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PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Welcome
to the Nassau County Legislature. We're going to call this meeting of the

Legislature to order and ask: Legislator Colonel Bill Gaylor to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you,
Presiding Officer.
(Whereupon, the Pledge of
Allegiance is recited.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay,
Mike, could you please call the roll?
CLERK PULITZER: Thank you.
Presiding Officer. 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, sir.
Legislator John Giuffre?
LEGISLATOR GUIFFRE: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Mazi Pilip
LEGISLATOR PILIP: Here
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Delia Deriggi-Whitton?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator James
Kennedy?
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Thomas
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: Thank you.
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: Presiding Officer
Nicolello?

LEGISLATOR NICOLLELO: Present.
CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank

you very much.
We're going to be opening the budget hearing in a moment. I just want to let you know that if you want to speak with respect to the budget, you need to fill out a slip which the clerk's table has right here. Submit it to the clerk's table and we'll put you on the list to speak. I have a number of slips already.

So the first item is Clerk Item number 306 of 2022. It is ordinance 71 of 2022. And it is the hearing on the Nassau County Budget. Motion to open the hearing, Legislative Rhoads moves to open the hearing seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So the hearing is open. First speaker is Beth Finkel.

MS. FINKEL: Well, good morning,

everyone. Thank you so much for having us here today. I'm Beth Finkel. I'm the state director for AARP New York. AARP has got two-and-one-half-million members in New York State, and right here on Long Island, we have almost a half a million members. And as you can see, our members and our volunteers are pretty passionate about what goes on in their county and in their community and really for very good reason, because Nassau County is really exemplary in so many ways about how it works with its older adults in the 50 plus and trying to make this community in AARP speak as age friendly as possible. So Nassau County actually is part of the age friendly designation of the United Nations, and AARP nationally oversees all the age friendly communities or tries to support them across the country.

One of the reasons we're here today is because we want to make sure that you know that we support it here. There are eight domains of age friendly. Among them
is housing, transportation, education, financial, being able to find work, parks, healthcare. And as I say them, I mean, I'm sure you're all sitting up tall because, honestly, Nassau County is a leader in so many of those areas.

There are areas that $I$ think we all know we'd like to see improve and AARP wants to be helpful with that. We're really happy about the County Exec's proposed 5.5 increase to the Health and Human Services because we know how much that's going to help Senior Services, which are foremost in our minds. But we also want to make sure that you understand, and I think you do, because you are us, your families and your communities and your neighbors are us.

People love Nassau County. They want to age in place here, but they have to be able to have the environment that allows them to do that. Older adults have built these communities by volunteering, by working here, by paying their taxes and
by voting.
We just did a some data collection in the last election from the Board of Elections, and we found that in Nassau County, almost $80 \%$ of voters in the last primaries were 50 plus; 80\%. And, in fact, consistently that's been across the last four general elections also. So they get out and vote, but they get out and volunteer.

And again, you can see the passion of our volunteers behind us. And I know you're going to be hearing from some of them. So I just really want to reiterate again that Nassau County 50 plus people are very dedicated to their community, and we as a group want to be a willing partner to help make life even better for them. So thank you for all you do, and I hope you'll call on us. Thank you so much.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you very much. Doris Sharpe.

MS. SHARPE: Good morning. My name
is Doris Sharpe from Hempstead. Respect and social inclusion. Everyone wants to feel valued. Intergenerational gatherings and activities are an excellent way for young and older people to learn from one another. Honor what each has to offer and feel good about themselves.

I am an active legislative officer out of Local Chapter 5234, chapters and other local organizations that bring young and older people together. It's critical to any community so we can learn from each other but contribute and give back to our communities. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, thank you for your remarks, Miss Sharpe. And we approve the hat, by the way (applause).

MS. BRADFORD: Good morning. My name is Elizabeth Bradford, and I'm going to be talking about social participation having to do with AARP.

Regardless of a person's age, loneliness is often as debilitating a
health condition as having a chronic illness or disease. Sadness and isolation can be combated by having opportunities to socialize and the availability of access, affordable and fun social activities for all types of people who could not really leave their home, they could get a personal connection with a friendly face. AARP has many programs on the line that they could learn to do and keep them busy from being lonely. AARP definitely helps combat isolation through virtual programming. Now, an added bonus was for the young people that were in the house with those that were isolated, they could now do things together. Doing virtual things together is an excellent way for the generations to learn together from one another and contribute and give back to our community.

It is a pleasure to be an AARP volunteer and continue to grow. I'm sure no matter what the future holds, AARP
will be in the know and continue to be a vital service. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. Bradford.

Ron Roel.
MR. ROEL: Morning, folks. Ron Roel, Glen Cove. Going to speak quickly. I've got two domains to talk about. One is the work in civic engagement. Next is community and health services.

So first, work in civic engagement.
Why must work be an all or nothing experience? An age-friendly community encourages older people to be actively engaged in community life and has opportunities for residents to work for pay or volunteer their skills. So I know about this personally. I'm involved in the Age-friendly Council in Glen Cove. I know that it's an important part of the community. It's growing there. It has affiliations with the local government and non-profits.

```
    Essentially, it's important for
```

people to maintain a sense of purpose and commitment later in life and have a lot to contribute. I know about this personally because I'm now a little farther north of a traditional retirement than I expected.

But still, it keeps you vital. It's important that you contribute all the way through life. And part of that is also being able to vote. As Beth Finkel mentioned, we found out that $80 \%$ of those who participated in the primaries earlier were 50 plus. And so, you know, 50 plus life is something which $I$ call an important part, as when I started the Act two section of Newsday, and that is that I like to think about making the second half of life even better than the first. So that's a work in civic engagement.

The second is quickly community and health services. Again, at some point, every person of every age gets hurt, becomes ill, or simply needs some help, while assistance and care must be
available nearby, it's essential that residents have access to affordable healthcare. This is something I think we all recognize increasing is important, especially as we get older. And I know personally, too, from from taking care of my mother with my brothers for many years, that caregiving is part of that. So having affordable support in terms of healthcare is critical. It keeps you vital.

It also cuts down on other services
that you need. People have appropriate healthcare. They can do a lot of things and be productive in life. And again, part of that is not medical care, but is support from families and from our system in general.

And so certainly families are always an important component of caregiving. But having a support system in place that that helps families and also provide services and resources. And I know that Nassau County is involved with their

Department of Aging, so it's important to have this kind of support. Because if you if you have this kind of support, it cuts down other government services. And so I think it's critical that we maintain this framework to really do this kind of work. Thank you very much.

MR. LARSON: Good morning. My name is Ken Larson and I'm from Westbury. My topic is outdoor space and building access, unlike my colleague here, I'm well into retirement, so $I$ appreciate the need for access and accessibility.

Outdoor space has been very
important to us as we've battled COVID.
Thankfully, the worst part of COVID, we hope, is behind us. But it does highlight the need for accessibility because there's nothing like face-to-face meetings when you have a relationship with the people, you can see them. It takes away your feelings of isolation or loneliness. And so we're advocating for that in a big way.
$\qquad$ $18=$

From my own experience, I have enjoyed a lot of the outdoor activities with some of our friends who are active, who are retired. We have a lovely park. We play we played bocce all before the COVID and we're starting it up again, hopefully soon.

We're advocating for buildings that are accessible: Stair rails, elevators, escalators. And we think it's we think it's important to keep our age group active. The Town and the County have been generally very supportive of us. We and AARP appreciate that. It's critical for us to be able to meet with our friends or colleagues or associates. And and the best way to do that is have buildings that are accessible to us, to all of us.

As I say, I've been very lucky. I've maintained my health. I tend to be active. I enjoy the parks, especially with my children. Not so much my children, actually, my grandchildren are
the ones $I$ enjoy it with. I see all of you laughing up there. You know where I'm coming from. And again, we appreciate all of your support, all of your help. And thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Larson. Meryl Manthey.

MS. MANTHEY: Hi, everybody. I am from Levittown. I grew up in Wantagh. I'm going to talk about housing.

AARP surveys consistently find that most older adults want to reside in their current home or community for as long as possible. Doing so is possible if a home is designed or modified for aging in place, or if a community has housing options available or suitable for different incomes, ages and life stages. Now, I was lucky enough that we had an apartment legally built on top of my mom's house and I was there for ten years. She needed to age in place. We had some experience with some assisted living rehab places that were not good, and
luckily she had the resources and I was able to be there for her.

When she passed, $I$ was in a state of panic. I didn't know where I would be able to go. Luckily, availability became for the Town of Hempstead Subsidized Housing Co-op. It's absolutely fantastic, but $I$ was just lucky to get in there. I'm a realtor and every day I have a friend who says I have nowhere to go. I don't know what to do. I have low income. There are no rentals available, subsidized rentals available in the Town of Hempstead for years, as far as I understand. So this is something that I am very passionate about. And I honestly don't know where to direct people. I direct them actually out of the county sometimes because there's just nothing available here. And of course, taxes have a lot to do with people who are trying to remain in their homes as well.

Second issue communication and information. We now communicate in ways
few could have imagined a decade ago. Age-friendly communities recognize that information needs to be shared through various methods. Since not everyone is tech savvy and not everyone has a smartphone or home-based access to the Internet.

In my complex, I'm one of the
younger ones that are still working, and when the internet is horrendous, I'm beside myself and the others are like, well, it's not a big deal. I don't care, you know? But they don't have the savvy or the wherewithal to communicate. And if you notice, everywhere you go, every health situation, oh, just go online, do the app, pay it this way, pay it that way, and it just doesn't work for them anymore. So it's just really more of a commentary about that situation. So I don't really know the answer to that, but it's just, like I said, more of a commentary. Thank you.

MR. DELLER: Good morning. My name
is George Deller. I would like to talk briefly about transportation.

Nassau County has come a very long way since I was growing up in Levittown in the early 1950s, where there were very few stoplights, very few stop signs, no arrows for left turns and right turns, and so forth. We've come a long way, but we still have a ways to go.

Of course, driving is not the only way that we get around. Our pedestrians need sidewalks and safe crossable streets. Walking around here this morning, I was very pleased to see the walk, don't walk signs and the timing. We need more of that in more places. We also can benefit from dedicated bicycle lanes and they benefit the drivers and the non drivers alike.

Of course, we have public
transportation options as well. Not all from the county, Long Island railroad, of course, but we do have the NICE bus system and what I call Able Ride, which
was used by several AARP members. When I was doing AARP tax aid, they would be able to get to and from their appointment to have their tax return done. So AARP is going to continue to collaborate with Vision Long Island so we can improve our walkability for pedestrians, no matter the age in all of our communities. And when we do one of those walkability audits, we pick the neighborhood. We actually walk the streets, you come to a major intersection. Is there a walk/don't walk sign if there is one. Does it actually have the time counting down? If it's a two lane road or a six lane road, obviously, someone is going to need a longer time to cross that six lane road than the two lane road. When we do those walkability audits, we come with people in wheelchairs, we come with canes and so forth. The fast walker -- I like to still think $I$ can be a little bit of a fast walker -- can go across the street in no

time. But that person with the cane or the wheelchair or the walker definitely needs more time. So we need to continue to look for more places for this and to have them just right.

Lastly, I would like to mention some of our wonderful parks here in Nassau County for walking. What I still call Salisbury Park, which is now Eisenhower Park. It's been Eisenhower Park for decades. Wonderful place. The Muttontown Preserve, wonderful place. Wantagh Park, wWonderful place. I will mention one, Tackapausha. I have stopped walking there because the trails have not been
maintained. So somebody, please give that a thought. Thank you for your attention.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

And to all of the AARP members who've come out today to join with us, Nassau County is a beautiful place. It's a fantastic place to live and raise a family. And it is that way because of all
your contributions over many, many years.
We thank you for your continuing
advocacy. All of us look forward to working with you on the points that you raised and the program that AARP is pushing for and advocating, and we also look forward to working with you in our communities.

Obviously, there's local issues that are important as well. So, again, on behalf of the Legislature, I thank you all for joining us today.

Legislator Walker.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: I, too, just
want to thank you all. And just on a personal note, I don't know what many young families would do today without -and I'm going to say grandma and grandpa -- but the seniors in our community and and many of you who fall into that category. When I go places with my grandchildren, whether it's bringing who to the bus stop or a game or, you know, parents are, especially during COVID when
things shut down and many of them had to work, you were their lifeline. I mean, you helped them with their families and bringing our seniors and our young people together. You have gone over and above to continue to do that, and I just want to thank you for that on a personal level. Because I although I've never joined AARP -- if anybody has their membership forms, maybe you better give it to me because I'm well past the time. I could have joined. But but thank you for all you do. Thanks for all you do for all of us. And and we would we really enjoy continuing to work with all of you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ferretti in particular is too young to join, but he'd like an application (laughter).

Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Thank. Bernard Macias. And if I said

that correctly --
MR. MACIAS: Thank you. Good
morning. My name is Bernard Macias and I am the associate state director for AARP right here on Long Island. I have plenty of applications in the car. I'll be more than happy to give them all out.

So I'm here today with a wonderful group of volunteers. So nationwide, a AARP has 38 million members; 2.5 million of those members are in New York State. But on Long Island, we have 500,000 members and we have the highest concentration of membership anywhere nationwide. So AARP Long Island is always looked upon nationwide at the national state office.

We are doing great work here. We are very passionate about that work.

Volunteers -- we have about 500 very active volunteers across Nassau and Suffolk. And it's all about the work that we do on behalf of our membership in the areas of age friendly, which we're so
passionate about.
We've done a number -- I know that George Deller, one of our active volunteers, mentioned walkability audits. That's something that we have done with Legislator Bynoe in Hempstead, we do across all of Nassau and Suffolk. Those walkability audits are a great way for our volunteers to get involved and be the eyes and ears in the community to see what are the type of improvements we need to make so that our pedestrians are walking safe.

I do have a couple of points that $I$ do want to mention on the Livability Index. In 2015, AARP launched its Livability Index to measure the quality of life in American communities across multiple dimensions. Some of those dimensions we mentioned earlier:

Housing, transportation, environment, social engagement. And we're happy to note that Nassau County's results were very, very good. The County's scores were

exceptional compared to the rest of the country. Also, when it comes to census data, Nassau County's total population grew 3.7\% to 1.4 million residents over the last ten years, with the most significant growth occurring among people 50 and over. I am a Nassau resident. I've been in Nassau resident for the last 22 years. Everyone in my community knows who I am, not because of AARP, but because I am a very active member of the community. My wife and I are happy raising children or young adults. Now in our community. We want to age in place.

And one thing I want to reiterate,
when it comes to age friendly, it doesn't matter if you're eight or 80 , the work that $A A R P$ is doing is not for just our membership. It's for our members and our families. We're really passionate about that. We'd love to work with all of you on these very important issues that face our communities today. Thank you. Oh, and I also want to note, when it
comes to volunteerism, what we have here today is just a small representation. We have members across Nassau, all the townships, North Hempstead, Hempstead and Oyster Bay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So
thank you, Mr. Macias and thank you again for joining us today.

Thank you, Dave Schwartz We appreciate it.

Pat Boyle. Next speaker.
MR. BOYLE: Hello, everyone. My name
is Pat Boyle from Gateway Youth Outreach
in Elmont. I know that you're going to pass a budget today. I know that it's a budget that gives a $0 \%$ increase to youth services. This is 30 years in a row that we've gotten either a cut or nothing back, nothing in addition to the funding that we would usually get. And now to come to the time where we're going to have to do the cutting as well, too. We talk to you and you all receive letters with regard to what's happening
to our young people in the communities. Anxiety, depression, and other similar maladies are happening to our young people everywhere, and it has to do with, yes, COVID. It has to do with other circumstances that are within the communities as well, too. It's not something that we want to do, but it's something now that we have to do because other costs are going up like crazy.

So one of the things that $I$ went to the high school superintendent with just on Wednesday, I told him no more counseling out of our agency for the kids in your program. Is that what you really want to see? I mean, I can't even hire another social worker to be able to work with us, to be able to help these kids out and know that It's an ethical dilemma for me as well, too. I am a social worker, but $I$ do run the agency and now getting money into the agency is what my priority is because we're not getting anything, any help from the County. We
are getting our money. One shot deals. We haven't seen the money in 18 months that it's been promised to us. But, you know, and hopefully the second round will get quicker.

But it's come down to the point right now where we can't do any more if money's not going to be able to come through, we're stuck. We can't do anything else. We're not going to be able to provide the counseling services that are necessary. And that's a sad
statement. I mean, I've always come up here and I've always said to you, I want to do as much for the community of Elmont, Franklin Square, Valley Stream, all of the areas that we cover. But now I'm not going to be able to do it anymore because I have to put money towards worker's comp, towards unemployment insurance, towards all these other things. It's going to take away from the remainder of our budget. We run a business, don't forget. And running a
business means that all of the costs that you see going up, we see going up as well.

I'm disappointed. I would hope that, you know, in some forms, in some way later on, you might be able to change this. But I'm disappointed in everything that's happened up until now. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Thank you.
Any debate or questions or comments
from the legislators during the hearing?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing None. Motion to close the hearing, Legislator Rhoads, seconded by Legislator Walker.

All in favor of closing the hearing signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature respond in favor.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those
opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously.
Next order of business is the
Legislature's budget, which is Clerk item 309 of 2022, Ordinance 73 of 2022. Motion by Minority Leader Abrahams, seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel on the ordinance. Any debate or discussion on the Legislature's ordinance hearing?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none. All in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Carries unanimously.

Next item is the County Budget, Clerk Item number 306 2022, Ordinance 71 of 2022. Motion by Legislator Kennedy seconded by Legislator Ferretti to approve the Nassau County Budget Ordinance.

So the Budget Ordinance is now before the Legislature. Any debate or discussion?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm guessing this is the appropriate time to make a motion to amend the budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, this would be the appropriate time to make a motion to amend the budget. I can--

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: We could discuss the amendments at hand before the motion and potentially the vote takes
place, that's fine by me.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Well, it's our understanding that
amendments were filed with the Clerk of the Legislature. However, it's also our understanding that Notice of the Amendments was not made as required by the Nassau County Charter, Section 305, which requires a notice published in Newsday twice in ten days advising the public of the nature of the amendment and when the amendment will be heard. This is specific to increases within any item of appropriation. It has been the obligation of a moving party, be it the Legislature or the Administration, to provide the Notice to be published in the newspapers for the Clerk to publish.

So the bottom line is, our understanding is that there was no Notice of the the Minority's amendments.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding
Officer. That's the responsibility that is taken upon by the Clerk's Office. I
assume. And also it's our understanding of the County Charter that that is only in the event of an increase and that's probably why the Clerk did not do that. We believe that legally and fundamentally our amendments are sound as well as legal and we decreased expenses. So from our standpoint, the amendment should be heard. There's no legal standing to not be heard.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, number one, you're incorrect about the procedure. It is your obligation to provide, in a Word file, the Notice that the Clerk is supposed to publish, and your side, unfortunately, failed to do it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That's something that's never been the case. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: That's always been the case. We have done it every year, year in, year out, when we made amendments, number one.

Number two, occasionally, when the

Administration wants a Notice published, such as when, for example, the cemetery ordinances, they provide the Word file and this published. That is the obligation of your side to do that. Mr. Leimone, do you have something to add? MR. LEIMONE: Chris Leimone, for the Administration. We have a deputy county attorney to confirm that position here, Kevin Hardman, if you need that interpretation of the charter. Yes. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes. Mr. Hardman.

DEPUTY COUNTY ATTORNEY HARDMAN:
Yeah. Under Section 305 of the Charter a requirement is that the Notice be published regarding any amendments that are going to increase the budget. That Notice never happened, from what I understand. And if that Notice didn't happen, the amendments are not properly before the Legislature.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. It's not just any increase in the budget,

```
but doesn't it state that before the
County Legislature inserts any additional
item or increases any item of
appropriation --
```

DEPUTY COUNTY ATTORNEY HARDMAN: The Notice was supposed to be published of any changes to the budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any
increase in the item of appropriation, which is what the amendment is. It's an increase in the item of appropriation. If you want to do what you want to do, you have to increase the appropriation. If you're increasing any item of appropriation, regardless of whether your amendment equalizes it elsewhere, if you're increasing any item of appropriation, you have to publish Notice.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, it's our understanding that based off of, one, the budget is not being increased in its entirety. It's not. It's clearly not increasing our
budget. Our amendments are equal. They even out.

It is our understanding as well that this is not based on past practice. However, we still believe that these amendments are fundamentally sound. These amendments could very well pass today. If you are taking the position that you do not want to consider them because of the reasons of the Charter, you could very well consider our amendments by emergency if you believe in them. But if you're going to stand behind the position that they weren't publicly noticed, even though they have a tremendous impact on people's public safety, then that's your position. But that has not been the past practice and we stand by the position that this budget is not being increased in its entirety. It just clearly isn't. But if you want to take the position that you're going to stand against these amendments or not support these amendments because of a technical error
of something being noticed, we have some members of the public that are here today. Let's debate our amendments and see what they think, because I'm willing to bet every single person is going to validate the fact that public safety is our utmost priority. And it's important today that we discuss amendments that protects their public safety.

Just so the public knows, we are talking about adding an additional 110 officers to our police force. One, to address the issues of hate crimes in our community; and two, the Commissioner testified several weeks ago that in order for him to provide more highly visible police officers on our streets to deal with the issues of crime, we would be able to hire an additional 55 officers as well. So from that standpoint alone, these amendments are sound. They are not political shenanigans, they are sound amendments.

So if you are willing to support --
if you're going to stand by the position that we didn't publicly notice it or we didn't provide a Word format to the Clerk in the Legislature, which has never been done before. But that's okay. If you're going to stand by that position, then provide the emergency so we can move forward, unless you are taking the position that you cannot support the emergency or you cannot support these amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: One, in terms of past practice, it's been done this way every year.

Secondly, as to your point that
you're not changing the budget in its entirety. Let me read again Nassau County Charter 305: "Public notice is required before the Legislature inserts any additional item or increases any item of appropriation". So clearly notice was required.

Secondly, amendments do not amend the tax levy ordinance. So if you're
changing the budget, you have to change the tax levy ordinance and you failed to do that. So if you want to suggest that this is of an emergency nature, we can start discussing that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let's move on. I'll make a motion to an emergency making a motion to amend the budget by emergency. Carrie A. seconds it. Let's just be clear what we're talking about today. Are we really trying to put up obstacles to stand in the way of public safety in this county?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Tell me what the emergency is.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: An emergency amendment to an emergency vote to amend the budget. Based off of our amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, but I mean, tell me the emergency that you're trying to establish. What you're trying to do with your amendments is take money from the Contingency Fund and shift it into the Police Fund. So that can be
done today. It could be done January 1st. It could be done June 1st. So why is it an emergency to do it today? Explain. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Because the budget is before us today.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: But you could move -- you can use that Contingency Fund at any point of the year.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, there's a motion on the floor. But more importantly, we are discussing the budget today. If we are going to make changes that are going to impact the budget going into 2023, it makes prudent sense to do them today when we're considering the budget. I don't know. That's just conventional wisdom that I would think.

But that being said -- but I think the root of the issue is because we're getting too bogged down in whether they were filed, noticed properly. Do you support the amendments? Because if you
support the amendments, you would do what you need to do, whether it's for our public, for yourselves, what may be the case, you would do what you need to do today to hear the amendments. So the question becomes, do you support the amendments?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Why don't we do this? We believe that the root of the problem is that --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: It's very straightforward.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Here's my straightforward response. The root of the problem here is cashless bail and policies of the Democratic Legislature and Governor of New York State.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here we go; let's go.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So I invite you -- we'll come back in and we'll vote on these amendments. I'll invite you and all members of your caucus. Let's go outside now and demand
that the governor of New York State bring the Legislature back and repeal those amendments. So you're willing to do that --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So now you open up the avenue for politics.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are you ready to go out?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So if cashless bail and bail reform are such significant issues that impact crime, which I've heard from all of you during the hearing that they are, then why wouldn't you support a proposal that adds an additional 110 cops if crime is that out of control? Based off your responses and based on what you're saying here for the last month, wouldn't you support a proposal that allows 110 cops as well as add money for a recidivism program to be able to address it? It doesn't make any sense. It's an oxymoron what you're proposing.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It
does make sense because you can have all the officers in the world go out there, but if the person you're arresting is getting out of jail and walking free before you complete the paperwork, that's a problem. And we're seeing the problem because those types of crimes,
burglaries, etc., major crimes are spiking. And it's not because we don't have 100 extra cops in the street. It's because of insane policies by our State Legislators. So we as local officials, let's group together, let's really make some news, and all together, 19 of us, call upon the Governor, the State Legislature, to come back into session, repeal these reforms.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, you want to call on an outside body. We'll consider calling any outside bodies, but we have control today to do what we need to do to ensure that our Nassau County residents are safe. So calling on an outside entity, whether
it's a State Legislature or the Governor, it may be the case that is something separate. That's not within our control. We can call on them and they'll do nothing or they'll do something. Who knows what they'll do? But today we have the onus on us. We control the narrative when it pertains to Nassau County Police officers. We control it. We have the ability to hire the officers now regardless of what the state does. If you're going to hang your hat on the fact that we hope the State comes along because all 19 of us will do it. I got to tell you this, dozens and dozens of counties, big cities in this place, they're not just going to move just because Nassau asks for it. But we can move forward with 110 additional officers today.

I'm still boggled by the mind -- I mean, $I$ don't want to start polling my colleagues. I'm boggled by the mindset that you don't support it. Is that
reality? Are you are you saying today you do not support 100 --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're still missing the point. You're missing the point that the real problem here is cashless bail. And if you want to address the real problem, you can do so. You can do this political stunt. But if you want to address the real problem and this entire state knows what this problem is, it's cashless bail, it's Raise the Age. It's the reason why kids are being brought in from Newark to check our cars, to take the catalytic converters because they know they can't be prosecuted. So let's go after these policies. Let's do it as a group.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, you're changing tunes.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: If we do it alone as Republicans, they're going to say it's political. If you guys come outside on the front steps and demand the Governor bring the State Legislature
back, it stops being political and they have to start listening.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Presiding Officer, you've never once answered my question in regards to 110 officers. So why would I even entertain some bogus thing you're going to ask us to do on the steps of the Legislature? This is a very sound, fundamental
question: Do you believe the amount of officers that are in the budget today, the 36 that the County Executive has added is sufficient? It's a very simple question.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Commissioner Ryder, I ask you to come up.
He's asking me a question that $I$ believe was something that was answered during the Public Safety Committees, but I'll ask the Commissioner to answer it. Do we believe, do we the County, does the Commissioner believe that the number of officers in the budget is sufficient? That's the question.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You
just asked it. Mr. Commissioner, please respond to that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Commissioner Ryder, before you respond, our amendments are in direct response to what the Commissioner said in my direct Q\&A with him. I was asking the Commissioner, if we wanted more visibility on our streets -and we talked about foot patrols when we brought it up, I said, Commissioner, how many additional officers would you need? And I believe based off our amendments, he had said 55. That's part of why we got to the 110. Then we felt it was important based on what we're seeing that's happening all throughout our country, the attacks on our minority population, Asian American, Jewish Americans that are being attacked based on their religion and their beliefs, which is wrong, which we all believe and we stand for. We felt having a separate unit for that purpose
was instrumental. So from that
standpoint, that is why, yes, the
Commissioner could say that the officers
that's in the budget is sufficient, but not sufficient for the visibility that we had discussed in our Q\&A back and forth a couple of weeks ago.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Very nice. You ask me a question, I have the person up who can answer it and then you answer it yourself.

The question that was asked of me. And I think it's more appropriate for the head of our great law enforcement organization is: Do we have sufficient police officers in the budget?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, we do.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS:
Commissioner -- can I ask a question?
COMMISSIONER RYDER: Sure.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Commissioner,
do you remember the discussion that we had on the budget?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, sir.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And one of the questions I had asked you was a direct perspective in regards to the amount of officers to be able to provide greater visibility. Do you remember that discussion?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, sir.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How many
officers in addition, I believe you had said we would need to be able to have higher visibility on our downtown streets like foot patrols?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That was that number 55.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So if we wanted to have a greater enhancement and more visibility to try to curtail crime, because I believe foot patrols would curtail crime, we would need an additional 55 officers on top of what's being presented today per the County's active budget.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: So our analysis that was done with the County Exec in
preparation for this budget was to ask for the additional 46 officers, which we got. Those 46 officers address the issue with the UBS Arena.

Your question is more visibility?
And I said if you had more officers, you always have more visibility, but that doesn't solve my issue of crime. And because if I have 1000 officers and I arrest 1000 people, I have 1000 people coming out of jail because of the cashless belt. That's the issue we have.

But we -- and I'm being honest, that doesn't fix my crime issue. The staffing level that we asked for and we were given was the staffing that our assessment got us. And that's how we move forward and deal and live within the budget that we had. We have been given.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Commissioner, I'll make sure $I$ understand you correctly and you and I have a rapport, so I don't want to put you in a box or squeeze you in any way.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I'm in a box. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But are you saying that the addition of 110 officers or even 55, we're willing to compromise -- you're saying those additional officers, you don't need them? COMMISSIONER RYDER: I'm saying that I have a responsibility to live within my budget. I have a fiscal responsibility both to my officers, that if $I$ don't over blow my budget, that they come back and take some away and I have that issue. So I had that responsibility to live within that budget. I did my assessment. I gave it forward to the County and they actually accepted extending the headcount for the first time in 20 years.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Commissioner, we're adding to your budget. So we're going to make your budget higher. So you don't have to worry about living within your budget. It's not like we're handing you a bill without being able to pay for it. We're adding the money to the budget
to pay for the officers. And I understand that just to tap on this -- since we're going into it full blown -- I know the Majority asked the Office of Legislative Budget Review, which I want to thank Maurice Chalmers at this time, obviously, for all the budget reports and things that he has done over the years, they've been very sound. But I know he asked the budget review for a ten year breakdown of costs. Commissioner, do you break down your costs ten years out? Have we ever forecasted a budget or what our budget costs would be ten years out? COMMISSIONER RYDER: That is not my my position. My position -- I look at crime numbers ten years out. I look at predictive analysis, I look at backwards numbers, I look at five year averages.

The budget is what gets put forward to me and then I look at it and see what I can live with and what I can't live with. And then I go back to the Budget Office, I sit with Andy and I say, I need more cops
to do this, and I was given the 46
officers that we actually asked for.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So just to get back to that now. So the 46 officers that you asked for, many of them are being tied to UBS. The 55 that we were asking for, in addition to creating a division for hate crimes as well to bump it up to the 110, the additional officers we are talking about are for visibility purposes. One of the things that I hear, you hear it from my constituents that come here, you hear from all constituents throughout the county, is that they like to see officers doing more foot patrols. Now, if you're saying that that won't address crime, $I$ beg to differ.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: No. That's not my answer.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, okay. I thought you had said that before.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That a presence is always a deterrence, but a presence doesn't fix the problem.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, we agree that there are many several faceted problems that exist. I totally agree. I can say that as a Democrat or a Republican, we should be able to say that we totally agree.

But what I guess what I'm driving at is, would adding more foot patrols increase public safety?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Adding more foot patrols would always increase a public safety. But if I said I have another 500 offices, it doesn't fix my issue because the crime that goes on in the county is done right in front of officers. The crime that's going on is done at -- the other day, four catalytic converters were cut. Three out of those fours were confronted by homeowners and chased them down the block. So it's not stopping them from the presence. The problem is we don't keep them -- give that discretion back to those judges. It's a problem. It doesn't fix my
problem.
My crime numbers have been
phenomenal over the last several years. We've driven it down to be that safest county. But last year, even though we got that vote, we still went up and going up every day. Because of that, we're up over $50 \%$. And most of that is that crime that's in those back streets and done at night, not walking down -- and again, I wouldn't have a foot post at night. Most of my foot posts would be in the daytime and very few of my crimes occur day. Most of my crimes occur at night. Most of my crimes occur late in the evening, through that midnight to 8:00 in the morning, 6:00 in the morning time period.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Obviously, we don't feel the need to have maybe foot patrols at night, but we'd have more visibility, more cars on the street road. I mean, we can go over the minimum manning numbers. I mean, there's no reason why we couldn't do that if we're
paying for it here.
But one thing you did mention that that did bring up some curiosity is that you mentioned that the crime is up over $50 \%$. I don't remember a number that high since I've been here. Is that the highest number that we've heard in decades?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, our five year average is still down because we have done such a great job in driving crime. Last year, even though our crime went up, everybody went up in the country. But our number is extremely low to begin with because of those years that we drove it down. So we're dealing off historical low numbers, so.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Historical low
numbers, and that's why you presented the five year. But I'm talking about a snapshot year in 2022, you said that we're up over $50 \%$ increase in crime, based off of last year. Based on the historical.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That is
correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That increase
from year to year. Is that the highest increase we've seen in some period of time? I don't want to quantify it with a year, you know.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: No, and I know where you're going. If you look back over the years and we've had this exact question when the Republicans asked it, they said the crime is up. I said, well, we're dealing with small numbers. So when you deal with small numbers, your percentages sometimes are higher. Two over one is $50 \%$ increase, four over one, you got 100\% increase. So it's as high as it is in the percentage. The numbers are still extremely low.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Got it. But in terms of the percentage, $50 \%$, where does that rank in the last 40 years, 30 years, 20 years?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I can give you the last five years, it's one of the
higher years of those five years.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I would think
-- and look, we're being accused of being political, but we're really not. And this is not for you to answer. This is really for my colleagues to answer. We're being accused of being political, but really
responding to the times. The times
reflects that we've seen from year to year, it's one of the highest increases from year to year. So the standard and look, Commissioner, $I$ know you're in a box, the standard number of the amount of officers we add, the 46 , can't be the response. If we are dealing with the highest number that we've seen in many years, one of the highest five, to me, we need to go above and beyond.

And it's still boggling my mind here as I sit here that we are talking about adding officers. I mean, I think I've heard from every single one of you guys to my right advocated that crime is up. We agree it's up. So let's do something
about it that's above and beyond what we
normally do. I feel like this
Legislature's always added 30 here, 40 here this year, 46. But this is an unprecedented time. It's one of the top five, as you just said, Commissioner. So from our standpoint, wouldn't we do something that's a little bit more unprecedented and add some more officers?

I guess that's not for you to answer, Commissioner.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I agree, let's do something unprecedented. Let's go out and tell those Democratic lawmakers.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You said that already.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
know. I'm going to say it again. Let's go outside. As a group. As a group, let's do something for the unprecedented. Because he just told you he could have 500 more officers. The problem is they're arresting people and they're
getting right out. So the root of the problem is not solved by this. The root of the problem is by changing the policy. It's not by hiring 400 or 500 or 1000 officers. But if you join with us, it actually has some substance.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, you are way off. Because I got to tell you, you go to some states in this country, they don't have bail reform. In Georgia, they don't have it. But guess what? Their crime is through the roof. You think they're going to respond with some state advocacy nonsense that you're bringing up? They're going to respond with more police officers.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Go
tell that to the people in your community that it's not a result of cashless bail. Go tell that to your residents.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You're saying -- you can talk about Georgia, you can talk about California. It doesn't matter, the crime itself and it's the

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { types of crimes that are subject to bail } \\
& \text { reform that's spiking. }
\end{aligned}
$$

(Whereupon, crosstalk.)
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, you're saying that bail reform is the one silver bullet issue that's increasing crime. If that was the case, we wouldn't be seeing crime increase all over the country. What I'm saying is, those jurisdictions are using their resources to get more police officers. Only in Nassau County, where we're advocating for 110, basically, we're saying, no, let's go advocate to our state officials. That's what you're saying. We have the ability to control it. It's in our power today, more police officers in Nassau County. And you if I'm understanding you correctly, you are saying no.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm saying that it is insane policy to tell a judge that they don't have the discretion to consider the dangerousness of a
suspect, to consider a flight risk. It's insane. We have to stop that. I mean, that's what I'm saying. That's my point.

But, Commissioner Ryder, when you do your great job in law enforcement, you have to work with other agencies. The DA's office. Right? The jail or the or probation. So if we look during the course of the year and we determine that, well, officers are important to add, but the problem that's going on is the DA's office doesn't have enough staff to deal with the discovery requirements and people are being let off because of technicalities. If we use the Contingency Fund at that point for that purpose, the money would be there to do it. But you understand that if the problem is officers during the course of the year, that we could give you more officers at any time you want during the course of the year. But we need to have the flexibility of that Contingency Fund to pay for the DA's office, to pay for the
jail, to pay for inmates. We need that flexibility. That's what I'm saying. Do you agree with that?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes. So over the last four years, five years, we have increased our headcount to 2,500. It's the first time last year that we've ever reached that number in the last seven years, eight years. And we got up to that number this year. The request was to even add more and we added more. When you talk about a presence out in the community, what we did and some of the other reasons, what we did was do just that. We add it to Community Affairs. We added bike cops, we added two PAL Divisions. So we added a lot of community programs, a lot of presence in the neighborhood to affect that. So when we did our assessment, I said I would like 46. I got exactly what $I$ was asking from the County Exec. But as asked by the legislator is that would I take more from more presence? Yes, sure. I could
absolutely always use more presence on the street. But the problem becomes it's not going to solve the crime issue. It will deter that crime. It will displace that crime issue. But when that cop goes away, the crime problem comes back. And when you look with the union issues, now you're talking about not only a presence, but then you're talking about sick leave and you're talking about minimum manning post and you're talking about negotiations. So living with the 46 that I have, answers my problem that I have to handle my budget and deal with what I need to deal with.

I think and I believe our crime is controllable in Nassau County and gotten even better. Examples: Stolen cars were up over $245 \%$, but we took a different angle and did a different approach with education and awareness. And then went out and visited these kids that were part of these gangs from New Jersey that were coming here because Raise the Age and the

bail system. We've taken more guns off our street this year than ever, but every one of them is walking out. One third of the 3,000 arrests we made last quarter walked out. So as I appreciate the fact that you're fighting to give me more cops, it doesn't fix my problem. And my problem is and again, I don't like being in this box, but I'm in it, right? It's just the job I have and I try to -- I never say no to anybody, but what I am saying is that that's not fixing my issue.

And it does raise up other things for me that become problems with unions and everything else and where it goes forward. Because once I put someone there, that becomes a standard for the Union and I've got to continue.

So what happens when crime plummets next year, which I believe it's going to go in the right direction next year, not because of any other change, but because of what we've done in the Police

Department. And when it does plummet and it does go down, the Union's not going to let me take that spot away. I've got to still have it.

So we've put the presence out there.
I know the communities have seen the bike patrols, we've gotten the thanks for that. We've added our PALS, which we've got. Thanks. We tripled the size of the Community Affairs and we've managed our budget and come under on the budget every year for the last five years.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So you said a couple -- I'm sorry. Were you done. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You said a couple of things, so I'll just make sure I understand you correctly. You said that you feel that this time next year we are going to be a better position because how we're dealing with crime, because all the things that we're doing. Right. But you
also said and the Presiding Officer said, well, let's go outside on the steps and advocate against cashless bail. If cashless bail is still here, how are you, and cashless bail has such an impact on crime, then how are you saying crime is going to go down?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Because of what we did at the Police Department, we had to make adjustments like we did with education awareness and going to Newark. I'm going I know the people that were involved in these organized stolen cars. I will now be able to keep them out of this county because of what we've done. And I will know that my residents here in Nassau County will start to lock their cars instead of leaving them open with the keys in them. So that automatically takes that out of the gate, which blew us out of the water. And they came here because of Raise the Age and cashless bail, that they're not coming back here because they know the cars are not open.

So it's going to be a little bit more involved. I'm not going to kill it, but I'm going to bring that to 40 will start on a lower set when I break out. So when I break, I always look at my quarters and I know what $I$ can win over and what I can't. I know this crime number is done, I can't fix it for the rest of the year. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I keep harping on the fact that no one thinks that 110 officers is going to fix your problem, as you said. But we believe 110 officers definitely makes your jobs a lot easier. I mean, everyone has to admit that.

Having an additional 110 officers makes your job easier, makes the public feel safer, deters crime, based on your words. Those are three good things. Three good things. So why wouldn't we want to do it? If it's just for those reasons alone.

Then I know you brought up the fact in regards to the budget. Look, I've never been in a county where we budgeted -- in my 20 plus years as a legislator,

I've never seen us ask for a budget breakdown for ten years out. We have budgeted here with a multi-year plan four years out. And my colleagues here will testify that we don't always do what's in the multi-year plan in year three, in year four, but suddenly we're going to do what's in year ten? It just seems like to me we're coming up with reasons not to do this.

But I stand by the fact, based on
what you had said, it would deter crime, it would make the public feel safer, it would obviously, I would think, make your jobs easier. It would make officers jobs easier, especially if we're able to have two-man cars. And I know there's union issues and other issues that go along with it. But to me, adding more officers to this force is a good thing. And I can't understand for the life of me how we're fighting so much resistance. We're bringing up bail reform? That's out of our control. Yes, everybody would like to

take a look at reforming bail reform.
I've heard the Attorney General, she's one of the most progressive people in this state. She talked about it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The race getting tight there.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So. So, yeah.
But either way -- well, let's not talk about races because $I$ can bring up races because there's candidates on your side that are proposing and saying that crime is out of control. But they won't even join us today in a vote to be able to address more officers in this county. That's an oxymoron.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All
right. Other legislators would like to speak. You're going in circles.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You know, it's funny. It's funny you say other
legislators would like to speak. I would like to hear from your other legislators that they don't support our amendment for 110 officers. I hear you saying it. And

then I would like to take a vote on the emergency to amend the budget so everybody could be on record of that vote on what their position is as well. Of course we're not.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We'll talk about. We're having a full debate now. We'll talk about your emergency -LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I get it. No, you're protecting your members. I get it. Rich, I get it. Your members, they're with us. I get it. You're protecting your members. You're doing the County Executive's bidding on this. I get it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: But I get what you're doing, too. This is just a political stunt. And again, if you want --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How is it a political stunt?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: If you
want real change, join with us and call upon this --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Explain to me


```
explain to me asking for 110 officers --
```

    PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
    Because you wont address the root cause.
You won't address the root cause of
what's happening in this state. A rise
and spike in crime.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, we disagree. We disagree on what the root cause is. I believe that adding 110 officers to combat hate crimes, to be able to address more visibility in our streets is a good thing. You go ask your residents if they think that's a good thing. I'm willing to bet they said yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm willing to bet my residents say let's repeal cashless bail. Let's do this.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm willing to bet -- but that's that's not before us. We have no control.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It can be.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: This is
amazing to me that you don't understand this.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: That's the most important thing that we could do today. If you want to send a message -- -

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You can't do that here.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We can. Let's go out on the steps of the building.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But, Rich. But, Rich.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It will be a story all over the state. Democratic Legislators join with Republicans.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Rich, even if we go outside and we do that, we still it would be like saying the words in the wind. They'll go to the wayside.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
won't doubt if you're with us?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Rich, come on.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Other
legislators want to ask questions.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Seriously. We have the control today.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Come
on. You're saying the same thing over and over. Let's go. Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Rich, I'm going to say I'm going to say something that's different. All right? I'm going to say something. Yeah, let's cut the mics off because we don't like what they're saying.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm not cutting the mics off.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm saying something different.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Come
on. We want to hear from someone else.
Your voice is saying the same thing.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Why wouldn't we take the vote on the emergency to amend the budget?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: There
is -- we'll get it to the emergency.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I understand
you want to protect your guys, and some of your guys really don't want to vote against cops. I get that.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We'll get it --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So don't.
Join us. Don't vote against them.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Listen, we're gonna move on.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You have the right to do something independent right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Maybe you don't want to hear from anybody else, but this is 19 member board, Minority Leader. Let's go. Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no, no, no, no, no. I want to hear from them because I want to.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. You do want to hear from. Stop talking, for Pete's sake.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah, I know you want to talk me down because you're really just trying to protect them.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're just talking incessantly. I just want somebody else to talk.
(Whereupon, court reporter
asks for speakers to speak one at a time.)

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: We have here, Presiding Officer, the written Emergency Amendment that I will that Mr. Muller said that we need to get signed, which is new to me, but we're willing to pass it around so that everybody can sign. Here we go. We're willing to do it (handing).

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

I agree with the Presiding Officer completely that this is nothing more than a political stunt. And you know, it's ironic that it's coming from the Minority
who just a few weeks ago refused to give us the votes to protect our cops for bulletproof vests, and cars, and the equipment that we needed with the Capital Plan. Didn't get a single vote from any one of you for that. But now today, you're going to come here and pull this political stunt.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Additionally,
please let me finish without --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, sorry. I
thought the mic was off.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Additionally,
you could talk about now, Minority
Leader, you know, kind of wishy washy
about being against bail reform, but not
a single one of you have ever publicly,
as far as $I$ know, correct me if I'm
wrong, publicly oppose bail reform or
criminal justice reform, possibly
Legislator Solages. If I'm wrong, I
apologize. Not one of you have ever come out against any of the state senators,
all of whom share the same party as you, who all supported and voted for the criminal justice reform. Not a single one of you have ever come out against the open border policies of Joe Biden and the and the Democrats who just a few weeks ago -- Commissioner, correct me if I'm wrong, Commissioner -- were there not three people arrested in Nassau County for burglaries who were caught on the border, coming over, came into Nassau County and committed crimes; isn't that true?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, they were part of the South South American Theft Group.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Right. Not one of you have ever criticized the cause of the increased crime that we are suffering in Nassau County. Instead, you come with a stunt. I guess you're going to use it on your palm card, whatever you have planned. And you come with a stunt and you try to convince the public that
it's the Republicans. Good luck, Good luck.

And if we had public here, they would back me up. But we don't because you didn't notice this, coincidentally. So let's talk real numbers. Let's talk facts. The numbers of arrests in Nassau County are up. We all agree, Commissioner Ryder testified to it. Yet, the number of inmates in the county correctional facility are less than half of what they were. What does that tell you? That tells you that despite the implication in your amendment that our police are not adequately doing the job, they are. They're arresting the bad guys, but the bad guys are getting let out. That's not the problem of the police. That's the problem of your party that you failed to criticize, that you fail to join us on opposing these heinous policies. The public knows it. We're going to find out in a couple of weeks about that.

The bottom line is we could talk all
about the substance of this, but I
believe the motion is about an emergency
item. And still, despite the Presiding Officer asking for justification for an emergency, there's been none given. So I'd still like to know what is the justification for an emergency? Thank you.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Mr. Ferretti,
you mentioned a couple of different
things. Not once did you mention that you
would support the emergency because you
know what the emergency is about. The emergency --

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Convince me.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Mr.
Ferretti, I didn't cut you off, but if you're going to cut me off, that's --

So the emergency is clearly for
these fundamental reasons:
If I'm taking the position that the Majority is basically saying to us that they are not going to consider the amendment that we put forward two weeks
ago, because you're saying that it wasn't publicly noticed because we didn't put into a Word format for the Clerk of the Legislature, which is -- never heard that before. But if that's the case, that's a position we're going to take. Great -- If that's the case, we are willing to put up by emergency, and we were able to put together the resolution so that we can have all the signatures so we can put forward today.

Now, why is the emergency needed for today? Well, it makes common sense that we're considering these amendments that we put forward several weeks ago were to address the shortfalls that we feel that the budget has presented. We think that there should be more officers. We are considering the budget today. We're not considering the budget in January. We're not considering the budget in November. We are considering the budget today. So it makes perfect sense. Even though the Presiding Officer had indicated that we
can do this transfer at any time, it would make more sense to consider it today, which we are having the debate and the discussion. It would make more sense to do it today. Why would we do it in in two months or three months? That makes no sense.

So from our standpoint, that's the justification. It's simple. The budget is being considered today. Unless you're telling me the budget is going to be reconsidered in a couple of weeks, then we'll come back. But that's not the case. We're considering the budget today. We are putting up we have amendments that we put up that should be considered as part of the budget.

But again, look, if you guys don't want to do it, that's okay. Just say you don't support 110 officers. It's okay. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So you don't think the Notice requirement is important?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The Notice?


> Oh, I'm a big of Notice requirement person because I said that because the the Assessor didn't do the proper Notice requirement as it pertains to the Correction of Errors. So I'm a big Notice requirement person, don't get me wrong. And I don't believe what you're saying is accurate. But you know what? In the spirit of compromise, I'm willing to live with that. It's okay. Give us the emergency today so we can move forward. Now, the notice part -- I would wish we had more people from the public.

Hopefully, they're there live streaming and watching it from their homes or from their offices. But to me, that issue is getting hung up and slowing down the real issue at hand. The real issue at hand is that the Commissioner said to me several weeks ago that he can use an additional 55 officers to address visibility. I didn't make this number up. We didn't make this up like a like we grabbed it out of the sky. That was a number that
the Commissioner had indicated. I thank him his honesty. And we want to do more.

Look, guys, we all see what's going on, whether you're a Democrat or Republican in this in this country and in this state, people are getting pushed into subways, children are dying. We see what's going on and we are not immune to it. A young man from Baldwin went to school in Buffalo and lost his life. A young father from Long Island went to visit his son in Marist College and lost his life. Now, granted, I know those are out of our jurisdiction, but their loved ones still live here and their loved ones still see what the Commissioner is testifying: A 50\% increase off of last year in crime. Well, if you want to say it's because of cashless bail, we don't care. To me, that doesn't matter. Yes. If you want to go advocate, we can discuss it. But that's not the issue. What we can control today, what we can control is the amount of officers we add
to this police force. That's what we can control.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Commissioner Ryder, the current list was when? The police list that you've been hiring off.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The police list that you're hiring off, what what year was it?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That test was in 2016 or 18? 18, 18.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Is there an intention of the Police Department to move to a new list? New test?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: We're meeting with the company. The RFP is out to pick the person to design the next test. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: And
there's a plan in place in terms of
hiring going forward. And the desire is for the Police Department from prior
conversations is as much as possible to use the new test for hiring officers?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That's correct.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: And part of the reason for that is it's
designed to encourage greater diversity and things that we need in our police department, correct?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: The recruitment process, we hope to increase the diversity in the test taking.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So the budget supports an increase in police sports, an increase in the budget for your department. But there is a plan going forward that we'll continue to hire as we need to, but we also need to get officers hired off when the new list is established, right?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That's correct.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: SO, I
mean, there's a priority there. And you
know, us as political officials and inserting ourselves into that, I think

for political reasons, $I$ don't think it's helpful.

And number two, again, going back to Legislator Ferretti's point, there's a Contingency Fund, and it's definitely for this purpose. So if a contingency arises, you spend the money, but you have the flexibility to do that throughout the year. So if Commissioner Ryder comes back to us and says those extra officers you hired are good, but I need more, then the money's there to do it, but there's no emergency that it be done today. You have not established an emergency.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: There is an
emergency. The Commissioner testified that over last year there's a 50\% increase in crime. He says one of the top five years of all time.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: But he says he has the officers to do -- again, he's told you repeatedly, he said you could give us we could give him 500 more officers. It's not going to address the
fundamental issue.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You're mixing
his words, he had the amount of officers to do it off of the 46 , but to add the extra deterrence, to add the greater visibility, to add the division of hate crimes, he doesn't have it. He can't have it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
mean, that's your perspective. But he told you repeatedly, you can give me 500 officers, is not going to address the root cause. But anyway, Legislator Ford has a question.

## LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Commissioner

--
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Other legislators have the right to speak.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The
Commissioner's in a box. Commissioner, I respect the position that you're in a box.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are
you going to have the respect for your colleagues to let them speak?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you. I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Good afternoon.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very much. Just briefly, how many years have you had in the police department?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I start my 40th year in January.

LEGISLATOR FORD: And you've risen through the ranks to be Police Commissioner, correct?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Kind of (laughter).

LEGISLATOR FORD: So, almost practically every department, correct.

So you're aware of everything dealing with regular patrol, whether or not detectives, you know, I mean, you headed IT, you also taught the Civilian

Police Academy, educating a lot of us in regard to policing throughout Nassau County. As a police commissioner, do you constantly review your personnel and the needs of the Department as well as the communities that you serve?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Every day.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. So that when
you proposed for our budget, the number of police officers that you were requesting, did you feel comfortable in this request?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I was. The assessment we did, and when asked by the County Executive what is the number? We said we'd like to get it to 2546 , and that was the number $I$ was granted.

LEGISLATOR FORD: All right. And
then despite the rise, basically the rise in crime, you have also indicated that Nassau County still is one of the safest counties in the United States; am I correct?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That's correct.


LEGISLATOR FORD: All right. So, you know, you've we've gone through a lot even with this, with so many things that have happened in the county. Working with all of us here. Do you have any reservations in amending any of your positions or if you felt that in the future, like, say, in January, all of a sudden you realize that there was a certain need that you may need to increase the police force, do you have any reservations coming before us stating that this is what you need to have?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: No, I'm good
with the number. And for the record, if
even if you gave me a number to go
higher, I wouldn't be able to put them into an academy until May or June.

LEGISLATOR FORD: All right. So
that's right. Now, as we're moving forward with the the candidates that will be put into the police academy to be able to come out on the street to do the patrols, as you said, that you've

increased bicycle patrols, you have, PAL, you have so many other different departments that have police that police officers are working in to respond to the community needs, correct?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: We have a plan and our plan has been met for this budget cycle. We'll see what happens next year.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. And, you
know, you always have responded regardless whether or not during COVID, you were right there every day on the phone with us deploying your officers, despite the dangers that they felt that they were facing, being exposed to COVID, to this horrible sickness. Even during the George Floyd protests, we have to say we're very proud of the fact the way that your police officers and the way that you oversaw them during all of the protests and the parades and whatever that they had, that our officers were able to maintain control without anything happening within the neighborhoods, and I
thank you very much for that.
As I said, you've always determined -- and I think that for me, I like to look at the professionals who know best. And I believe that you are that professional that has guided us, you guided us and helped us during police reform, which I know some of the members on the Democratic side voted not to vote for the police reform bill that we sent to Albany, even though it was accepted by the State. I am very concerned when all of a sudden we are determining what is best for the Police Department.

When I think about in the past and I
know that our presiding officer has talked about cashless bail, but the changes that happened in Albany, despite the fact that the DA and a lot of law enforcement, went before the State Legislature and said, we know that we have to make some changes in the criminal justice system. And they wanted to have a big discussion to look at what would be
best to approaching this. But the Democratic Legislators decided that they knew what was best for New York State. And despite any warnings or any pleas, they decided to pass this and we we have witnessed the disastrous results of their vote.

When I also think about the fact that they then followed with, they decided that all of a sudden in the middle of all the protests, they decided to repeal 50A, which impacted our police officers throughout New York State. And it wasn't that the unions were against the repeal or any changes to the 50A, and you can correct me if I'm wrong,

Commissioner, because I'm not an expert in policing. But even though the unions did go before the State Legislature and said, please don't, please don't repeal this, we want to talk with you about it just to go over some of the impacts that it may have on officers and to see on further discussion what is best, they

decided that they were going to then -and despite a letter that $I$ wrote to my representative and to the State asking them to hold off because of what it was going to do to our police officers, they decided to go ahead and they voted for it, which resulted in the fact of all of a sudden it seemed to our police officers that public sentiment was against them. That our State and our representatives decided that they weren't going to protect the backs of those that were protecting us. And we've seen a number a record number of police officers, seasoned police officers throughout the state, especially in New York City, that opted to retire because after all the years of service and all the dangers that they faced, they realized that the public wasn't going to be for them. And this was the message that they sent. So I'm sorry today that all of a sudden you decide that it's better that despite the fact that the Police Commissioner gave us in
our budget what he felt that he needed to adequately protect us throughout Nassau County, that you have decided now once again you are going to determine what is best. And I dare say, based on the record that I've seen in New York State and the Democrats that vote for some things I have to say, I don't have any confidence in what you have to say. Thank you, Commissioner.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you,
Presiding Officer. My colleague Kevan asked the question, and I think I'd like to respond directly to the question. The question was, why wouldn't we do it? Just. Just why not? It'll flood the streets. It'll have more cops there.

Now, I can only draw upon upon many years experience running a business and and quite a few years of experience over here. It's a very facile kind of response to say we just throw money at something
or we just throw people at something. It actually hurts the situation because when you go ahead and you do something like that, then you just sit back and you pat yourself on the back and you say, look, we've done something, we've accomplished something, but you really haven't. It actually hurts because it distracts from the real problem. You go ahead and you put more cops out and let's say instead of arresting the same guy ten times, you arrest the guy, same guy 15 times or 20 times. But it doesn't make any difference. It's the few people who are who are a very small minority of people who are out there committing these crimes and they're doing it over and over again. And arresting them, putting more cops out, even if that would result in arresting them more times, it doesn't matter. They're getting out every single time and they're just doing it over and over again. So I would say it's been my habit over here, not a habit, I should
say. But you all know that I've gone against my party at times and I've gone against a whole Legislature that had been some 18 to 1 votes. If I thought that this would make sense, if I thought that that this would actually accomplish something instead of just making people feel better, that we've looked at this dystopian situation that everyone's painting and and we've now fixed it, I would I would go ahead and I'd vote for it. I have no no problem doing something like that. But I think it's actually harmful. We go ahead and we do something and we think we fix the problem and it distracts us. We haven't gone ahead and addressed the real problem. We haven't gone ahead and looked at really what's going on over here, how do we fix it? Just adding people, just adding money. It never fixes a problem.

If you look at any business, you
look at any institution, you'll find the same thing. You've got to sit down,
you've got to analyze why do we have the problem? Will adding more people fix it? Well, then, sure. By all means, go ahead and do that. But if it's not going to fix it, then you've actually harmed the situation.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Any other legislators for Commissioner Ryder?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi. I.
I feel -- I know this is part of your job, but I. I'm sorry that you're in an uncomfortable position.

I just wanted to address one thing that Legislator Ferretti mentioned about giving bond authorization for public safety use. There's over $\$ 100$ million. I think it's 140 something, Michelle is going to check, that's there and available for public safety. So it's ready to go for whatever you need. If it's vests or ambulances, whatever it is, We have bond authority available, just so you know, and the Treasurer's Office will send you the information if you need it.

I've been trying to say it over and over again. I'm upset because this is money that we passed in the last ten years to go to public safety, but it's sitting there. So I don't know if there's a way to look into that.

And I will have to just say, as a resident of Nassau County, you know, I'm concerned about certain things. And I do believe, as we've mentioned before, that certain -- I think there was some good intentions of maybe not wanting someone to sit in jail for six months if they couldn't afford the $\$ 500$ bail. I don't know how much it cost the county to keep someone in jail for that long. I mean, it doesn't make sense to keep people in that don't belong in there for a minor crime, you know, and have the taxpayer pay for their food and everything else for six months, just over a $\$ 500$ bond that they can't afford. So I think I supported that. I thought that was a good idea to try to free up the system a little bit
that way. Do $I$ think it went too far? I do. I will say that, but I think that it needs to be amended. I don't even think it should go back to the way it was totally, because $I$ still think it's wrong to have someone sitting in prison for, or jail in our case, for six months for not being able to afford a $\$ 500$ bond. But I hope it's something that we can work towards coming up with a solution.

Again, I think the intention was good, but it does it needs to be adjusted and $I$ would totally support it. I don't think they care what we say, honestly.

But I think that there are changes that should be made. But anyway, that was just my two points.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Legislator's Drucker, Mule, and then
Ferretti has a question for the Commissioner.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Minority
Leader, did you want --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I was just
going to speak to the emergency
because --
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: That's what I was going to speak to.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, oh, just --

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'm just going to speak on one small point --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, because
there was precedent in 2018. Sorry to cut you off, Legislator Drucker.

But there was precedent in 2018, which I'm looking at the actual transcript from 2018 on October 29, 2018, where we did do an amendment to the budget by emergency, I have it right here in front of me.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All right.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So it was it was moved by Legislator Ferretti, it was seconded by Legislative Mule, and then it was moved by the Legislature, by you, Presiding Officer. And it clearly states
that we didn't ask for any justification. We didn't ask for any of that stuff. We amended the budget by emergency. I can read the transcript into the record, if you like.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So we're talking about precedence. We have in 2019, the following year that your County Executive, Laura Curran, sued the Nassau County Legislature and she argued that lawmakers had not given proper public notice about emergency budget amendments. The case ultimately did not go to a judicial decision because she made a deal with the minority. But your County Executive and your County Attorney sued this Legislative Body and said that you can't do what you want to do. So we have dueling precedents.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: She clearly, as you know, Presiding Officer, and if you say Democrats can't say negative thing about Democrats, tried to usurp the power of the Legislature.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So
now -- oh, come on.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Oh,
now I got a call -- I was on vacation -from Kevan saying we were all together on this; these are these amendments. We were all together. We approved it.

Legislators stood up, made some changes. Got a call, I'm on vacation. Oh, by the way, we made a deal with the county Executive. You know, we're not with you anymore. So now you're going to say, Well, she usurped our authority.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Sorry, my friend.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I see what we're trying to do here. We have amendments on the floor. It sounds like to me. I really believe it sounds like to me some of your members want to support them, but. But we're not going to allow them -- why wouldn't we let the vote go
forward and let the vote go the way it's going to go?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Can we go to the substance again, we have questions for the Commissioner. Now you're back. You don't want to hear from the Commissioner?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm trying to
-- I have --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We'll
talk about the emergency. I promise you. We'll talk about the emergency. We'll talk it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Go ahead, Legislator Drucker. I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I just want to talk on one brief point regarding the Presiding Officer's contiguous question about what the emergency is and Legislator Ferretti.

So from my perspective, I'm only
going to talk about one issue. I think all 19 of us can agree that hate crimes, Commissioner, have increased exponentially over the past couple of years to the point that it has touched every one of our districts in one way or another. And, you know, thanks to this Legislative Body, we passed a bipartisan antisemitism task force. And we have been earnestly working on that. And we had a meeting yesterday and it was attended by Legislator Giuffre, Legislator Mule, and I know that Legislator Pilip, Legislator Ford and Legislator Kopel are on the committee, too. But we all agreed that hate crimes is so such a scourge. And I want to thank you, Commissioner, because in all of the incidents in my district, you and your your staff, your office, your Department have been incredibly responsive. And, you know, I know that I can contact you in a moment's notice about something that happens in my district and you get back right away.

That's how engaged and responsive you are. But I have to believe and
unfortunately, it's not your fault, we live in a in an era now where it's on the rise and it's not dissipating. It's not going down. Every time we hear about it, we wring our hands, we get outraged and we speak about it and we do things. But I have to believe that the only way you're going to confront this scourge, Commissioner, is by deploying more officers to a hate crime unit to really try to -- you're doing an amazing job with the car thefts and burglaries and the catalytic converters. There were arrests made on the catalytic converters.

And you and we are seeing that the residents are being a little bit more diligent in not leaving their cars unlocked, etc., so it going to account for maybe that statistic going down. You're being incredibly responsive when it comes to that. But $I$ don't know if you're able with the staff that you have
now to really make a difference and confront the scourge that's going on with the hate crimes, antisemitism, especially in my district. So I have to believe that it is an emergency today as far as I'm concerned, to see you get more help, more assistance to deploy, more officers to respond to these type of crimes. Wouldn't you agree that it would be helpful? COMMISSIONER RYDER: Last year we had 27 hate crimes in Nassau County. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Reported.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Reported. That is correct; 27. We average over the last five years 25. Most of them are kids drawing swastikas in concrete like happened last week, or spray painting some graffiti of hatred. We had zero violence in hate crime in the last year, in the last three years. And when we look at hate crime, we took at hate crime -we have our head of it with Sergeant Sabrina Craig, who was here with me that day -- We have it report through our
detectives who investigate it with crime scene. We then send it up both to the Detective Division and to the Patrol

Division. We have the Deputy CO of each command oversee those numbers and reports to make sure it is done and we are reactive to to the public's need, and then we push it through.

That being said, there is a zero
tolerance for hate crime. The County Exec has made that clear. I have made that clear. There is a zero tolerance. We do do a great job going after the hate crime in Nassau County. But again, reported last year, it was 27 hate crimes. Most of them were graffiti issues.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'd like to see zero.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: So would I.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So if you had more cops, would it make a difference, is the question.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Honestly, and I'm being honest. Absolutely, I don't
believe it would at all in that in that area. And the reason $I$ say that is because, you know, kids are not going to draw that graffiti or call some of these antisemitic remarks and make some threats. A lot of our threats today work on this thing.
(Whereupon, holding up a cellphone.)

COMMISSIONER RYDER: So I can't prevent that from happening. I can only go after the offender and make sure he's arrested.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So I agree with you and I thank you. So my point, though, is also, first of all, you mentioned that you don't see violence associated with the with the hate crimes or the hate language. That's usually the case because there are people that want to do it at night and they don't want to challenge. They don't want to be confronted. So you're never really going to see or you're not usually going to see violence
associated with the hate crimes that you see. I mean, I'm not talking about the city of New York where crazy things happen. I'm talking about here in Nassau County. So that doesn't surprise me.

But I'm a firm believer that perception becomes reality. And when people, at least in my community, see swastikas and antisemitism and words of hatred scrawled on sidewalks, in schoolyards, in town and county parks, they feel unsafe. They feel uneasy. So I believe that with more cops being around, more visible, that's going to make people feel safer.

That's all I'm talking about. And that's why I'm saying that this, I believe, is an emergency. That's all I'm saying. That's all, Commissioner. That's my opinion. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you. Legislator Mule.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Thank you, Presiding officer. I'm kind of going to

```
be all over because I'm responding to
things that have been said. The first
thing -- I just I also wanted to as
Legislator Deriggi-Whitton mentioned with
regards to the Capital Plan vote. I know
that Legislator Kevan numerous times
asked that the public safety issues be
taken out and we would vote immediately
for them. So I just need to make sure
that that's very clear for the record.
    And, Commissioner Ryder, in your
testimony here today, you said you
believe that crime will -- and this is
your words will plummet in the next year
because of proactive measures that you've
taken with regards to the issues that are
going on right now; is that correct?
    COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes.
    LEGISLATGOR MULE: You did say that.
So being proactive is a good thing,
despite what's happening in the state,
being proactive here locally.
    COMMISSIONER RYDER: In that
category -- again, I judge my crime
numbers by the category. What I can control and what I can't. I can't
control, \(I\) can to a little bit on the cat cons. But there's too many streets and too many nights to cover everything that gets hit, and we have caught and arrested some. Stolen cars. We use it as a messaging to try to bring that number down. I still can't. I'm still up \(100 \%\) in stolen cars from last year, but I call that a victory from where \(I\) was at 240 by March.

But next year, my focus on stolen cars and what we're going to try to do regarding cat con's will make a difference in their numbers. That doesn't mean my robberies are going to change or my burglaries are going to change or my larcenies from vehicles are going to change. So we still have --

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Well, that will be because of your education campaign to encourage people to lock their cars. COMMISSIONER RYDER: Right. Again,
now I'm going to talk in big numbers.
When we talk of \(50 \%\) increase in overall
small numbers compared to the years before, you talk about where you can make a difference in your overall crime number, you go after the big numbers. So the big numbers are larcenies. And we're doing a program now with all of our malls so we can focus on the larceny side. But we're losing support from a lot of the security people within those stores because they're not signing the statement. They refuse to prosecute. They just want it for insurance purposes. They're not even calling us anymore. When the crime occurs, they let the offender leave and then they call us. And so now we're battling with corporate to say, hey, you got to sign this at least so I can put that person into the system. Unfortunately, in that case, when that bad guy is gone, \(I\) have to still eat the number. I can't say I'm not reporting it to me because that's playing a game
with the numbers. I have to take that number. So what we're working with, both with corporate and a lot of things, is trying to bring that number down. So when I say my certain numbers are going to plummet, not crime overall, but I'm going to be able to get down my larcenies in most of my malls, I hope. And I'm going to also get down some of my stolen cars, because they went up so much. That's the categories that I talk about.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Sure. But it's due to proactive measures. And believe me, I applaud. You always talk about taking a multi-pronged approach to everything and that just makes absolute sense. And I appreciate it as a resident of Nassau County, that that's how you approach things. But every day you're looking at what's happening and what can you do to think outside of the box to approach things from a different way than things have always been approached. I mean, I've heard you do it numerous
times.
COMMISSIONER RYDER: Correct.
LEGISLATGOR MULE: The request by
the minority for the 55 additional police officers comes directly from your testimony that you would you think 55 additional officers would be good for community presence and you stated that on the record. So I just want to say our request for that is -- and you don't need to respond to this -- is not based -- I'm actually I'm responding to something that Legislator Kopel said. It's not based on nothing. It's based directly off of what you said.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Well, if I may comment.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Of course.
COMMISSIONER RYDER: What I said was, the question was, could you use my officers and I said, yes; what would be a nice number? And I said that number. But I also said that I get a budget that I live with and I find my way to work on
crime and at the same time live within the budget. And it's always, you know, when I said I can always use more but more doesn't fix my problems. There's 33,000 cops in the city in New York, and they have the highest crime rate in the country right now.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: They don't have you.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: So you can put cops on dots. But they can be on the dot, but they're spending most of the time inside because they're processing arrests that are coming out faster than they are. And that's the problem.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Sure. One of the other things that I wanted to talk about, in our back up notes, there's mention of attrition and that, if I'm understanding this correctly, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that the number of officers that you're losing every year is greater than what you're going to be taking in; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: No. So I have to take you back to the Mangano time. LEGISLATGOR MULE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That was when we depleted a lot of cutbacks and things were done. That was the management style at the time that Commissioner. Our style is to keep hiring and get in front of the number. And we do that because labor costs are cheaper when they start. And so we obviously, we get a three for the price of one. And now new contracts, which is the unforeseen, which I don't know what's going to be there. That may change training and everything else. But when you look at the numbers, we've gotten to the headcount for the first time in 15 years and now we're above the headcount. And no matter what the number is, if I was still at 2546 come May, the County Exec is going to allow me to put an additional 50 because of the eventual attrition, because they we know we lose about 100 officers a year. So that's why
we do two classes at a minimum of 50 per year. That's a plan so we never fall behind, and it works because it's cheaper labor.

LEGISLATGOR MULE: Okay, thank you for clarifying that for me.

Legislator Drucker mentioned about hate crimes -- and this is something that we're going to discuss in the future -but we know that there's issues with the language line. So it's very possible that crimes are not being reported by people who are not comfortable with English speaking -- but again, we'll talk about that at a future time -- so those numbers might not be accurate in terms of what's actually happening.

And then the final thing that \(I\) wanted to say and this really is isn't for you, Commissioner, bail reform is certainly more nuanced than it's being presented as bail reform is all bad, da, da, da, da, da. Legislator DeriggiWhitton said that as well. Presiding

Officer, I know that you agree with that, because you and I both presented at the Village Officials. They asked about it and I thought they were going to throw things at me when I said that that bail reform needed to happen. And when you got up to speak, you said that you agreed, but you thought that some changes needed to happen and I certainly agree with that. So I think we need to be careful about the language that we use when talking about bail reform, because bail reform is not bad. Perhaps, the way it was executed is problematic. I think we could all agree to that to some extent, but bail reform absolutely had to happen. It was a social justice issue. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
think the point I made and look, you did make those remarks and I appreciated those at that meeting, but the point was, none of us no reasonable person wants someone who's stolen the loaf of bread to
have to sit in jail because they can't afford bail. That's a very fair point.

But to take away the judge's discretion to even consider dangerousness or flight risk is crazy.

Legislator Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Just to be clear, because I did bring up bail reform as well, conceptually, bail reform is something to be entertained, to be discussed. New York State bail reform. What was passed in Albany needs to be completely repealed out the door; it's a disaster.

I have a question for you,
Commissioner Ryder. But before before I get to it, there's been a couple of legislators that have said, because I know Presiding Officer had in my opinion, a really good idea that we come together in opposing New York State bail reform as a Body of 19. And I've heard a couple of which said, well, they don't care.

They're not going to care what we say,
blah, blah, blah. It was only a couple of months ago that the powers that be in Albany put a bill forward that would change Nassau County completely with the the accessory units, and we came together in a bipartisan fashion. Nassau

Republicans and Nassau Democrats together spoke out against that, sent a message to Albany, and they reversed course. So the idea that they don't care has been proven wrong. If we come together, we're Nassau County. We're one of the biggest suburban counties in the country. If we come together and we oppose the crazy things that we all know are going on coming out of Albany, we have and will make a difference. So I ask you to rethink that. Going to the issue of the emergency. Up until Legislator Drucker responded, I still didn't really hear a reason, but I did hear your reason. I acknowledge it. But my question for Commissioner Ryder, as it pertains to that assume arguendo these amendments were passed today,
what's the earliest that these police officers would actually be in the academy, let alone on the streets?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: They would go into the academy, if we can get that number, by May. And then it would come out in December to January depending on the training.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Of '23. So December of '23? So over a year from now?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: While I
respect Legislator Drucker's position, Notice is important, too. And it's not like these police officers would be on the streets anyway any time soon. So I do think that that notice portion should be fulfilled if this was to be entertained. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Just very briefly, building upon what was said just
just a moment ago, I'd make a modest suggestion that perhaps we just ask Commissioner to think about it. And if the Commissioner comes back and tells us, you know, at some time, do a study and then you consult with whoever you need to consult with, because none of us here are experts. If you come back and you tell us in the future, next month, two months, three months that you need more, you need more, and you and and more is going to help you do your job properly, I think I think there's nobody here who's going to say no. So considering the fact that that nothing is going to happen immediately, regardless, as you've pointed out, why don't we just agree to table this discussion? And as I say, you come back and you tell us you've heard the concerns and legitimate concerns everybody's concerned about crime on the streets. Everyone's concerned about hate crimes and so forth. If you come back and you tell us that you need more, I think we're
all going to take that very seriously.
And I suggest, as I say, that we just we just table this this item until such time as as as the experts tell us that it's going to be useful and productive to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Anyone else have anything for the Commissioner?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Okay. Thank you very much. We all
know you were in a difficult position, so we appreciate you. You've always been an up front guy and you came and, you know, so just thank you.

There is another component to this I'd like to address, which is the financial component.
(Whereupon, off the record conversation.)

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you, Presiding officer. So when we talk about why is this an emergency and \(I\) think

Legislator Drucker did a good job and I hope I can follow suit. I'm going to angle it from a different perspective, insomuch that \(I\) don't want to argue the components or the philosophies or ideology around bail reform. But what I do want to talk about today is recidivism programs, and I want to talk about the lack of one here in Nassau County. And I would go out on a limb to say that this is an emergency, that we don't have a recidivism program, that reducing recidivism is a vital component of increasing public safety, that reentry programs help former offenders rebuild their lives and make them less likely to repeat offenses and return to prison, and that reducing the number of reoffenses makes communities safer.

We need programs that would enable our offenders, our neighbors, the folks that are challenged to find a way to either gain literacy, be able to get basic skills to rejoin the workforce, to
be able to deal with mental and physical health challenges be able to in some way or another, maybe turn the corner on alcohol and drug issues, find housing. There's a variety of different challenges that lead them back to offending. I said it when we talked about it during an earlier hearing. Desperate people do desperate things.

It has been brought to my attention when we talk about the catalytic converters that are being stolen out of these cars, that a large majority of the time, these these are folks that are on drugs that are struggling. And it was brought to our attention here. Confirmed by the District Attorney's office that we no longer as a county, provide that service. That we have some components for people who are mandated to that. But we all here know that the cashless bail and some of those other, the Raise the Age, that a lot of those folks aren't mandated to anything. They're just put back into
society. They're put back into society without being mandated to anything and without having any ability to have resources that would undergird them and set them on the right path. So I deem that to be an emergency.

I don't know how in good conscience we could talk about the rise in crime, but fail our charge to provide opportunity for stability. Opportunity for folks to turn the corner. And the longer we allow them to suffer and spiral, we are putting every single person in Nassau County, including ourselves, susceptible to crime, being a victim. Let's not do that. Let's take this opportunity to amend this budget and provide those who are challenged, who are struggling, who are spiraling, some level of hope. Some level of hope. So we can we can debate bail reform, this, that and the other. The reality is it exists right now. The reality is that we decided that because our program wasn't perfect, that
we were going to throw it out the window and have nothing, nothing to support these folks.

So today, I say to my colleagues, if you are going to finances right now, Presiding Officer, let me just say, this is a drop in the bucket to be able to provide these individuals with the services they need and the community with a sense of protection, of safety. If they know that people have someplace, somewhere to turn where they can get the help that they need so desperately. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Just
just one small point of disagreement. I don't think there's nothing to support those that are coming out of incarceration. The Correctional Center has programs. I think probation has programs as well.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: No. So the recidivism program, when asked on the record by the DA's representative that
presented themselves in the hearing that day, they stated they only had it for
mandated individuals, individuals who
were mandated to have that type of
services. So those who come out, who are not mandated to be in any type of recidivism, any type of supportive services program, they're left to go out and find help on their own. They are left to go out and be in programs that are not evidence based. They're left to go out and re-offend because they're desperate and CODA, the original program was built around changing thoughts. And that's what recidivism programs are birthed out of. It's about changing thoughts. So we may have these programs that provide services around literacy, that provide services around mental health and health assessment, that provide services around housing.

But when you have a recidivism program, it's a one stop shop. You can go there and get everything you need under
one roof. If you send people out and have them circling around trying to find help, they're likely not to make it from point A to point B., You put them under one roof and they get what they need in one place, they're likely to have some level of hope for themselves and in some way possibly regain some level of reentry into being a productive citizen.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Chris, you walked to the mic, did you have something?

MR. LEIMONE: Yeah. I just wanted to clarify just a couple of things with respect to the reentry program. The County does have a contract with Leadership Training Institute, and it's a reentry task force program. It runs through September 2024. It's approximately \(\$ 1,000,000\) worth of funding funding towards that. It is a comprehensive reentry services.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And who goes to that program? Because the district
attorney representative that was here clearly stated, clearly stated that they had only services for those who were mandated, not for those who were not mandated. And so those who are not mandated are the same people that everyone's talking about here today: The people on cashless bail, the young people on Raise the Age. That they're not mandated to anything.

MR. LEIMONE: Understood. I just wanted to correct, because you had said that there's no reentry program. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I didn't say there was no -- I said there was no program for those who are not mandated, is what I said. And the program that was disbanded were for individuals who were both mandated and were not mandated.

They needed that assistance, understood that they needed it, and came there and got that service. The large majority of those folks that were in that program were not mandated. Those were folks that
were engaged by credible messengers. Individuals who lived in their communities, who successfully navigated that program and became productive citizens, and they went back out and found those people. They found those people in their communities and they brought them to that program. That program was able to undergird them and support them.

Now, the program may have had its challenges, but because they have it challenges that doesn't mean we throw it out. We're all rooted in policy. Part of policy is reevaluating programs and then making modifications, not throwing things out.

We can't sit here today and talk about cashless bail and Raise the Age -Those programs, the same way they needed to be re-evaluated and then reintroduced, is the same way we needed to approach this program that was just thrown out of the window. We have to we got to stop
doing that. And what we've done is we're pointing the finger out at everyone else, but we need to look at what fingers are pointing back at us because we're contributing to it by not having that program. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Good, good. Thanks.

Just on the financial end of this, we obviously have a control period in place. We have an oversight board that has expanded its reason for being in a control period to include the risks in the out years and specifically in the four year plan.

So, yes, we did ask the Office of Independent Budget Review to do an analysis, and it was done over ten years. Why? Because the police do not reach their full salary until they go through that full nine steps -- and by the way, this doesn't include their COLA payments so we wanted to see how much it would cost.

But in particular, for the next three years, again, NIFA, which is essentially a Democrat run control board, is citing our out years as risky. In fact, NIFA in their report stated as follows with respect to the issues with respect to our out years:
"The proposed plan also includes budgeted contingency reserves of 25 million in fiscal year 23, and 35 million in fiscal year 24. However, despite the availability of these reserves, they are insufficient to cover the County's known risks and long term liabilities".

So NIFA, which is, again, using this as a pretext to stay in a control period, has called into question the viability of the County's four year plan. So your proposal we understand that your proposal for the first year grab some money out of the Contingency Fund, the \(\$ 25\) Million Contingency Fund. It's easy to do that. It's money sitting there for contingency. But in year two, it costs the county
additional \(\$ 8\) Million and year three an additional \(\$ 10\) million and a year for an additional \(\$ 12\) million. So can you explain, because you have never provided this, how you're going to pay for the increased costs over years two, three and four? Could you provide an indication of where the money is going to come from to pay for that? Because the Contingency Fund rationale applies to this year, it doesn't apply to the outer years.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Got it. I'm going to do this, because \(I\) know that the hours are getting later and many of us have things to do. So I'm not going to belabor this. I mean, if \(I\) can in my response, Presiding Officer, I'm going to also summarize and then I'll be happy to take a vote on the emergency, if not on the emergency, on the budget.

The way we envision the -- and
first, I want to say that that we agree with the numbers that Maurice Chalmers has presented. We don't disagree with the
numbers. From our standpoint, the numbers are accurate, but it's not a number issue.

Presiding Officer, as you well know, this county, every single year -- we're going to do it today -- we pass multiyear plans. Some of the county executives in the past present tax increases in those plans. They present draconian cuts in those multiyear plans. But we don't do those cuts, nor have we done those tax increases. I think we all can agree to that. So basically what you're presenting is a snapshot today of what it will look like in ten years, which is fair. But at the same time, what \(I\) say is that in year three or year four, we can manage the budget. Maybe if we realize that there is an enormous amount of cost that's in PD, we don't bring on the 46 officers, we bring on 26 officers. We can manage the budget.

So from our standpoint, because of what has been identified by the

Comptroller and I believe the Office of Management and Budget, we're seeing that sales tax next year is going to be to the tune of anywhere between 19 and 50 million. The Comptroller conservatively sat right here, said it could be as high as \(\$ 50\) Million sales tax surplus into 2023. So the money is there. And what we're talking about today in terms of the amendments, the total amount is \$6.2 million and a \(\$ 3\) billion budget. And we're getting accused of political shenanigans and stunts.

If we really wanted to pull a stunt, that wouldn't be for 6.2 million. I mean, aren't the residents' public safety, their concerns, worth more than 6.2 million out of \(\$ 3\) billion? I mean, I'm going to get to that more. I just want to address the two issues on the statement of the emergency. I can read into the record what happened in 2018, but clearly there was no justification. There was no this extra explanation of why we need the
emergency. Mr. Ferretti, you moved the emergency and Legislator Mule seconded and we voted on it. And just to be clear, Presiding Officer, you brought up the point in regards to where was \(I\) when we took this vote in 2019. My statement, if you read the whole statement, which I'm guessing you didn't, my statement clearly said, "Minority Leader Kevan Abrahams-D from Freeport said in a statement that his caucus believed that the amendments were adopted properly and legally. We do not understand the logic or rationale of the lawsuit". So if you read my whole statement, it clearly stated exactly where I stand today. That ultimately, as

I said before, there is we believe that the Legislature and the County Executive was usurping their powers. I said it then and I'm saying it now, so there's no contradiction.

But that being said, more
importantly, I don't know where this justification issue is. You're taking
this position on the notices, okay.
Granted, I don't remember that. But you know what, Mr. Pulitzer, every time this comes up, we're going to make sure we notice it. Even though we believe it should have been done properly already. But putting that aside for a second, we're talking about being able to vote on an amendment that will add more officers to this budget. It's very simple whether you want to do it or not. I think this Legislative Body should take their vote on the emergency. See where he stands. I'm willing to bet some of the members on your side, Presiding Officer, that have not said too much today would join us. Allow them to join us. Why would we stop democracy and prevent them from joining us? Because of the justifications not presented because Legislator Drucker didn't make a convincing argument in terms of a Hate Crime Division, even though I think he did. That's the justification? The justification is that
we disagree on what properly should be noticed and how it should be noticed. Even though I disagree with your position on that. That's the justification that we're taking today.

We're asking you today, you add you said that we can't do the emergency by a voice vote, which we know we can. But that being said, we'll accept that we have the written resolution here. I'm just asking for three of you to join us. Which one of you of you three -- I see a lot of you looking down. You want to look me in the eye? Which one of you three will join us today? We're talking about adding 110 officers.

Look, if you think that we're
pulling a stunt and the \(\$ 6.2\) million -- I
think Nassau County residents lives are much more important than that -- but if you think we're pulling a stunt, we're willing to compromise. Let's go in the back room. Let's make a deal. We can we can lower the number. What could it be?

55 officers, \$3 million. What would get you guys to move to do something that gives our residents the comfort? Let's do it. I'll move off the 110. If you think the number 110 and what it presents, \$6.2 million in a \(\$ 3\) billion budget is a political stunt. Let's move. I'll move down off the number. What number makes it feasible for you for not to be considered a stunt? Whatever. I'll let you guys pick it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are you finished?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, I'm asking for three of your members to sign on to our resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We heard you say that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So? So I'm asking my colleagues, will you --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are you done?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Will you join me in this resolution today to put
forward this emergency so we can add 110 officers or whatever number we compromise to to the budget for public safety so that we can address the concerns in this county. The Commissioner said that he's seen a \(50 \%\) increase, one of the highest of five years in a long time. Which one of you will join me?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You, the Minority, has failed to provide the notice required by law. The Minority has failed to amend the levy as required. You have failed to explain how you're going to pay for it in the out years saying, well, sales tax will this or whatever. While your colleagues on NIFA tell us that they have to stay in a control period because things are troublesome in and out years, and you have failed to establish the emergency.

We had the Commissioner up here for a length of time. He informed you that 500 additional police officers are not going to deal with this issue, which
relates to cashless bail under the policies of the State. I indicated that even if you approved it today, the officers would go in later this spring. They would not they would not graduate and be in the streets until December. There's no emergency. We can move that money out of the Contingency Fund any time throughout the year. So you haven't established a single point to allow us to to agree with you and to vote for this today. So your minority has failed completely. So there are no votes for this.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You can keep saying that. But in 2018, when the emergency was provided by Mr. Ferretti, which \(I\) can read into the record, if you like, there was there was no ask for an explanation.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, we're asking for a justification --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So you're changing the rules because you don't
really want to vote on the amendment.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're not going to dictate to us in the rules because you failed to apply by the rules. But be that as it may, what I'm telling you is you failed to establish a basis for the emergency. So apparently in 2018, there was an agreement between the minority and majority --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That is your opinion.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It's all or our opinion.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Which you didn't offer in 2018.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: But apparently there's an agreement at the time that an emergency existed. There's no agreement today. And, in fact, the evidence that we've been able to get through testimony is there is no emergency. There is no emergency to take the money out of the contingency and do this now. And, in fact, as the

Commissioner said, if you do that, if we do what you want to do, those officers are not going to be on the street until December of 2023.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That's why it's an emergency.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Where is the emergency?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That's the emergency. You just made my point. The emergency is it takes a long time for the officers to get on the street and it takes a long time to --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
They're not going to be in the academy until the spring, so we have to do it now in October.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That's if we act today, they'll be there. But if we wait until January, based on what you're saying, it'll take even longer to 2024. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All right. That's all right. We have a disagreement.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I don't want
to -- we beat this down so hard. I mean, obviously, you don't want to support the amendment for 110 officers. I get it. I don't understand the rationale why, but I get the fact that you don't want to do it. So let's just vote on the budget and move forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
I agree. Any other debate, a discussion on the budget?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing None.
All in favor of Nassau County Budget signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed, any abstentions?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. Unanimous. All right.
*********

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Next
item is the tax levy ordinance Clerk Item
number 307 of 2022. It's an ordinance
number 72 of 2022. We need a motion and
second. Motion by Deputy Presiding
Officer Kopel, seconded by Minority
Leader Abrahams.
Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Hearing none. All in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed.
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Lastly, is the multi year plan Clerk Item
number 308 2022, Resolution 2132022.
Motion by Minority Abrahams Seconded by
Legislator Kopel.
Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All in
favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed.
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Carries unanimously.
Legislator Ferretti makes a motion
to adjourn, seconded by Legislator Giuffre.
All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Nassau County Legislature respond in favor.)
(Whereupon, meeting is adjourned, 1:38 p.m.)
*******
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline age-friendly \(_{[1]}-15: 14\) & applaud \(_{[1]}-120: 15\) & 154:14, 155:11, 156:3 & blah \(_{[3]}-127: 2\) \\
\hline Age-friendly \({ }_{[2]}-15: 20,22: 3\) & applause) \({ }_{[1]}-13: 19\) & & blew \(_{[1]}-72: 21\) \\
\hline agencies \(_{[1]}-67: 7\) & application \({ }_{[1]}-27: 20\) & B & block \(_{\text {[1] }}\) - 59:21 \\
\hline agency \(_{[3]}-32: 15,32: 22,32: 23\) & applications \({ }_{[1]}-28: 7\) & & blow \(_{[1]}-56: 12\) \\
\hline ages \(_{[1]}-20: 19\) & applies \(_{[1]}-141: 11\) & & blown \(_{[1]}-57: 4\) \\
\hline Aging \(_{[1]}-18: 2\) & apply \(_{[2]}-141: 12,150: 5\) & backs \(_{[1]}-100: 13\) & Board \({ }_{[1]}-12: 4\) \\
\hline aging \({ }_{[1]}-20: 16\) & appointment \({ }_{[1]}-24: 4\) & backwards \(_{[1]}-57: 19\) & board \({ }_{[3]}-80: 18,139: 12,140: 4\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { ago }_{[10]}-22: 2,42: 16,53: 8,82: 2,83: 8, \\
86: 2,86: 16,88: 21,127: 3,129: 2
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { appreciate }_{[7]}-18: 13,19: 15,20: 4, \\
31: 11,70: 6,120: 18,130: 15
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\text { bad }_{[5]}-84: 17,84: 18,119: 23,124: 23,
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
bocce \(_{[1]}-19: 6\) \\
bodies \(_{[1]}-48: 22\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { agree }_{[19]}-59: 2,59: 4,59: 7,63: 25 \\
64: 14,68: 4,81: 22,84: 9,111: 3
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { appreciated }_{[1]}-125: 22 \\
& \text { approach }_{[5]}-69: 21,120: 16,120: 20 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\text { bail }_{[39]}-46: 16,47: 11,50: 7,50: 12,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Body }_{[4]}-108: 18,111: 9,126: 23, \\
& 145: 13
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 113:10, 115:15, 125:2, 125:10, & 120:23, 138:23 & 72:5, 72:6, 72:24, 74:24, 75:2, 77:19, & body \(_{[1]}-48: 21\) \\
\hline 125:16, 129:18, 141:23, 142:13, & approached \({ }_{[1]}-120: 24\) & , 82:21, 89:20, 98:18, 105:1 & bogged \(_{[1]}-45: 23\) \\
\hline 149:12, 152:11 & approaching \({ }_{[1]}-99: 2\) & 124:21, 124:23, 125:6, 125:13, & boggled \(_{[2]}-49: 22,49: 24\) \\
\hline agreed \({ }_{[2]}-111: 16,125: 8\) & appropriate \({ }_{[4]}\) - 17:14, 36:17, 36:20, & 125:17, 126:3, 126:9, 126:10, & boggling \(_{[1]}-63: 20\) \\
\hline agreement \({ }_{[3]}-150: 9,150: 18,150: 20\) & 53:14 & 126:12, 126:22, 131:7, 132:22, & \(\operatorname{bogus~}_{[1]}-51: 8\) \\
\hline ahead \({ }_{[9]}-100: 7,102: 4,102: 10\), & appropriation \({ }_{[7]}-37: 15,40: 5,40: 10\), & 133:22, 137:9, 138:20, 149:2 & bond \(_{[4]}\) - 104:16, 104:23, 105:22, \\
\hline 103:12, 103:15, 103:17, 103:19, & 40:12, 40:14, 40:16, 40:19 & Baldwin \(_{[1]}-89: 10\) & 106:9 \\
\hline 104:4, 110:15 & appropriation" \({ }_{[1]}-43: 22\) & based \({ }_{[16]}-22: 7,40: 23,41: 5,47: 18\), & bonus \(_{[1]}-14: 15\) \\
\hline aid \(_{[1]}-24: 3\) & approve \(_{[2]}-13: 18,36: 8\) & 52:15, 52:18, 52:22, 61:23, 73:18, & border \({ }_{[2]}-83: 6,83: 12\) \\
\hline Albany \({ }_{[6]}-98: 12,98: 19,126: 13\), & approved \(_{[2]}\) - 109:9, 149:4 & 74:12, 101:6, 121:12, 121:14, & bottom \({ }_{[2]}-37: 20,84: 25\) \\
\hline 127:4, 127:10, 127:17 & area \(_{[1]}-115: 3\) & 121:15, 135:12, 151:21 & box \({ }_{[7]}-55: 24,56: 2,63: 14,70: 10\), \\
\hline alcohol \(_{[1]}-132: 5\) & areas \(_{[4]}-11: 7,11: 8,28: 25,33: 18\) & Based \({ }_{[3]}-44: 19,47: 17,61: 23\) & 93:22, 93:24, 120:22 \\
\hline alike \(_{[1]}-23: 20\) & Arena \({ }_{[1]}-55: 5\) & basic \(_{[1]}-131: 25\) & BOYLE \({ }_{[2]}-5: 14,31: 13\) \\
\hline Allegiance \({ }_{[2]}\) - 6:7, 6:11 & \(\operatorname{argue}_{[1]}-131: 5\) & basis \(_{[1]}-150: 7\) & Boyle \(_{[2]}\) - 31:12, 31:14 \\
\hline Allow \(_{[1]}\)-145:18 & argued \(_{[1]}-108: 11\) & battled \({ }_{[1]}-18: 16\) & BRADFORD \({ }_{[1]}-13: 20\) \\
\hline allow \(_{[4]}-109: 24,123: 22,133: 13\), & arguendo \(_{[1]}\) - 127:24 & battling \(_{[1]}-119: 19\) & Bradford \({ }_{[2]}-13: 21,15: 5\) \\
\hline 149:11 & argument \(_{[1]}-145: 22\) & Bay \(_{[1]}-31: 6\) & bread \(_{[1]}-125: 25\) \\
\hline allows \(_{[2]}-11: 22,47: 20\) & arises \(_{[1]}-92: 7\) & beat \({ }_{[1]}-152: 3\) & break \(_{[3]}-57: 12,73: 5,73: 6\) \\
\hline almost \(_{[3]}-10: 7,12: 6,94: 20\) & Arnold \({ }_{[1]}-8: 5\) & beautiful \({ }_{[1]}-25: 23\) & breakdown \(_{[2]}-57: 11,74: 3\) \\
\hline alone \(_{[4]}-42: 21,50: 22,73: 21,128: 4\) & ARNOLD \(_{[1]}-4: 5\) & became \(_{[2]}-21: 6,138: 5\) & brief \(_{[1]}-110: 21\) \\
\hline Alternate \({ }_{[2]}-2: 11,6: 18\) & \(\operatorname{arrest}_{[2]}-55: 11,102: 13\) & become \(_{[1]}-70: 16\) & briefly \(_{[3]}-23: 3,94: 11,128: 25\) \\
\hline amazing \({ }_{[2]}-78: 2,112: 14\) & arrested \({ }_{[3]}-83: 10,115: 14,118: 7\) & becomes \(_{[5]}-16: 24,46: 7,69: 3,70: 19\), & bring \(_{[11]}-13: 11,47: 2,50: 25,61: 4\), \\
\hline ambulances \({ }_{[1]}\) - 104:22 & arresting \({ }_{[6]}-48: 4,64: 25,84: 17\) & 16:8 & 73:4, 75:10, 118:9, 120:5, 126:9, \\
\hline amend \(_{[9]}-36: 18,36: 21,43: 24,44: 9\), & 102:12, 102:19, 102:21 & beg \(_{[1]}-58: 18\) & 142:21, 142:22 \\
\hline 44:18, 76:3, 79:24, 133:18, 148:13 & arrests \({ }_{[4]}-70: 5,84: 8,112: 17,122: 15\) & \(\operatorname{begin}_{[1]}-61: 15\) & bringing \(_{[4]}-26: 23,27: 5,65: 16,74: 24\) \\
\hline amended \({ }_{[2]}-106: 4,108: 4\) & arrows \(_{[1]}-23: 8\) & behalf \(_{[2]}-26: 12,28: 24\) & brothers \({ }_{[1]}-17: 8\) \\
\hline amending \({ }_{[1]}-96: 7\) & Asian \({ }_{[1]}-52: 20\) & behind \({ }_{[4]}-12: 13,18: 18,41: 14,124: 4\) & brought \(_{[7]}-50: 14,52: 13,73: 22\), \\
\hline Amendment \({ }_{[1]}\) - 81:13 & aside \(_{[1]}-145: 8\) & belabor \(_{[1]}-141: 17\) & 132:11, 132:17, 138:9, 144:5 \\
\hline amendment \({ }_{[13]}-37: 12,37: 13,38: 9\), & assessment \({ }_{[5]}-55: 17,56: 15,68: 21\), & beliefs \(_{[1]}-52: 23\) & bucket \({ }_{[1]}-134: 8\) \\
\hline 40:11, 40:17, 44:18, 75:24, 84:15, & 95:15, 135:21 & believer \(_{[1]}-116: 7\) & Budget \({ }_{[9]}-9: 14,36: 4,36: 8,36: 10\), \\
\hline 85:25, 107:16, 145:10, 150:2, 152:5 & Assessor \({ }_{[1]}-88: 4\) & belong \({ }_{[1]}-105: 19\) & 57:6, 57:24, 139:18, 143:3, 152:17 \\
\hline amendments \({ }_{[37]}-36: 24,37: 5,37: 22\), & assistance \(_{[3]}-16: 25,113: 8,137: 21\) & belt \({ }_{[1]}-55: 13\) & budget \({ }_{[78]}-9: 3,9: 6,31: 16,31: 17\), \\
\hline 38:7, 38:24, 39:18, 39:22, 41:2, 41:7, & assisted \(_{[1]}-20: 24\) & benefit \(_{[2]}-23: 18,23: 19\) & 33:24, 35:8, 36:18, 36:21, 39:19, \\
\hline 41:8, 41:12, 41:24, 41:25, 42:4, 42:9, & associate \(_{[1]}-28: 5\) & BERNARD \({ }_{[1]}-5: 13\) & 39:25, 40:8, 40:23, 41:2, 41:20, \\
\hline 42:22, 42:24, 43:12, 43:24, 44:19, & associated \(_{[2]}-115: 18,116: 2\) & Bernard \({ }_{[2]}-27: 25,28: 4\) & 43:17, 44:2, 44:9, 44:19, 45:6, 45:14, \\
\hline 44:23, 45:25, 46:2, 46:6, 46:8, 46:23, & associates \(_{[1]}-19: 17\) & beside \(_{[1]}-22: 12\) & 45:16, 45:18, 51:12, 51:24, 53:5, \\
\hline 47:4, 52:7, 52:15, 86:15, 87:16, & assume \({ }_{[2]}-38: 2,127: 24\) & best \(_{[7]}-19: 18,98: 5,98: 15,99: 2,99: 4\), & 53:17, 53:24, 54:23, 55:2, 55:19, \\
\hline 108:14, 109:8, 109:21, 127:25, & attacked \(_{[1]}-52: 22\) & 99:25, 101:6 & 56:10, 56:12, 56:15, 56:20, 56:21, \\
\hline 143:11, 144:12 & attacks \({ }_{[1]}\) - 52:20 & bet \({ }_{[5]}-42: 6,77: 16,77: 18,77: 21\), & 56:23, 56:25, 57:8, 57:11, 57:14, \\
\hline Amendments \({ }_{[1]}-37: 8\) & attended \(_{[1]}\)-111:12 & 145:15 & 57:21, 69:15, 71:12, 73:23, 74:2, \\
\hline American \({ }_{[3]}-29: 19,52: 21,83: 16\) & attention \({ }_{[3]}-25: 18,132: 11,132: 17\) & Beth \({ }_{[3]}-9: 23,10: 3,16: 11\) & 76:3, 79:24, 86:18, 86:20, 86:21, \\
\hline Americans \({ }_{[1]}\) - 52:21 & Attorney \({ }_{[2]}-75: 3,108: 17\) & BETH \(_{[1]}-5: 7\) & 86:22, 86:23, 87:10, 87:12, 87:15, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { amount }[7]-51: 11,54: 4,63: 14,89: 25, \\
& 93: 4,142: 20,143: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & attorney \(_{[2]}\) - 39:10, 137:2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { better }_{[7]}-12: 19,16: 19,27: 11,69: 19, \\
& 71: 23,100: 24,103: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 87: 18,91: 14,91: 15,95: 10,97: 8, \\
& \text { 101:2, 107:17, 108:4, 108:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline analysis \({ }_{[3]}-54: 24,57: 19,139: 19\) & ATTORNEY \({ }_{[2]}-39: 15,40: 6\)
Attorney \({ }_{[1]}-132: 18\) & 71:23, 100:24, 103:9
between
\([2]-143: 5,150: 9\) & 121:24, 122:3, 133:18, 141:21, \\
\hline analyze \(_{[1]}-104: 2\) & \[
\text { attrition }_{[2]}-122: 20,123: 24
\] & beyond \({ }_{[2]}\) - 63:19, \(64: 2\) & 142:19, 142:23, 143:12, 145:11, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Andy }_{[1]}-57: 25 \\
& \text { angle }_{[2]}-69: 21,131: 4
\end{aligned}
\] & audits \({ }_{[4]}-24: 11,24: 21,29: 5,29: 9\) & bicycle \(_{[2]}-23: 18,97: 2\) & 147:7, 148:4, 152:8, 152:12
BUDGET \\
\hline \[
\text { answer }_{[8]}-22: 22,51: 21,53: 11,53: 12,
\] & authority \(_{[2]}-104: 23,109: 15\) & bidding \(_{[1]}-76: 15\) & budgeted \(_{[3]}-73: 24,74: 4,140: 10\) \\
\hline \[
58: 20,63: 6,63: 7,64: 11
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
authorization \({ }_{[1]}-104: 16\) \\
automatically \({ }_{[1]}-72: 20\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Biden }_{[1]}-83: 6 \\
& \text { big }_{[9]}-18: 25,22: 13,49: 17,88: 2,88: 6 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & Buffalo \(_{[1]}-89: 11\) \\
\hline answered \({ }_{[2]}-51: 6,51: 19\) & availability \(_{[3]}-14: 5,21: 6,140: 13\) & 98:25, 119:2, 119:7, 119:8 & building \(_{[3]}-18: 11,78: 11,128: 25\) \\
\hline answers \(_{[1]}\)-69:14 & \[
\text { available }_{[7]}-17: 2,20: 18,21: 13
\] & biggest \(_{[1]}-127: 13\) & Building \(_{[1]}-1: 12\) \\
\hline antisemitic \({ }_{[1]}-115: 6\) & 21:14, 21:21, 104:20, 104:23 & bike \(_{[2]}-68: 17,71: 7\) & buildings \(_{[2]}-19: 9,19: 19\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { antisemitism }_{[3]}-111: 10,113: 4, \\
& 116: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & avenue \(_{[1]}-47: 7\) & bill \(_{[3]}-56: 24,98: 11,127: 4\) & built \(_{[3]}-11: 23,20: 21,135: 14\) bullet \(_{[1]}-66: 7\) \\
\hline Anxiety \({ }_{[1]}-32: 3\) & Avenue \(_{[1]}-1: 13\) & II \({ }_{[1]}-6: 6\) & bulletproof \({ }_{[1]}-82: 4\) \\
\hline \[
\text { anyway }_{[3]}-93: 14,106: 17,128: 18
\] & \[
\text { averages }_{[1]}-57: 20
\] & bipartisan \({ }_{[2]}-111: 9,127: 7\) & bump \(_{[1]}-58: 9\) \\
\hline apartment \({ }_{[1]}-20: 21\) & \[
\text { aware }_{[1]}-94: 2
\] & birthed \(_{[1]}-135: 16\) & burglaries \({ }_{[4]}-48: 9,83: 11,112: 15\), \\
\hline apologize \({ }_{[1]}-82: 24\) & \[
\text { awareness }_{[2]}-69: 22,72: 12
\] & bit \(_{[6]}-24: 24,64: 9,73: 2,105: 25\), & 118:19 \\
\hline app \(_{[1]}-22: 18\) & aye \({ }_{[7]}-9: 18,34: 21,35: 18,152: 18\), & 112:19, 118:4 & bus \(_{[2]}-23: 24,26: 24\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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