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PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All
right. I'm going to call the meeting of
the Nassau County Legislature to order. Ladies and gentlemen, please rise as Minority Leader Abrahams leads us in the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Whereupon, the Pledge of
Allegiance is recited.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Mr. Clerk, could you please call the roll?

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Roll call, June 28:
Deputy Presiding Officer Howard Kopel?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Alternate Presiding officer Denise Ford?

LEGISLATOR FORD: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Thank you.
Legislator Siela Bynoe?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.


CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Carrie
Solages?
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Debra Mule?

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator C.
William Gaylor, III?
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Present.
CLERK PULITZER: Thank you.
Legislator Vincent Muscarella?
LEGISLATOR MUSCARELLA: (No
response.)
CLERK PULITZER: We'll come back.
Legislator Ellen Birnbaum?
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Here
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Delia
Deriggi-Whitton?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator James
Kennedy?
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Tom McKevitt?


LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Laura
Schaefer?
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator John
Ferretti?
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Arnold
Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Rose Walker?

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Joshua
Lafazan?
LEGISLATOR LAFAZAN: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Steven
Rhoads?
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
CLERK PULITZER: Minority Leader
Kevan Abrahams?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Vincent Muscarella?


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He is away.

CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you.

As another sign that things are getting back to normal, we are going to be resuming a tradition we have here of honoring our top cops each month at our legislature meetings.

Today we have three honorees, police officers from the First Precinct. I would ask Legislator Steve Rhoads, to introduce our Top Cops. Actually, I'm going to withdraw that. I invite them up. I'm not sure who is here from Police Benevolent Association to do the presentation, but I invite you to come and do that.

MR. MULLICK: Good afternoon, everybody. Kevin Mullick, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Nassau County Police Benevolent Association.

James McDermott wasn't able to make it today, so I'm honored to present the Top Cops for June, 2021.

On March 25, 2021 at approximately
1600 hours First Precinct Officers Ryan
Phillips, Patrick McGrath, and Joseph Tuffarelli were assigned to Patrol within the confines of Wantagh when they were assigned to a call for an emotionally disturbed person.

The complainant, a social worker, called 9-1-1, stating that he received a phone call from an emotional distressed male who expressed intent to harm himself. The subject also stated that he intended to harm responding Officers.

Upon their arrival, Officers made contact with the subject via a department issued cell phone. They explained to the subject that they were there to help him. The subject agreed to come outside with his hands in the air to ensure the safety of everyone involved, but when the subject exited the home, officers
immediately observed that the subject was armed with a large hunting knife in his right hand. The subject refused multiple verbal commands to drop the knife. The subject then walked toward the officers with the large hunting knife. Officers retreated in an attempt to maintain a safe distance from the subject.

Officers Phillips and McGrath
pointed their tasers at the subject while continuing to give verbal commands. The subject continued to walk towards the officers ignoring their verbal commands and ignoring their verbal commands to drop the knife.

At this time, Officer McGrath
deployed his taser at the subject, but the taser was not effective. Officer Phillips then deployed his taser successfully, incapacitating the subject and allowing fellow Officer Tuffarelli to take the subject into custody without further incident. The subject was then transported to a mental health facility

so he could receive the help that he needed.

Due to their quick thinking and excellent tactics, the officers were able to take the subject into custody without further incident or injury. At a serious risk to their own personal safety, the officers were able to diffuse a violent situation.

The PBA is proud to name Police Officers Ryan Phillips, Patrick McGrath and Joseph Tufarelli as its Legislative Top Cops for June of 2021 (applause).

POLICE COMMISSIONER RYDER: First of all, it's great to see everybody back and back up here where we are discussing good positive stories done by our men and women in law enforcement.

All the tools that you give them and all the resources and the support that you give them is why that was a successful conclusion. The training we now do about deescalation, our new mental health crisis response that is underway,
and the processes about keeping and making sure that we get those that needed treatment, not prison, treatment. That is what we've been doing and the officers did an outstanding job using the tactics they were taught in the police academy. Again, it is thanks to all of you and supporting us and making sure we have tools to do that job and a thanks to the training they get at the academy.

We now have our new building and new class up and running, but it is also thanks to the three men that stand behind me for what they did that night, taking the time to respect the life of another and then using the proper tools that were given to them so we have a great successful conclusion.

Congratulations to them and, again, thank you very much (applause).

OFFICER PHILLIPS: Hello, my name is Ryan Phillips. I would just like to thank -- well, this is a great honor to be here right now.

I would like to thank the Nassau County Legislators, the PBA, and the President James McDermott and Police Commissioner Ryder. This is a great honor and it's really nice to get the recognition from all of you. Thank you. (Applause.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you very much, Presiding Officer.

I just want to say, I'm so happy that you are here today and we are back in a position where can again celebrate the remarkable achievements and accomplishments of so many of the outstanding police officers that we have here in the Nassau County Police Department.

One of the most discouraging things that we've seen over the course of the last year is that there are elements of society that are attempting to turn our police officers who are out there to
protect and serve the public everyday into public enemies instead of the public heros that they are.

Every profession has those individuals who don't live up to those ideals, but the vast majority, 99\%, almost completely, are police officers like yourselves that are out there doing their job every single day putting their lives at risk to help save lives and to help keep people safe and to protect our communities. So getting back to Legislative Top Cops as a legislature, gives us the opportunity that you won't see on the front page of Newsday or the Daily News, that is celebrate those accomplishments, say thanks to all police officers that do such a tremendous job. This is beautiful example of exactly what we're talking about.

You know, here you are presented with someone who wanted to take your lives, and instead of reacting to the situation negatively, you relied upon
your training, you relied upon your discretion, you relied upon your heroism and your judgement to take a step back, right? When someone came after you with a knife, you retreated to maintain a safe distance. When he wouldn't drop the knife, instead of going for a gun, you went for a taser which is the training that you received, making, again, the right to decision to preserve and protect the the life of somebody who was perfectly willing to take yours, but you used discretion to save his life, get that individual the help that he needed and at the same time, protect the public from someone who was emotionally disturbed and dangerous, not only to himself, but to the community around him. These are the types of actions that go on every single day, not just here at the Nassau County Police Department, but in all police departments all across the country. These are the things that we should be talking about.


And, yes, absolutely, we had an involved and appropriate discussion about reforms and ways that we could do things better, but we should never forget that there are people out there who wear the uniform of our county and wear police uniforms, law enforcement uniforms, all across the country who are out there doing their very best putting their lives on the line to keep us safe. That's the thing that we need to keep in mind and we need to celebrate.

Officer Phillips, Officer McGRath, and Officer Tufarelli, I want say on behalf of the Legislature and on behalf of the people of Nassau County, thank you for your heroism. Thank you for what you did, not only to save this life, but to save countless others, potentially, from someone who is truly dangerous and get them the help that they needed.

So God bless you for what you do every single day, and God bless all of Our Nassau County Police Officers for the


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Next is the Public Comment portion of our meeting.

I would like to invite Brian Sullivan, the president of Nassau County Correction Officer's Benevolent Association.

MR. SULLIVAN: Good afternoon, everyone. I'll give everybody a chance to get settled after that very nice event, nice ceremony. Obviously, that was a great event for the police department. Glad to see that. I plan to do something similar in the future with our correction officers.

I'm Brian Sullivan, President of the Nassau County Correction Officer's Benevolent Association for the record.

Before I get started, the thing I want to speak to about the Capital Plan, the Capital Budget, I can't help myself. With the Commissioner speaking about training and deescalation techniques and
mental health training; wow, what a concept. I wonder what that's like, but that's for another budget meeting.

I'm here representing Nassau County Correction Officers and I am here, as I said, to speak on the Capital Plan. I have stood and spoken here on countless occasions regarding the infrastructure problems we face at the correctional facility: Crumbling buildings, numerous electrical and plumbing problems, locksmithing issues, HVAC, lighting, mold, dilapidated vehicles, etcetera. I've also spoken here numerous times about the Jail Master Plan, usually a six year Jail Master Plan that is designed to alleviate and correct all of these issues. I've had several meetings with the last several jail administrations. Plans have been discussed. Pie-in-the-sky ideas of building chilled water plants to use for air conditioning and heating, putting up new buildings, etcetera. They're all great ideas, but
$\qquad$
they're all fantasies. None of that's ever happening any time soon at the jail because nobody wants to invest in correctional facilities.

We currently have an architectural
design firm after years of discussion touring our facilities doing an overview of our place along with a firm that reviews criminal justice initiatives and alternatives, etcetera. This same group actually are the same ones that did the studies of closing Ryker's Island in the City and building high-rise borough based alternatives with boutique shops and restaurants below them. Why we're exploring these avenues is a mystery to me because that's another fantasy. It's not happening here, it's certainly not going to be happening in New York City any time soon.

I fought for years to get out HVAC issues fixed in our facility, all while new precincts were built in Nassau County, parks were rebuilt, a new Social

Services building was built, and as we spoke of at last year's budget meeting, a new property building is being built for the police department along with a training academy that we're involved with.

It took years to address our major HVAC issues (heating/ventilation/air conditioning). Many were finally completed so our staff didn't have to work in a correctional environment in stifling heat, but we still have over 60 air conditioning units that are still in need of replacement in many areas of our facility.

Like every year in budgets, from our perspective, the police department asks for dollars and they get it; they deserve it. They deserve every penny they get. We ask for pennies and we get salt. Going back to the entire Sposato administration as continues now, we cannot get our infrastructure problems adequately addressed or lined up no
$\qquad$
matter what we do. I'm not sure what we need to do to get these things rolling, as we see new buildings and initiatives being done all around the County.

We all know no one wants to invest money into correctional facilities, especially in today's climate with so many of our elected leaders in the state looking to release dangerous criminals loose on the public everyday and put the criminal justice system out of business.

But you know what? This is also a social issue inside our jails. Before, it used to be, who wants to make criminals and our jails comfortable? We don't need to put money into jails. Let's just pay the salaries and what it needs to run them.

But it's much more than that. Environment dictates safety in our facilities: Heat creates tension; neglect creates liability and security risk -- severe security risks. Please remember -- and I know everyone here

does, but $I$ want to say it for the record
-- that we have over 1,000 of our Nassau
County employees working in these
dilapidated buildings that have numerous safety and security concerns,
particularly since now we are only housing the worst of the worst inmates because through bail reform, the lesser crimes -- some of them not so lesser -are released out onto the streets.

I know not everything is going to get fixed at once. Look how long it's taken us to get issues addressed that I spoke of like the ACs vehicles that were finally purchased after years of neglect and debate. We continue to have vehicle fleet problems that create safety and security concerns. The issue is, where do we start?

I just want to read you a quick, if you'll indulge me:
"...Facility Capital Repairs that
are at the top of the list - - there are several others -- but at the top of the

list our 832 Building, named because it has 832 cells in it, copper lines for domestic water lines are currently being held together with clamps and rubber gaskets due to inferior copper installation;

Waterproofing at B. D. in the 832
Building, the inability to maintain
temperatures. There is a 70-year-old hot water tank that hasn't been replaced in our B Building; 70 years old;

Number one on the list is the 832
building roof. Currently, roofing is 15 years old pending Department of Public Works resolution, I'll get into that in a second;

There is fencing that separates us from the old folks home in the Knolls. That fencing was installed in 1992, it's outlived its use for life and is now a security concern. Senior citizens living next door to the jail;

As I spoke about, HVAC;
A fire alarm upgrade. We are at end
of life on compute and nodes that were submitted in 2014. They are unable to service all of the troubles in our fire alarm systems;

Community sirens to restore community alerts for the surrounding areas haven't been replaced;

Parking lot, things like that, we need topcoats;

Additionally, from our logistical support unit itself, if you'll allow me, we used to have back in the year 2000, 68 mechanics working in the jail. We currently have 20 people in our
logistical support unit, of which 14 are actual mechanics, trained mechanics;

We have over 2,000 toilets and
showers to maintain. We currently have 150 cells out of service in the plumbing and HVAC. Due to us having no one working in the HVAC field on staff, we have to utilize outside contractors on almost a daily basis;

The next trade of importance is
electricians. We have three on extended leave due to injuries. One has been here for 40 years and is going to soon retire. That leaves us currently with one. In a facility of this size, people like electricians are indispensable during especially extreme weather-related events;

The jail currently, and for the last couple of years, has no locksmiths. How many locks and keys do you think are in a correctional facility? We have no actual certified locksmiths on staff at the correctional facility. We have other maintenance men that make due;

The importance of maintaining mechanics at the correctional center is extremely urgent. Not only do they provide mechanical things -- electrical, plumbing -- they are also responsible for removing snow, doing laundry for the inmates, supplies, etcetera;

The County has over 160 vehicles in our fleet. We currently have two garage
$\qquad$
mechanics, one of which is out on extended leave;

Lastly, we have no welders. The jail is full of bars, full of metal, full of everything like that and we don't have any welders on staff.

With this said, all of these things need to be prioritized. They have been prioritized. The mantra here for years and years has been no money, no money, no money. Plus, we're behind the wall so who sees it. The only one ranting and raving is me here. With an appointed sheriff, he can't stand up here and rant and rave, like $I$ do, and bring attention to what people don't see behind the scenes, so, unfortunately, that job falls to me.

I have to bring special attention to the roofing issue. Our 832 Building is in dire need of replacement; not repair, replacement. It's 15 years old and through our investigation, wasn't done correctly by the vendor 15 years ago. We

currently have the Department of Public Works sending two men teams with what amounts to caulking guns trying to plug holes in the roof in the facade. It's the biggest waste of time I've ever seen. We're spitting in the wind with this roof. I also have a video that I'm going to send you of the roof that is actually flapping in the breeze that was patched, goes back to 2019. It was patched, never been replaced yet. One of those flex seal kind of deals. They put it down and the roof was actually flapping. That roof is still there, it was tacked down. You can imagine what it's like now 2021.

Additionally, when the previous
administration replaced the AC units, they simply went over the current compromised roof creating more roofing problems. Everything was done backwards here because it was all done on an emergency basis.

Reading some highlights of previous Capital Plans, if you'll indulge me:
"...the 2020-2022 Capital
Improvement Plan talks about projects to provide body scanners. There was $\$ 800,000$ allocated for body scanners. That ended up -- with our fiscal problems before, that money disappeared and our department went a different route to buy different types of body scanners which were bought and it was done in a much better fashion. What happened to that $\$ 800,000$, I have no idea;

We talk about the Jail Six Year Master Plan supporting the rehabilitation of the Nassau County Correctional Center for current day and future needs. Two objectives are to reduce the amount of maintenance as well as properly address deficiencies and repairs. That is 2020 to 2022;

2014 to 2016 we talk about a Capital Plan for which the initial focus would be to rehabilitate portions of Cellblock A for housing inmates. I have no idea what Cellblock A referred to back then, we
have an A building that hasn't housed any inmates since 1993.

After this is complete, evaluations are being made assessing additional needs of the facility, and here $I$ am again.

We go back to the 2007 Capital
Budget, the Correctional Center projects include a Jail Six Year Master Plan. That seems to come up year. Kitchen retrofits, vehicle reimbursement, things like that.

We talk yearly, yearly, yearly about the Jail Six Year Master Plan, but nothing ever seems to get done, unless it's done on an emergency basis.

If there's one thing I'd like to see accomplished with this round of Capital Budget Hearings, is to establish performance bars. Timelines. I want to see dates nailed down for these projects to commence. No more generalized statements that the listed projects are part of a Capital Plan that we're exploring. As you can see, obviously, the

Jail Six Year Master Plan goes back at least to 2004 and earlier.

The only Capital Expenditures that occurred here are emergency expenditures. Does anybody remember the Muffin (Phonetic) Monsters from last year. Muffin Monster sewage treatment choppers that are in the buildings. Years of neglect that caused a shutdown of one of our main buildings because we didn't address this long foreseen and long discussed sewage problem. The building had to be shut down, all the inmates had to be moved to the other side of the facility so we could replace sewage treatment grinders that gave out after 20 years. They just could not be fixed any more. That all had to be done on an emergency basis.

With roofs falling in on our heads, the main focus of the previous administration was to have inmate visitor shelters installed. That was done. Thank God we have visitor shelters so the
$\qquad$ $33=$
visitors to our facility can step in out of the rain. The only problem is, it continues to rain inside our building, when it's raining outside because the roofs are all compromised.

There is a daily death rattle from our plumbing and electric issues. Our computers and and IT issues are a disaster and, once again, we don't have a locksmith in a correctional facility. We make do instead; what make do means, I have no idea. What happens when we need a locksmith in an emergency situation, hope the electrician can fix it? That's not a good mix inside a correctional facility.

Safety and security since the day I started here is a buzz word; Safety and security, Safety and security, Safety and security. None of that can be accomplished if the buildings are falling down over our heads and the can is continually kicked down the road.

My number one priority here, again,

is please help us fix the roof in the 832 Building. Slip and fall hazards, officers running into dorms where inmates are fighting and we have to separate them and we're running through puddles of rain water inside a dormitory; it's insane that we have to deal with this year in and year out.

I appreciate the time. I'll take any questions if anybody has any.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Brian. We appreciate your repeated visits here to make us aware of what is happening at the Correctional Facility.

As you know, we, I think at your instance, toured the facility a couple of years ago, so we firsthand witnessed some of the defects that you are discussing today.

I do remember in 2018, the Minority Leader, myself, and members of the administration went to your offices to talk about remedying some of these issues. In particular, the subject of
$\qquad$
the Master Plan came up and was
repeatedly answers to want we are going to do going forward and here were are almost three years later and there's been very little movement.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: As you
know, we held up the Capital Plan because of these issues and we have commitments now from the administration on the 832 Building to get that roof replaced in a timely fashion.

But you're right, we have to insist on time lines going forward for when the work is going to be done. We intend to stay on top of this until those conditions are upgraded as our fine employees have a right to be working in. We will stay on top of this.

MR. SULLIVAN: I appreciate it,
Legislator Nicolello. It's funny, I've
said it here before a couple of times.
I'm usually here advocating to hire correction officers. That's something
that I will do again at the budget hearings in October.

I'm also here -- it's funny, I don't represent CSEA employees and I'm here trying to advocate to hire CSEA employees in another union so we have a safe and secure facility here. I appreciate the time. Anybody else?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ford and then Legislator Deriggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon, Brian. Thank you very much. I guess and I agree with Presiding Officer that we will make sure that that roof gets replaced. We have to start these projects and make sure we follow them through and start with a better plan so that we are not doing everything by emergency. I agree that it does create an unsafe condition.

Considering the fact that when you talk about the fence being so old and you have elderly. And because of bail
reform, we only have the most egregious of criminals that basically living now in the Nassau Correctional Facility, so we need to totally address this. We will being having a public hearing on this, a public safety hearing on this probably within the next three weeks.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right.
LEGISLATOR FORD: I intend though, and I'm going to ask if you would then take me on a tour through the jail to highlight prior to this hearing a lot of the grievances that you brought up in regard to the buildings, the conditions and stuff like that. I even have a concern as well even when you talk about the vehicles. Because as I understand, I don't know where we are will all the vehicles, if they are all up to date, because I know these are the same vehicles that we use to transfer the adolescent defendants. It just seems to be a lot of patchwork type of stuff. I understand the sheriff really can't get
up here and complain, but I would really like to see him to see him get up here and tell us what he is going to do to start to correcting a lot of these issues, because we thought three years ago they started working on all this stuff and obviously they haven't. I think we need to address this specifically. I know in the past, Jerry Laracuta (phonetic) had talked about the locksmiths. You have special types of locks for the jails cells and stuff like that. So this is something -- we're back. The pandemic is over. We are back.

MR. SULLIVAN: I sat here originally
with a whole presentation about our vehicles, what is that, two years ago. It was very eye opening. Since then, maybe I just have to keep coming here and doing that type of stuff, because a lot of our vehicles were replaced, we still have several that need to be replaced. But it's amazing when you expose some of

the issues that are there, that action comes around.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I'm also concerned about the number of employees that we have there. I always advocate for more.

I think you need it a lot of times, I'm sure you're aware. You might have officers that have to work overtime. They might be doing double shifts or whatever and if something happens, as much as it's nice and people say, oh, well, they're making money. Sometimes, they want to go home.

MR. SULLIVAN: You can't go home.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Yeah. And that is
a sad fact.
We will do what ever we can. I will
reach out to you this afternoon and we will set up a tour and then we will schedule a public safety hearing.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Legislator Deriggi-Whitton and then Legislator Rhoads.


LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you. Thanks for coming down. I know it is a hassle, but it does keep us informed and I appreciate it.

So where are we with the vehicles?
Because I know there was a million dollars put in at one point under the prior administration and $I$ know some of that wasn't spent. Then I'm understanding another $\$ 318,000$ for sheriff vehicles are also part of this capital?

MR. SULLIVAN: I believe that's going forward. The one thing that I say here every year is that we had to pull out a million dollars to buy several vehicles and we did buy several patrol vehicles and transportations vehicles, medical unit is in dire need of vehicles, stuff like that. If you have some older vehicles, if you have -- in the past, it was $\$ 250,000$ a year that was allocated for our transportation budget. That gets eaten up with maintenance. A lot of maintenance and a lot of repair on older
vehicles so you're not buying new vehicles with that.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So with
the 1.3 though, were you able to--
MR. SULLIVAN: We did buy several
vehicles. Like I said, after that last presentation that I gave here, it took at least two rounds to get the orders done right because they always kick back the order if a comma isn't in the right place. But we did get several new patrol vehicles, transportation vehicles, but we still need more. I believe there are numerous old Crown Vics that are still being used by many of our people that aren't even in production anymore and it's very expensive to keep things like that up and running. They all need to be replaced.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: The $\$ 300,000$ that's coming now -- 313 or something. Do you have that allocated -because I think what happened last time, like you said, it just seemed to sit for
a long time.
MR. SULLIVAN: I can guarantee almost all of that is allocated for repairs.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Really?
MR. SULLIVAN: That's not going to be for the purchase of new vehicles.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
$\$ 318,000$ for repairs for cars, wow.
MR. SULLIVAN: I will double check that for you, but that's what's gone on in the past. When you have $\$ 250,000$ in there, that's kept on the side for repairs and upkeep and maintenance.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: All
right. Just check on the million too.
The last time we met, there was $I$ think
only -- I don't want to say the wrong number, because $I$ don't recall exactly.

But there wasn't a very big percentage of that that was spent.

MR. SULLIVAN: That was spent, yeah.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So
let's just see what's left and see what
$\qquad$
we can do to move it forward.
The two million that you are getting today, do you have that allocated in your mind, what you want to do with that. I know you said your priority is the roof. MR. SULLIVAN: My priority is the roof. We don't have a price for the roof. All of the stuff, the back up information that I have gotten, we are up there just filling with little cans and caulking guns and things like that. We need to find out exactly what it's going to cost. DPW I'm sure will have that because there's been studies done before, but I have not been given number and I don't know whether two million is going to cover that for the 832 Building.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: All
right. Just keep us -- even via e-mail --
advised. I felt good when I saw some of these numbers. Especially for the vehicles. I thought we were making strides. You are the one that --

MR. SULLIVAN: If we don't keep a
rolling system going --
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
agree. I would also like to attend, either with Legislator Ford, or however you would like to do it, I'm always available.

MR. SULLIVAN: Sounds good.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I was curious if you happen to have anyone here from the administration that could give us an update on the roof replacement over at the jail, since that, obviously, is an important issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I think Ken Arnold is participating online.

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: The question is on the 832 roof?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: So the 832
roof, we indicated with our Requirements Contract the emergency work to patch the roof while waiting for our new
$\qquad$
consultant, LiRo, who recently started to do an evaluation and immediate redesign of the roofing system on the building. The roofing system on the building is already complicated because of the amount of equipment that sits on the roof and that is why it always has issues with water infiltration. During our patching work, we actually found locations where some of the dog houses on top of the roof were missing pieces which was causing a lot of water infiltration. We have been addressing that. LiRo has started their work and their first test is to get a plan on how to seal the roof and replace it and then they will be looking at the rest of the building which includes the hot and water piping and various other issues that will have to be discussed with the Corrections Facility staff on what we need to address.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Commissioner
Arnold, do we have a time table for when we would expect these various phases to

be completed?
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: I need to sit with LiRo to get a time table. They're just finishing their evaluation of the roof. I have to sit with them and get a time table based on what they're recommending and the amount of work this will require.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Is that
something that you're going to need to wait until they do their evaluation to create a time table, or is this something you might be able to get in advance of our public safety hearing?

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: I need to
speak with them and see where they are in
their process. I will know once I get
back next week exactly where they are and then $I$ can tell you if $I$ can produce $a$ timeframe of if we need a little bit more time to put that together.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Let's try and
push them if we can. This is already
taken far longer than $I$ think anybody
really reasonably expected.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Understood.
The contract took much longer than we wanted to. We did put a retroactive start date in the contract halfway through that process because I knew this was going to be an issue. The did start, I think Friday, I think it was a little earlier than that to get this up and running, which is also why and which also why I spoke with the contractor out there to do something immediately.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thanks, Commissioner Arnold.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Does anyone else have any questions or comments?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
think we're good, Brian. Thank you very much.

MR. SULLIVAN: See you at the hearing. Thank you very much. Have a


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Next Speaker is Doreen Dunne.

MS. DUNNE: Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Doreen Dunne. I am the executive director for Long Island for "Girls on The Run". We are a national non-profit. I'm here because this type of program, as I'm going to explain, is so important in any year, but now more so than ever after we have come off such a crazy year and a crazy time in all of our lives.

Girls on The Run is an after school program for girls in grades 3-8 that uses a curriculum of lessons and social/emotional learning lessons and we integrate fun movement activities and running, or course, and goal setting. The girls ultimately complete an end of season 5 K at the end of the season which is typically held right over here at Hofstra University. They've been our partner for a number of years. Girls on The Run has been around for 25 years.

We've only been on Long Island in Nassau County since Fall of 2012, and then only since 2016 in Suffolk County.

On Long Island there is a lot of opportunity for this age group, so what we hope to do in our program is to get girls at a young age and provide these tools and strategies during there formative years. The lessons cover things such as managing their emotions, self-taught manners, what we say in our heads and out loud manners. As adults, I think that is relevant as well. Each lesson is reinforced with, like I said, running.

We really want to get a lifetime appreciation of fitness activity and instill really important tools and strategies. We rely on volunteers to mentor our young girls in our communities. We have scholarships sites that are fully funded thanks to donors and sponsorships.

The goal here, and the reason I'm
$\qquad$
here, is to raise awareness of this type of program, because it is just so crucial that girls are given this opportunity for after school programming that really means something. And it's not a competitive program, it's accessible to all athletic abilities. Even if someone is disabled mentally or physically, we have adaptations in our programming to accomplish that. But we really give kids an opportunity to belong to part of a team when live in such a competitive culture. It's a place that they can really belong and come and just be with their peers and grow as humans at a really young age as they're approaching those middle school ages.

Like I said, I'm just here to grow awareness. I would love to work with you and work in developing, especially with a particular focus on underserved communities. That's a real big drive of my own. A lot of districts, as you know, didn't have after school programming or
clubs or recreational activities this past year. It was hard enough to get in-person school, so this is really a big charge of mine to bring this program to more underdeveloped communities to these girls will have someplace to go and belong and then to celebrate the 5 K at the send of the season.

We have two seasons a year. The spring season, that goes March through June. The girls meet twice a week for an hour and a half, so it's a very comprehensive program. Then we also have a fall season that meets September through December.

Our office just moved into
Eisenhower Park, I saw a few of you there at our ribbon cutting ceremony, very exciting. We will host a small summer session at Eisenhower Park this summer. We hope to see it grow on Long Island. We do have many school districts, but it doesn't have to be at a school district. We look for partnerships at parks and
$\qquad$
other opportunities for us to really develop this program.

I really appreciate your time and for you listening and for you listening. If you have any questions; otherwise, I would I love to just reach out by e-mail. If anyone is interested in speaking with me one on one, I could go on and on about Girls on The Run, more than five minutes.

I really appreciate your time and giving me this opportunity to share more about this non-profit.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. Dunne. I think Ms. Schaefer has a question.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi.
MS. DUNNE: Hi.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you so much for coming and talking about it. I remember my niece was involved many years ago in New Jersey, before you were here. I heard a lot about the group and I think it is great organization.
You said you were going to e-mail,
so I just wanted to, basically, ask you
to do that so we have your contact info
and get involved to whatever extent we can.

MS. DUNNE: Thank you so much. I appreciate that. We are all over the country. We even have one in every single state, so there's different
concentrations on this. It's been around
for long. That usually how people hear about it, from relatives and friends in different states.

Thank you so much.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: You got it.
Thank you.
MS. DUNNE: Thank you, again, for your time.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you.
*************************

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Pearl Jacobs.
MS. JACOBS: Good afternoon.
Congratulations to our Top Cops.
I would hope that Commissioner Ryder has the unwavering support of the entire legislative body. The majority of the times that I speak, I speak on behalf of the Nostrand Gardens Civic Association in Uniondale. Today I speak as a tax paying resident.

I frequently speak regarding issues of our minority communities being highly taxed and under severed here in Nassau County where we pay some of the highest in the nation, and there is minimal investment in our communities; however, our tax monies that are allocated for the Nassau County Police Department I do not complain about. Our community of Uniondale is served and protected. I would shutter to think what what out quality would be like if we didn't have the outstanding police department that we

do.
The comment that Commissioner Ryder made concerning the low diversity recruitment numbers in Nassau County was not said with any malice or ill-intent. Over the past several years, I have attended numerous diversity recruitment community meetings in Uniondale,

Roosevelt, and Elmont, attended by Commissioner Ryder and his administrative team. No commissioner has worked harder than Commissioner Ryder in an effort to improve diversity recruitment numbers within Nassau County Police Department. I can certainly attest to this.

Our community has and will continue to support Nassau County diversity recruitment efforts with outreach efforts, yet diversity recruitment efforts remain low. The root cause of these diversity recruitment numbers is attributed to a longstanding system of systematic racism in our country that has been allowed to fester generation after

generation. The social injustice that many African Americans have suffered in this country for generations lends to the mistrust and apprehension of this current generation.

Commissioner Ryder actions, community connections, outreach and support to minority communities has demonstrated that he is a leader that not just talks the talk. He is a man of action, because a person's words mean nothing if their actions are the complete opposite.

As a county, we would be continue to be better severed by a leader with vision, empathy, commitment, and a humble nature to apologize when one makes a mistake, as we all make mistakes.

Commissioner Ryder, thank you for your leadership, your protection, and dedication to all residents of Nassau County, now and for many years to come. God willing.

Now a word to the Legislative Body.

We all see what's happening in New York City, which is just a 40 minute ride from Nassau County that is a sad and scarey set of affairs: Gun violence everyday, children cannot play freely due to random shootings, violence in subways, elderly men and women being violently attacked and mugged, fireworks being mistaken for gunshots, indecent exposure and defecation on city streets, racing cars and motor cycles on residential streets and in parks, noise pollution, and not to mention the out of control sanitation issues where there is litter everywhere. People are leaving in droves because of this extreme downturn and the quality of life in New York City.

Quality of life the is the
foundation for every community. In my opinion, this sad and disturbing downturn is attributed to a severe lack of leadership and lack of support and respect for the police. Here in Nassau County we are experiencing some of the

same deterioration of quality of life
that is currently in New York City. I think we're being tested as a county.

You as the Legislative Body, along with along with community support, are essential in assisting our Police Department. The use of technology would be of great assist to law enforcement as our police cannot be everywhere. New York City got one thing right: That was Vision Zero, putting lives before votes. Let Nassau County put our lives before votes.

Statistics prove that crime is reduced by $25 \%$ in areas where cameras are located. As civic president, I have advocated for cameras in Uniondale, yet I am still waiting for these cameras. As police cannot be everywhere, technology can add assistance and support and most of all, save lives. I am pleased that our police will soon be wearing cameras, as this technology will be beneficial to both the suspect and the officers.
$\qquad$ $60=$

Legislator Abrahams, I have a question. Most recent improvements I see on Westbury Avenue and Merrick Avenue south of the Southern State, they look beautiful with the new repaving, just like Salisbury Park Drive. These roads were in fair-to-good condition prior to their repaving. Question: Is Jerusalem Avenue, a roadway that is currently in poor-to-fair condition, still on the Capital Improvement Calendar for repair this fall as you stated at the April 26 th legislative meeting?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yes.
MS. JACOBS: This fall?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yes.
MS. JACOBS: Okay. Do you what month?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The fall.
MS. JACOBS: The fall in general.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yes.
MS. JACOBS: So it will be done
before, let's say, November?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm not going
to say that; $I$ said the fall.
MS. JACOBS: I did see today, I
don't know, there might be a police report on it, the bridge on the Meadowbrook Parkway coming off of Jerusalem Avenue, the overpass, there was a car that lost its axil. I was going to stop and take a picture, but the traffic was too bad. So there was another accident, not an accident, but he lost his axil. Okay.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The axil was attributed to the road?

MS. JACOBS: Yes, it was.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How do you
know that?
MS. JACOBS: Because he came over, he ran over. He was sitting over there and I asked him and he said it was attributed to the bump. It was a low car, it was a sports car, and he lost his front left axil and his front left wheel was that way (indicating).

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So it was a


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Next speaker is Juan Sayles; I don't know if I have that correct or not.

MR. SAYLES: Good afternoon. That's Ivan Sayles. That's okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Sorry. The "I" looks like a "J".

MR. SAYLES: That's okay.
I would like to introduce myself. My name is Ivan Sayles. I'm a small business owner of Rachel's Waterside Grill on the Nautical Mile in Freeport and the Tropics on the bayou. Former president of the Freeport Chamber of Commerce, current President of the Nautical Mile Merchants Association.

I'm a small business man. If you add up all the other small businessmen and women like myself, we are actually the largest in the business in the United States. Unfortunately, we don't have a big voice like big business, we have a lot of tiny voices that need to be heard.

I want to talk about the CARES
money we have. I believe it's 63 -forgive me if my actual numbers are wrong. I'm hope you will get the concept and the big picture. It is my understanding you have about $\$ 62.9$ million in CARES money, $\$ 20$ million went to Nassau County, $\$ 10$ million is a grant, and $\$ 10$ million has been allocated for loans.

I was the fourth commercial application to get Sandy money after my restaurant and home was destroyed. I got my money four years later. I know that had nothing to do with Nassau County, but we're gonna get to the point on that. I also applied for the restaurant grant in November and ended up getting it, I believe, in the first week of February.

My point is, the government is not famous for its speed. The People in need, need the money now. I have was fortunate -- I was able to beg, borrow, and steal to get my restaurant put back together. It's ruined my credit and it

hasn't recovered since. I was fortunate. A lot of other businesses during the past pandemic are out of business and that is evident by empty store fronts throughout Nassau County. I'm urging you to take this money and not use if for infrastructure, not use it for anything else. For whatever reason, the powers that be have smiled upon the restaurant industry and they have gotten PPP money and grant money and, unfortunately, I have to use that for certain things, like payroll, rent, mortgage. But what $I$ can't use it for is to give it to the other small businesses like my coffee guy, my bread guy, the linen company, who suffered just as much as everybody else, but there is no grant specific for them. For some reason, the powers that be decided just restaurants. So now Nassau County has the opportunity to give us more money. I urge you to give it out in a very speedy fashion so we can help these people get the help they need
directly. That is pretty much it.
Also, I'm not a man of words, but I would be more than happy to help any committee or volunteer my time with any committee or department to help expedite the distribution of these funds to the people who need it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Sayles.

Legislator Deriggi-Whitton?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I just
want you to know that prior to today, the funds were available for the Restaurant Recovery Act as you mentioned. Going forward, we are going to have opportunities for all types of businesses, for small business, so that will help the people that give you supplies, as well as other businesses that did not have the opportunity under the Restaurant Recovery Act.

MR. SAYLES: That's good. We applied
to a company, I hope you're not using them anymore, called Zoom Grant, which

was horrendous. I think it took me about six hours sitting in front of the
computer to fill out the application for the grant. Because once you hit a button, you had to wait until the other 10,000 people did it too. It was just a horrendous system. I hope you do something about it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I just
want to mention, I was on the American Recovery Committee, so what we did to help this exact situation is we opened up an office in Eisenhower Park at Field 6. We have representatives there that are going to know about the Federal Grants, the State Grants and the County Grants all in one stop shopping. You have to go on the website, it's Boost Nassau is the portal. It's pretty simple to do. You make an appointment and you can go and meet with them and they can walk you through everything and tell you exactly what you are eligible for. MR. SAYLES: Okay. It was more

specifically about the money that Nassau County has in its hands now that needs to be distributed as fast as it can to the people that need it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Hopefully, we're going to do it today.
The other thing is, from what I'm understanding, you are less restricted with some of the money that's available at this point. You have to ask them to get the clarification on that.

MR. SAYLES: All right, Legislator. Thank you. Have a good afternoon.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, sir.


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thomas Kaufman? Good afternoon.

MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon. Thank you for taking the time listen to me.

I received this in the mail recently (indicating). This is about the gas tax that you're against raising; the tax on gas, sir. This is yours, right (indicating)?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes.
MR. KAUFMAN: I'm against taxes, but I'm really an environmentalist. My major reason for being here today is to ask you what you are doing in regards to the environmental dealing with the situation we are in right now. We have fires in Arizona, fires in California, fires in Australia, a major heat wave out west and we are experiencing some of that here. We know the climate change will make people move all over the world. They think 80 million people will be moving. Some of those people will probably be here on Long Island because of the rising

levels of the sea. Do we have a plan for that on Long Island? Do we have a plan if we actually have to move?

I know people are concerned, the public is concerned with taxes and police protection and fire protection, and so am I. But if the climate is such a disaster, the police, the fire, the taxes, hmm, are they going to help us? Are they going to change the environment?

I printed up something from The Guardian, it's about the stratosphere. The stratosphere is shrinking. Do we know that? Do you have any idea about -I will hand out these copies afterwards.

If we can't breathe, and we can't drink the water, and we don't have enough crops to feed ourselves, are we not in serious situation? Nobody is going answer, okay. What are you doing about dealing with climate change? Do you have any plan for the population on this island to deal with what is happening in the environment? Please don't tell me it
is the government's responsibility; it is your responsibility. You are responsible for your constituents. There are people
that are going to suffer massively due to this climate situation. What have you done in last 3-4 years since you've been in office to deal with any of this?

Silence. Does this mean no one can
answer me? I can't have a dialogue with
somebody here? Somebody can't say, hey
--
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: This
is a five minute comment period.
MR. KAUFMAN: I know it's five
minutes, but we can talk, can't we?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It's
for you to make your comments and then,
if we want to respond, we can. It's
basically for you to make your comments.
It's not a dialogue.
MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. So at the end
of five minutes we can talk?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: At the end of five minutes, you're done. If
anyone up here wants to respond, they
can. If not, then if you want to talk to me off line at some point, I would be happy to do so.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Great.
An idea: I'm driving around town and I see people in their cars texting with their windows rolled up and their engine running. This is adding to the pollution in the environment. What is Mineola going to do about that, or anybody in Nassau County going to do about that? I mean, they're fining people in San Francisco for being in their car for more than five minutes with the engine running. They're also doing it in New York City.

I have another question about recycling. I put my stuff out on the street everyday, but I don't know where it goes, and I have a feeling it is not actually being separated. Another issue of mine.

Long Island Railroad is letting the
train sit on the tracks forever these last couple of weekends, engine running. Why? Makes no sense. None at all. It's adding pollution to the environment, it's adding noise pollution. Even the drivers tell me it's the stupidest thing they've ever seen. Okay. You're not the Long Island Rail Road.

What are we doing to do about the environment? That's really my question here. What can you guys do? Who's in charge? Who's in charge of the air quality, the water quality, the food that we eat? Who makes sure that the children of the future, people behind me, your grandchildren, are going to be able to live in a healthy environment? Who's in charge of that here?

You have committees. What committee is gonna deal with any of this? All around us we see the problems. We're not stupid. You read the papers. You know what's happening. You know the climate's in danger, what are we going to do?


I have 13 seconds. I would love to talk to anybody here to plan something for the future. You have to have a plan. You just can't keep going blindly into the future. What is your plan?

Anybody want to talk?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you for your time, Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I can
say this about the flyer I sent out --
MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm going to make a statement. I listened to you patiently for five minutes.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay, please.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
stand firmly against the proposal to raise gasoline taxes by 55 cents a gallon. I stand firmly against the proposal to raise the cost of home heating and cooling, which according to one estimate, would be an increase of $26 \%$ increase of natural gas costs alone.


This would raise 16 billion dollars for the State government; however, in a time of us emerging from a pandemic, with gasoline prices already sky rocketing, with the economic fall out from the pandemic, with seniors on fixed incomes, people who are economically disadvantaged having difficulty putting food on the table, these proposals are a bad idea. So I sent a mailer to my entire district informing people of the proposals and to contact their State Legislators. I stand firmly behind that mailing and, as I said, I oppose those proposals.

Fortunately, the State Legislature
has gone out of session, so it is unlikely that that is going to happen this year. But certainly, if we know anything by the last few years, a proposal such as cashless bail, it certainly can be brought up again next
year. The important part of sending mails outs is letting your constituents know. Often times things happen in

government that your constituents aren't aware of. I have a tremendous amount of positive feedback back for that.

But the concept of raising gasoline prices in this environment, raising the cost of heating your house or cooling your house is a terrible idea.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm with you on that, partially. But when people drive SUVs and let them just sit there burning the gas where ever they are. The bigger the car, the more gas. We know that SUVs put $20 \%$ CO2 in the air. There's something that has to be done in order to cut down on that. If the gas tax does that with people, they take a much more serious responsibility about how much gas they burn, great. But if they don't -- when it hits them in the pocketbook, it's like, yeah, maybe I shouldn't let my car run forever in the parking lot.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
mean, look, that's a point, but this is a regressive tax. That person that's

driving the Escalade or the Yukon probably has the wherewithal to pay for the extra costs. What happens with taxes like this is the people who could least afford it, get hit the hardest. If you're driving an Escalade, you can probably pay 55 cents more a gallon. It's gonna hurt a little bit, but the guy who is using his car to get to work has got to pay more for his gas, those are the people that get hurt by something like this.

MR. KAUFMAN: I understand that. I really do. That is what the "gilets jaunes" protested against in France two years ago. But there has to be something in order to deal with the environment and help us keep the air clean.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Look, I'd be happy to discuss this with you.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm ready.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You
have my telephone number.
MR. KAUFMAN: Please do. Can we
have a meeting?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes, absolutely. My name and address is on -what?

MR. KAUFMAN: Is there an environmental committee here?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We have a committee called the Planning and Development Environment Committee, so we do have a committee to focuses on the environmental issues.

MR. KAUFMAN: Will you invite me to that?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes. When there is items before us, hearings, we will make sure you are on the list.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Sure.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you. I
appreciate it.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: That concludes our public comments for today. We are going to go into the Legislative Calendar. We are going to go a little



PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Start of with Item \#26.
A resolution approving an amendment via memorandum of understanding to the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the County of Nassau and the Nassau County Police Benevolent Association.

That is moved by Legislator Ferretti and seconded by Legislator Rhoads. The item is before the Full Legislature. I will turn the floor over to you.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Good afternoon, everybody.

So kind of where we left off the last time we talked about it is, we come into the possession of several body cameras to conduct tests, both --

I'm sorry, Deputy Commissioner Kevin Smith, Nassau County Police Department.

So we have come into possession of several cameras. These are to perform tests and to make sure they perform as we expect with no reason that they wont. Although, there are things like battery
life, durability on the camera itself and the harnesses that keep the camera on the police officer; video performance; the uploading process, downloading process; all things that are to be looked at.

We expect the cameras to be introduced in the Eighth Precinct in September, and parts of the Fifth Precinct as well. At that point, it will be kind of like a test, if you will, to make sure the behave in the field as expected by the officers that are wearing them on a daily basis, 24-hour-a-day. We have a Draft Policy that we are working on. I know people are concerned about a draft, we do. We've had several policy meetings about it. We update the draft regularly. As I've stated, there are many facets of policing that are going to have to be looked at. We will mimic policies from other departments around the area, New York City being one of them and My HCP (phonetic) being another organization that basically sets
policy on a lot of police issues around the country. They will, of course, be tailored to fit our needs for our particular work environment. As you know, we don't do certain procedural things the same way that New York City does. For instance, we relieve our officers in the field, not at a central location or a central station house.

Training modules will have to be established as well. Both for the people who are wearing the cameras, how to operate the camera, as well as protocol and policy which will be stated in the draft.

In addition, the people who are behind the scenes will have to be trained as well. As staff that will be accountable to our Intelligence Bureau on a specific Body One Camera Unit which will be manned by supervisors and Intel analysts. They will be auditing the process as well and making sure, trouble shooting different situations that might
arise as people begin to be accustomed to wearing these cameras, turning them on and off at the appropriate times and things of that nature, and to make sure they are complying the appropriate way. The video that's going to be ascertained by the cameras will obviously be used for a variety of things. The District Attorney will probably receive a variety of camera footage for things such as discovery in criminal cases; looking at video that will pertain to certain investigations that we would loop; analyze complaints; review circumstances surrounding different police activity. On the administrative end of the program, it is going to be maintained, as I said, by a staff. They too will have to be trained. The training will probably be more extensive, in that they are going to be looking at most of the video from behind the scenes, as I said, in the Intel Bureau. They will also be responsible for training; issuing new
directives; repairs or facilitating repairs on the cameras as need be; upgrades as we go along; and video distribution, as I said, to the appropriate authorities that might need it, such as the District Attorney's Office, Attorney General, whatever the case may be. They will also be responsible for liaison with the District Attorney's Office, our internal ITU, other agencies as need be.

The principle people behind helping us are Getach who manufactures the device itself, and Island Tech Services which installs and maintains the working and upgrades that might be needed as we move on into this program.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I take it by your stopping, you're opening the thing up to questions, correct?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I'm ready.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
The only question I have, and then I will let the rest of the legislators go is, in

terms of turning the body camera on and off, obviously, there would be a protocol for when officers do that, correct?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: When the officer puts the camera on, he has to engage it to work. To be powered on, he does that by pressing a button. Now it is in a standby mode. When it's time to actually record, if he is having a conversation with someone or about to have a conversation with someone or he is going on call, he engages it lightly one second. Basically, pressing it and going like, one Mississippi, that type of thing, and the camera engages. To shut it off, he does the same thing, but he counts three and then it will go off.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: In terms of when they actually do that, when they activate the camera, that will be determined by protocol and policy of the Department of interactions, calls --

COMMISSIONER SMITH: That's right. Certain types of services will put it on,
vehicle and traffic stops will put it on.
As he engages the public. And if feels
the need, if he's having a conversation with someone and he feels the need to turn it on, he can turn it on at any time.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. The protocols and procedures will be important to publicize. That will give the public an extra level of comfort I believe.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Absolutely.
That will be done through RedLand
Strategies. They are going to look for community outreach. They are going to community outreach and they're going to talk to different people and find out what their expectations are, do they feel there will be any problems with the camera program.

I can't see a lot of people against
the camera program. I think the way we are going to lay it out is going to be pretty nice, pretty good. I think what

feeling is around the Police Department is the officers are ready and prepared to deal with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Anyone else?

Legislator Solages?
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you,
Presiding Officer.
Good afternoon.
COMMISSIONER SMITH: Good afternoon.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I noticed that at the last meeting you mentioned that the program would released through the Eighth Precinct and today you mentioned that it would be also unveiled for the Fifth Precinct, which is the 3rd District. Can you please describe more information as to what led to that difference?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: We wanted to engage an entire precinct to see how it runs on entire level. Now that entire level was the Eighth Precinct. It's a precinct that kind of falls into the

```
middle of items when it's calls for
service, has a large scope of people in
the Eighth Precinct, but much as I said,
calls for service was one of the big
determinations. We don't want to
overload the system at first. We also
decided at one point that the Fifth
Precinct would be a good area as well. A
few isolated cars in the Fifth and we are
constricted to by some budget restraints
too, as to how many cameras we can order
at the time.
```

    LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Understood.
    The fact that you are willing to
    increase the scope of the program beyond
the Eighth Precinct and also with the
Fifth Precinct, shows that you are
willing to learn the best capabilities
for this program to succeed. I
appreciate that, and I thank you for at
least this being a fluid plan and not
just a stagnant, stale plan. I
appreciate that.
Thank you.


COMMISSIONER SMITH: You are very wel come.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any other legislature have any questions for Commissioner Smith?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Is it safe to say that anytime an officer goes on a call, the camera will be turned on?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: That is correct.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: That is done manually by the police officer?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: That's correct.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Is that how it's always done in all departments?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. Every department does it as they feel best suited to do it. There are different triggers that can be put on, different devices to make the camera go on automatically, but with that also could come failure. That means batteries. For instance, to take a gun out of your holster, it means an extra battery has to
be put on it. To take your taser out, your night stick out, if those are the conditions that you want to put forward, you may have additional failure.

Batteries have to be checked out more frequently; how long do they last? We've been advised even by the people who manufacture the item, sometimes the less triggers you have, the better off you are.

Just how officers are trained with tasers and weapons and night sticks, it becomes muscle memory to make sure it goes on and to hit it to make sure it goes off. We feel this is the best way to proceed at this time.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Is
there anything required that the police officer should put it on as they go to a call; is that mandated in anyway?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: The whole procedure will be a training session for officers, so that they learn when it is to be going on or when to take it off.

Even the policy will cover things such as if an officer, perhaps, forgot to turn it on; what would you do in that circumstance? Well, you'd have to contact the supervisor; perhaps, write a report, perhaps, learned to be retrained in it.

Initially, there will be mistakes.

I kind accept that that will happen. We looked at other police departments, and at first when they were introduced, officers at times, maybe when they haven't been trained for long enough or had enough experience with the camera, has maybe failed to put the camera on once or twice. But they learn very rapidly to do this. Just as they learned, as I said, with their weapons and other protocols, they learn how to do it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Let me just follow up again. The determination
of when officers turn on their cameras, it's going to be specified in a written procedure or protocol that's going to be provided, correct?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: That is
correct. And we will provide that to the public.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those procedures are being developed now?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: They are.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Is
that internally in the police department with the consultants?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Internally by
the police department and we have been
advised by the consultants at times.
When we ask them to research certain
questions for us, they provide that pretty diligently.

Legislator Gaylor?
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you,
Presiding Officer.
Commissioner, good afternoon.
COMMISSIONER SMITH: Good afternoon.


LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Just two quick questions: Are there currently any villages that are using bodycams in Nassau County?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I think there are several. I think Freeport has them and I believe Malverne has them. I'm not sure about other villages.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Have you done any coordination or checking with them on their policies and procedures?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yeah. Some of the people we have on our team have been checking out with Freeport and Malverne and talk kind of anecdotally about how the cameras work.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Great.
COMMISSIONER SMITH: I think they have a different product than us.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. My second question, unrelated to the first:

Instead of a manual procedure to engage
the body camera, is there a means or a way that it can be automatically engaged
when the service call goes out to the precinct car?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: It's called a trigger device. There are many kinds of trigger devices. The problem with the more trigger devices you have, they're more subject to failure. Trigger devices need a battery to engage things.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Right.
COMMISSIONER SMITH: An additional
battery. Other than the battery that comes on the camera, any external battery that we have that attaches to our camera as well.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: All right. Part of your study and analysis is looking at these various means to trigger and determine which is the best.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: We believe that manual activation and manual off are the way to go.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Very
good. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:


Legislator Walker?
LEGISLATOR WALKER: The battery that they have to use for these cameras, is there a way they can recharge them in their vehicle? I mean, just like our phones, there times that your battery can go all day or a day and a half or whatever, depending on how much you're using it. Sometimes if you're using it for a GPS, or whatever, certain things use the battery up quicker. So our officers, their shift is a long period of time. If they were very active during that time, could those batteries die and they don't have access to recharging?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: All our
officers are going to be issued an individual camera which has an internal battery. It also has an external battery that can be attached on. The internal battery give them, perhaps, 12 hours, and the external battery should feed the the camera itself and, perhaps, give anywhere from 5 to 6 more hours. In addition to
that, each officer will be issued what's called a magnetic tether. Basically, what that does is it's a plug in, just like you might plug in your Iphone into your car. It plugs in on one side and the other is a magnet that holds it to the bottom of the camera. It detaches very easily. It can be just ripped away or as the officer gets out, it can just fall to the seat of the car. It does not lock him into the car. That continues to provide battery power as he's driving around on, patrol as he is looking and patrolling his neighborhoods, and things of that nature.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE FOX: Hi.
This is Deputy County Executive Tatum
Fox. I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr.
Presiding Officer. I am by phone.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Go ahead, Tatum.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE FOX: Hi, everyone. I apologize that I am not
there. I just wanted to let you know I am here. Thank you, Commissioner Smith as well and the legislative body. I'm away on family vacation for the first time; otherwise, I would be there.

I just wanted to speak to question regarding when the camera will be turned on and while it appears at this point with all the technology available, it would be a manual process to turn the cameras on, the camera itself, the technology will allow us to explore automatic triggers while they do come with other items that would be necessary, like blue tooth activation, and I will leave that to the technical people, which is not me. That is definitely something -- this is a starting point and we can explore all options and see what works best in Nassau County with the body cameras based upon input from this Legislative Body, from the community, and all updates of the policy will be shared with the public for all to examen. It
will be an ongoing dialogue in regard to the policy.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Tatum.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE FOX: If there are any other questions, I just wanted to let you know I am here.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Tatum.

Commissioner, did you want to add anything?

POLICE COMMISSIONER RYDER: NO. I think Tatum said it perfect. You're all going to get to see the policy and procedures. We will go through them, and we will release those publically when it is all said and done so the public will continue to have dialogue with Mike Balbone (phonetic) and his team there.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are there any other questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
COMMISSIONER SMITH: Thank you for

```
    your time.
    PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
    you Commissioner.
    Any other debate or discussion on
this item?
```

(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none. All in favor?
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor with, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously, 18:0. Thank you, all.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Item
\#4. An ordinance to adopt the Nassau County Budget for the Nassau Community College for the Fiscal Year commencing September 1, 2021 and ending August 31, 2022, and to appropriate revenues and the total amount of monies to be raised by taxation within the County of Nassau for the purposed of Nassau Community College for such fiscal year.

Moved by Legislator Drucker, seconded by Legislator Walker.

So that puts this item before us.
Mr. President?
DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Good afternoon, Legislators.

Jermaine, J-E-R-M-A-I-N-E, F.
Williams, President, Nassau Community College. I'm joined by Julio Izquierdo, Vice President, Finance of the College and Adrian Kerrigan, Vice President for Institutional Advancement.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Before you begin. We had a motion and a second
$\qquad$ $01=$
and we actually have to open the hearing.
DR. WILLIAMS: My apologies.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No.
That was my fault.
All in favor for opening the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye". (Whereupon, all members of the Nassau County Legislative Body respond in favor with, "Aye".)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing is open. Now the floor is yours.

DR. WILLIAMS: My apologies.
Thank you, all the legislators for
taking the time to meet with the college over the past several weeks. We presented a presentation and we are thankful for your insightful follow up to help ensure that we're very candid in
terms of how the college is being good stewards of the monies and the funds providing for Nassau County.

We still remain the largest single campus community college of the 30 SUNY. A few weeks ago, $2,800+$ students graduated from Nassau Community College, so we provide a great benefit to the County and we are very thankful for your ongoing support here today, and looking for your continued support.

I would like to just reiterate before any questions, comments or concerns, that the budget before you shows no tuition or fees increase and we, obviously, are doing that for multiple reasons. One of the primary outcomes is to ensure the residents of Nassau County are able to access a high quality academic and student support experience at an affordable rate.

I am definitely open to questions or concerns.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you.
My concern, and it's something I
brought up after our briefing and you had provided a response in terms of the recouping plan for the college. This is a nationwide trend, but we have seen a loss of the number of students attending Nassau Community College and I think it is crucial that we turn that around.

The efforts that you and your administration are making $I$ think have to really be geared for success in terms of brining more students to the college. It is an excellent education opportunity at a very reasonable cost. The more that we can bring students in, not just from

Nassau County, but, perhaps, from other areas of our state. I think one of the recruitment plans is for international as well, which I think that would be better for the long term success for the college, so we would like to see you be very successful with your recruitment efforts.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thank you, Presiding Officer. To that, we have actually just started a partnership that will commence in the Fall 2021 with Adelphi University were students are able to attend Nassau County and actually live at Adelphi University. One of the things you saw on the recruitment plan was housing, given time and taking an alternative approach, but still providing the need.

One of the other components that I can share about recruitment, students will have two partnerships starting in Fall of 2021 as well with Baldwin School District and West Hempstead where several high school seniors from those schools will actually be taking their senior class at Nassau Community College, which is helping them experience Nassau Community College. There is recruitment. Hopefully, they will transition to Nassau Community College.

```
    One of the other features that I
```

will share is that Board of Trustees recently approved a few academic programs because we want to make sure we are providing the academic programs that are need. Cyber Security was recently approved as well as Office Medical Assistant. All of these and more, I didn't even mentioned the other Duncan (phonetic), that's up you your slate a little later, which will provide an opportunity for 200 students to be in our hospitality program. We are endeavoring to make changes so that we can increase enrollment.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Does anyone else have any questions for Dr. Williams?

Legislator Walker?
LEGISLATOR WALKER: I don't really
have a question, just a comment. I know
when I worked in the Hicksville School
District, I did a lot to encourage our
students to go to Nassau Community. Many
of them were not as affluent and could
not afford a four year right off the bat and I would encourage them all the time. Saying, you're gonna get a great education, you work real hard, you can get a scholarship to another four year school and continue your education wherever.

I love the idea with Adelphi, because many of those students then might go on to attend Adelphi for the rest of their program and keep our students here in Nassau County and on Long Island and close by.

I know that high schools offer many students college credits for classes. Those college credits, are they acceptable (sic) at Nassau also?

DR. WILLIAMS: The short answer is yes. I could get into a very long answer, but --

LEGISLATOR WALKER: The short answer is yes.

DR. WILLIAMS: As long as they're an accredited institution, then yes. They
would be accepted. We have several students who come in with those transfer credits.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: And anything I can do and I'm sure many of the legislators or all of us would say the same thing, anything we could to within our districts to help add recruitment to our community college would be wonderful.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. You all did so much, as I look around and make eye contact with several legislators who I've talked with on several occasions. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you, Legislator.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Drucker then Legislator Gaylor then Legislator Mule.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Dr. Williams, it's always a pleasure
to see you.
DR. WILLIAMS: Likewise, sir.

> LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I want to commend you on presenting a very good budget this year. One that, despite the challenges you're facing, does not require a tuition increase, which is certainly a very opportune time to not have a tuition increase.

But it is still concerning to me and I'm sure to all of us. I have a personal affection to the college because of my affiliation there and $I$ would like to see the college flourish and certainly be able to sustain itself in years to come. The disturbing trend of declining enrollment is concerning to me and I'm sure to all of us. When I was at the college as a trustee, we had about $22-23,000$ and we are down to about 12-13,000 and change now; is that correct, Dr. Williams?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes. That is as far as the Fall --

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: And you are still anticipating a further decrease.

We have to try to reverse that. I have been having conversations with you and your staff and the administration here and the Police Department to try to find ways -- for example, we talked about the Micro Credential Program and to use that as a way to enhance enrollment and retention and I would like to see those initiatives pursued further by the college, because this is an opportunity for you to pull our all the stops and do what you can to reverse the trend. You'd be remiss, and we'd all be remiss, if you don't explore every possibility to take advantage of some of the things we have to entice residents of Long Island to come to the college. Not just young people, working people, older people. The college to this day remains a feudal and wonderful opportunity as a gateway, as a pathway to many, many successful careers. This is a step that many people in Nassau County and coming off of a pandemic, this is a perfect
opportunity to take advantage of the great institution Nassau Community College has. I would like to see initiatives that we've discussed be advanced further.

I'm concerned, yes, you have a budget that's gonna get you through this year. I'm concerned about next year. I'm concerned, you're not getting an increase in funding from the County. I'd like to see that increase as well. But with attrition and with the current enrollment, and with the increase in expenses and the salary and contractural obligations you have, I'm concerned. I'd like to see a real initiative that is imperative by the college to try to reverse that.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Legislator Drucker for all of your support and comments. We are forward facing and looking towards the future, absolutely.

And I know my expectation, I will confirm when I return to the office, is that our
dean and chairperson of criminal justice are meeting with you and your team and others to really flesh out that idea and talk more about it. It's just one idea, but there are multiple ideas.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Micro
Credentialing is really, really an opportunity that we should not squander. Do you agree?

DR. WILLIAMS: I do. Yes, yes. It is something I know that as I looked through the historical documents with the college has been a conversation for multiple years, and it is something that we need to move forward with like we did with dual enrollment and concurrent enrollment and the Adelphi partnership. We do recognize that potential and we are pursuing it. Over all, not just with just the specific --

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: You know, you can always count on my support of the college and I'm sure most of us here as well. All of us here as well.

But again, I'd like to see the dialogue between us continue and even grow so we can take advantage of these opportunities and these initiatives. I certainly have presented you with some.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Presiding Officer?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Legislator Gaylor, then Legislator Mule.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

So my colleague pretty much hit the points that $I$ was going to raise. I'm particularly concerned about the declining enrollment, because year after year, at least the almost six years I've been here, every year we hear the same thing. Enrollment declining, we are doing $X, Y$,and $Z$, it's gonna turn around and it's not turning around. I challenge you to put a stop to that and figure out a solution here relatively quickly
because I don't know how much longer you can go with declining enrollment and stand before us and ask for salary increases and budget increases. There's going to come a point and time that you may not get the budgets that you want, like you will this year.

I attended Nassau Community back 1981 and it was a great opportunity and a great time for me in my life. There was a time when there was multiples of tens of thousands of students attending Nassau Community College and now we're down to some very serious low numbers that if we don't turn it around, we may lose this gemstone in our count. Maybe it gets consolidated with Suffolk Community or maybe SUNY takes it over. Those things are always possible and always talked about.

So I challenge you to take this to heart, okay. Turn this around quickly, because you have the perfect opportunity to fix the problems at the college.

That's where I'll leave it.
DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Legislator Gaylor.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Mule.
LEGISLATGOR MULE: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I too wish to congratulate you on the budget this year and that there is not increases for the students. I know this is being done under extremely difficult circumstances.

My question was going to be about the possibility of having the students stay at the campus, because I know there is the one community college upstate where they have dorms and you're telling us that that is already in the works. I think that's a really great opportunity. I look forward to hearing more about that and if it goes through.

Just to reiterate what everyone else has said, we have to do whatever we can to make sure that Nassau Community
remains a viable option for the students of Nassau County.

Actually, I do have a question for the presiding officer. It's my understanding that back in January a motion was filed to put Dr. Kishore Kuncahm who is the superintendent of the Freeport Schools on the Board of Trustees. Given the fact that the county population of Asian Americans is increasing and you put forward the Office of Asian American Affairs, which is a wonderful thing, $I$ think it would be important to make sure that gets calendared as soon as possible. He would be a wonderful addition to the Board of Trustees to the college, an incredible asset. I know because I was the Board of education working along side him and I know what he can bring. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I would agree. He is tremendously talented educator and he would certainly bring his talents to the College Board. The
proposal was made to replace George Garden, who happens to be one of the only Hispanic Americans who has been appointed to any position of significance in the County. There are certainly going to be openings in the next couple of years and it's certainly something we are going to look at. We are still looking at him, but of course it's -- you don't want to take someone off who is doing a fine job and who represents this community very well. Let's put it that way.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi.
Good to see you.
I was just looking -- I know this
program was set up to it being, hopefully, 30\% County, 30\% State, and the State contribution is only the 21\% right now. I know it's based on enrollment, but do you know how many students it would take to get up to the $30 \%$ how many students of an increase it would take,
approximately? Sorry, it's a math question.

DR. WILLIAMS: No, no. So, its proportional. So even if we did increase the students, the FTE is such that right now, and I'm looking at the Vice President of Finance, that it would not happen, because the FTE is capped at 2,947 per FTE, so it actually would have to increase in order for that third to come into play.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So that's how we would be able to get the third from the State? If you increase the --

DR. WILLIAMS: Funding would need to increase. It is still proportion.

MR. IZQUIERDO: The State would need to increase the amount. Right now, it's a fixed amount, so the $21 \%$ is going to be 21\% no matter how many FTEs we have.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
thought it was based on enrollment.
MR. IZQUIERDO: It is based on
enrollment, but it is based on actual
FTE. What the County gives is based on a total amount and that gets rolled out through enrollment. The higher the enrollment, the lower the percentage from the County.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: WOw.
MR. IZQUIERDO: In terms of the
State, it will stay constant because they go by FTE.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: And, FTE, for the record is?

MR. IZQUIERDO: Full time equivalent students.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Full
time equivalent students. And that is different from enrollment by how?

MR. IZQUIERDO: Enrollment you can go by different ways: Head count, which is part time/full time students, it's two people, one part and one full time, that is two head counts. FTE will be one and a half.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Really?

So, in other words, if you go part time to Nassau Community College, the State is not reimbursing anything? MR. IZQUIERDO: They are
proportionate, so if they call part time halftime, it will be counted at half FTE. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay.

So we would have to increase our full time enrollment to increase the State funding.

MR. IZQUIERDO: Both. Both increase the State funding.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay.
All right. Thank you.
DR. WILLIAMS: The stenographer needs your name and title.

MR. IZQUIERDO: My name is Jose Izquierdo, Vice President of Finance.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Birnbaum?
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Hi. So during COVID you were able to teach the students virtually; you had classes remotely?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: And now, in
the fall semester, are you going to
continue doing any remote courses?
Because I was just thinking that might be a way of getting at least some part time students.

DR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely. We taught less than $10 \%$ of the courses at a face-to-face component in fall and spring of this past year. Obviously, there were clinical, labs, those types of opportunities, but by in large, the overwhelming majority of courses were either remote or online.

What we have realized, to the point you are getting at, Legislator, is that, some of these are really good opportunities to be taught remote or online. So we want to not come back as the previous Nassau Community College, but we want to use this as an opportunity to provide the educational platforms that students need based on the $70+$ programs that we have and the diverse learners
that we have. Everyone doesn't want to be or need to be face-to-face. We have invested in technology so that we can make that happen, and we are really looking forward to really diversify how we offer the educational opportunities. LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: In terms of outreach to all the high schools in Nassau County, do you have liaisons with each of the schools?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes. I talk with or communicate with superintendents, Our Office of Admissions communicates with principals, guidance counselors. I also communicate with principals as well. Then we have counselors who also go out and they host events at local high schools, at the college, at community
organizations, different places throughout the County, yes.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: And in terms of marketing, have you increased your marketing efforts; are you doing something differently now?

DR. WILLIAMS: We actually have, and yes, we have increased and we are doing something differently. We put out an RFP several months ago for Vice President for Institutional Advancement, it's a very collaborative effort across the college with faculty and students.

We have a new marketing firm that just came on a few weeks ago. You may see some of the College's new marketing with Nassau Community College as the smart choice. Really looking to grasp that opportunity for the students and for the influencers so they know to what several of the legislators said, you can start at Nassau Community College with high quality academics and student support at a really affordable rate and then go wherever it is where you want go, whether that's directly into the workforce or transferring to a four year institution or both. A lot have of our students have a combination of both.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Great. I hope
it's all very productive and that we see the enrollment increase.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you,
Legislator.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Thank you. Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
think we're good. Thank you, Dr. Williams.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you,
Legislators. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Drucker makes a motion to close the hearing, second by Legislator Walker. All in favor of closing the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative Body respond in favor with,
"Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Aye. Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing is closed.
We are going to Item 10, which is an ordinance to adopt the Nassau County budget for the Nassau Community College for the fiscal year commencing September 1, 2021 ending August 31, 2022 and to appropriate revenues in the total amount of monies to be raised by taxation within the County for the purposes of the college for such fiscal year.

Moved by Legislator Drucker, seconded by Legislator Walker. Any further debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any public comment, which I neglected to do during the hearing?
(Whereupon, no verbal

```
response.)
```

| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: |
| 3 | Hearing none. All in favor signify by |
| 4 | saying, "Aye". |
| 5 | (Whereupon, all members of |
| 6 | the Nassau County LEgislative |
| 7 | Body respond in favor with, |
| 8 | "Aye".) |
| 9 | PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those |
| 10 | opposed? |
| 11 | (Whereupon, no verbal |
| 12 | response.) |
| 13 | PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It |
| 14 | carries unanimously. |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | $\star * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$ |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
I'm going to call the Consent Calendar next.

These are all items that went through Committees a couple of weeks ago and it's been agreed by the Majority and Minority that no further debate or discussion is needed at this point with respect to these items:

Item 12, Ordinance 52; Item 14, Ordinance 54; Item 15, Ordinance 551; Item 16, Ordinance 56; Item 17, Ordinance 57; Item 18, Ordinance 58; Item 19, Ordinance 59; Item 20, Ordinance 60; Item 21, Ordinance 61; Item 22, Ordinance 62;

Item 25, Resolution 90; Item 27,
Resolution 92; Item 28, Resolution 93;
Item 29, Resolution 94; Item 30,
Resolution 95; Item 31, Resolution 96;
Item 32, Resolution 97; Item 33,
Resolution 98; Item 34, Resolution 99;
Item 35, Resolution 100; Item 36;
Resolution 101; Item 37, Resolution 102; Item 38, Resolution 103; Item 39,

Resolution 104; Item 40, Resolution 105;
Item 41, Resolution 106; Item 42,
Resolution 107; Item 43, Resolution 108;
Item, 44, Resolution 109.
Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer
Kopel, Seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams.

Any debate or discussion on these items?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor with,
"Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Going back to the start of the Calendar.

Item 1 is a Local Law to amend the miscellaneous laws of Nassau County in relation to the imposition of a public safety fee and driver responsibility fee for violations issued pursuant to Title 86 thereof.

Motion by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Schaefer.

That's a motion to open the hearing.
All those in favor of opening the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those Opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Hearing is open. This item is in connection with another item on the Calendar today with respect to the school bus camera program that is about to be rolled out in the county, which has certain statutorily mandated fees associated with violations.

What this item does is it removes the public safety fee and the driver's responsibility fee from being added on top of the statutory fees, so it reduces the total fees that someone would pay for a violation by taking out the public safety fee of $\$ 55$ and the driver's responsibility fee of $\$ 45$ for tickets for violation in terms of the school bus camera program.

Anyone want to discuss or debate?
Legislator Birnbaum?

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: I
whole-heartedly support this legislation, just as $I$ was whole-heartedly was not in support of similar legislation several
years ago when the $\$ 55$ public safety fee and $\$ 45$ driver responsibility was tacked onto the red light camera bill, because as it says, these are fees and I don't think it is what our goal is, to improve safety.

So I whole-heartedly support no including an extra \$100 tacked on and imposing it on a vehicle when the operator is stopped for illegally passing a stopped bus.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Motion by Minority Leader Abrahams to close the hearing, second by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel.

All in favor of closing the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed.
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing is closed.
No we go to Item 5 which is a Local
Law to amend the miscellaneous laws of
Nassau County in relation to the imposition of a public safety fee and driver responsibility fee for violations issued pursuant to Title 86 thereof.

Motion by Legislator Gaylor, second by Legislator McKevitt.

Any further debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All in favor, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Now we go back to Item 2 for another hearing.

This is a Local Law to amend Title 86 of the Miscellaneous Laws of Nassau County, as added by Local Law 19-2019 in relation to changing to 60 days, the period that a written warning will be issued in lieu of a Notice of Liability following commencement of the school bus photo violation demonstration program.

Motion by Legislator Bynoe, second by Legislator Ford to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Hearing is open.

Anyone want to speak on this one?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, obviously, it is what it says it is.

It's an extension of the warning period following the commencement of the program which I believe had said 30 days and now we are extending it to 60 .

Mr. Rich?
MR. RICH: David Rich, Traffic and Parking Violations Agency. Good afternoon, Legislators.

This is a proposed amendment to extend the warning period to 60 days and 60 days per school district.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. The second question that has come up and maybe you could clarify, basically, this 60 day warning period for an individual school district commences under this amendment; it will commence when this
school district opts into the program, correct?

MR. RICH: That's correct, yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Does anyone else have any questions for Mr. Rich?

Legislator Birnbaum?
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Hi. Is this program being run exactly like the red light camera where somebody who receives a fine will be able to go online and see a video what happened?

MR. RICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: And they can make an appearance in court if they want to fight it?

MR. RICH: Yes. The first Notice of Liability will have the information. If they want to request a hearing, they can submit a request for a hearing, or they can pay ir, or they can call us if they have any questions. Same type of noticing that we have for the red light camera program.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Are you aware of any problems with the program that necessitates this extended period of 60 days; has there been a problem in other areas where it's been used, do you know?

MR. RICH: I'm not aware of any information pertaining to that question.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: I'm just concerned about divided highways, for cars coming in the opposite direction, not behind a bus, but from the other direction and they're unable to see.

MR. RICH: If the cameras are unable to capture the vehicle or plate, a violation will not be issued.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: I'm talking about the driver of the car who didn't see the school bus, if there's traffic on the road and going in the opposite direction.

MR. RICH: Probably, initially, an assumption would be we would issue the Notice of Liability, but if the person protested it and requested a hearing,
then the Judicial Hearing Officer would hear their claim.

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Would we be able to hear any kind of summary of how many violations were issued in the 60 day period that the test, you know, once it gets initiated; would we just be able to get some data of any kind?

MR. RICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: That would be great.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon. When are we going to start letting the public know about this and educating them about the school bus cameras?

MR. RICH: I'm going to assume once we execute the contract, we're gonna meet with the vendor who is going to assist, as well as the County's Press Office, in providing a proper roll out and a Public Safety notification.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. Just to go back to what Legislator Birnbaum brought up about divided highway, I mean, I know
under state law, there are certain
medians you are not allowed to -- you
have to stop in both directions, but can you find out if there is any use of a median that would not have a car subjected if they were going in the opposite direction that they would be subjected to having a ticket for passing a stopped school bus?

MR. RICH: We do. What we're hoping to do also is, during the rolling period, it will also give us the opportunity to identify where they may be issues where a violation should not be issued, if it is too far across or where the operator of the vehicle did not have the opportunity to view the school bus.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. Then the school bus cameras will be automatically in service once the driver stops and pulls the lever, or whatever it is, where their doors open and the arm comes out, correct?

MR. RICH: Yes, once the stop arm is
extended and the red lights are flashing, the camera will be activated.

LEGISLATOR FORD: All right. Will
we also have training for the school bus drivers so they know always when to open the doors and not open? I know sometimes, it has been brought up in previous hearings, like if a school bus driver may be waiting. Sometimes a they're at a person's home and the student may be delayed coming out, so not to stop the traffic. They may sometimes have it open, but they might wave people through, to make sure they don't do something like that.

MR. RICH: Yes. That's all part of the roll out. The bus drivers will be trained not to wave people by, but if they do, they should close the stop arm so that way at least a violation is not captured.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. Thank you very much.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Not much of a
question, perhaps, just a note of caution
to inject into this. Those of us who
have been around a while may remember the program where we had speed cameras near the schools. The roll out was disastrous and the program failed because of public outrage, so I think we need to take extra care in terms of the training of the school bus drivers as well as the public education and implementation of the program to make sure that people don't get tickets unfairly.

MR. RICH: Understood.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Anyone else?

Legislator Ferretti and Legislator Walker.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Good afternoon, Mr. Rich.

MR. RICH: Good afternoon.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The tickets
that will eventually result from a violations of this school bus camera, will they be subject to the same boot and
$\qquad$
tow regulations as the outstanding red light camera tickets?

MR. RICH: As I understand it, they could be included in the Boot and Tow Program, yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: You mean they will be? What's the plan?

MR. RICH: Right now, they would be. There is nothing in the ordinance that prevents it. The are included because it's considered a Photo Enforcement Violation or a Notice of Liability.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What's the status of the Boot and Tow Program right now; is it suspended right now or?

MR. RICH: It is still currently suspended.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. Is there gonna be any kind of warning to violators that these ticket will be subject to boot and tow if they are not paid timely?

MR. RICH: The way we do it in our own letters that TPVA sends out, we put
the warnings, so the additional includes boot and tow, includes possibly a default judgement. Then what happens is the case is assigned to a collection vendor. Again, it is more voluntary compliance where in those warnings notice, it warns of boot and tow, default judgement, license suspension, registration suspension. After that, if still no response, then they are eligible for boot and tow.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Is the Traffic Court open right now?

MR. RICH: Yes, it is.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When did it reopen?

MR. RICH: October 5th.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. I just want to make sure the residents have the proper notice that they're subject to boot and tow, especially in light of the fact that the court was closed for a period of time and some people obviously -- and, you know, this penalty for the
bus cameras is significantly higher than the red light camera. Obviously, its going to be, especially in these times, difficult to pay right away, so it is a concern I had with regard to the boot and tow.

MR. RICH: We offer the folks payment plans. As well, as I understand, the boot and tow vendor now also offers a payment arrangement as well. They will have an opportunity for a payment arrangement prior to being boot and towed as well.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Is there a plan to restart the Boot and Tow Program; is there a timeline?

MR. RICH: Not currently, no.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. Would
you be able to give us some advanced notice as to when ever that is the case when it is going to be restarted?

MR. RICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Advanced in, like, 30 days advanced?

MR. RICH: Yes. I mean, ideally, once we bring our collection vendors online, they will get first attempt and then after that the Boot and Tow Program would resume.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. We have several legislators in line.

Legislator Walker, Legislator Saloges, and then Legislator Gaylor.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you. I have to say that this is something that I look forward to once we work everything out and our the school districts, hopefully, will all come on board.

I have received many, many phone calls from,my residents of people blowing the stopped busses. It is a very, very big concern to them. Often times there's multiple children getting on a bus at a bus stop and crossing the street in front of the bus and then all of a sudden, $a$ car is flying by or whatever. Thank God
there hasn't been serious injuries in my legislative district, but it doesn't say that it couldn't happen.

I would hope that once school
districts do come on board that the school districts provide the information to their families and certainly the PTA. Hopefully, I would be pushing for that in my district, the PTA gets involved. It isn't just these issues with the buses, I have -- especially in front of my high school and middle school -- parents double and triple parked and kids are cutting through. It's a very scarey situation. Every year there is constant calls about it. Obviously, they want us, as Legislators, to fix everything; we can't always fix everything, but $I$ hope this is one step moving forward that will help to keep our children safe. That really is a safety issue and that's what we need to focus on, so thank you.

MR. RICH: Agreed.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you.

Thank you, Presiding Officer.
Quick question: Is there technology
that blocks out the face of the minor, any minors to protect their privacy? That's all, just a question.

MR. RICH: I'm not aware of that, but I could check with the Vendor. I'm not sure, but I will check with them.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Gaylor?
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you Presiding Officer. Good afternoon, Mr. Rich.

MR. RICH: Good afternoon.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: The violation -first of all, is this truly a violation of the VTL that someone would be charged with for passing a school bus caught on camera?

MR. RICH: Yes, it is; it is similar to the red light camera.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Are they issuing a VTL 1172 on this case or --

MR. RICH: It is cited, but it will be a Notice of Liability.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: So an 1172
carries a five point violation, we all
know you need 11 points before you lose your license. Are there any points under this program?

MR. RICH: No, there're not.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Very good.

This is a fine for a first offense of $\$ 250$; does the fines escalate for second and third offenses?

MR. RICH: Yes, they do.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. And the probationary period or this 60 day period was increased from 30 to 60 days, is my understanding, to give additional notifications to county residents or any resident from any jurisdiction would get a ticker, correct? You live out of state, you can get a ticket.

MR. RICH: Yes, as long as you commit the violation.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. So it applies to everybody.

Do you know when Suffolk County rolled this out when they had their little probationary period, which I think was 30 days, how many violations they issued in that month?

MR. RICH: I saw the press conference. I want to say it was above 20,000. I forgot the actual number.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: 20,000 violations for passing school buses?

MR. RICH: Warnings.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Warnings. So during the first 60 days, you're doing to issue warnings. What if you get multiple warnings during this 60 day, or do you just get one and the second -- the second violation during the warning period, is that a ticket or is that another warning.

MR. RICH: No. It would still be -anything that is issued or captured within that 60 day period will still be a warning, and it would be for each event
captured.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: So we could reasonable expect like numbers, $10-20,000$ violations a month for school bus violations, correct.

MR. RICH: In the warnings, I would say anything is possible, yes.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Then you see a lower number once this is fully implemented -- each month.

MR. RICH: What we see in other jurisdictions where they've done it there's basically a $3 \%$ recidivist rate; so less than $3 \%$ get a second violation.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. All right. Is your agency staffed to handle this increased workload, either court reporters or judges or administrative hearing officers or even just support personnel, are they equipped to handle the expected influx of tickets that the County is now going to process?

MR. RICH: We will be. I spoke with DCE Fox about it. We will make sure that
we will be.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: It's all good
then. You spoke to DCE Fox. Okay. I got it. Thank you, Mr. Rich.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Anyone
else?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No.
Okay. Thank you.
MR. RICH: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any
public comment? Come on up, Pearl.
MS. JACOBS: I applaud this
Resolution. I think it is past due.
Everyday, I see people run right past the buses with the stop signs out. In fact, last week I was stopped for a stopped bus and the person in back of me, the idiot, was honking me, okay. So I think -- what is the fine, $\$ 250$ ? You should make it \$1,000.

The school districts, they do have the option to opt out of the program?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: They would have to opt in.

MS. JACOBS: Oh, so they have to opt in. So if they don't opt in, it is not enforced in their school district, correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Correct.
MS. JACOBS: Well, okay. I will
make sure Uniondale will opt in. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any
other public comments?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none, motion by Legislator Bynoe to close the hearing, second by Legislator Ford.

All in favor of closing the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The hearing is closed.

Now we go to Item \#6, which is the vote on this proposed Local Law to amend Title 86 of the Miscellaneous Laws of Nassau County as added by Local Law 19-2019 in relation to changing to 60 days the period that a written warning will be issued in lieu of a Notice of Liability following commencement of the School Bus Photo Violation Demonstration Program.

Motion by Legislator Ford, second by Legislator Bynoe.

We need to amend this. The amendment will clarify that the 60 day warning period will apply to specific school district after that school district opts in.

Motion to amend by Legislator
Ferretti, seconded by Legislator Ford.
Any discussion on the amendment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Hearing none, all in favor of the amendment, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously.
Now as to the item as amended. Any
further debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none. All in favor, signify by

| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | saying, "Aye". |
| 3 | (Whereupon, all members of |
| 4 | the Nassau County Legislative |
| 5 | Body respond in favor by |
| 6 | saying, "Aye".) |
| 7 | PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those |
| 8 | opposed? |
| 9 | (Whereupon, no verbal |
| 10 | response.) |
| 11 | PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: |
| 12 | Carries unanimously. |
| 13 |  |
| 14 | $\star * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$ |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Now we are going to the Capital Plan Items.

Starting with Item \#3, which is an ordinance to adopt the Capital Plan for the County of Nassau for the first year of the four-year capital plan to commence on January 1, 2021, pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

Moved by Legislator Gaylor, seconded by Legislator Solages.

That's a motion to open the hearing, all in favor of opening the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing is now open.
There is Ken Arnold.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Good afternoon, Presiding Officer. So Item 8 and Item 9 are associated with the Capital Budget and Four Year Capital Plan for 2021 and also 2020 which was just enacted on. The budget includes a total of $\$ 242$ million in General Capital and \$120 million in SSW Capital for a total of $\$ 362$ million. Thirty two percent or \$116 million is from non-County sources.

The 2021 plan includes 41 new projects. These projects, some are a roll over from 2020. These new projects are all further enhance traffic and safety projects, most notable being our Traffic Accident Prioritization Study, or as it's referred to in the Capital Plan as the Traffic Master Plan. It also includes various roads, repaving, streetscapes and park facility projects that's been added to address concerns
brought to the Administration.
Buildimg condition continue to be a focus and, as such, projects the police academy, Five Towns Community Center, Kellog House and as mentioned earlier, the expansion of the College Hospitality Center.

Following, some new additions, like EV charging stations, the body cameras, which is part of the the 19th Amendment, a new project that was proposed, and also a Police Reform Act enhancement for public areas project is also included.

I'm available to answer any questions.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Good afternoon, Ken.

On that Five Towns Community Center, do you know off hand what that item is and what we are doing there, what you're planning.

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: The Five Town
Community Center, currently we have a project where we are working with GOSAR
for an emergency generator and also the HVAC system for the building.

Additionally, the roof needs to be done and we also need to look at the building and see what other additions the building needs for it's life services to keep an adequate structure for the current use.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. I got it.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any
other questions?
Legislator Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you very much, Presiding Officer.

I totally support this Bill, the budget, but looking through the back up that is presented to us, we noticed that there are a number of projects for road repair, Ken, in all of our districts. One of the things I noticed that's in the budget, is the half million dollars to remove and replace curbs and sidewalks.

I know I speak to you about repairing sidewalks a lot, and as a result, I'm
compelled to renew my appeal to the majority to assign my Sidewalk Repair

Bill to a committee so it can be advanced. It was filed a long time ago and without that Bill, people in Nassau County are being unfairly forced to repair sidewalks on county roads that have absolutely no connection to their individual properties. Their back of their house may be on a county road and they may never use that sidewalk, but they are required to repair it.

The result is that these sidewalks all over the county are not being fixed and they remain in a dangerous and defective condition. And really is something that helps. Every tax payer on Long Island has a house on a county road and I would like to see that Bill advanced.

Again, thank you, Presiding Officer, for allowing me the opportunity to say that.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.

Thank you. Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal

```
    response.)
```

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none, is there any public comment on this hearing?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Again,
hearing none.
Motion by Legislator Birnbaum,
seconded by Legislator Lafazan to close the hearing. All in favor of closing the hearing, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Hearing is closed.
Now we move onto the Ordinances and Resolutions to raise the Capital Plan.

Item \#8, Ordinance 126, to adopt the Capital Budget for the County of Nassau for the first first year of the four year plan to commence on January 1, 2021, pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

Motion by Legislator Gaylor, seconded by Legislator Deriggi-Whitton to adopt that.

There were amendments which will have to be in the form of an amendment in the nature of a substitution which will provide as follows:

Increases to funding for various projects including various facilities; Electric vehicle charging stations;

County building roof renovations;
Polaris Field upgrade;
Park furnishings;
County pool improvements; .

Traffic Signal improvements; and
A NICE bus grant;
Also adds projects for the Joysetta and and Julius Pearse African American Museum, as well as police reform-related projects; and

Fire Service Academy Master Plan.
We need a motion to amend by
Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, seconded by Legislator Gaylor.

Any debate and discussion on the amendment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none, all in favor of the amendment, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Passes
unanimously.
Now as to the item as amended, any further debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All in favor, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by saying, "Aye".)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The
Ordinance 126 passes unanimously as amended.

We have to do the same thing with respect to Resolution 168.

Resolution to adopt four year Capital Plan for the County of Nassau to commence on January 2021, pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

Moved by Legislator DeRiggiWhitton, seconded by Legislator Gaylor.

There are amendments that have to be made. The amendment is made by Legislator Gaylor, seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

Any debate or discussion on the amendment?
(Whereupon, no response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All in favor of the amendment, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those
opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Item is amended.

As to the item amended, all in, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Resolution 168 passes unanimously.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Then
we go to resolution of Ordinance 51,
which is item 11 on the calendar.
A Bond Ordinance providing for a
Capital Expenditure to finance the capital projects identified herein within the County Nassau and authorizing
$\$ 284,976,622$ of bonds of the County of Nassau to finance such expenditure pursuant to the Local Finance Law of New York.

Moved by Legislator Kopel, seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. Any further discussion on this item?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none, all in favor, signify by
saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously.
***********************

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Move to Item 23, Ordinance 63. An Ordinance supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Management and Budget.

That is moved by Legislator Ford, seconded by Legislator Bynoe, which puts that before us. This is the American Rescue Plan item. I know there are some questions, do we have anyone from the Administration?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Good afternoon, Presiding Officer, Minority Leader. Do you mind if I make a few very brief remarks?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Okay. Just to present it.
I'm Evelyn Tsimis, Deputy County
Executive for Economic Development. It is my pleasure to be back with you today following last week's public hearing. We appreciated the public hearing and the opportunity to present the County

Executive's Economic Recovery and Community Reinvestment Package, which would direct $\$ 62.9$ million dollars of ARP funding to much needed assistance for small businesses, non-profits, to develop our workforce, revitalize our downtowns and support our residents including our seniors, veterans, youth and more. We thank you for the discussion and the suggestions.

As we stated, we consider this an innovative process given the significant funds still available in the first payment still to come from Washington. Last week our team outlined in detail, the Administration's approach, both in terms of the dollars we are allocating, as well as the processes we are putting in place for distribution of this important funding.

To review, the categories of funding in the $\$ 62.9$ million are as follows:

Just under $\$ 18$ million for health and human services. These funds will be
directed to the County's non-profit partners who are positioned to assist our residents, many of whom are still struggling with much needed support. We also provide an opportunity for new partners to apply. The funding is much needed and the non-profit partners are poised and ready to get to work;

We also outlined a $\$ 32.5$ million
Economic Development Program. This
includes $\$ 20$ million for small business grants and loans. Building upon our successful Restaurant Recovery Grant and Boost Nassau Loam Programs;

Also included in our proposal is to provide technical assistance to businesses, ensure outreach to our MWBE, boost local tourism, and infuse funds to important workforce development initiatives to promote apprenticeship programs for skilled workers and partnerships with local colleges for training and upscaling our workforce; We also outlined a proposal for a $\$ 9$
million investment in sewer and water infrastructure including a $\$ 3$ million Septic Replacement Program and funds for a Multi-year Ground Water Conservation Program;

Finally, we've included funds to support our school districts and additional resources for consulting assistance essential to our managing of this funding.

We will continue to build out our administrative processes through a universal portal for applications and tracking of funds as well as our Boost Nassau Resource Center and other procedures to ensure the funds are distributed fairly and following the evolving federal guidance.

We look forward to your support in promoting our Boost Nassau online portal, a one stop shop for figuring out eligibility and applying for Federal, State, and County aide programs; those already available and those coming online
as we build out our programs. I
appreciate some of the suggestions at
last weeks hearing that were made on many of these topics.

We also expect to take the resource program on the road, as our Office of Minority Affairs and Asian Affairs and Hispanic Affairs have done in the past, to our county libraries and other places where the communities are, understanding the concern that not everyone can get to Eisenhower Park and do so conveniently.

I think we all agree it has been a long road to recovery, but Nassau County is poised to come back from the COVID-19 pandemic stronger than ever. We urge you to take this next step in directing important Federal Assistance, by approving the Administration's plan.

Thank you, We're happy to take some questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Evelyn.

Legislator Kopel?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you.
As you recall, Ms. Tsimis, last meeting during Committees, we had quite a few questions.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Yes.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: You, the collective you, promised some responses. I'm not aware of any responses. I can go through them, if you'd like.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Sure. We can go through them. I don't know if any effort was made to provide them.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Not so far as I know.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I can give off a couple that $I$ think came up in my presentation on Economic Development, if you'd like me to do that.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Sure. Why don't you go over that first.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I can start with that.

I think there was some questions raised by Legislators Rhoads and Ferretti and perhaps others, about the number of grants we had distributed through our Restaurant Recovery Grant Program. The total number was 289, I think the question was it 250 or 275 , that number has been changing. The final number was 287, I believe. That includes all of the funding we allocated from the CDBG-CV funds, so it was just it was just over \$2 million. The grant actually had been for a little under 2.2, but some went for administrative cost to National Development Counsel that ran the program for us, which turns out to be 1 in 5 of the full service restaurants in Nassau County. So we are pretty pleased with that number. Do we think we can do more? Absolutely. Are we excited about the Small Business Grant Program? Yes. Just to clarify so everyone understands, that program is open right now, you can get an application. We are funding it with the
$\$ 800,000$ that was remaining CDBG-CV account. As of right now, people can download those applications. I think we have about $\$ 300,000$ worth of grants in the pipeline already.

I'd also, while I'm at it, like to address the concerns raised by Mr. Ian (sic) Sayles earlier today who spoke about the delays he felt he faced at the beginning of the Restaurant Grant Program. He applied in November, I believe, and his grant was in his hands by February. It is was late November, because we did this right after Thanksgiving; it was almost December. We don't think three months is terrible. Obviously, when we kicked it off, there were actually some serious concerns with the Zoom Grant portal. The vendor subsequently switched to a different portal, it's called the SM Apply and it's part of Survey Monkey. I think they were surprised by the volume of what came in those first few days and weeks, but
within a few weeks, we adjusted that. I think Mr. Sayles was probably caught up in being one of the first applicants and then it took his grant a little longer than some of the others. Once we got the process moving, they moved much quicker. I just want to state that. Should we go forward with the same vendor with the $\$ 10$ million allocation, if you're kind enough to approve that today, we will look to have things continue to move quickly, as they have been lately.

Other questions I think I was asked specifically about are the benefits of loan versus grants. I think we just want to state that, once again, we agree, we'd love to do more in grants. There's still money that can be allocated by the Legislature with the County Executive over the next few weeks, and hopefully the Economic Advisory Council will
continue to discuss the business assistance.

In terms of the loans, we have heard
from a number of businesses that, for
their long term survival and doing a lot better, they could use larger amounts than we would be able to do in the form of a grant. The loan fund allows you to do up to $\$ 200,000$ per grantee based on their plans, how hard hit they were and what their plans are for the future. We do think the balance of grants and loans is one that we'd like to continue to make. Again, some of it is short term and survival, and the rest of is sort of showing what they can do if we invest in them more over time.

I'm trying to think what other questions were directed my way. I'm happy to take them on.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: All right. My turn?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yup. Absolutely. Those were just the two that popped in my head.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That's great and I know those were definitely asked.

Well, let's start out with one of the big ones. The $\$ 375,100,000$ intension; is that still there? When we last spoke, you were going to get guidance as to the permissibility of it and if you intended go ahead; do you have update on that?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I do. As indicated last week, the Administration had very productive discussions with Senate Majority Leader Schumer's Office, as well as with the US Treasury. The Senator strongly supports the concept of direct cash payments and we know that direct cash payments are clearly allowed. I don't want there to be worry about that.

As you know, we are looking to maximize the scope of the eligible universe of recipients. The

Administration expects to file a specific plan on that soon, and we will include with that an opinion of counsel to justify the expense, as you had
requested.
I don't have anything more to say on that today, but that is where we are -LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. So if you expect that that would be allowable, then we can go further on that eventually.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Cash payments are clearly allowed.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: What about, one of the questions I had asked at the time was about the the allowability of using funds to, perhaps, pay off, finally, some of the claims for business owners that have been hard hit, since that would serve a dual purpose, it would certainly strengthen a lot of the businesses that desperately need the money now, as well as defray some of the continuing interest costs and lower the amount owed by the County for these items. Is that allowable; did you find that out? DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Yeah. I believe that Conal Denion from the County Attorney's Office has been
looking into that item. He is on by phone. My understanding was we couldn't do something that would be considered tax relief.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: It's not tax relief at all.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Right. You're talking about something else, so I don't know if there's a response yet. I think Conal is available by phone.

MR. DENION: I am available to comment. It's Conal Denion from the County Attorney's Office, Evelyn.

Legislator, the question is still
under review in the County Attorney's Office and I will remind the County

Attorney of your interest and that you asked the question again, but it is being looked at the County Attorney's.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. Thank you, Conal.

Now, within spending categories, one of the questions was whether the

Legislature would have input as to specific grants. In other words, just to give you an example, one of the examples that I specifically mentioned last time was within the youth programs. I mentioned a group that has been very active here in my district and, actually, indeed beyond my district. They're not one of the established programs.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Right.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Are those other people going to be considered, and do we here in the Legislature get a say in that?

Going further, other such questions within the same general category: School districts, $I$ know it is intended to give certain school districts. Do we have a say as to which school districts and the distribution? What about private schools, what about charter schools, what about the religious schools?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: On
the question of the process we are going to follow and the Legislative involvement, our plan is process the grants as quickly as we possibly can. We are in the process of developing guidelines for the eligible activities and you wouldn't have to be a current county vendor in order to be eligible. So it what would be posted on the

County's Boost Nassau portal, it would be an application, it would lay out the criteria and then it would be treated as a grant through that portal.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Who decides?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Our consulting team and the County's team are putting together the guidelines and the criteria right now. That hasn't been finalized.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Is it then your response that the Legislature would not have a role?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: No.
My response is that we are finalizing the
guidelines and the criterial for the grant portal and the application process. We're not looking to upset the apple cart of the items that are already approved by the Legislature, versus items that may be grants and don't require that. So I'm not an expert in that realm, I just know that we are developing that procedure right now. We will be looking for guidance. I think, if you recall, maybe this was before I was here, but there had been examples of the County receiving emergency-related funding, such as the CARES ACT and during Sandy. From what I understand, in those prior, almost similar, emergencies situations, we were able to move funds quickly through an application process. We are looking to learn from those previous and hopefully do better and move things even quicker this time around, because we did hear some concerns about how long that took. Similarly with the our Septic Program. As you know, there is an
existing program that is already available for State funding for septic replacement. Once the Legislature, hopefully, approves the new funding from ARP, we would use that as a model. The guidelines are already in place, the criteria for what you have to do in order to secure the funding from ARP would be available and our residents would be able to apply.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Right.
Another one of the questions --
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: On last --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Go ahead. Sorry. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: One last point is we also, obviously, have the Legislators participating in the Economic Advisory Council. Legislators McKevitt and DeRiggi-Whitton, and we could possibly, once we have this scoped out a little bit more in terms of the guidelines, we'd be happy to share it and have those discussions.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The other question I had was whether some of these funds could not be used to displace some County borrowing in terms of, for instance, various capital projects in the allowable categories. We spend an awful lot of money every year, perhaps. This, again, would be a financial benefit to the County. The County is drowning in debt.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: So think --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Perhaps we could avoid some.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I apologize, Legislator.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Go on, please.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yeah, I think there are two points on that. One is we get see the specifics of the infrastructure package coming down from Washington. Also, the second piece would be that we also have additional funds here. I'm not precluding that, I
just think it's not in this particular $\$ 62.9$ million phase. There will be future phases with addition items and additional support. If you have specifics you'd like us to consider, we are extremely interested in receiving those. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: All right. I will just conclude with a comment. That is with respect to these particular items, there are a lot of unanswered questions and I don't particularly think we are ready to vote, but, again I'm speaking for myself. That's just my opinion. I'd like to get some answers before go ahead and vote, because at this point to some extent, it would be kind of a blank check.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ferretti?
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Good
afternoon, Ms. Tsimis, how are you?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I'm fine, Legislator. How are you?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I'm doing
well, thank you.
The $\$ 20$ million for the Boost Nassau Program that would be $\$ 10$ million equally for the loan and for the grants, right?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Yup.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Would eligible businesses be able to apply for both?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So you can get a grant and still apply for the loan?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: You you also apply -- our Boost Nassau Team is helping them apply for the State grant, which is a significant program as well, $\$ 800$ million. Regina Williams from the Boost Nassau team is here and we've been really making an effort when we speak to the residents and business owners to encourage them to apply to the County's program, which, again, we haven't pushed out as much as we would like, because we're holding, waiting for
the $\$ 10$ million to be allocated. We have some money in the account, but we are very anxious to get started and work with all of you, once we have the allocation of the $\$ 10$ million, but we are encouraging businesses to do both -- all three, in theory.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you.
Now, the 2.5 for the schools, when we spoke last Monday, I had some questions about the eligibility for that, which school districts would be eligible, what the requirements would be, how that was going to be distributed. Do you have any further clarification on that issue?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I do not and I don't know if anyone else from the Administration has an answer on school districts. That's one piece I did not work on, I apologize. I will see if I can get you something before we wrap today. You are looking for whether the charter schools are eligible --

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: That, also
even the public school systems; how is it going to be divided? What are the eligibility requirements? Similar to what Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel was saying. Just asking for 2.5 however --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Someone can correct me here, Andy or someone, but I believe there is separate funding directly going to the school districts and this pot is to provide them with assistance; is that correct?

MR. PERSICH: Good afternoon, Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget.

I believe the intent and purpose is to help some of the school districts that had broadband capability issues with at-home school learning. We haven't developed a plan as far as who the recipients will be and what the need will be, but I would imagine it would be based on need, because school districts did receive an exorbitant amount of money in addition to relief from the Federal Government, so I think we are just trying
to expand based on the guidelines that we have, that certain districts need a little bit more boost or broadband boost, for lack of a better thing, to get them up and running for occasions that just occurred.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I understand
your response and I appreciate some direction in terms of where you're looking to go with that funding. I just don't really know exactly what that means. I don't know which districts had broadband issues. I guess some further clarification, if you can get that. Are you aware of any districts that had broadband issues?

MR. PERSICH: Legislator, me personally, no; but $I$ did hear that some of the districts did have some issues with getting online capabilities for the student learnings. Whether they were charter schools or public schools, I don't know the answer to that, but I think there were some issues.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I will add, again, this is a marker. One that we think is ready to fund and ready to go. We also understand that as legislators, you may have more visibility into some of those things than we do. We would urge you to get in touch our office and we'll happily talk to you as we try to sort out the details of making this funding available to the school districts that need it most.

The guidelines, as I mentioned, for some of these programs are still in the works. But we feel confident that those together. Frankly, the discussion at these meetings has been helpful to us.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Yeah, I'm just trying to wrap my head around it.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
It's a new process for everyone.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Yep. I'm sure every public school district had to make some changes to the way they spent their money over the year. I know the
districts in my legislative district, they bought little chrome books for every student. They were a hundred and something dollars a student times however many students. Who ultimately pays for that? It's the tax payers, right? You get the school budget and it goes up for that amount. Every district really had unexpected expenses last year and I'm sure each district would have a list of things they weren't predicting they had to pay for and I just don't know how you quantify how you're going to be distributing this money. Just would like a little bit more detail.

With regard to a question that Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel asked you of the $\$ 100$ million, the 375 payments, I heard your response and I appreciate that. But last Monday when we had our hearing, we really had pretty targeted questions and it was my understanding was that the Administration was going to meet with the Treasury Department, not just to
discuss whether direct cash payments can be made to residents, I think that's a foregone conclusion last Monday. I think
that the question that we took away, or at least I took away, that you were going
to be presenting to the Treasury
Department is whether the County
Executive's proposal, which specifically
was going to sent direct $\$ 375$ cash
payments to 300,000 Nassau County
households that were eligible for STAR and have STAR; was that question posed to the Treasury Department in your meeting late last week?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
understand there were discussions concerning both the direct cash payment itself, as well as the universe of eligible recipients. I know we are still looking into that. I don't have anything more to add on that point.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Well, that's
tough for me to swallow, because that's exactly what we spent hours discussing
last Monday and that's exactly what what you indicated that the Administration was going to discuss with the Treasury Department late last week, so. That wasn't brought up at the meeting? That wasn't --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I don't have anything more to say. We are going to go through the same thing we went through last week on this. For better or for worse, the Administration's position is that we are working on it and we plan to file plan with the Legislature soon to carry out what the County

Executive has announced and we are still in discussions with the US Treasury Department and internal. We intend to provide an opinion of counsel at the time. We intend to get you a plan as soon as we can, but I don't really have anything more to say today.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: You don't see how one is related to the other; in other words, that $\$ 100$ million allocation, you
want us to vote on $\$ 63$ million right now, but you're contemplating $\$ 100$ million for this 375. Our vote on the $\$ 63$ million could change depending on how the $\$ 100$ million goes. I guess, you kind of indicated you were gonna have answers for us today after speaking to the Treasury Department late last week. That doesn't sound like you do.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I don't have anything more to say. We will file a plan.

We do think you can move on the $\$ 62.9$ million of necessary relief for businesses for our partner organizations who are very interested. Some came and spoke to you last week. Anyone who has been on our Economic Advisory Counsel, we have youth organizations, folks who help folks with mental health issues. There's really no reason to hold back this proposal due to the continued work that is going into the other one and getting it right.

> Obviously, our team feels strongly
that these programs are fundable, that we are going to develop finalizing some of the guidelines to push the money out fairly and transparently. We've moved pretty quickly to get a universal portal up and we're adding to it everyday with new opportunities. We just encourage you to move this piece and we will continue to talk about the other one.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Back in May, when plan was proposed for the direct cash payments for $\$ 375$, the County Executive stated she was planning on also using the sales tax revenue that came in at excess of what was predicted, in the event that that was necessary to get these direct cash payments out. Is that still the plan of the Administration in the event that the original plan of using the Federal money for that purpose is not permissible?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
have no comment on that. I honestly
don't know.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Does anyone
from the Administration know?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
think it's probably best if we stick with that we will file a plan soon and we don't have any more comments on this item at today's meeting.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. Thank you.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Schaefer?
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Good
afternoon. How are you?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Good afternoon.
Okay. I have a question about the
Small Business Grant Program.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Sure.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I see it is $\$ 10,000$ per eligible business.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yes, uh-hmm.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Is that max
that they can get or is that what they will get regardless of --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
That's what they will get. We initially
decided -- the restaurant grant we had two levels of funding. It was if you had 10 or under employees, you got $\$ 5,000$ and 50 or under received $\$ 10,000$. We just decided for simplicity many of the smaller business -- actually, the restaurants, we know they could have used it. We may, if we end up with enough funding, go back to some of those folks, but for right now, we are going with the $\$ 10,000$. We think it is very helpful and it just simplifies things as well.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay. Is that open for applications now?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: It
is. There's just what's left in the funds from the funds from the CDBG CARES

Act special allocation through Kevin Crean's office. That could run out within the next month or so if we don't have additional funding from the Legislature.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay.
Then I wanted to ask you about the Tourism Program. The $\$ 500,000$ is going to support a marketing promotional campaign for Nassau County. Can you tell me how much do we spent on marketing promotional campaigning now?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: The County right now allocates -- the Parks Department actually oversees this contract, even though I consider tourism economic development, $I$ actually don't live and breathe that contract -- but I believe it's \$1 million of hotel/motel taxes that's generated and goes to Discover Long Island. I think that is about a third of their budget. We've felt that a half million -- even though we got a lot of proposals and ideas from

Stu Richner (phonetic), from The Herald papers, some of the members of the Economic Advisory Council, lot of folks talking about how to sort of boost Nassau's visitor profile, including something they announced last week up in Port Washington, Legislator

DeRiggi-Whitton was up there talking about the Downtown Deals Promotion -- but we thought half, again, the budget, was a good amount to do this, even though we know New York City is spending 30 times that on their tourism, that given our investment of a million, that half a million could be well spent in a good amount of time. We would focus on our downtown attractions, our downtowns, our beaches, very Nassau County specific. As opposed to the larger Discover Long Island effort, which is discover Long Island and more regional, this would be just Nassau.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay. So this $\$ 500,000$ would be in addition to the
million.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Yes.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: And that's a million a year, you say, that we typically spend?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay. I think this was it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ford, then Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Good afternoon.
LEGISLATOR FORD: In regard to the
small businesses, do we have a list of what type of business would be eligible for any type of --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
We're looking primarily at the retail sector. Again, back to the notion of downtowns and boosting our downtowns. The application is currently up on the Boost Nassau portal. I don't know that I
brought it with me, but we're looking at, sort of, if you think of whoever is on that main street. It will be the retail, service to the end user, purchaser.

We're not looking to fund professional services necessarily; although, we know many of them are located in our downtowns, we just felt that we really needed to target this, again, $\$ 10$ million for the number of businesses we have in Nassau. At some later date, perhaps we can add a side funding and expand it to professional services, for instance. LEGISLATOR FORD: So hair salons
would still be able --
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Hair salons would be eligible, yes.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Mr. Sayles, I
think his name was --
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Mr.
Sayles, yes.
LEGISLATOR FORD: He had indicated also, I guess some of his providers, like the bread guy --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: The providers, exactly.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: The milk guy. What about them? This would be, basically, the funding would only go to Nassau based businesses, correct?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So if he gets his bread from somebody in Queens, that bread business would not necessarily be eligible.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
That's right. I'm not sure about
wholesalers, either. That would --
again, if there was more funding, maybe we could look at something like that.

Right now, it's just for the retailer; the people selling.

LEGISLATOR FORD: What about the warehouse type of --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: We just got an application for one of those actually. The team that's managing this
for us asked the question. We put it on hold for the moment while we sort that out. We will have to see how many employees they have. If they're larger, they wouldn't be eligible. If they're smaller -- again, having your feedback is helpful. Right now, we started with the retailers, but we could look at that.

LEGISLATOR FORD: What about, I know
one of the issues that we had in Sandy for the businesses was that they had to have been in business, by certain time in order to eligible for any type of Sandy funding. We had some restaurants that opened up in March, April or June of 2012, and then the storm hit in October, so they lost everything. The were completely demolished, and because they had to be in business for a year prior to Sandy, I guess with tax records and things like that, they were not eligible. They couldn't get any help whatsoever. Are we going to limit ourselves? Because I think of some businesses that probably
started right before the pandemic hit and if they are hanging on by that thread, would they be eligible for something like this so they can stay in business?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yeah. We have them eligible the have to be in operation after March 1, 2020 in an attempt to capture those that were a concern. I'm going to check on that. I feel like with the restaurants we went back a little further. I just need to check.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So they had to be in business prior to March 1st.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yeah, I'm not sure. No. It's after. As long as their after March 1st. We didn't have the same cutoff as we did with the restaurant. Again, the eligibility changed because the ARP eligibility is not exactly the same as the CARES ACT/HUD Grant. Those were very targeted. You had to save at least one job. And there other things about what the criteria were

in the CARES, so we have been in the process of making sure. Actually, the applications that's up now checks the box on both. We thought as soon as we get the ARP funds, we could move quickly on new applications using the new funds. We wanted to make sure they were eligible. That before or after March 1st date I have to double check.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Perfect. And then
with the Veteran's Agencies, a lot of them have small little service areas. Like they might have a bar set up or a kitchen and then they have hall, or whatever. I know that in speaking with some of my Veteran's Agencies that have these establishments that it was a little cumbersome: Asking for different information, they had to have so many employees. These are like small businesses. They're mom and pop, and the are part of Main Street. They may not necessarily be on Main Street, but they are part of the fabric of the community.

They do provide a lot of services.
Is there any way to relax some of
those rules to make it easier. Some of them just maybe need $\$ 5,000$ or $\$ 8,000$. They're not looking for large sums of money. Just something that maybe can help, because they're membership. Think about the people that help keep their VFW or American Legion open. Those people could have been impacted by the pandemic.

A lot of times they make that extra money by people renting out the halls; of course, none of that happened. I would ask if there's any way that we could, sort of, relax the rules and just make it a tad bit easier for them so that you're not asking for social security number of people or how many employees. I mean, usually it's just a guy. The guy who's head of it. He cleans the kitchen, he does everything.

You know, $I$ just think in
consideration of the services they do provide to so many of our Veteran's
anyway, that we take a look at this and say, "you know what? Let's be a little bit kinder to them". It is a good group.

And then also, I guess with the
Veteran's is this also -- I know a woman -- I for get the name of it -- she provides a service where she does outreach to the Veteran's, reflexology, whatever. Would she then, with that type of business, which she directs directly Veteran's, would that be another business that may be able to be eligible under the Veterans?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yeah. I think we would encourage her to apply. As long as they're either a non-profit, a 501-C3 or a small business, which ever way she would fall in, hopefully, we could assist her.

On the other point, we have tried to scale back the documentation from the restaurant to now, but also have the benefit of having the Boost Nassau Center. I don't want to minimize how
much a real person can help when you're struggling with this. We clearly have businesses, the minute they heard -- I think when we announced the Restaurant Grant Program, there were businesses out there that thought they will just give their name and a check was gonna come. Unfortunately, we have federal
restrictions and rules we have to follow.
They were one thing for $C D B G-C V$ and they're slightly different under ARP. The County has a responsibility to make sure, in this case under ARP, that the business has suffered an economic loss due to the pandemic. If we were to give checks out without somehow documenting that loss, then we would be the blame and you would all be upset. We have to have some paperwork.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Yes. I like the fact that you said you would probably do district outreach, getting to the districts. Maybe we can coordinate it with Chambers and do a tutorial. I know
whenever we do the Senior Programs where people will figure out how to do their senior exemptions, whatever, it's always been very beneficial and has helped people where they can go right in and get everything done right then and there. I think that is a great program and I will be happy to work with you in my district when you bring it there.

My last question. With the loans, the difference between the loans and the grants are that the grants are a limited amount of money that a business will be getting if they're eligible?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yes.
LEGISLATOR FORD: But the loans, you're actually then provide an opportunity for long range. Like said, somebody may need $\$ 100,000$ to be able to tide them over to 2023 or something like that. Once the loan is paid back, so they borrowed \$100,000 and I'm hoping the interest will be very low.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
They're low. They will be very, very flow.

LEGISLATOR FORD: They're low.
Okay. When the proceeds are paid back, does that money go back to the Federal Government, or does it stay with us?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
That is an excellent question, and as of last Friday $I$ was waiting for an answer based on the Treasury. I don't believe it goes back to the Treasury. I think it would probably stay in fund that we created. I believe it can stay longer than the 2026, but we're waiting for confirmation of that. Obviously, we want it to be revolving, not just come back in. The consulting we've been working with on this, National Development Council, they believe it can be a revolving fund that goes out, but I'm waiting for confirmation of that from Haggarty Consulting.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So then this can
maybe be something we can the over the years, we can recycle.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: It would be wonderful.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Constantly recycle back out to businesses on a small business type of thing.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Exactly.
LEGISLATOR FORD: And I know that with the $\$ 375$ when it was proposed, I read in the paper that the belief was that, say you gave it to the STAR homeowners, that that would be subject to Federal Tax, so the people would only realize $\$ 250$. The grant money that we would be giving to businesses and whatever, that is not subject to taxes at all?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I don't know of Conal knows the answer to that. I always refer tax questions to Conal.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. I do ask
for a response to that, because that
would be something -- It would be unfair to the businesses.

MR. DENION: I don't know if.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Oh, I didn't
realized he --
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
He's on.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Sorry, Conal.
MR. DENION: Yeah, I don't know if
the County is able to answer tax
questions that apply to individuals.
LEGISLATOR FORD: So we need to find out, right?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yeah.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. Thank you.
MR. DENION: Again, $I$ don't know if this is something the County to provide an opinion on, whether an individual is going to be taxed. You can also ask the County Attorney that question. I don't know if that's something that is within our ability to determine.

LEGISLATOR FORD: But $I$ think it is important issue that we need to, because if businesses think they're going to receive $\$ 20,000$, but in the long run it's only $\$ 15,000$, paying that tax on the money may end up being another hardship on them. I'm hoping that maybe we could try to get that clarified and make it so that -- maybe if we go to Senator Schumer to confirm and have them do whatever they need to do to ensure the fact that this money would not be taxed. No taxes, a tax-free grant. That's what my request would be. Thank you.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Rhoads.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Deputy County Executive Tsimis, I know you've been asked about this before and I know it is an uncomfortable topic for the Administration to be discussion,
but I do feel compelled to press for answer. We know, based on what we've been told by the Administration, that there seems to be universal agreement that direct cash payments can be made to residents using the ARP Funds, correct? DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And we know the Administration's plan was to provide roughly 300,000 residents with $\$ 375$ payments based upon their eligibility for STAR; that was the plan, right?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Correct.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Based upon the fact that you're telling us that the Administration has to get back with new plan, can we infer from that that we are not able to use STAR as a basis for making those payments as promised?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
don't think that is what I'm saying. I'm saying that we are going to file a plan.

It wouldn't be a new one, because we haven't filed one before. The specific details that will be in the County Executive's plan will be before you in short order. I really don't have anything more to say today.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Well, you didn't file a plan, but the County Executive went out and had a press conference and that's the plan that she announced. It's not something that was filed with the Legislature, it was filed with the public.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Okay.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Are we to assume the plan that will be filed with Legislature is that roughly 300,000 will receive $\$ 375$ base upon STAR?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I don't have anything more to say on this today. I'm sorry, Legislator. I just don't.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Well, the
conversation did take place with the Treasury Department late last week, as was indicated --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: And
I reported to you that the Senator
supports the cash payments strongly, the US Treasury has indicated that we can make them, and that we're looking to maximize the scope of the eligible universe of recipients, and we will have a plan to you as soon as we can.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Oh, is it the Administration's plan to make it available to more than just STAR recipients?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
don't have any further comment on the plan at all.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Were present on the call?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I was not.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Who was actually on that call with the Treasury

Department?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I actually don't know.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Was Conal Denion on the call with the Treasury Department?

MR. DENION: This is Conal. I was on the call and I will defer any questions to the Administration to my client on the nature of the call.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: We are your client, Conal.

MR. DENION: Again, the
Administration, it is it up to the County Executive to advise whether or not she is going to answer questions about that with counsel on the call. I realize that the County Attorney's Office works for the entire county, but as you know, they are questions where counsel represents the County, but also the County Executive -first reports to the County Executive, so I'm going to defer those questions to the Administration.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I only have two
questions, Mr. Denion. Question one is, was the question asked whether or not direct payments can be made using STAR as the criteria for eligibility? Because based on basis the hearing last week, that was really the only relevant question. So was the question asked?

MR. DENION: Again, I will defer the question to the Administration, questions regarding the call to the Administration.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So as our counsel, which you are, you're refusing to answer that question?

MR. DENION: No. I'm not refusing to answer. I have to take it up to the County Attorney who I report to as well. Again, between the Administration and the County Attorney, I can discuss that question and we can get you an answer to whether the Administration -- I believe that they have spoken to the issue and I will defer to them on whether they want Counsel to address any particular questions or whether they would like to
do that themselves.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Who else was on the call, Mr. Denion. You may not feel comfortable answering that question, but I'm curious if any of the other participants on the call might be able to answer it; who else was on the call?

MR. DENION: Again, I'm going to
defer those questions to the
Administration. I don't know if Katy is there in the room, but $I$ think it's a question between the Legislature and the Administration and $I$ will defer to the administration on how they would like to address that question.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
I'll speak for the Administration and just reiterate what we've said. I've said it already. I don't think it is going change. We have nothing more to say on this topic and we, very
respectfully, and thankfully appreciate if we can try to look at the \$62.9 million item before you and continue
discussions on the other item on a separate track. That is where we are, Legislator, we can go around it, but that is where we are.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The problem is, as Legislator Ferretti pointed out, is that the conversation is not just about the $\$ 62.9$ million, because how we spend the $\$ 62.9$ million, or whether it can be more than that, depends upon the answers to what the acceptable use is of the $\$ 100$ million. If that $\$ 100$ million is on the table, then we can talk about maybe supplementing what's in the $\$ 62.9$ million, shifting it around, using it for other priorities that are related to pandemic expenses. To say that we are only going to talk about the $\$ 62.9$ that's before us, and by the way, we don't have a lot of information about that $\$ 62.9$ million, other than that you want to spend $\$ 62.9$ million, there is an interrelationship between the two. We are talking about a part of a pool of $\$ 192$
million that's available to be spent
that's already in the County's coffers.
I know the Administration would like to handle it in the piece mail fashion because it might be more convenient for them, but we also, as legislators, have to look at the broader scope of the entirety of the 192 to make sure that where we're spending it is spending in a way that best reflects the priorities that are best gonna help businesses and residents in the pandemic.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I understand your position. We do think this meeting and the vote is on the $\$ 62.9$ million. The other item is not before you today. We did not bring it forward to you and we would appreciate your vote on this item. We do think that you have some flexibility given the significant amount of funding coming in still this year and next year to fund the $\$ 62.9$ million, address the other proposal separately, and still come up with great

ideas of other things that we should include that we might have missed in our $\$ 62.9$ assistance for small businesses
that need it for youth services
organizations that are poised and ready
to help our young people and all the rest
of it, Legislator. It is a matter of approach, I understand you disagree with the Administration's approach, but here we are and we respectfully request a vote on the item before you.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
appreciate that position from the
Administration and it's clear that we're not going to receive an answer. I do find it rather instructive, however, that the one question that we asked at the hearing, which we were promised an answer to based upon the conversation that the Administration was having with the Treasury Department, you are refusing to provide us with that answer. It is
rather telling. I suspect it is answer that you didn't want to get and it's an
answer that probably will prevent you from being able to use STAR as the basis for making those direct cash payments, which leads to a bevy of other questions. Whether those questions are answered today, or whether those questions are answered a few weeks down the road when the Administration finally presents its plan, if residents are not receiving the \$375 check based upon STAR that the Administration promised in a very public way intentionally, residents need to know that. It is an issue of transparency. It's an issue of fairness. They need to know it. I have no choice but to accept your answer. At the point, I'll move on, but we really deserve to have that information. Now, with respect to the Boost Nassau Local Business Program. Do we actually have a definitive answer -actually, I'll switch to the Boost Nassau Small Business Loan Program since I believe them to be interrelated -- do we
really have a definitive answer since you're asking us to approve $\$ 10$ million dollars for this loan program, whether that $\$ 10$ million dollars is going to have to go back to the Federal Government in 2026 when we are required to have exhausted the funds?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: We believe --

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You believe it, but did you get an answer from the Treasury Department?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yes, we are waiting for confirmation from Haggarty Consulting that is looking at it right now.

Look, either way, ARP allows for
loans. I don't believe they intended for the money to go back. I think the loan programs that have been set up in the past -- Boost Nassau, which we funded through New York Forward, gets paid back into a fund, but it doesn't go back to the Federal Government. I just don't
want to speak out of turn, because the Haggarty Consulting team wanted to double check with the Treasury and review the guidelines and details and they said it might even need a comment in advance of the July date. The consultant that had managed the prior loan fund for us believes it can be a long term loan program that sort of grows Nassau. I'm hoping they're right and that's where we are on it. Either way, you have quite a few years to loan and get the money back. I'm hopeful that we will be able to do something along those lines.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: But the concern
that I have is that when we had the hearing last Monday, the idea was for us to ask questions and for us to be able to get answers in advance of us having to vote on something. Right now, the Administration is asking us to vote to allocate $\$ 10$ million towards the loan program when we don't have a definitive answer from the Treasury Department that
we're not going to end up forfeiting that \$10 million because it actually wasn't dispersed.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: A
loan program is absolutely allowable
under ARP guidelines. I know it is. And the specific guidelines of our program need to be written in a way to ensure we get the maximum use of those loan dollars for the most businesses in Nassau County. We have not crafted the loan in the final detail and had it scrubbed by our consultants yet, but I can assure you that we will advance a loan program. It will be consistent with our guidelines. I think you will be pleased with the effort, just like the ones that we advanced through the CARES ACT funding and that many businesses took advantage of. I can get you a report on that as well.

We are using this money very wisely and prudently. Some of it is a little bit in the weeds; details with the

Treasury guidance, it has been evolving. We are very anxious to do everything exactly right. I understand your concern, Legislator.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Well, it is not really a discussion that's in the weeds, it's a discussion that's relevant. We are limiting the amount of money that we are providing as a grant program so that we can create a $\$ 10$ million loan program, which we think we are able to do, and we think we might not have to turn the money back in 2026.

The question that I have -- which I don't know of Mr. Persich is still in the room, and $I$ sort of said this at the hearing -- for me, the context of this is what happened with the CARES ACT money. We were told there was a $\$ 385$ million deficit. The Administration asked us to approve the use of CARES ACT funds.

Ninety five percent of the CARES ACT funds that we got that covers salaries and benefit that help close a budget gap
and in the next month, we are announcing there's a $\$ 78$ million surplus. So there's $\$ 78$ million that could have gone to businesses, could have gone to residents, could have gone to a variety of other pandemic-related uses that is sitting in a County bank account right now, as opposed to having provided that relief. So when we are analyzing this, forgive me, I know the administration wants to fairly and transparently distribute this money, but transparency hasn't really been a strong suit here. I'm looking at how you're spending this money in the context of wanting to have solid answers, before I actually give up the only voice I have on this, which is my vote, on the plan.

We want to provide this money. We want to get it out to public, but we need you to help us by providing us the information that we need in order to be able to do that.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
understand. I believe we can reallocate the funds.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: So my question for Mr. Persich is, look, there's a question with respect to this loan program and whether or not we are ultimately going to have to turn back the \$10 million if it's not exhausted. We don't have a definitive answer on that. In the short term why isn't it a better plan to simply take the $\$ 10$ million allocation, allocate it to the grant program so that there's $\$ 20$ million in grants and use part of the $\$ 78$ million that's sitting in surplus that should have gone to businesses and residents in the first place, and use that to fund the loan program and provide twice the impact?

MR. PERSICH: I'll defer on whether we can use surplus money to create a revolving loan program under local finance. I think Conal would probably be better to answer that. I dont think we
can do that. I think with the ARP funding, because it's federal money, it doesn't restrict us, so it's segregated. It's not taxpayer money. Remember, money we have in the General and Operating Funds come from tax collection. It gets a little dicey with that.

That said, $I$ think the ARP funding -- the plan with the loan program is to create a revolving loan program that will be --

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I understand the concept and I agree with the concept. The question is should we be using money that we can hand directly to businesses and say, you know what, we're gonna take \$10 million and put that in our pockets and we're gonna dole it out as part of a loan program where, ultimately, the $\$ 10$ million in principle will still be County dollars, as opposed to being used to assist businesses and residents in direct payments.

MR. PERSICH: I completely
understand what you're saying. I think it gets into a little bit more of a gray area. The buckets, as I term them as, what you can do with certain buckets of money, this bucket of money I think meets the criteria that it's eligible for a loan program. Now, can it go endless? I think that's one of the questions out there. I think this is the policy of the Administration. They put forth a plan saying we're gonna give $\$ 10$ million in grants and we're gonna do $\$ 10$ million in a loan program. It's like with every other budget here, I mean, it's dynamic. This is all new and guidance changes. CARES guidance changed day-to-day. That's how they think, it's one of those things that it's a policy decision, of course. I think we set a plan in front of you to make a decision that we want to do this loan program.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I know that's
the Administration's decision. All to often it seems the Administration's
approach is, well, we think we can do this and if we can't, then we'll deal with the consequences later. I don't want a situation where in 2026 we're looking back at this and saying, oh, gosh. I guess we shouldn't have used it for loans because now we gotta write the Federal Government a check for $\$ 10$ million to pay them back the money. Wouldn't it make more sense to get the answer to the question first, before we actually create the loan program, and if the answer is something we don't like, we can reallocate those $\$ 10$ million towards a grant program. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I just want to be clear, National Development Council, they are a very well regarded national non-profit that's been running the County's Restaurant Grant, Loan, and the new Main Street Grant program using all their dollars, they proposed how to run the $\$ 10$ million loan program. We're just in the process.

They believe it can be done and it can be a very significant effort for Nassau County's businesses. We are double checking everything with Haggarty, who's the newly onboard consultant, to make sure what they said is accurate so that we can spend the money this way.

I believe we can reallocate if we needed to, if we choose to do more in grants rather than the loan. Again, you're clearly allowed to do a loan program under ARP.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I get that you can do the loan program. The ultimate question is whether you're able to keep the money that you use as principle beyond 2026 .

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yup. Understood; understood.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: You don't know the answer to that, right?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Conal can help me out. I think we took a quick look at that and we asked Haggarty

Consulting to confirm that we could and we are waiting for an answer.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: As we sit here today when we're supposed to be voting on this, we don't know that answer.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I'm hesitant to say. I personally don't know for sure, so that's where we are.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Okay. And it's National --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
National Development Council.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Did you ask
National Development Council about the $\$ 100$ million?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: No.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I didn't think so.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
They've been involved with the business grants and loans from the beginning of the pandemic, a long time consultant to the Office of Community Development and very well regarded.
 LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Do we have a definition yet as to what a retail sector business is? That was one of the questions that was asked Monday.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I apologize. I did not bring the application for the Boost Nassau Grant Program with me for today's vote. I had it last week. I thought that would be discussed at the hearing. We do have the specific outlines of the application that is currently, as I said, up on the portal for CDBG CARES ACT and it was consistent with what's eligible under the ARP as well. I just don't have it with me, Legislator. I apologize.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's okay.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: But a retail business is what you would think it is. It's the retailers that are on the main street. The laundry mat and the little corner store. It's the bagel shop that wasn't eligible for the restaurant grants; they're eligible now. We've
tried to expand it to reach everyone as you walk down that main street and you pass a small business, those are the folks that we are aiming to help.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The $\$ 10,000$
limit on these grants is a self-imposed limit, isn't it?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yes.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So we're not
limited by the Federal Government --
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: No.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: As far as the $\$ 10,000$, so we could make it more if we wanted to.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
That's correct.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The rationale
behind using the loan program versus the grant program is that it enables us to give out larger loans than the $\$ 10,000$
that we've self-imposed as a limit.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
That's correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So in theory, if we were to scrap the loan program and give a grant program, we could actually increase the $\$ 10,000$ and make it more useful for certain businesses.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I believe you could. I think, again, you'd have to go back to the purpose of the ARP funding. It's to make up for losses due to the pandemic and businesses do need to make a showing of that. For many small businesses, the size, we really found the \$10,000 mark what they'd find helpful.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: To be perfectly honest, a mom and pop business that closed their doors for three months during the pandemic, the $\$ 10,000$ is barely gonna cover rent. As I mentioned, we are encouraging them to go for the State's program as well. We are working very closely with them to get them as much money as we can.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: By the way, if anyone is already in it, and $I$ believe
you indicated that the Boost Nassau Program is already giving out grant money through CBDG?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
CDBG.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Are businesses that have already received grant money going to be eligible again to receive grants through --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: As of now, we were thinking now. We would like to see a new bucket of businesses get the grant money. The only one category I mentioned is, perhaps, some of the restaurants who might have gotten the smaller dollar figure. If we have funds available at a later date, we might try to fund them again. Right now, we're looking to fund new businesses, not those who just received a restaurant grant.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: The other
question that $I$ had, that $I$ would like an answer to, back on Monday was that we are using \$9 million, essentially, for
infrastructure projects, including \$3
million for the Septic Tank Fund that you want to create. My concern with that is, not that the programs themselves aren't valuable programs. Clearly, they are. There is a clear environmental impact, certainly, with respect to the septic tank program. The question $I$ have is whether it's an appropriate use of what are supposed to be COVID relief funds for an item that really isn't directly related to COVID. Mr. Persich or Mr.

Denion, would we be able to use budgetary surplus or another County Fund to fund those programs, as we do any other infrastructure program? It'd free up $\$ 9$ million to be put into either direct payments or grants to local businesses. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

You're talking about the infrastructure for water and sewer, right?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Right.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
mean, that is eligible under ARP.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I understand you can do it. My question is, are there sources of funding we can use within the County's existing funds outside of the \$192 million that we are receiving, that we can use to fund those programs and free up $\$ 9$ million to go into direct pandemic relief, which I believe is more appropriately suited to where this money should go.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I think the Federal Government considered this direct pandemic relief by including water and sewer in the eligible categories for ARP expenses, and the Administration has tried in the \$62.9 million plan to balance a number of very worthy causes, as you mentioned. In the scheme of things, we think the $\$ 9$ million is the right figure for this use at this time. I know Deputy County Executive Schneider is looking at some other items in the space of environmental and other areas, but for right now we felt this was
the right amount for something that is clearly eligible.

Again, we are anxious to get some of these programs started. I think there was a lot of interest in both the septic program and the water conservation initiative, which is a multi-year.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I'm sure there is and I'm sure they're valuable.

My questions isn't whether it's acceptable under the guidelines that are imposed by the Federal Government. My question is: Are there other monies that we could be using to fund them not as part of this pandemic program; in other words, can we use part of the $\$ 78$ million surplus? Can we use that to fund the program?

MR. PERSICH: I will get back to you on that, Legislator. I don't know the answer to that. The only funding issue I would think is probably because it is sewage related and that type of an effect may be coming out of the Sewer and Storm

Water Fund; I don't know the answer to that question. Whether I can take surplus dollars to give a tax payer relief on a septic system in his house. You know what I mean? I don't think that fits the general purpose of LFL as far as how we disperse money out. Under the General Fund or the five major operating funds, I know what fits the criteria. I don't know about Sewer and Storm water.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Again, it's go nothing to do with the validity of the idea or the concept itself. It's just I'd like to maximize the dollars that we are using that we are getting from the Federal Government for things that are directly related to the pandemic and getting help into the hands of people who suffered as a result of COVID-19. If there's another way for us to accomplish the same goal through the septic program using other funds, I prefer to do that. I would love to get the answer to that questions before we actually had to vote
on this, which is one of the reasons why
I asked the question on Monday -- last Monday. So if we could please get an answer, that would help me figure out what I want to do with this.

MR. PERSICH: We'll get back to you on that.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Legislator Mule?

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I was listening to what was being said about Boost Nassau Business Grant Fund, that's \$10 million; is that correct?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Yes.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Let me backtrack a little bit before that.

The group that was put together that had the Hofstra President --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: The Economic Advisory Council.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: That was all based on questionnaires that were sent out and you got responses from I think around 1,000 business?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Correct, Legislator.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: So would the answers to those questionnaires form the basis of this plan that you're using?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: It was one of the inputs that we used. We also looked at, clearly, residents and businesses who responded were interested in small business grants. They liked loans as well for longer term investment and to help them recover from larger losses.

We also looked at the HRNA study that was done for the Rausch (phonetic) Foundation about how to help downtowns, which also talked about grants and loans and the direction of our funding to those purposes. HRNA actually presented to the members of the Economic Advisory Council,
which includes, as the legislators who serve on it know, all the major Chamber of Commerce, Hispanic American Chamber, African American Chamber, and also the Council of Chambers. We also have small business people themselves on. Of course, everyone says, we'd love to have a grant. You always want the cash infusion, but there is interest in loans. It did come from all of those sources that I mentioned.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: So the decisions that were made were based on studies and based on the actual interest of the small business owners themselves; is that correct?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I think that's fair to say, and people have spoken directly to me and to the County Executive. It's sort of in all these different forums you hear the same thing. Some people will say forgivable loan, because they want the larger amount and they know there's just a limited pot of
funding. The forgivable loans, to my understanding, I think only the Federal Government can forgive loans. So what we are looking at is an extremely low percent, one percent, to keep folks engaged in the program.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: So let me get back to my original question. The \$10 million for the grant and another $\$ 10$ million for the loan; is that correct?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yes. Separate.
LEGISLATGOR MULE: Separate, right.
But if we didn't have this $\$ 62$ million today, which would include the $\$ 10$
million and the $\$ 10$ million -- and $I$
think I heard you say that people who come to the Boost Nassau Office and apply for the grant, that money will not be available; is that correct?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: We have a few hundred thousand, I'm gonna say, left in the CDBG-CV account --

LEGISLATGOR MULE: I'm sorry. Can
you repeat the amount?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
CDBG --
LEGISLATGOR MULE: No, I got that. What was the amount?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: A few hundred thousand, about $\$ 300,000$. We have about $\$ 800,000$ in Kevin Crean's, Office of Community Development account. This is all CARES, special CARES ACT allocation that you all directed. That's how we did the food distributions and free PPE kits and grants and loans in the height of the pandemic. So there was some money left in there. I think about $\$ 350,000$-- it's not out the door because it's a reimbursement, but it is on way out the door. At $\$ 10,000$ a pop, it will go pretty quickly, if we don't have new influx of funding from the ARP.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Right. Okay. To my way of thinking, we should be doing what we can to help the small businesses. I do support this.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Thank you, Legislator. I appreciate it.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Gaylor?
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Good afternoon, Deputy County
Executive Tsimis.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Good afternoon.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: How are you today?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I'm find. How are you?

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: All right. So I have a couple of questions that I need clarification.

On grants that we've already given during COVID to businesses to help them out, would they also be eligible again for grant money or would they fall to the bottom and we'd be looking to give grant money to different businesses? I thought I heard you say that one in five business

have received some kind of grant already. Would this grant money target the other four out of five? DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Yes. That was out of the number of full service restaurant that we think there are in Nassau County, that's based on the Department of Health. We only provided restaurant grants to full service restaurants that had a permit with the County. Again, this was in the height of COVID when safety was an issue, so we also wanted to follow very closely with the Health Department and they were a huge help. We are, at that point, planning to look at, again, a larger pool of small businesses, not just the small business restaurant. We are looking to fund as many as possible with the $\$ 10$ million, and not to give repeat grants to the restaurants who already received a grant; at least not initially.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Is the awarding of the grant based on first come
or first serve of is there some kind of order of merit listing based on criteria, or what determines business "A" gets it and not business "B", or "C", or "C" gets it versus "A, B, or C"?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: To some extent, it's first come first serve, entering the portal and submitting the all the right paperwork. You don't fully enter it until you get everything in, but then in terms of who gets funded, they have to meet the criteria outlined in the application, which follows the ARP eligibility. Again, they have to prove they've had economic hard due to the pandemic. They have to promise to use the funds for certain types of expenses like rent, they commit to that in the portal process, and then they're funded. LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: How will the public become aware? What's the Administration's plan to publicize the various programs?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Actually, included in the budget before you is the $\$ 500,000$ for the Boost Nassau Center itself, which includes the temporary staffing that we've put in there. We have a great team. Dr. Regina Williams from the Office of Minority Affairs is leading. We have a about three new hires and a few more on the way. It will support the staffing, but we are also looking to place some advertisements to get the word out about the Boost Center itself and the resources that are available.

We're also looking to spend another million plus, about 1.5 million for partnerships with non-profit organizations that would include -- we've gotten some proposals already from Hofstra, we know the Nassau County Chamber of Commerce wants to be involved to get the word out. We had Eric

Alexander present last week at the public hearing stating we had to get the word out at the ground level. To the extent
that the potential partners are
non-profits, we would be able to fund them.

Again, it all goes back to the portal. Applications would be made by these non-profit organizations. Like I mentioned, Hofstra, Nassau Community College may have a way to get out to the businesses, I'm not sure, but they would be eligible to participate in our efforts to get the word out.

In addition to that, as I mentioned, we are looking to take the Boost Nassau Program on the road as things have opened up and we can do public meetings again and go visit folks in libraries and community centers. We would follow the lead of our Office of Minority Affairs, Hispanic Affairs, and Asian Affairs and set up programs in libraries and places like that. We would love to work collaboratively with legislators in their districts.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: If I heard you
correctly, the small business restaurants would have to apply through some non-profit agency to get into the portal?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Oh, no. I'm talking about how we're gonna get the word out.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: I want to know how the small business restaurant owner is gonna know that this program exists.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
was just telling you all the different ways we're gonna get the word out.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: I got it and I understand 100\%.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
They have to go through the portal, Boost Nassau.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: How are they gonna know that?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
You're gonna tell them, I'm gonna tell
them, the County Executive is gonna keep
saying it, and we're gonna have newsletters and flyers and we're gonna
get the word out. Our outreach offices will host programs and we're gonna look it as a partnership with all of you. Regina Williams will be out there as well. She's a powerhouse. We'll get the word out. I assure you, Legislator, if the money is allocated, we will let people know it is there and we will encourage you to join us in that effort. LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Sure. All right.

I think I heard you say, and I'm paraphrasing, but it might be pretty close, there's a lot of interest in water and sewer programs. When it came to the 9 or 10 million funding. I would assume when there was not a lot of interest, for our Veteran's, because you've only
allocated $\$ 1$ million for the 42,500
Veterans that live in Nassau County. And 42,500 that live here would benefit individually maybe to the tune of $\$ 22$ if we were to divvy up that $\$ 1$ million. And I know your list of what you want to do
with the $\$ 1$ million includes such things as provide transitional housing, food, financial, employment training, healthcare, mental health, counseling, substance abuse counseling, emergency housing, food pantry, employment counseling, educational benefits; how does $\$ 1$ million do that for 42,500 people?

Veterans who have served our country
so we could sit here today and talk for hours about this ARP funding, but yet your Administration only grants \$1 million for our Veteran's, but a lot of interest in water and sewer programs. I think there's a disconnect there. I'd like to hear what your thoughts are on why we have disrespected the Veterans. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Legislator, thank you for the opportunity to comment on that. At last week's public hearing, I'm not sure if you were here for this part, Deputy County

Executive Kyle Rose-Lauder laid out the
plan for helping the Veteran Non Profit Organizations. I think her point was -again, this is not my area -- is that our own Department of Veteran Services does a tremendous amount dealing directly with Veterans and helping them and getting them all kinds of assistance as evidenced by the recent stand down.

The idea though, there are non-profit organizations who support Veterans who do not currently have contracts with the County and we are looking to start some new partnerships with those organizations and the Department of Veteran Services, I believe, identified those organizations.

I think there may have been some conversations with some of them and that the $\$ 1$ million was based on a determination of what would be a good, sort of, first year effort with those non-profit organizations.

Again, as something new and above what the County's own Office of Veteran

Affairs does to support our Veterans who be, obviously, care very deeply about.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Sure. Our
Veteran's Service Agency does a great job. There's no doubt about it. Ralph Esposito and everyone of the employees over there should be commended for the efforts that they do.

My understanding is none of this $\$ 1$ million will go to supplement the Nassau County Veteran's Service Agency; is that correct?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I believe it's for non-profit partners of the County to provide services, which is the case for some of the other categories, to provide services. Which is the case for some of the other categories that we are funding as well; Youth Services, Office of the Aging. This is to provide supplemental funding to the County's partners who provide direct services to those individuals.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Who are those
partners?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
believe Deputy County Executive Kyle
Rose-Lauder presented on that last week;
I dont have the list.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: That was before Committee. We are before the Full

Legislature. Is the Deputy County
Executive here to talk? To speak? Can you call to get her to speak?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: If it is necessary, we can see if she available.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Would you do that?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
You're looking for a list of agencies that --

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: I want to know how the $\$ 1$ million is going to be spent. I want to know what input the County Administration used to determine why only \$1 million was allocated to from these monies to Veterans; it's pretty simple.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I know the intention, again, as we've mentioned, applications would be on the portal for non-profit organizations to submit proposals for, again, with criteria that would be developed for them to apply for funds in the Veteran's Services area, as is the case with Youth Services, Mental Health Services and others.

Again, the Department Heads have been very involved in this. We have throughout the Health and Human Services vertical, some very knowledgeable team members. I believer I've identified those non-profit partners that we already have. As I mentioned, in the area of the VSA, we do not have partners that receive funding from the County, so this would be a new effort. I look at it as this is something we've never done before and a great opportunity for the Administration to stake its claim and help Veterans in a new way, buy providing funding directly
to non-profits that provide those services. Again, with all due respect, I don't look at it as a negative. I think it seems to me to be a positive that we are doing something we've never done before.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: But I'd like to know which non-profit agencies that you're talking about. There are many of them that come under heavy scrutiny because the administrative fees are very costly and the amount that they actually push forward for the Veteran is de minimus for every dollar they get: High overhead, they keep the money, they pay their salaries for themselves and they give very little to the Veteran. I think it behooves us to know who we're giving the money to and what their overhead costs are and exactly how much of each dollar is in support of a Veteran. It is pretty straight forward.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
That's an important point and I think
that maybe as part of the criteria that are developed for determining which if the non-profits receive grants, one of the criteria we can ask to include is what's the percentage going back to administrative costs. That's a great suggestion, Legislator. I'm happy to take it back and make sure the VSA team and Deputy County Executive Rose -Lauder take that into account.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Please do.
Veterans are a very important part of our County here and we owe them a lot, so please take that back. Please take my comments and concerns and thank you for the great jog that you've done. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Minority Leader Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How are you,
Ms. Tsimis?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I'm
well. How are you, Minority Leader?

TOP KEY COURT REPORTING, INC. (516)414-3516


LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, thank you. This is my first time back. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: Good to see you.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm happy to hear, one, the County's use of Rescue Plan money is proceeding forward. I am concerned, because from what I'm hearing from the Majority, is that there's a potential that it may be tabled. I'm concerned because I've heard from residents throughout the County for the last 13 or 14 months, those that have struggled, those that received a direct payment that they received from the Federal Government directly some time ago, they are still struggling. That doesn't only include residents, it includes all the entities that we're talking about helping with the Rescue Plan today. I'm hopeful that this will go forward, but it sounds like it won't.

I do have a question, because I know there's been a lot of discussion that's


```
been centered around the $375 direct
payment initiative the County Executive
announced some time ago. I just want to
make sure that's clear for the record,
that is not before this body today;
however, I do respect the Majority's
concerns in regard to whether or not the
amount will be permissible based off of
the guidelines of using STAR. I'm
correct --
    DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
You're correct, Legislator.
    LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So we can help
a hand full of folks to the tune of
almost $63 million and get that process
going today. One of the questions and
why, you know, my Finance Director,
Michelle Darcy is coming up to me, I just
want to be clear, of the $62.9, how much
of that will be contractural expenses
that will come back to the Legislature?
Those that are asking questions in
regards to what we have, potentially a
blank check that's gonna go out, I
```

believe a substantial amount of that would come back to the Legislature at some point for Rules Committee or it will be for the entire Legislature. Let me clarify that. It will be Rules Committee members in that particular committee. DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I don't.

MR. PERSICH: As part of a supplemental appropriation that we presented forward to you, it's \$60.4 million.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So \$60.4 of the $\$ 62.9$ million would come back to this body in the form of contracts before the Rules Committee; not all 19 of us, but some of us that sit on that committee will have an opportunity to review those contracts and see how this money is being spent?

MR. PERSICH: The answer to the questions is yes. It will be part of the Contractual Service line and who we enlist to do these programs will come
before you.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So to me, is there any impediment from your discussions, and I'm assuming your discussions with the Department of Treasury or even with the Majority Leader in the Senate, Chuck Schumer, had been more centered around the direct payments, but has there been any discussions in anything that you've presented as part of the $\$ 62.9$ million that is not permissible by the Department of Treasury or anyone you've spoken to? What I'm driving at is, all these particular measures that you've identified in terms of using the $\$ 62.9$ million has been deemed permissible, whether by the Department Treasury or any entity in the Federal Government.

MR. PERSICH: We vetted these programs through out consultants, as well as our internal vetting process that we have here. We believe all these programs are eligible under the guidance that was
given to us.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: If I may, let me just try to summarize this. So we have $\$ 62.9$ million of which there's been no entity in the Federal Government, and based on your discussions with the Federal Government, they've all been vetted and seem to be approved for use based off of those guidelines. On top of that, of the $\$ 62.9$ million, $\$ 60.4$ million, which I don't know the percentages of that, maybe you know, Andy, sounds like a very high percentage -- like 98\% -- Will come back to the Legislative Body for a vote. So even though things may not be clear in terms of how well-defined it may be for some that want to see it on this particular body, a large percentage of it, which to get the ball rolling, a large percentage of it would come back to this Legislative Body -- I'm sorry, to the Rules Committee Body, for a particular vote.

So, to me, I don't see the great
impediment. I've heard from residents not for the last 13, 14, 15, some odd months; they're struggling, they need this. I think any time delaying this process, whether is a week or two weeks or two months is going to be a disservice to those constituents, and I'm talking about the business community, the
community-based community. I think to their standpoint, it'd be a disservice. If I can spend two seconds, because I know my colleagues have spent some time talking about the direct payment in terms of more clarity. The direct payment, I know we're trying to define the universe, and, Ms. Tsimis, I heard your statement in terms of leaving it where that is today. There are certain populations that within that particular universe of using the STAR program, which would be up to $\$ 500,000$ per household -- there are certain, I would think, demographics of folks that would meet what we kind of saw last year with the Federal Government.

Those populations I'm speaking of would be like folks who received enhanced STAR, or even folks that received a senior tax exemption, which we can justify their salary income. If push came to shove and you weren't able to get a response, is the County looking to pivot to potentially those populations? Because I don't think anyone up here would argue that folks that are enhanced STAR, which is a much lesser salary than folks that are on regular STAR, as well as the senior tax exemption to them. Actually, I hope no one is arguing direct payment assistance to anyone. I think from that standpoint, we should be more assisting you in making sure that anyone that lives in this County is able to get some type of relief as pertaining to the last 15 months. I respect the questions and the dialogue and the debate and I think we need to do our due diligence as legislators, but $I$ don't think, if I'm hearing everyone correctly, everyone is
saying we want to support the County Executive in this initiative in terms of getting direct payment assistance to everyone in this county.

So I ask the question, and I will go back to it again, has the County looked at the potential opportunity in the event this does get stalled or you don't get the proper responses? To address some of the concerns I think I heard from Legislator Ferretti and Legislator Rhoads, as pertains to other populations where we know the universe could be shrank (sic) to some degree, but at the same time it would model kind of what the Federal Government did in terms of the income levels. Has the County looked at those particular opportunities and those demographics with the enhanced STAR and the senior tax exemption?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I
think it is safe to say that we are
looking at the universe of who will get the checks right now and it's probably

best if I don't talk about pivoting, because we are very much on the original plan and sorting that all through.

But I appreciate your remarks about, I think we can all agree, that there are many residents that deserve the assistance and that we should be working collaboratively to get it to them, so thank you.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, thank you.

I guess this question might have been asked already: When do you anticipate being able to get a response or being able to formalize a plan?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Formalizing the plan, $I$ don't know what the timeframe is; hopefully, as soon as possible.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, that's what I'm driving at.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Things are a little bit up the air --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I hate the
fact that you're caught and stuck in the bureaucracy of Washington DC and the red tape that exists there. From that standpoint, I want to try to see how fast we can drive through that. I have constituents all throughout my district that would love to be able to get $\$ 375$. If there is anything my office can do to help make that process happen, then I'm open to doing it. I think we should take a more supportive role towards ensuring that the County actually gets the plan done. I'm not too caught up in when the County Executive announced it versus -DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: It gets done.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: To me, the bottom line is, we need to get this done and how do we get it done. I want to be able to extend my office as a support role for that.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Thank you, Legislator.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That being
said, I just want to encourage all of my colleagues today to vote through the $\$ 62.9$ million.

Based on the testimony from Mrs.
Tsimis and from Andy, it clearly -- the Legislative process would be that the Rules Committee would get another opportunity to vote on 60.4 of the 62.9, which, Andy, I'm still giving you time as a human math machine to be able to give me the percentage on. I believe it's a very high percentage that would still come back to this Body before one penny of that $\$ 60.4$ million is actually dispersed. So we have an opportunity today to do something that would send a strong message to the business community, to the community-based community and to many other folks. We have an opportunity to send a very strong message that we go their back and we are supportive of them, rather than it get caught in the murkiness of a potential table, because that shows that maybe we don't clearly
know exactly how we want to deal with this and how we want to proceed.

I would encourage my colleagues to support that based off the fact that \$60.4 million will come back and be presented to the Rules Committee at a later point before one penny of that $\$ 60.4$ is dispersed.

Do you have that percentage, Andy?
I saw you calculating it on your phone.
MR. PERSICH: Ninety six percent.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Ninety six percent, thank you very much.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: At the risk of -- you've been extremely helpful, Minority Leader, and at the risk of disagreeing, I do think we are -earlier in my remarks, I mentioned that for some of the grants we are looking to expedite and the process would look the same as other grants that the County
does. I'm not an expert on that, but I do think there may be a difference between a grant and a contract. Some
will come back to Rules and I'm not sure that that full dollar figure that the Budget Director cited --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Could you get back to this Body, would you be able to get that number?

I don't know if there's anymore questions, Presiding Officer, but would you be able to get that percentage for us?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Yeah. We can get that for you.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: How
long will it take you to get that?
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Again, like I said, I believe we are
developing the process for an expedited grant program, but, maybe Andy is right.

I don't want to stand in the way of this.
I hate to say that almost $100 \%$ are coming back before you as contract amendments.

I think that's what you're saying. I'm not sure that's accurate. I think we're
looking at a way to expedite to existing County vendors funding because this is, again, emergency funding.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The reason I brought it up is because I think that will allow this process to go forward, but at the same time it would alleviate some of the concerns of potentially writing a blank check.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I understand. He seems sure.

MR. PERSICH: Despite what Evelyn is saying, I think the process will be we will contract with these grantor agencies that will distribute the funds. We will select a vendor from that and they will be the ones that will be administering the funds.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: We would still approve that --
(Whereupon, crosstalk.)
MR. PERSICH: -- on 95\% of the
money, because we don't do this stuff in house. We don't have the capability --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm still
comfortable with that percentage. That is really what I'm driving at. When those contracts, whether it is with that particular entity that is going to disperse the grant money, we're still going to have approve that particular contract. And you may have a contract that disperses that many other smaller agencies which is totally fine, but ultimately, we will have a bite at that apple to be able to approve those monies.

MR. PERSICH: You have to look at it another way too. It's the way the structure of the County Budget is done. We have only certain ways to put supplements into certain, $I$ use the term buckets again. You know, how are we going to spend this money. I have to see what best fits this and this is how it fits into that bucket, that category, of how we are going to disperse funds.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I gotcha. MR. PERSICH: Because the way the
budget is written. It's by control center, then by department, and then it goes down to the object code level, which is how we disperse money here.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I understand. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Just so I'm clear on one of the big specifics, the Boost Nassau Program, in terms of the Main Street Small Business Grant Program and the Small Business Loan Program, all would come back to the Legislature in the form of contracts, is that what you're saying, Andy?

MR. PERSICH: I'm saying the vendor that will be administering that program will come before this Body.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. All right.

All right, we are going to --
Legislator Rhoads?
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And at that time, will we be able to ask questions regarding the grant program criteria?

MR. PERSICH: I would say yes, but
that's a programmatic thing.
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: We haven't gotten that far, Legislator, but if that's the process you're looking for then --

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Well, if I can ask. If the idea is to get immediate assistance --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: I believe the County Executive's Office was speaking to the County Attorney's Office and the Office of Procurement and Consultants to try to come up with the most expeditious way of getting this funding in the hands of the qualified organizations that are going run various programs for us. So I think --

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I was under the impression the Boost Nassau Program was already providing --

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS: It is, but now we're changing the funding source to ARP. It is up and running with CDBG-CV and the issue that is under

review was whether we can proceed with the same vendor with additional funding without coming back to the Legislature. Could it be done as a grant, would be need to amend the contract that they have with the Office of Community Development. These are all in the weeds, but very important details that we've been working through for the last week since we knew this money was coming and determined that this was something that the County Executive and the Economics Advisory

Council and everything else wanted to try to accomplish. I'm sorry if it's a little in the weeds, but this is where we're living right now. We are trying to make everything exactly right by County procedures, by ARP regulations, and so that question is one that is under review. Right now, this organization is managing what was the Restaurant Grant Program, pivoted to a Small Business Grant Program, using the same funding stream and we just added to the current
contract. It was a contract amendment and we put a new funding source in. Now if it's \$10 million more, $I$ personally, as the DCE over this subject matter, wanted to have a few checks on that to make sure it's done properly whether it we could either do it in the form of a grant directly to National Development Council, the are an eligible non-profit, or do we need to do a contract that will then come before this Legislature. That's why I'm a little hesitant about what about what Andy is saying to you, because we've been looking at both of those options.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So we don't know whether it's coming back to us or not at this point?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Assuming that you want it to, then we will lead in that direction. At least on those two programs, because I think this is that significant; the grant and the loan.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: What's the
timeframe we can expect? If we were to approve this today, what's the timeframe we could expect money to actually get into the hands of businesses?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Look, if it was a grant that's allowable under ARP regulations, County

Procurement, etcetera, that would move faster, because it wouldn't necessarily need to come back to the Legislature. If we determine that it needs to come back to the Legislature, that's going to add a month or so to putting the $\$ 10$ million into these funds. It's just is what it is. Everything has it's tradeoff, as a relative of mine always says.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: In terms of the grant program itself, are three any provisions within that program specifically for MWBE?

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
Well, we absolutely -- we didn't set aside MWBE Funds, but we will absolutely make a push on MWBEs as we did with the
restaurant grant.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Okay. Thank you.

DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TSIMIS:
You're welcome.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We're gonna take a break, the caucus, for a few moments, and then we'll be back.
(Whereupon, at 5:11 p.m., a brief recess is taken.)
(Whereupon, at 5:41 p.m.,
Legislative Body is back in
session.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
We are back. We've concluded the questioning, obviously, so I'm going to give the legislators an opportunity to make statements, if they want, before we vote on this.

Legislators? Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you. At the outset of this discussion I said that I would like to table it pending the
receipt of answers to the questions that we asked several weeks ago. We didn't get the answers till now. We didn't get any answers today to the questions that we asked. Nonetheless, I am persuaded this time that we ought to vote to go ahead with this relying on the good faith of the Administration that these funds will be fairly distributed in each case, and that the wishes of all of the Legislators will be considered in a fair way, and that there is not going to be any favoritism shown.

However, I would lay down a marker: Going forward, we do need to have much more transparency in terms of the future allocation of funds from this traunch of money and certainly for those who will be here when the next traunch comes through. We need to take many things into consideration. This county has got a lot of fiscal problems. The fact that we have extra money now, should not bind ut to the fact that overall we have an
issues. That issue is, among other things, is that we've go people who are running businesses, who own buildings who run businesses, for instance, who are waiting for years in many cases for tax SERP money to come to them. That would help these businesses. Right in the middle of a pandemic or the end of a pandemic, they could use this money.

At the same time, the County is paying 9\%, 9\%, that's crazy. You can't get $9 \%$ anywhere. Nine percent this is costing the County on this money and we're not going ahead and paying for it and that doesn't make any sense to me.

I think that we need to be far more -- and that's just one of the items for which we ought to be thinking about. Using this money in a way that -- this is a unique opportunity -- we need to use this money in a way that is going to help people to be sure, but it's also going to help the County in the long run. Not only in the short run, not only tomorrow.

It's very nice. If we give people a few bucks -- and certainly many people can use it, I don't deny that -- but we need to do it in a smart way. We need to do it in a way that it's going to help people not only today, but tomorrow. It's going to help us keep taxes down, it's going to help us pay back people to whom we own money.

As I say, I will vote for this today relying on the good faith of the Administration, but laying down that marker that going forward we need to see more information and we need to have better cooperation from the Administration.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ford.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very much Presiding Officer.

I whole-heartedly agree with you, Legislator Kopel. I am voting yes, but I am disappointed in the lack of answers to the questions answers to the questions

raised by many in my caucus. This is an important initiative to help our businesses, Veterans and many others. We need to be assured this is distributed fairly. These urgent votes of these monies has to stop and all future spending specifics must be brought forward in questions, even those that are uncomfortable, must be answered.

I also, as we talk about this urgency and how we have to help our small businesses and we need to get this done, I understand that. But I also echo the sentiments by Legislator Kopel that when we have businesses that are still waiting the tax SERP, their money, when they have successfully grieved their assessments and they are owed tens of thousands of dollars by this County, and they're not getting that funding, I think that that is a disgrace. You can't declare and say you want to help in this sense, but we're not gonna help on that sense. I think it is about time that we start looking at
all these issues and listening to all of us and our questions and concerns of the many businesses and many residents that we represent as well. Let's all start working together so that we can make sure this County succeeds and does well in the future years to come.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I, too, will be voting in favor of this $\$ 62.9$ million, but $I$ just want to stress the focus on this $\$ 100$ million that was previous promised by the

Administration to residents in forms of direct cash payments. I was sitting in the back at the time, but I heard some members of the Minority talk about the urgency of this vote today, the $\$ 62.9$ million. I didn't hear much, though, about the urgency that residents are facing. There are plenty of residents,
middle class Nassau County residents who maybe didn't qualify for some of the Federal stimulus checks so far. I get plenty that come to me and say, I haven't received a dollar, while they were promised by this Administration that they would be receiving $\$ 375$. Nothing that we've heard over the last seven days, including the hearing a week ago, has convinced me that that's still the plan. I know in my district, you can count on one hand how many residents would not have qualified for this direct cash payment. They were all promised by this administration that they'd be getting in. I think we really need to see going forward a plan quickly, as to what is going to be happening with that $\$ 100$ million. Again, that is more than half of the money that's been given to Nassau County through this program and it's just floating our there in the wind. Not only was this promised to residents, but we, this Legislature, was promised an answer
after your meeting with the Treasury Department which we have not received, still.

Please, if you can get those answers to us. If it is not going to go the way the Administration promised, whatever the alternative plan is, we certainly need to know what it is. And I would certainly hope that it is going to encompass the same residents that were promised this direct payment a month ago.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Rhoads?
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I, too, am going to be reluctantly voting yes on the $\$ 62.9$ million spending plan from the Administration.

My concern is, sort of what I
expressed during my questioning, it is
really not a plan. I gotta say the
Administration has really lowered the bar
on transparency and on getting us
information that we need in order to be
able to make decision that obviously have a significant impact on businesses and residents in our district. And we've been put in a difficult position. The last thing we want to do is hold up getting relief to residents. I wish the Administration showed the same sense of urgency, essentially, when it took \$78 million out of the hands of businesses and the mouths of residents out of the CARES ACT funding that we received based on what ultimately was a misrepresentation about the County's budget status.

I know that we are taking the
Administration on faith as Deputy
Presiding Officer Kopel mentioned, but I have a hard time taking the administration on faith. Because when it comes to assessment, when it comes to CARES ACT, when it comes to borrowing, when it comes to probably at least two dozen other instances that I could point to over the course of the last
three-and-a-half-years, taking the Administration on faith really hasn't turned out very well. But here we are doing this again, because, ultimately, we want to get funds into the hands of residents which is already been delayed as a results of the Administration's handling of the CARES ACT funding, which has already been delayed by almost eight or nine months. We don't want to be a source of further delay.

I fully expect that over the course of the next few weeks as the administration figures out what its actually plan is, which we would have liked to have seen before our vote, we're gonna hold our feet to the fire. The idea is to get this money into the hands of residents and businesses as quickly as possible -- and groups -- as quickly as possible.

Now that it's approved, the pressure it on you to get it done. We have done or doing our part in allocating the
funds, it is up to you now to get your are act together and come up with the details of this plan because it is already been delayed far too long. This wasn't a surprise that we were receiving this money. I don't know why when we received it, why we waited till May to seemingly formulate what we've been presented. This is something that should have been the subject of months of discussion and the fact that we are at the point we where we are now with nothing but general ideas and platitudes is really source of tremendous frustration.

I'm gonna vote yes today because we want to do our part in trying to get the money out as quickly as possible. But going forward, we've got to demand better and the Administration has to do better. This is just unacceptable.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. Just briefly to add to that. Obviously, there's a balance between the desire to
get these monies to our small businesses and residents as quickly as possible after suffering so much during the pandemic, but that has to be balanced with doing our due diligence to make sure things are done properly, that there's authorization, that there's detail. And most telling example of when somebody apparently didn't do that was the County Executive who announced on May 17th that there was a plan to send direct payments to everyone who received $S T A R$ and a month later the Administration is scrambling to get clarification that all STAR recipients can receive this. Again, you have to do your due diligence before you approve of these things.

We need to make sure that those who suffered greatly, our residents, our economically disadvantaged residents, our middle class, receive payments. We have to make sure our businesses, Veterans and seniors are supported. We have to make sure they have adequate support in this.

We are confident by the fact that the vast majority of the spending will come back to us in the form of contracts, so I will support this as well.

Anyone else? Legislator Walker?
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Just another comment regarding the Veterans. I just want to be sure. I know that Legislator Ford asked about the various Posts, and so on and so forth, and you said, hopefully, you would try to make them be able to qualify and they can even come and sit and have a meeting, or whatever. To those other organizations, the non profit organizations that assist our Veterans as Legislator Gaylor said, many of those outside organizations -- when I say I'm guilty of it myself, I gave to many organizations that $I$ found out after the fact that a miniscule amount -- if I have $\$ 25$, they were lucky if they got fifty cents. I want to make sure that any of those organizations, the money is going to the Veterans, or I'd rather just

```
see it go to the Veterans themselves in
Nassau County, not going to outside
agencies. I know you said that's
something you are going to check on, but
that is very important to me.
    PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Anyone
else like to speak?
```

        (Whereupon, no verbal
        response.)
        PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
    Hearing none, All in favor, signify by
saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by
saying, "Aye".)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those
opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Item
\#7. A vote on a proposed Local Law to amend Article 10 of the Nassau County Administrative Code to require written notification to towns, villages, cities, and school districts of agreements proposed to be entered into by Nassau County for the operation of multi-unit shelters to be located within such jurisdictions.

Motion by Legislator Walker, seconded by Legislator Schaefer for this item.

In response to questions that were raised by the Minority about the definitions of the legislation, we have submitted an amendment to provide more detail and more description of exactly what this is intended to cover. Without going into too much detail, the specific definitions was to take it from State Law in terms of the shelters that would be affected by this. I would need a motion
for an amendment in the nature of a substitution.

Moved by Legislator Rhoads, seconded by Legislator Ford.

Anyone want to debate the definition section of the amendment?

Legislator Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I don't have a debate, but I was apprised by our legal staff that there might be a technical error in the language: Section 10.1.1, it says in the last sentence, "...a commercial hotel/motel used as temporary placement pursuant to Section 352.3(E) of this

Title.." I think it's supposed to refer to not this title, but Title 18 of the New York Code Rules and Regulations. I don't know if that is something that warrants a correction that can be done immediately, or whatever.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We're gonna find out.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: We're gonna find out.
(Whereupon, off the record discussion.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It appears that an error was made. Thank you for pointing that out. Obviously, we wouldn't want this to be adopted with an error, even though it is a typographical type of error, we want it to be as clear as possible.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'm good, but not that good. You could blame the Minority Counsel for that (laughter).

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Fine (laughter).

All right. I need a motion to table.

Moved by Legislator Walker, second by Legislator Drucker. All in favor to table, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislative
Body respond in favor by


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We have one item left, Item \#24. A Resolution authorizing the County Executive to execute an agreement with American Traffic Solutions Inc., D/B/A Verra Mobility, and two Agreements with school districts in relation to the County's School Bus Stop Arm Photo Enforcement Program.

Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams.

Do we have someone from the Administration to speak on this? I believe we're going to need the IG as well.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: I'm here, Presiding Officer.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. Thank you.

DEPUTY COUNTY ATTORNEY GREGWARE:
Dan Gregware, Deputy County Attorney. Today we're asking the Legislature to authorize the County Executive to enter
into Verra Mobility to install, operate, and maintain a school bus photo violation monitoring system on school buses owned, operated by, or under contract with school districts located within the County as part of the County's Stop Arm Program.

We are also requesting the
Legislature to authorize the County
Executive to enter into participation agreements with school districts located within the County who wish to participate in the Stop Arm Program.

Any questions?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes.
We have a report from the IG. I'd like to ask Jodi to comment on the finding s or her review of this matter.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Jodi Faranzese, Office of the Inspector General. I'm here with Deputy Inspector General Ned Schwartz. As you all know, our office conducted a
review of the documents in the
Legislative Package, including the adverse information that was disclosed by the Vendor in the disclosure forms.

The information regarding the investigation of this Vendor. During our review, we spoke with the Inspector General of the City of Chicago and the City of New York to obtain as much as information as we could so we can share that with this Body.

At the point, $I$ 'm going to hand it over to Ned Schwartz because he has been working very hard on this.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL SCHWARTZ: Good afternoon. This is Ned Schwartz, DIG.

Presently, the Vendor is under an Independent Monitored Agreement with New York City in connection with a number of traffic cameras, pole mounted traffic cameras that were installed by one of it's own subsidiaries. Long story short, issues came to light about improper
installation of some of these cameras. Initially, 12 locations revealed 12 of the 12 were not done correctly.

Subsequently, the Vendor engaged an engineering firm to do broader check and it was discovered that of the 749 camera poles check, inspected, 485, which is just under 65\% were done improperly. We understand the Vendor started remediation work subsequent to that. In March of this year, the Vendor in the City of New York entered into a

Monitorship Agreement whereby, the
Vendor's remediation work as well as
future installation work were going to be overseen by an independent engineering monitor. That is ongoing.

We understand that the Vendor has
been in compliance thus far with the
Monitorship Agreement. We would note
that per the terms of the agreement, the monitor is required to provide oversight for $25 \%$ of the remediation and $25 \%$ of the new installation work.

We are in contact with the Chicago IG. Some of the information is not obtainable, we also understand that the Vendor has indicated that it would share with you the agreement it reached with the City of Chicago, but only if you could somehow ensure the confidentiality of that agreement. It is a matter of public record that the City of Chicago OIG did conduct an investigation pertaining to the Vendor's attribution of an endorsement by a Chicago City Official, which was not something that it should have done. The Vendor did not provide a copy of the Chicago IG report. It did not agree, apparently, with everything said. The City and the Vendor entered into a two year Administrative Oversight Agreement, which is, essentially, an agreement not to do anything wrong for those two years. That would be, essentially, a deferred situation. The vendor successfully completed the two year period with no
adverse activities, so that agreement is now expired.

Can we answer any questions?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any questions for the IG Office?

Legislator Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Presiding Officer, I have a question for the administration, not necessarily for the IG.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Perhaps Mr.
Cleary can stop up?
MR. CLEARY: Robert Clearly. Chief Procurement and Compliance Officer.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Firstly, I do have a question of the IG's Office. Are you committed to implementing the Monitoring Program, or monitoring situation if this contract is approved?

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE:
Legislator Drucker, after we had our findings, we briefed both the Majority and the Minority Counsel's Office, but we

also briefed the Administration and indicated that in our view, a heightened level of scrutiny with respect to this contract may be a good idea for the County. During the discussion, it was my understanding that the Administration was not dismissing that out of hand that, perhaps, heightened scrutiny may be a good idea.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay. So then I have a question for Mr. Cleary.

If that is in fact what is going to go forward, how do you plan on implementing that? Will it be part of the contract, will it be memorialized in the contract?

MR. CLEARY: Okay. We agree that some additional scrutiny, given the history of the Vendor, is warranted. The issues that occurred on the previous contract are not exactly equivalent to the services that are going to performed here; nevertheless, there's enough of a history there for us to take note and to
take some action on that.
This is a little bit different, so there's a number of steps that can be taken and will be taken with respect to this contract that will add additional scrutiny relative to other contracts.

The first thing is that every school bus in New York State is inspected by New York State DOT every six months,
including the equipment that this Vendor would be installing using on these buses. The have already worked with this Vendor, first in photo busing Broome County. The did have some issues with the initial installation. They have dictated an 11 page guide that describes exactly how the equipment has to be installed. That is the guide that the company will use on all buses in the state, including ours. There is already inspection on every single bus. It may not happen at the time of the installation, but it will happen within within six months. The entire fleet is constantly being produced
for inspections to the State. That proves for an additional level of scrutiny that would not normally be available on other contracts.

Now, this contract does not involve installing fixtures, such as the poles that were installed in New York City that resulted in that particular monitorship. We did speak to the Vendor about that monitorship. They are not recommending using that monitorship in this county. We don't necessarily need that need particular degree of scrutiny, on the other hand. We can say our county has been working with this Vendor, including installing fixtures, for about a decade, since 2009 I believe. My understanding is that our Department of Public Works has worked very closely in inspecting those installation, so we have a relationship in that regard.

The remaining elements of the contract are the services provided and the revenue process. Now, TPVA will be
reviewing all of the money before the Vendor is paid. So there is additional protection in that regard, because there's no money going to the Vendor until we've reviewed everything thoroughly to ensure that every single amount that's paid to them is correct. I think Dave can speak to that more thoroughly.

Any other elements of the scrutiny of the contract that we want to talk about?.

We will working with the Press Office on the Public Notice and we will be working with DPW on the signage.

Again, two different IG reports from two different offices, two different cities. There are obviously concerns; on the other hand, in both cases, the Vendor, once put on notice, has performed acceptably.

We have an existing relationship with the Vendor. We believe they are put on notice now and we are going to be
scrutinizing this as we go forward. I think the Department will be willing to report periodically, and I would be willing to report as necessary regarding any findings about the Vendor during the course of the contract.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So, is this type of what you now call this type of scrutiny, is that satisfactory to the IG's office based on their findings have been; is this satisfactory to the IG's office?

Doesn't sound like there's a great deal of scrutiny that is going to be implemented by the County.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE:
Legislator Drucker, I have to say that from our discussions with the City of Chicago and the City of New York, it does seem clear that the Vendor, once it is overseen by a little extra level of scrutiny, the do seem comply. The City of New York interaction with them was positive in the sense that they complied
with the Agreement. They did what they had to do. Same with the City of Chicago as well. They got through the two years of Administrative oversight without any issues. I have no reason to doubt the Administration and Mr. Cleary, specifically, I have no reason to doubt that he will not stay on top of this. I'm not certain there -- I'm concerned, but I do believe that this is something that manageable by the County.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: That's good.
Listen, I want to commend the IG's Office for uncovering and do the proper vetting, because that's what you're entrusted to do, and we, as a Legislative Body, have to protect our residents so I'm appreciative of that. But at the same time, I don't want to see this contract delayed. As long as there's proper scrutiny, I'm okay with it. This

Legislation, it will save lives. It's
designed to protect the safety of children and families. I know Legislator

Bynoe and myself have worked very hard to get this legislation passed. It's that important. To have it slowed down now would be disastrous. We want to see is passed and implemented so that the start of the school year in September, we can assure the residents in our respective districts that their children and themselves are safe.

Again, we have an obligation as legislators to protect our residents and provide the necessary oversight to all our contracts. I just want to make sure that the IG's Office is happy and that the proper monitoring is sufficient to oversee this. I'm okay with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Here's
my concern with what you just said. It is a lot of words, but it seems like what you are saying is we're going to do everything that we were going to do beforehand, so we are simply going to do the same thing. I don't see where anything you said will provide an
additional level of scrutiny of their activity. You're simply going to do what you do with other contracts. That's basically what you told us.

MR. CLEARY: Well, I think that this contract, because of its very nature, has additional scrutiny already built into it through the form of New York State looking at every single bus every six months. That doesn't come with any of our other contracts almost, right. So you already have a physical inspection of the equipment to make sure it is installed properly, to make sure that it's working properly, and it's on a regular basis. And we're gonna be in touch with the State regarding any deficiencies in that regard. So I don't think you can say there isn't any additional scrutiny in what we would normally do on another contract. Yes, it's what we would do on this contract, but that is an additional level of scrutiny.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: If I made that reference, that was not correct, but it seems as if, again, with this extra stage of scrutiny, the scrutiny they're going to get is exactly the same they were going to get before the IG's report. What level of comfort do we have that they're getting the scrutiny they should get, the additional scrutiny?

MR. CLEARY: Well, we've already had this discussion with the Vendor. They understand that we are going to be monitoring this performance more closely than we would on other contracts. We've offered to report back however often you would want us to to ensure that. If, in fact, there is a reason to institute a monitorship, then, certainly, we will insist on that.

If there is a failure on the performance, if there's a failure on any of those obligations -- one of the other recommendations that wasn't spoken to
from the Inspector General's Office was having a checklist of deliverables and TPVA will be putting together and using that scrupulously on this particular contract.

Again, they have not had any indication of financial or performance other than those that were described. Those particular problems do not relate to this particular contract, but because of all that's been found, all that's been discussed, the fact that they are under a monitorship in New York City, we are on notice that we need to make sure that we look at this more closely than other contracts.

Now, we do have an ongoing relationship with the Vendor, so we don't expect any problems. Again, these
services are materially different than those that they had problem with. We've actually had some of those services and had not had a problem.

```
    So I agree with you that this is
```

largely the same implementation process that we would us, but we don't have this conversation with everyone here about other contracts. We don't have this conversation with the Vendor themselves, we've already discussed the possibility of having a monitorship, and if we find that's it's necessary, we will go in direction and make sure that that happens if it's warranted.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Have you checked into this Administrative Oversight Agreement that they apparently have with the City of Chicago? It seems like a lesser -- it seems like additional scrutiny, but not to the extent of a monitor. Have you considered that? Have you raised that possibility with the Vendor?

MR. CLEARY: I haven't spoken to them about that, but we can certainly do that. I mean, that was an internal Chicago process. We don't have quite the same process, but it doesn't mean that we
couldn't also take that as an additional interim step, absolutely. I think the Vendor would agree to something along those lines.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Legislator Walker, did you have a question?

LEGISLATOR WALKER: I just agree with Presiding Officer. Who would we even have in the County that was able to make sure that this -- one of the problems was the way things were wired or something like that; we have somebody who is able to do that?

MR. CLEARY: Well, as I said, the work is being inspected by the State. State. They're really the, I think, the subject matter experts in this regard. We'll have a functional familiarity with the use and installation of the equipment, but we are relying on the State in that regard.

The State is already worked very closely with this Vendor and the Vendor
understands what the State's obligations are and so that gives us some reason to believe that we're in better hands in that regard than we would be otherwise. LEGISLATOR WALKER: I mean, like I said, I'm very much in favor of this legislation. I hear constantly from my residents regarding this issue.

I guess a part of me doesn't see that we, as a county, already are gonna have much more scrutiny of, as our Presiding Officer said, than what's already being done by the State, and the Vendor, hopefully, learned it's lesson and is doing the right thing.

MR. CLEARY: Well, I'm certainly going to be working closely with Dave on this contract, with TPVA on this contract. So I, personally, am going to have more scrutiny on this contract than I would on almost any other contract because of the way this has started and the nature of it and who's impacted by it. I, personally, know that I am going
to be looking at it a lot more closely than some other contracts.

We will discuss with the Vendor the interim suggested level of scrutiny and I will report back on that, if that's what's desired.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon.
The contract is one thing, but I think that some of the issues raised had to do with the installation. And, I guess, Rose was even talking about the wiring of some of this equipment that they didn't do it properly in New York City or Chicago, or did I miss something here?

MR. CLEARY: Well, that was the wiring in the New York City posts. I should point out that the issues in New York City were raised by the Vendor and brought to the City's attention, which is a good sign. It's not good that what happened, happened. But at least when they found the problem, they did come forward and admit it.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I would say that,

I know the State will do their
investigating and do their inspections, but I think with something like this that's so important to us, because we want to make sure that this program -you know, I support it -- I want to make sure it's working properly for the benefit, especially, of our students, the kids on the buses and stuff like that. If we rely just upon the State to do all the inspections, I think it would behoove us to try to get somebody within the County to have some working knowledge of how these school bus arms operate and to make sure that we, ourselves, can do our own inspections at times to make sure things are installed properly and working properly instead of always waiting for the State. Is this any way of achieving that?

MR. CLEARY: I think we'll have to talk to the State about that. Perhaps, we can -- I don't know if we can coordinate with them to have somebody
demonstrate what they're looking for so we can have some internal capacity.

That's a fair point.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Yeah. I mean, to rely on the State is crazy. This is very important. We've been waiting a long time for this.

Thank you.
MR. CLEARY: I'm sure we'll have the ability along with the bus fleet operators to be able to test the equipment ourselves to ensure that it's working, functioning properly, and at least some of the installation we might be able to inspect. But we're not the subject matter experts, as I said, so we would need some guidance in that regard.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Because if
somebody gets a ticket and they want to go to court to say they got it incorrectly, who does the inspection on the school bus that created the ticket?

Who goes out to verify that that is working properly and that that person
wasn't ticketed incorrectly?
MR. CLEARY: As I said, the fleet operators are, presumably, inspecting the buses every day before they go out. I would have to believe that was the case.

LEGISLATOR FORD: They probably would need to be sort of trained or brought up to speed to understand how the equipment works and how it's installed, correct?

MR. CLEARY: Yes. There does have to be a basic functional knowledge of the equipment and the operations, absolutely. LEGISLATOR FORD: All right. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton and then Legislator Gaylor.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay. Do we know if the State actually looks at the speed (sic) cameras as part of their inspection?

MR. CLEARY: Yes. I've been told that by the supervisor of the office.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay. And they look at it for working and accuracy and everything else, the State?

MR. CLEARY: They inspect that it's been installed properly and operating properly.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay.
We were just discussing it with Counsel and I think we're in an opportunity where we could require ATS to hire an independent monitor to do spot checks or somehow keep an eye on it; why don't we require that as terms of this contract?

MR. CLEARY: Well, we can have that discussion with them again.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Well, maybe we should do it as part of this -I mean, I know we would have to amend the contract, but before we -- I mean, I don't want to delay it either, but on the other hand, I think we should put something in that says that we're requiring them, ATS -- they have this record, they're the ones who have the
obligation to hire a subcontractor to do periodic checks and report to the County.

MR. CLEARY: As I said, we did have the discussion about Schwartz Engineering (phonetic). At the time, they were resisting to that, and they did point out that New York State is looking at everyone of these buses.

As far as the installation and operation, $I$ think that is a significant degree of scrutiny that we don't, as I said, usually have on these contracts. If we find there's other performance problems or that there are even issues in that regard, then it certainly would be warranted to continue its services.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I think we should take the proactive road and just demand that they agree to hiring at least for a year or so, whatever time we feel comfortable. I mean, they're coming to us with a little bit of a botched record and we're giving them the benefit of the doubt. I think it is okay. I
think it's understandable that the County wants to move forward with this, but I also think it's not out of the realm of reality to tell them that they have to hire an independent contractor to report to us.

MR. CLEARY: Well, I will say, again, we have a 10 year relationship with the Vendor with acceptable performance. The issue in New York City, the allowed to occur, but they did raise it and they are correcting it, obviously.

The issue in Chicago is, presumably, not something that's going to happen here, we'll have to watch for that, and obviously not the primary work of the contract.

This is not a situation that is as clear cut as some other contracts where we have mandated the hiring of an integrity monitor. I think the reason the Inspector General -- if I may put words in their mouths, perhaps -- I think the reason the Inspector General's Office
is suggesting additional scrutiny is because there's a recognition that we're not saying there's an integrity problem here that clearly needs a monitor to be able to do business with them. I mean, right now, we are already doing business with them.

I think it is something that does warrant additional scrutiny, it does warrant a heightened level of awareness of what they're doing and making sure they're actually checking every box in their deliverables. I haven't come to the conclusion that an integrity monitor is the right course at this time for this contract.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Yeah.
More of an engineering. It's not that we're questioning them abiding by the contract, we're questioning their actual ability to do the work correctly. It would be more of an engineering expert that would come in and do a report. I don't think it would even be that costly.

Even if it's not every bus, I think we should do our due diligence and take a certain amount of the buses every six months and really have somebody look at them.

MR. CLEARY: It just was suggested that I point out that the subsidiary that did the work in New York City is not going to be doing the work on this contract, so we don't have that concern. As far as, again, the technical review of the installation, New York State is doing that. Even if they're not doing every single bus before it goes on the road, they are going to be doing these on a regular basis and they're going to see if there's an issue. They're gonna identify that pretty quickly. It's not like it's out of the question to have a separate private Vendor inspect the work as well, but I don't think that's really where our concerns are likely to fall in this particular contract. They've done other
work for us and it's been considered to be acceptable, good work.

I think that the remedy that you're suggesting is, perhaps, not the ideal way to address the concerns that we have. I think the concerns that we have need to be addressed by vigorously enforcing the terms of the contract and by documenting that and by ensuring that every other element of the contract works well, as well as coordinating with New York State to make sure the equipment is installed and operating correctly.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I guess
our level of comfort is a little
different. I just think when something is brought to our attention as a
potential problem -- it's an important contract for us, because we all want to do the right thing for the safety of the kids. I don't want to see something go wrong that would in any way hamper this program.
We're not asking them to spend a ton
of money and we're not asking for a huge amount of inconvenience of their time or the buses. I just think it kind of sends a message that if you want to do business in Nassau County and we have questions, we're gonna come down on you and you're the one that's gonna have to pay for it. I think that's how we should approach it. They should pay for it. This shouldn't be a County expense to hire an engineer, I think it should be this company.

I don't know if we can amend a contract at this point, but I like that idea. Again, it sends a message to companies.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Gaylor, did you want to add anything?

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Just a couple of quick questions.
Is this same Vendor that Suffolk
currently uses?
MR. RICH: No, it is not.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Rich.

Second, how will we know if there's a failure.

MR. RICH: For the most part, if we don't retrieve any images or events captured for the day, then we would know that the camera is off line.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Very
good. I'm gonna come back to that in a sec.

What does the State inspect every six months, is a vehicle inspection, akin of the annual inspection, a personal motor vehicle or will it include inspection of the cameras, and are we for sure that the State is inspecting the cameras, video, mounting, wiring, the components, there's a proper imaging; do we know for a fact?

MR. CLEARY: As I said, I said to the supervisor of the unit today and he assured me, yes, they do inspect everyone of these cameras when the bus comes in as
part of the inspection, including the operation of the equipment, making sure it's installed properly according to the guidelines.

Again, they did have to come up with an 11 page direction to the Vendor on how to install these things properly, so it's very clear what they told the Vendor what to do, the Vendor understands that and it's very clear on what they're going to find acceptable and what they're not going to find acceptable.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

Coming back, Mr. Rich, to knowing if there's a failure. So I get a ticket, school bus ticket. I go to court. How are you gonna prove the case? Is there is a daily calibration check? Is there an Affidavit from the Vendor on a daily basis for every ticket? How are we gonna do it; is it similar to the red light cameras, or is it a different kind of process? Can you just walk me through
that so I fell comfortable?
MR. RICH: I would actually have to check. On the red light camera, we know that there's a system start up and check and it does a self-diagnosis. If it goes off line, it automatically alerts the Vendor. I have not gotten into the details, unfortunately, with the school bus stop arm on how that's done and how the system starts up, so I would have to get back to you on that information. It's not similar to the school speed zone camera where there's an affidavit by the deployment, who installed it, if it was a mobile unit and whether it was deployed correctly. We're not at that level and I don't see any requirement for that type of information, but $I$ will get back to use on what we use or what the Vendor would use to ensure that the system is currently operating. I know that they use the same type of cell service, so we will be able to tell if it goes offline. As far as the bus operator/driver, if
they see something visibly, they will
report it immediately and we will know
that something is wrong with the camera. If there is nothing visibly that you can see that the system is offline, we would have to refer to or rely to the systems themselves to tell us the camera is offline.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: So we would have sufficient evidentiary basis to prosecute somebody who gets a violation and wants to challenge it?

MR. RICH: My goal is yes. I will
have to look into that for you.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Okay. If you
would, please. I know we have the probationary period we'll call it, so we have some time; if you could and just let us know. Appreciate it.

Thank you, gentlemen, ladies.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Anyone else?

Legislator Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Just a real
quick question. Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Mr. Cleary, would you be able to commit -- as a way of satisfying our concerns raised here, would you be able to commit to doing a six month or one year performance evaluation to see how it's going, this way we don't have to amend the contract. The Administration just do an internal performance evaluation every six months or every year?

MR. CLEARY: Yes. I believe we accommodate that.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: And this way, we wouldn't have to amend the contract.

MR. CLEARY: I think it makes sense to do anyway under the circumstances.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay. I'm okay with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Birnbaum?
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: In accordance to that, when we're giving the 60 day
preliminary, sort of, trial period, can we also find out how it's working? You would have that information on how many tickets, violations have been noted. Wouldn't we get an early signal at the beginning?

MR. CLEARY: Yes.
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: So you could
give us a report after 60 days when each
school system enacts this, then we can see how it's playing out and then get another report maybe six months or a year later.

MR. CLEARY: Sure.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
share the concerns that Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton has; however, I would
like to see something, perhaps, short of amending the contract.

My suggestion is that we table this for today. I will recess the meeting. We will come back in two weeks for the Committees and take it up at that time. This way, Mr. Cleary, it gives you time.

We had just gotten the IG's report. It gives you time to speak to the Vendor and maybe develop a plan to satisfy all or our concerns.

MR. CLEARY: Understood.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So it will be two weeks. We have our Committee on July 12, a recess today, and we will just bring this contract back up. Motion to table.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So moved.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Who
was that? Legislator Rhoads, makes a
motion to table. Seconded by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of
tabling, signify by saying, "Aye".
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Aye.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Aye.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Aye.
LEGISLATGOR MULE: Aye.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Aye.
LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Aye.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Aye.
LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Aye.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Aye.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Aye.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Aye.
LEGISLATOR LAFAZAN: Aye.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Aye.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Aye.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed?

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Nay.
(Whereupon, Presiding Officer clarifies Ayes and Nays.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Passes by vote of 17 to 1 , the motion to table. I'm going to put this meeting to recess and we will be calling it again in two weeks.
(Whereupon, above item is
tabled, meeting is kept open;
meeting to recess, 6:36 p.m.)
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| 202:16, 222:22, 222:25, 228:16 | submitting ${ }_{[1]}-251: 9$ | survival ${ }_{[2]}-177: 3,177: 1$ | mporary ${ }_{[2]}-252: 5,298: 1$ |
| 231:21, 263:18, 273:10, 273:13 | subsequent ${ }_{[1]}$ - 304:11 | suspect $_{[2]}$ - $60: 25,223: 2$ | $\operatorname{tens}_{[2]}-114: 12,287: 19$ |
| 276:20, 277:2, 277:7, 287:16, | subsequently ${ }_{[1]}-175: 21$ | suspended ${ }_{[2]}-142: 16,142: 18$ | tension ${ }_{[1]}-24: 22$ |
| 289:11, 290:4 | Subsequently ${ }_{[1]}-304.5$ | suspension ${ }_{[2]}-143: 9,143: 10$ | term ${ }_{[8]}-104: 22,177: 3,177: 12,226: 9$, |
| stimulus ${ }_{[1]}-289:$ | subsidiaries ${ }_{[1]}-303: 24$ | $\text { sustain }_{[1]}-109: 14$ | 230:11, 232:4, 245:16, 277:18 |
| stood $_{[1]}-21: 8$ | subsidiary ${ }_{[1]}-328: 8$ | SUVs $_{[2]}-77: 10,77: 13$ | terms ${ }_{[29]}-86: 2,86: 20,103: 2,104: 5$, |
| Stop $_{[3]}-301: 9,302: 7,302: 14$ | substance $_{[1]}$ - 256:6 | swallow $_{[1]}-193: 24$ | 104:13, 119:9, 122:8, 122:22 |
| stop ${ }_{[13]}-62: 9,68: 18,113: 24,139: 4$, | substantial ${ }_{[1]}-265: 2$ | switch $_{[1]}-224: 23$ | 130:18, 141:9, 169:18, 176:25, |
| 139:25, 140:13, 140:20, 145:23, | substitution ${ }_{[2]}-162: 17,298: 3$ | switched ${ }_{[1]}-175: 21$ | 184:23, 185:5, 190:10, 251:12, |
| 151:18, 171:22, 287:7, 306:14, | subway ${ }_{[1]}-59: 7$ | system $_{[15]}-24: 12,45: 2,46: 4,46:$ | 66:16, 267:17, 268:14, 268:18 |
| 333:10 | succeed $_{[1]}-89: 20$ | 57:23, 68:8, 89:7, 159:3, 243:5, | 270:3, 270:17, 278:9, 282:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { stopped }_{[6]}-131: 11,131: 12,139: 10, \\ & 145: 20,151: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { succeeds }_{[1]}-288: 7 \\ & \text { success }_{[2]}-104: 13 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 302: 4,333: 5,333: 11,333: 21,334: 6, \\ & 336: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 284: 17,297: 24,304: 22,324: 14, \\ & 329: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| stopping ${ }_{[1]}-85: 20$ | $\text { successful }_{[5]}-13: 23,14: 19,104: 2$ | systematic $_{[1]}-57: 2$ | terrible ${ }_{[2]}-77: 8,175: 17$ |
| stops $_{[3]}-87: 2,110: 12,139: 21$ | $110: 23,170: 14$ | systems ${ }_{[3]}-27: 5,189: 2,334: 7$ | test ${ }_{[4]}-46: 15,82: 11,138: 7,322: 12$ |
| store $_{[2]}-66: 5,236: 23$ | successfully ${ }_{[3]}-12: 21,287: 18$, |  | tested ${ }_{[1]}-60: 4$ |
| stories $_{[1]}-13: 18$ | 305:24 | T | estimony ${ }_{[1]}-273: 5$ |
| Storm $_{[2]}-242: 25,243: 11$ | sudden $_{[1]}-145: 24$ |  | ${\text { tests }{ }_{[2]}-81: 18,81: 23}^{\text {a }}$ |
| storm $_{[1]}$ - 204:17 | suffer $_{[1]}-72: 5$ |  | ether ${ }_{[1]}-97: 3$ |
| story $_{[1]}-303: 24$ | suffered ${ }_{[5]}-58: 3,66: 18,209: 15$, | $76: 10,221: 14,273: 24,283: 25$ | texting ${ }_{[1]}-73: 8$ |
| straight ${ }_{[1]}-261: 23$ | 243:20, 294:20 | 9, 299:22, 336:21, 337:1 | thankful ${ }_{[2]}-102: 24,103: 10$ |
| Strategies ${ }_{[1]}-87: 15$ | suffering ${ }_{[1]}-294: 4$ | 337:15, $338: 18$ | thankfully ${ }_{[1]}-220: 23$ |
| strategies $_{[2]}-51: 9,51: 20$ | sufficient ${ }_{[2]}-313: 16,334: 11$ | tabled $_{[3]}-263: 11,300: 8,338: 23$ | Thanksgiving ${ }_{[1]}$-175:16 |
| stratosphere ${ }_{[2]}-71: 13,71: 14$ | Suffolk ${ }_{[4]}-51: 4,114: 18,149: 4$, | tabling $_{[1]}-337: 17$ | that, we ${ }_{[1]}-27: 9$ |
| stream $_{[1]}-280: 25$ | 330:23 | tacked ${ }_{[3]}-30: 15,131: 3,131: 9$ | them" ${ }_{[1]}$ - 208:4 |
| Street $_{[4]}-206: 23,206: 24,233: 22$, | suggested ${ }_{[2]}-320: 5,328: 7$ | tactics $_{[2]}-13: 5,14: 6$ | themselves ${ }_{\text {[9] }}-220: 2,240: 5,246: 7$ |
| 278:10 | suggesting ${ }_{[2]}-327: 2,329: 5$ | ${ }_{[1]}-207: 17$ | 246:16, 261:17, 296:2, 313:10, |
| street ${ }_{[5]}-73: 21,145: 23,202: 4$, | suggestion ${ }_{[2]}-262: 8,336: 21$ | tailored ${ }_{[1]}-83: 4$ | 317:6, 334:8 |
| 236:22, 237:3 | suggestions [2] - 169:11, 172:3 | $\operatorname{TAKEN}_{[1]}-1: 25$ | theory ${ }_{[2]}-188: 8,238: 2$ |
| streets ${ }_{[3]}-25: 11,59: 11,59: 12$ | suit $_{[1]}-229: 14$ | talented ${ }_{[1]}-116: 23$ | there're ${ }_{[1]}-148: 9$ |
| streetscapes $_{[1]}-157: 24$ | suited ${ }_{[2]}-90: 19,241: 10$ | talents ${ }_{[1]}-116: 25$ | thereof ${ }_{[2]}-129: 11,132: 14$ |



|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

> 170:24
> workload $_{[1]}-150: 18$
> works ${ }_{[6]}-98: 20,115: 19,191: 15$,
> 218:18, 323:10, 329:11
> Works ${ }_{[4]}-6: 11,26: 16,30: 3,309: 20$
> world $_{[1]}-70: 22$
> worry $_{[1]}-178: 18$
> worse $_{[1]}-194: 12$
> worst ${ }_{[2]}-25: 8$
> worth $_{[1]}-175: 5$
> worthy $_{[1]}-241: 19$
> Wow $_{[1]}-119: 8$
> wow $_{[2]}-21: 2,43: 10$
> wrap $_{[2]}-188: 22,191: 19$
> write $_{[2]}-92: 6,233: 8$
> writing $_{[1]}-276: 10$
> written ${ }_{[6]}-93: 3,134: 9,153: 14,227: 9$, 278:2, 297:6
> Y, and ${ }_{[1]}-113: 22$
> Year $_{[6]}-31: 13,32: 9,32: 14,33: 2$,
> 101:5, 157:8
> year $_{[57]}-15: 23,21: 17,23: 17,27: 13$, 32:10, 33:7, 35:8, 35:9, 41:15, 41:22, 50:10, 50:12, 53:3, 53:10, 76:19, 76:23, 101:11, 107:2, 107:6, 109:4, 111:9, 113:18, 113:19, 113:20, 114:8, 115:10, 121:11, 123:22, 125:9, 125:14, 146:16, 156:7, 156:8, 162:7, 165:4, 171:5, 185:8, 191:25,
> 192:10, 201:5, 204:20, 222:23,
> 242:8, 257:22, 268:25, 304:12,
> 305:19, 305:25, 313:7, 325:21,
> 326:9, 335:8, 335:13, 336:13
> year's ${ }_{[1]}-23: 3$
> yearly $_{[3]}-32: 13$
> years ${ }_{[39]}-22: 7,22: 22,23: 8,25: 16$, 26:12, 26:15, 28:4, 28:11, 29:10, 29:11, 29:23, 29:25, 33:18, 35:18,
> 36:5, 39:6, 39:19, 50:24, 50:25,
> 51:10, 54:21, 57:7, 58:23, 65:14, 72:7, 76:20, 78:17, 109:14, 112:15, 113:19, 117:7, 131:2, 212:3, 226:13, 285:6, 288:8, 292:2, 305:22, 312:4
> Years ${ }_{[1]}-33: 9$
> York ${ }_{[32]}-1: 16,22: 20,59: 2,59: 18$,
> $60: 3,60: 11,73: 18,82: 23,83: 7$,
> 167:5, 200:13, 225:23, 298:20,
> 303:10, 303:21, 304:13, 308:9,
> 308:10, 309:8, 311:20, 311:24,
> 314:9, 316:14, 320:14, 320:17,
> 320:19, 325:8, 326:11, 328:9,
> 328:13, 329:12, $339: 8$
> YORK $_{[1]}-339: 4$
> young $_{[5]}-51: 8,51: 21,52: 17,110: 18$, 223:7
> yourselves ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:9
> youth $_{[4]}-169: 9,181: 6,195: 20,223: 5$
> Youth ${ }_{[2]}-258: 21,260: 9$
> Yukon $_{[1]}-78: 2$
> yup $_{[1]}-234: 20$
> Yup $_{[2]}-177: 22,187: 7$

