These are like the Ferraris and Lamborghinis of the world being cared for at the highest level compared to the majority of horse owners on Long Island. The majority of horse owners on Long Island are not actually wealthy. They, like boat owners, have enough disposable cash to afford a horse but they are in no way wealthy. This horse to them is their form of recreation. It's a living, breathing member of their family like the dogs and cats in your homes.

## Nassau Mounted, with all due

 respect, they have very good ideas about horse care and I agree with it. Their experience is related to how a Nassau mounted horse must be housed and trained and not directly relates to how a commercial boarding operation regarding sport horses and pleasure horses should beRules - 4-26-21
maintained and cared for. And there is a difference how you a treat a mounted horse and what's expected of it is certainly not what a pleasure horse would be exposed to nor a sport horse. And there are differences in how they need to be managed.

To -- I'm going to say it wrong -Ms. Bynoe, to your concerns about how the horses were turned out. I agree 100 percent horses must have turn out. There's concerns about in the winter and stuff like that with ice. That's a whole different concern. But yes, the horses should have regular turnout and exercise.

I would ask that you look at other successful operations both public like DDR Farms currently at West Hills Park where the dumping had taken place in Sweet Hills, was formerly Sweet Hills, and also Lloyd Harbor Equestrian Center located in Caumsett State Park. It is an RFP by the state park. You can look at both of those commercial operations and see on any given day how they're run and how open they are.
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You can look at private
operations. In particular, although Thomas School of Horsemanship in Huntington is closing, it has been for sale, it ran successfully for 70 years. A hugely successful lesson program that I think the majority of people on Long Island are familiar with and many in this area, Nassau and western Suffolk, attended at some point. Their children attend and their grandchildren attend. That would be something you could look at why aren't there public programs.

Both Thomas School and DDR offered programs to Girl Scouts. As far as handicap programs at Nassau Equestrian Center, I will point out there's an excellent facility right around the corner at SUNY Old Westbury called Horseability that deals incredibly well with disabled children of every range.

The other question $I$ have is, when you're discussing again Mr. Russo's repeated violations and failure to comply and certainly when you look at the proposal for this property the original vision and what has come
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about 12 years he's had to put forward public programs. There's no public programs. And I can tell you as president of Nassau Suffolk when I tell people oh, you know you can go ride at Nassau Equestrian Center they're like no, you can't. John never picks up the phone. I've called, I've called. I never get a call back. People are completely unaware that they have the right to bring their horses there, make an appointment, come in, use the trails, use the facilities. No idea at all. If they are, nobody knows that this is open space. Nobody knows that this is available. Again, $I$ 'm urging you to look at other successful operations in the area and how they run their business and say why isn't Nassau Equestrian Center looking like that? Saturday afternoon, coming to this beautiful weather, you should roll down and there should be lessons, there should be leasing, there should be all kinds of activities. And I rolled down on a beautiful spring afternoon and from the road nothing is happening.
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Also, the last point $I$ want to bring up, $I$ understand when the choosing process, the difference between the operator one John and operator two, the second proposal was they didn't pick it because they were buying and selling horses and Nassau County didn't want to be a part of that. Buying and selling horses is a standard business practice for owners to make money. It's part of the business. The boarding operation at the basic level does not bring in the revenue or it does not to the amount that buying and selling a horse does or leasing horses.

Mr. Russo currently offers
leasing. Leasing is a huge generator. There's no difference between leasing and buying. If you have a lesson horse that's falling down the ranks and needs a lesser range of activity and you have a person in your program who would like to buy that horse you're telling me Mr. Russo wouldn't be willing to sell that horse? Buying and selling horses should not be a reason to choose one respondent over another. There's
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no reason that you can't buy and sell horses. People do it all the time from racetrack owners to the backyard person.

I appreciate your time. It's very heartening to hear that you have taken our concerns. We've been going at this for ten years. This is a valid concern. This facility should be a flagship facility. There's the New Jersey Horse Park, Bucks County Horse Park, the Kentucky Horse Park, which ran a national event just this past weekend. There's no reason that Nassau County shouldn't be having something, maybe not a national event yet, but something like that where the county can be proud to say we host Olympians that come in.

And when the RFP is put out it's very difficult to find that only very few people find it. I would like to be able to post it to national organizations. And wouldn't it be wonderful to have somebody who's nationally recognized come in, a nationally recognized trainer to come in and be able to operate out of that facility. To
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have Olympians come in. To have people who have won at the international level come in. Right now nothing like that is happening. Thank you for your time. I really appreciate it.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you very much. Jennifer Armstrong. Sorry. Go ahead Ms. Armstrong.

```
MS. ZWERLING: I'm Robin
```

Zwerling. I've been a rider for over 50 years and a former boarder at Old Mill for over 15 years and I will not return to Old Mills. So I have no personal interest in this. I hope you indulge me because there have been a number of comments that bear on my comments this afternoon. I will try to talk fast and get it all in.

There is a black cloud over this facility. From early 2010, starting with a letter to Mr. Mangano and up to the present, we have alerted the county and most, if not all of you, directly to serious issues and asked for help. But we did get a lot of lip service from the county.
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In May 2016 this binder was submitted to the county at a meeting run by Mr. Walsh of the real estate department. Ms. Krieb was there. I believe Mr. McDermott may have been there as well. I'd have to look at the attendance.

And this binder documents problems that were occurring at Old Mill from the time that Mr. Russo took over until that meeting in 2016. And this much of the binder, I really ask you all to look at it, this much of the documents are documented complaints, correspondence with the county, correspondence with Mr. Russo and proof of the problems at Old Mill. In here is an early fax by Mike Tilly to Mr. Russo with a two-page single space list of problems that Mr. Russo was supposed to address.

Number two was Mr. Russo's threatening and abusive behavior toward boarders. We never heard anything about that. Never heard that Mr. Russo addressed any of these issues.

After our presentations at the May
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2016 meeting Ms. Krieb said we heard you. Now what do you want us to do about it? That was incredible since the county should know what to do about it.

After that meeting we got no feedback and nothing was done that we know of. It was all the status quo. More information, more binders, more correspondence was sent to the county over the years. We pointed out specific instances of violations of the lease and also pointed out specific potential violations that the county should investigate. In fact, we provided a marked-up version of the agreement with comments under certain portions directing their attention can you look at this? Can you answer these questions? But that never happened. That was just status quo.

Now, at the end of this RFP process, in November 2019, at a meeting with Ms. Krieb and Mr. McDermott and others we were told that they recommended that Mr. Russo be awarded this lease again. What was more shocking was that they said that none of our
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prior proof of mismanagement and violations was even considered. And we all have to ask why not? And specifically this binder, the other binders were not considered. And that wasn't in the past. That has to do with his violations over the course of ten years. When we pointed out at that meeting that the IG, inspector general's investigation was ongoing they seemed to act surprised and so they didn't know. Which was unbelievable. The inspector general issued a report and found violations, which she relayed to you, of the prior lease. Most of them were excused away by self-serving statements by Mr. Russo saying oh, we won't do that again and the inspector general didn't address many of the complaints.

I won't go through the failures that the inspector general found but, for example, the reserve fund, no matter what the excuse is, you didn't have one. He violated it.

Now let's look at the issue of the financial reports. In response to a FOIL in
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2014 the county produced only a few reports with inadequate information. At the meeting in 2016 again, the May meeting, we had raised the missing financial reports and the deficiencies in the ones produced. Ms. Krieb was emphatic that the comptroller would never allow that to happen. But it did. And contrary to that contemporaneous information, the inspector general's report says that the information statements were all on file but as Mr. Russo claims --

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Excuse me. Mr. Pulitzer what does that mean?

MR. PULITZER: The five minutes are up sir.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you sir.

MS. ZWERLING: Please indulge me since the county addressed many of these issues.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We will
let you wrap up. We're not going to stop you on a dime but --

```
                                    MS. ZWERLING: I'll speak
```
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faster. I'll try to wrap up. But please indulge me. This was a ten-year situation and I know the county was able to say many things to you. I will speak fast. Thank you. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: No, no ma'am. Please wrap up. MS. ZWERLING: I'll wrap up. Financial reports, the county says they were lost, that they couldn't be found, but then we never heard anything about them.

Someone who oversaw the agreement from 2010 to 2013, someone we never knew the existence of, who claims to recall financial information, who was this person? We don't know. We didn't know anything about him or her.

And the county accepts the financials that state that as -- they accept the financials as true. But at the same time, quote, the operator's books and records lack accuracy, closed quoted.

Let's just talk quickly about the prevailing rate. I am wrapping up. The prevailing rate. We asked in writing were
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prevailing rates paid? What were the prevailing rates for constructing the upper part of the indoor ring? Because the grooms, who shovel manure and take the horses in and out of their stalls, constructed the top part of that indoor ring. Were they supposed to be paid minimum wage? Were they supposed to be paid rates for construction? Were they even allowed to do this? This was never answered by anyone at the county.

Did the inspector general look at any of the payment records for these people? Were there checks? Were the taxes paid? Were they paid in cash? Did you look to see what they were paid? Were they paid minimum wage? The inspector general spoke with Mr. Russo and a few others, but at no time did the inspector general ask any of us questions about our firsthand experience at Old Mill. Those who had submitted all of this proof and more.

In response to the IG report, we submitted, one of us submitted FOILs, that I would also like to have put into the record,
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which asked for specific backup for the IG report. I have also three emails with me that I sent to each legislator and other officials at the county that $I$ would also like to be put into the record.

Now, astonishingly, the RFP review committee has recommended to you to award again the lease to Mr. Russo. And I have to ask you which one of you would sign an agreement --

## LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Okay.

Thank you very much.
MS. ZWERLING: -- with someone
who has violated a prior agreement for ten years?

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Ms.
Zwerling, we appreciate your comments. We gave you time to wrap up. Now, let's hear from some of the other public. Thank you.

Jennifer Armstrong. Before you start, we had extended the time from three minutes to five minutes to give additional time.

```
MS. PEIFFER: I don't think I'll
```
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take that much time.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: As I said, we're not making anyone stop on the dime. Just when they go over just ask them to summarize their comments have some.

MS. PEIFFER: I'm Jacqueline Peiffer, and I submitted this last night about the revenue and I wanted you to have the numbers ahead of time so that you could really walk through this.

My name is Jacqueline Peiffer. I'm a longtime resident of Nassau County. A former boarder for 25 years at Old Mill until I was evicted for speaking to the county and of course the county didn't back me up. So, I have been riding, training and showing horses for over 50 years and managed a farm myself for five years.

As you have heard, there are many
reasons why Nassau County should consider issuing a new RFP, and $I$ am going to try to quickly walk you through the revenue sharing portion. This is a ten-year lease with a five-year option. There are approximately 60
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existing stalls and number of temporary stalls which are not mentioned anywhere that are not included in any calculations. Some barns put up temporary stalls from spring till fall. They rent them out to trainers. New York is a good central location for the showing season. You can show all over the northeast and end up out at the Hamptons.

So, some barns put up these temporary stalls but you don't know about that. He has temporary stalls there now and what he's doing with them $I$ don't know.

The numbers, as you can see, are on page five and six. So, between the second and eighth year Mr. Russo is giving the county $\$ 80,750$ per year. 60 stalls at his basic board rate of 1160. Which somebody told me has now gone to $\$ 1,200$. That $\$ 69,600$ a month in gross revenue times 12 months is $\$ 835,200$. So, he is offering you a little less, about 9.5 percent of those figures.

What he is not including in here is the new 25 stall barn. The new 25 stall barn without question will be a full board barn.
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Right now these trainers are getting these extras. But, unfortunately, two people couldn't be here to tell that you it is the barn that gets the extras. It's not trainers. Chris does not go and groom her clients' horses and give them baths before she gives them a lesson. She gives them a lesson. The barn gets paid to perhaps saddle up the horse, give it a bath, clean it up etcetera. But he's not talking about that. But I'm telling you that this new barn will be $\$ 2,400$ a month. That will be $\$ 60,000$ a month gross revenue times 12 months will be an additional $\$ 720,000$ that he is not speaking about.

In the contract the cost of the barn he is allocated at $\$ 125,000$. So you can see that at $\$ 720,000$ a year that barn can be paid off pretty quickly. This gives you a gross revenue of a $\$ 1,555,200$ yearly which now becomes five percent. He is now actually giving you five percent of gross revenue not the 9.5 percent that he talked about. What is missing here too is the
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loss revenue of lessons. The North Shore Equestrian Center at CW Post, a friend of mine told me they do approximately 100 lessons a week. I used the figure of $\$ 60$ which is the lowest of Mr. Russo's lessons. Group lesson is $\$ 60$. Semiprivate, private more expensive. But I used the least amount.

So, 100 lessons a week at $\$ 60$ is $\$ 6,000$. I said 40 weeks taking off for weather or holidays or whatever. But it's perhaps $\$ 240,000$ a year in revenue you're not entitled to.

Gold Coast leases him -- Lisa Zimmerman was supposed to be here and had something happen -- she told that she does about 160 lessons a week at Gold Coast. At $\$ 60$ that's $\$ 9,600$ a week. Again, $\$ 384,000$ a year you're not in that.

Nassau County does maybe a handful of lessons a week because they don't answer the phone, they don't return phone calls and they don't want to be giving lessons because their private boarders want a nice, quiet facility for themselves and their horses. So
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you are losing all of the special programs. He's had ten years to develop programs. We would have loved to have clinics. We would have loved to have Olympic riders come in and do demonstrations and talk to us. Which other barns all over Nassau, Suffolk County do things like that. He's had ten years to develop that. Zippo.

So, one thing that people haven't spoken to a whole lot about here today is the RFP. I just want to go through that quickly. When you were asking these proposers to make a recommendation to share revenue with the county you failed to mention in the RFP that the indoor ring was staying. In fact, the day of the walk-through, also Nancy Henderson is out of state, she was one of the proposers, she was told specifically, she turned to one of the county employees and said can I build additional stalls? She was told explicitly you may not build additional stalls. Don't even think about it.

She said Jackie, I put 40 stalls in the proposal anyway. Mr. Russo put in 25.
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She said if I'd known I could put in 25 you think I would have put in 25? I didn't know. Nobody spoke to her. It says in the RFP that you're supposed to be notified if there are any changes to the RFP. She was never notified.

So, not only did they not know about the indoor ring was staying, which is year-round revenue, they didn't know any number of stalls. People just put in that number because they just put it in and took a shot at it. But they did not know. Is the number 25? Is the number 50? What if somebody wanted to proposed 50 stalls? Would you accept that? Nobody knew what to put in. So how do you calculate your revenue when you don't know what is allowed?

This RFP was biased to begin with, and that's why we are asking you please to rewrite a new RFP. It would only take 60 days. Rewrite the RFP. Put all the information in. You've got 30 days to do another walk-through.

Oh, Nassau County never interviewed
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anybody. They made assumptions about buying and selling horses. Everybody buys and sells horses. They made assumptions without once speaking to any one of the proposers about what was their vision for Nassau County. What is it that they would do differently. Okay? One of the proposers is famous for having programs every single week at his barn. You never spoke to anybody.

So we're asking you, bottom line is we're asking you to please take 90 days. Give everybody all the information and let's really get an honest proposal on the table.

And when you have the review committee, please not just Nassau County employees and mounted police that only know how to do mounted police. Let's have somebody from the equestrian community. We can offer you veterinarians. We can offer you people like Christina and Kathleen. We have all kinds of people that can give you an informed -- help to educate you as to what is needed in a public stable. Okay? That's bottom line. That's what we are asking for.
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Tell me please, how come we filed two different FOILs in 2013 and 2016 and in all that time they came up with five pieces of financial information. Couldn't find anything. Showed me the box. Sorry, not here. But mysteriously he was allowed to recreate all of his missing financials.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Next speaker.
MS. ARMSTRONG: I am Jennifer
Armstrong. I'm not a professional equestrian. I am a resident of Nassau County. I live in Manhasset today. I was born and raised in Nassau and I have been at Old Mill Farms since I was 12. I've ridden there all during high school. I left for college. I came back to riding. I've been at Brookville Farms. I was at Jericho Stalls. In the last ten years I was at Old Mill Farms again until the last three years.

Everybody here has acknowledged some of the things that have gone wrong with this RFP and so forth. But what's really troubling and why I'm here and I can tell you
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I have been there. I have watched some programs. There were summer camps years ago. There are no summer camps. There are no ponies for anybody to ride. I have had friends try to call and get lessons for kids. There's only one trainer there. She belongs to Somerset and she trains her students and they all ride under her. That's the way this barn is managed.

It looks beautiful because the grooms and the people who work on those horses work for Somerset, not for the county and not for John Russo.

Why hasn't the public had full use of this property? Especially the residents of Nassau County? After all the material that has been submitted it is clear that the residents over the years and the mishandled financials have had no effect on the committee that has brought this RFP forward.

The effect of the current
management, most of the property and the stalls today are leased to Somerset. They might pay John Russo for the stall. They
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charge an extra $\$ 1,000$ for what we call all-out boarding. They get the stall. They pay John Russo for the stall and their grooms do full boarding. They wash the horses. They tack them up. They get them ready for lessons and they take care of them. We go there and lease the same stall. We take care of our own horses and we'd like to take lessons from other trainers but there are no trainers because they were kicked out when Somerset came to Nassau County.

Somerset used to ride over at Old Westbury all the time and her sister rides up at Half Moon. So I don't know why she left Old Westbury but they came to John Russo. Those horses are handled by Somerset and it essentially cuts off all the use of the property to the general public. We are not allowed to use that indoor. We waited for it to be built. We watched it being built and after she came we couldn't use it until three o'clock in the afternoon.

The county needs to take some accountability for this. You have some
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responsibility for letting these violations continue and be mishandled. And clearly, it was not the intention under why the property was being bought for that the county has the responsibility to insure the safety and the access for the general public.

John Russo has cut this property off to the public and the ability for it to offer horsemanship and leadership skills to this all socioeconomic groups of Nassau County and the surrounding area.

My horse was injured when $I$ was out of town and he had to be stall bound for six months. I couldn't move him out of NEC because it was the middle of January. So NEC, after six months, was unable to assist with any rehab. I paid Somerset for one month to walk him five minutes in the morning and five minutes at night. It was never done. I left under the advice of the Ruffian Equestrian Center that the horse should be removed. I never thought that I couldn't come back. I was gone for seven months. I never was asked to reserve my stall or where the horse was
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going.
Upon my return, upon the horse's return, of March of 2018 I tried to contact John Russo by phone, by text. I went up there in person. He was never around. I have my phone. You can give it to the FBI. You can see every text that $I$ wrote to him. I said give me an answer. I never got an answer from him.

Since I couldn't contact Mr. Russo, I contacted my congressman, Tom Suozzi. I said you go ask Mr. Russo if $I$ can come back since you bought the property for Nassau County. He did. He came back and he told me the derogatory statements that Mr. Russo had to say. They were offensive. I wonder why -I see my time is up. You would have no idea if this man would ever say anything if I wasn't a woman.

What's more concerning to me is when I explain my grievances to the investor general Dan Schlayer he clearly ignored Mr. Russo's comments to me by stating we know that John Russo has no people skills. So I
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ask you, how does it happen that you see someone who hasn't lived up to his current contract, he has no people skills and that you want to give back this RFP and give him another contract?

What we are asking for today again, I'm the fifth person to say it, with all the other excuses of COVID and everything else and it's taking you two years to give him another contract why you don't reissue an RFP under the conditions of what needs to be done to this property for the use of the public? Thank you for your time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you.
MS. ARMSTRONG: I'd also like to submit to you a 17-page contract which you get from the Lloyd Harbor Equestrian Center which tells you exactly everything that you pay for and who gets it and who it will be done by.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Don Giorgio.
MR. GIORGIO: Good afternoon
everybody. I won't take too long because I'm
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sure you all want to go home. It's the end of the day. I'm going to start also saying with my conclusion that it's essential that Nassau County allow a new RFP take place that's accurate, that has all the bases covered and is very explanatory as far as what to do. Let me state first that I'm a Nassau County resident since 1967. I'm a rider for over 40 plus years in the equestrian community. Just to give you a little bit more background about me. I ride as an amateur competitively and I'm ranked number eight in the country as an amateur. So, I do come with experience. That would be nice if somebody asked me my experience with regard to an equestrian center and how it should be run. Because I did run an equestrian center, Calumet Equestrian Center itself, 13 years a 60 acre facility that did service physically challenged people. That did service seniors. That did service veterans. Not just lip service like you've been given.

For me, I also own three horses at the same time. Which is why I work full time

Rules - 4-26-21
because I got to pay for them. I'm not a professional.

Old Mill is a magnificent property
in a magnificent location that would allow access to so many people, so many programs and so much opportunity for the county to have a jewel of an equestrian property. It's not right now.

You have instead 12 years of
failure. Twelve years of not meeting the potential of what if could be. That's sad. It's underexecuted as a property and underutilized as a property. I tried myself to call and ask for a stall. The cell phone I suspect that is -- I'm sorry -- the phone number that is there $I$ suspect is a cell phone number that belongs directly to the vendor. I don't believe there's any official landline for somebody to call. I do have friends that have called and crying about lessons and, as the others have said, there's never a phone call back.

So, from a perspective of public access let me say what it should be, what it
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can be. But you can't know what you don't know. You can't know what you're missing unless you've been informed. I respect the mounted police. I respect the SPCA. I respect the Parks Department but they don't know a commercial boarding facility. They don't know a performance horse. A horse that goes out and competes. They don't know lessons programs. So how can be they be the arbiter as well of what they don't know? It's impossible.

So, what is missing? What's missing is public access. Where I board, Lloyd Harbor Equestrian Center, which is 25 miles from my house, because there's nothing in Nassau County and believe me I would love to be in Nassau County, 25 miles from my horse, is a large sign that you can't miss, you can hit your car with it and you still wouldn't damage the sign, that says it's public property. It's very clear that it's there. So, there's a sign missing.

You need programs for physically challenged, mentally challenged. You need
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clinics that teach riding, that educate people in riding because there's no new riders coming into the environmental. Without new riders the property will ultimately fail. We're not fostering new riders. You need school horses that allow you to do that program. And most importantly, you need a safe environment.

To mention what one of your concerns are, I belong to United States Equestrian Federation as does every serious rider. Under the United States Equestrian Federation you must take safe sport courses that deal specifically with children and their safety. And if you fail the course you cannot compete. And you take the course every year. I would love to see that these people at Old Mill take the course like every registered United States Equestrian Federation member does. But they're not members. It's a private facility relegated to 40 people, 50 people when this facility should be servicing hundreds of people a month. Thousands of people a year. That's not what happening. It's underutilized and underexecuted.
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So, in going there, you guys don't have a clear vision of what can be. You need assistance. You need advice. You need guidance to know what you don't know so that people that are well intentioned, like the mounted police and the parks department, don't lead this property down a path historically of underutilized and underexecuted. And we don't find ourselves waiting year and a half for a facility to be improved to what it should be.

And having other people mask as vendors for the property is something the county should be aware of. Because it did come out in the Office of the Inspector General's rules there was another facility being paid along with John Russo and that did get rectified. So, it's like your hand got shown after the fact and you changed your hand to make it look better.

I know you are all smarter than that. I know you all want this to be a jewel of a property. I would love to be there as a Nassau County resident but unfortunately I can't be because I don't get phone calls
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back. And it's not a facility, from what I have heard, that I would want to board at. So I don't care who runs the facility. I really don't. It's not my bias interest. What I want to see is the county have a vision plan like a Robert Moses and know exactly what it can be and what it should be. A safe environment for children, a great environment for the equestrian community and a jewel for Nassau County to celebrate to the equestrian community and all the residents of Nassau. So I thank you for your time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you
sir. I have some questions. Commissioner Krieb.

Thank you very much we appreciate it.

Or Victoria. Was there anyone from the equestrian community as part of the committee that looked at this?

MS. KRIEB: No. Just what Victoria advised you. There were members of the parks department, two from the mounted police and one from the SPCA. But all the
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information that had been gathered during our discussions has been taken into account and the RFP process as well as incorporated into the new contract.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: It does sound as if Mr. Russo deliberately wanted to exclude programing from what he was doing. People repeatedly said he didn't answer his phones. The IG's report has substantiated there was no programing. This is a public facility. Shouldn't programing, or as Mr. Giorgio mentioned, lessons be front and center of a public property?

MS. KRIEB: Yes. As we mentioned before, that is the responsibility to provide that service. That's one of his many services.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Right. It's one of many services but again it's a public property. So that has to be one of the prime services. It's troubling that that's his history. It's troubling that if we go forward with this contract for the next ten years he's going to relapse into what he was
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doing before. If he's making more money with his business operation without bringing members of the public in, without bringing in programs for the disabled, without doing lessons, he's going to go back to doing that. MS. KRIEB: But the oversight committee did not exist. He was pretty much on his own out there. With the oversight committee, and again, it's not limited to the members that are mentioned, other members of the equestrian community can be included or will be included. That's not a closed door on the number of people that can sit on the committee. So, with some oversight I believe his arm will be forced to provide those services.

And the other thing I wanted to bring up is the funding that was brought up before his minimum is what's stated in the contract. But nine and a half percent of gross is what he's going to provide to the county. So any program or aspect of programing that he brings, including the additional structure, we're entitled to nine

Rules - 4-26-21
and a half percent of gross not the number that's in the contract. That's a minimal that he would have to give us.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: In terms of the bidding of the contract did the bidders know the numbers of stalls that were available?

MS. KRIEB: Yes. There was an amendment. There was a question and answer time when they could do a walk through and there was an amendment provided, and Tori can attest to that, that included the -- correct? I think the amendment clarified that, correct?

MS. KASO: Yes. Off the top of my head I do believe that the amendment that was issued after the walk-through where any verbal questions may have been erroneously answered would have been clarified in the amendment.

MS. KRIEB: That clarification is
included in the IG's report that the amendment was issued and clarification was given.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Do you
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want to speak to that Jodi?
MS. FRANZESE: Those issues are clarified in the report. There was an addendum. There was an allegation that the RFP didn't have the number of existing stalls. It was a vague RFP. We did find that the number of existing stalls was included in the addendum. And the one vendor who didn't actually receive the addendum indicated to the IG's office that they counted the stalls at the walk-through so they knew how many stalls were there, if that helps at all.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: What would the timeline for a rebidding of this?

MS. KASO: Well, I believe the official recommendation in our procurement policy is 18 month lead time for a new contract to start the RFP process and get it finalized.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The
recommendation is 18 months?
MS. KASO: To get the process started. Obviously this would be a little bit shorter because we have a little bit of the
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preparation done. But, I personally, unless this was literally the only thing I focused on for the next two months, two months is a very, very -- we have to submit our contracts for your review with a decent amount of lead time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: One of the
things that was indicated was there was a boarder who complained or sought to complain or did complain to the county was then evicted. Did that ever come to the attention of the county? Obviously there were issues. But was somebody evicted because they complained to the county as far as you know?

MS. KRIEB: No. Not that I know of. I know that Mr. Russo asked some of his tenants as they are attesting to were asked to leave the facility. But no, we weren't aware of that. That was part of his business practice.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Anyone
have any follow-up questions?
MS. TABACO-WEBER: One thing I
failed to mention and should bring to your attention that Mr. Russo ran the Lloyd Harbor
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Equestrian Center, it wasn't called that, up at Caumsett State Park, that's a state RFP, he ran that and was denied when he bid in again. He also ran the park facility in Suffolk County Park now known as DDR Farms and before that it was Sweet Hills. He ran that as well and rebid and was denied. I would ask you to consider why if he was so great at what he did he was denied?

I can also say $I$ was at this
walk-through for the county for this last bid and I was there when they told them you are not allowed to go in the indoor arena. That was said. The indoor arena is not staying. There's two residences on the property. One is a mobile home and one is I guess a cottage you can call it. The prospective bidders were not allowed to go into either one of those to look to see the condition of them and would it be suitable for housing for staff.

The walk-through was completely
rushed and we were urged quickly go from place to place to place. If you're spending a
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quarter of a million or half a million dollars and ten years of your time -- and by the way, if you're bringing 40 horses from a facility that's a major undertaking that you have to consider. You want to go to the walk-through, you want to see the condition of the stables. Does this need repair? Do I need to do that? No. No. Quickly. That's how it was conducted.

When we say the walk-through was rushed and the respondents were swinging to get this place and Mr. Russo was still allowed. Again, please, we're begging you reissue the $R F P$. It should not take 18 months. Most of the work has already been done. Thank you for your time.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO:
Commissioner or Victoria, did anyone check his prior history out, Mr. Russo? Obviously he has a history of operating facilities and then not being brought back. It's really troubling.

MS. KRIEB: I'm not sure. I
imagine that Caumsett had a bidding process
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like we do. He could have lost the bid. I have no idea why he didn't return. He also has a brother I think that's in the business. Again, $I$ don't know the details. But it was a bidding process I'm sure that the state had at Caumsett.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Legislator Bynoe and Schaefer have questions.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you
Presiding Officer. Commissioner, the questions are going to be for you. You stated that you didn't know about anyone being evicted from Old Mills or NEC for having spoken to the county. You didn't know of any retaliatory behavior by Mr. Russo. But you said --

MS. KRIEB: The information that we had and the tenants being asked to leave came through conversation with the tenants when they met with real estate and parks. During our own conversations I wasn't aware of any kind of retaliation.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But then you stated that it was his business practice.
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MS. KRIEB: He's running a
business. So it's his own preference if he's asking people to stay or leave. We weren't involved in any of that. The county wasn't involved in the daily operation of his business. So for whatever reason if people left or new tenants come or they stay we're not involved in that aspect.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Of a public facility they're being asked to leave because it could appear retaliatory.

MS. KRIEB: We weren't aware of any of that being retaliatory. From what I hear from other people, and again, it's sort of rumored, it was relationships, business relationships that didn't work.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Does the contract have anything in there that protects whistleblowers or individuals with retaliatory --

MS. KRIEB: I must refer to
Dennis for a second.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I think that's important.
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MR. MCDERMOTT: I'm sorry
legislator. There is language having to do with the advisory committee that if anyone has any complaint they bring it to the advisory committee who can review it, interview witnesses, conduct a hearing and make a determination that the operator is required to follow. So, if someone was evicted, and again, without knowing what his permit is, his permit may say I can evict you for any reason for 30 days much the county permit has --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: We should have some protections for whistleblowers.

MR. MCDERMOTT: I'm not arguing that. But if there is a complaint under the new agreement, if it's not resolved I believe it's either within seven or 14 days, it will go to the advisory committee who will take the complaint, do some research, speak with outside people if they need be like Cornell and they'll make a decision that will be binding on the operator.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Again,
whistleblower clause needs to be in there. I
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just want to address one other thing.
Commissioner, you mentioned and you stated the horses were treated well and the care of the animals --

MS. KRIEB: Again, I only know that because we had the experts there. I'm a dog person.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Then you mentioned that all these other issues are incidental and I actually disagree with that.

MS. KRIEB: I didn't say they were incidental. I said that there as important and they're not incidental.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I think folks not being fingerprinted and knowing that it was required and exposing young people to individuals without any vetting I think is --

MS. KRIEB: His staff that worked around minors should have been fingerprinted.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I think that's a deal breaker for me, that's the deal breaker, along with some of the other issues that have been raised today. I'm really concerned about that. That's a serious
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violation, and I think that we talked about safe horse course and some other stuff that should be in play. I can't support this. I can't support this, this item.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Legislator Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you.
I don't know if you would know this Commissioner Krieb. I thought I had heard Mr. Russo had also had another stable somewhere in Babylon. I don't know if anybody's familiar with that.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Russo does
own Babylon Stables. His family owns it and his brother runs it now.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: How long has that been for, do you know? Have they owned it for?

MS. ARMSTRONG: They've owned it for a very long time.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I don't
know if Commissioner Krieb would know or if actually one of the woman here would know how many school horses they have there?
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MS. ARMSTRONG: I was probably the last person there boarding. They don't have any school horses. He might have two. He has two boarders there whose father was in horsemanship for a very long time who also gives lessons every once in a while. They're both very ill now but the two horses are still up there and he uses them sometimes in the summer program.

The majority of the boarders belong to Somerset. There are no -- you don't have to worry about the lessons and the kids because there are no lessons. There's only one trainer up there. I was there. I had one trainer who left. I had Chris who was thrown out. And he said to me you can have Holiday as your trainer. Her and Lisa run Somerset. I said okay. I was paying $\$ 75$ for a lesson. I lesson. I go to some shows and I trail ride. That's what I like to do for enjoyment when I'm not working on Wall Street.

The fact of the matter is, I got a discount from Holiday to have a $\$ 90$ lesson from her. She was always busy because she had
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her kids. I understand these kids want to get, you know, into college and ride their horses. She does the buying and selling not Mr. Russo. She gets horses. She leases them out to clients.

You know how kids ride. They buy all this stuff and they quit. Then somebody else they want a bigger horse. They buy and sell horses. That's what trainers do. That's what Somerset does on this property. The majority of those stalls belong to Somerset.

There are some boarders that are left there. The Fallons are still there. Michael and his wife are still there I know and he has a few. He has sometimes a different trainer come in and it depends on who he likes. That's how he runs his barn today.

## LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Does anyone

 know how many employees are there? Commissioner would you know?MS. ARMSTRONG: He only had two grooms there that worked. When I was there he had two grooms that worked for him. Those are
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the two grooms that put up the indoor.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: How many horses would they be responsible for taking care of in stalls?

MS. ARMSTRONG: They might have five or six or seven. It depends on how many horses he had. But Somerset pays four or five grooms to take care of all their horses.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you.
MR. MCDERMOTT: Legislator, just to make one quick clarification about the trainers. The new agreement states that the operator has to make reasonable time available at their premises to any certified instructor based in Nassau County so that the instructor may give lessons to their clients who are boarders at the premises. And he can't charge more for those outside license than he does for his own.

So if any of these women do end up boarding there and they have an outside trainer they can bring the trainer on.

MS. HORST: I'm sorry Legislator
Schaefer, I don't mean to interrupt your
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questioning, but Presiding Officer, in light of all of the debate today and all of the questions the administration is asking that this not be called or moved forward so we can get all the questions answered and get back to you at a later date.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you and that's exactly what we were going to do. Ma'am, I think we've had enough for today. Ma'am no. We're going to move to table the item. That's what you want, right? Sometimes it's better not to have additional comments because you're getting what you want at this point.

Motion to table by Legislator
Schaefer. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Thank you. Carries unanimously. The item is tabled.

Thank you all for your patience in waiting all afternoon. Jodi, thank you very much.

$$
\text { A-32, } 2021 \text { is a resolution }
$$

authorizing the commissioner of shared
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services to award and execute a purchase order between the county of Nassau acting on behalf of the Nassau County Police Department and Video Hi-Tech Equipment Corp. d/b/a Adwar Video.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads.
Seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. That item is before us.

Thank you Inspector Field for your patience.

MR. FIELD: Thank you for hearing this today. Deputy Inspector William Field, police department.

Item A-32-21 is a purchase order between the county and Video Hi-Tech Corporation doing business as Adwar Video. They are going to assist us in installing and furnishing the Nassau County Police Department's training center and new police academy. The installation includes projector, projector screens, audio speakers, cabling and other electronics.

There were four bids received. The vendor with the lowest bid was disqualified.

```
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The maximum amount authorized under this purchase order is \(\$ 1,706,985.67\). It is capital and grant funded. That's it.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any questions? I think we're good. Appreciate it. Again, thanks for your patience hanging out all day.
MR. FIELD: Thank you very much.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Any debate
or discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Carries unanimously.
Motion to adjourn. Legislator
Rhoads makes that. Legislator Schaefer seconds it. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye. Those opposed? We're adjourned.
(Committee was adjourned at 5:30
p.m.)
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> 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.
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