



RULES COMMITTEE 10.03.2022

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right. I'm going to call the Rules Committee to order. I'm going to ask Legislator Lafazan if he would lead is in the Pledge.
(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance is recited.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you.
Mike, could you please call the roll
for Rules Committee?
CLERK PULITZER: Yes. Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Legislator Siela Bynoe.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Delia
DeRiggi-Whitton?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Ranking Member
Kevan Abrahams?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Laura Schaefer?

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Steven


Rhoads?
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.
CLERK PULITZER: Vice Chairman
Howard Kopel?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Chairman Richard
Nicolello?
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum, sir.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you very much.

As I said, we do the contracts portion of the Rules Committee first. So I'm going to call all of the contracts that will be considered:

A-39, A-40, A-44; these are resolutions authorizing the Commission of Shared Services to execute blanket purchase orders or purchase orders between the County and Summit Handling Systems, Hempstead Ford Lincoln, and Geo-Comm Inc.

$$
E-116, E-118, E-119, E-120, E-121,
$$

$E-122, E-123, E-124, E-125, E-126, E-127$, E-128, E-129, U6 and U7; Resolutions authorizing the County Executive to execute personal services agreements or amendments to personal services agreements between the County and Leventhal Mullaney, Lewis Johs, Vincent MacNamara, Bee Ready Fishbein, West Group, WSP USA, Berkman Henoch, LiRo Engineers, Savin Engineers, Greenman Pedersen, Inc., Discover Long Island, Wildlife in Need of Rescue and

Rehabilitation, and the Nassau Pops Symphony Orchestra.

Motion by Minority Leader Abrahams, seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel to put those items before us.

Next item is E-83-22, a resolution authorizing the County Executive to execute an amendment to a personal services agreement between the County of Nassau and One World Judicial Services. We need a motion to un table. Legislator Rhoads makes that motion seconded by

Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of untabling E-83 signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed.
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay, that contract is un tabled.

Then lastly, before we start considering the individual contracts, we need a motion to table E-129 and E-123 of 2022. There are issues with the IG with respect to these contracts that have not yet been resolved. E-129, E-123, motion by Legislator Bynoe, seconded by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor of tabling these two items, signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed.
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(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries unanimously.

First, a contract to be considered is with the Department of Information Technology. It's A-44 Geo Comm Inc.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JACOVINA: Good afternoon. Joe Jacovina, Deputy

Commissioner, Information Technology.
A-44-22 Geo Comm. This is to authorize an award of purchase order to Geo Comm Inc to provide professional services to update information on the County's geographical information system known as GIS. The County currently uses state data and county data based on the application. This project will provide compilation and data clean up of the state and county data, creating a new, more accurate county data set. This data is utilized by many departments, including fire marshal, police Department, DPW, etc. This purchase is based on state GSA contract

and the maximum amount authorized is $\$ 224,309.25$.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Can you tell us which departments this supports? Would you know offhand?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JACOVINA: We use it for land record viewer, assessment uses this data, Firecom for dispatching. The police department uses it extensively. This is a combination of both county and state data. Again, as I said, depending upon the application, DPW uses it to track things from manhole covers to fire extinguishers where roads are located, its cross section of roads, etc.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay, thank you. Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JACOVINA: All right. Thank you.


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Social Services E-84, One World Judicial Services.

MR. STRONG: Good afternoon. Darrian Strong, Director of Child Support Collection Enforcement. The contractor provides the department with personal services in connection with paternity, local support, Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, abuse and neglect proceedings.

The contractor also provides the department with personal service of summonses and complaints in connection with proceedings with the Supreme Court Surrogate's Court, the request for a preliminary conference, subpoenas, order to show cause petitions, and any other legal documents to be served in matters involving the Nassau County Department of Social Services.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you, Mr. Strong. Question, I see that the contract expires December 31st, 2022. Is there an
$\qquad$ $10=$

RFP out or pursuing another contract at this time?

MR. STRONG: Yes, I believe this is an extension of the contract.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. All
right. But $I$ mean, that this is expiring in December. What are the plans for going forward?

MR. STRONG: We're going to still utilize the same contract.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So we could expect to see another amendment?

MR. STRONG: Yes.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So I would just
encourage the Department to get that to us before the end of the year.

MR. STRONG: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Any
questions?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So.
Yes. If you don't mind.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Go ahead.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So this
was tabled a while ago, correct? A few
months ago.

MR. STRONG: Yes.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Do you remember why it was tabled? Anybody? I don't have it in front of me.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Yes. There was an issue with the CSEA in terms of the work that was being performed by the outside contract as to whether it was CSEA work or not. And that's been --

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: And it's resolved. Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRONG: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any other questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRONG: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next two contracts with the Police Department, A-39-22 Summit Handling.

INSPECTOR FIELD: Good afternoon,
$\qquad$

William Field, Inspector with the Police Department. First item is A-39-22 is to authorize an award and purchase order for a lift truck/forklift trucks for the Police Department. The lowest responsible bidder was Summit Handling, and the maximum amount authorized under this purchase order is $\$ 146,632$. It is grant funded.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: What is a lift truck?

INSPECTOR FIELD: It's basically a heavy duty forklift made by Toyota that can we utilize in our impound lots. Any time we process evidence related to vehicles, so they're able to move them around in tight confined spaces, damaged vehicles, they can move around vehicles that we don't have keys for; anything like that.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any other questions for this? Okay. Let's go on to the second one.

INSPECTOR FIELD: Okay. Item

A-40-22. This is to authorize an award, a blanket purchase order for Ford OEM, original auto parts for various Nassau County departments. Hempstead Ford Lincoln was identified as the lowest responsible bidder. The maximum amount authorized under this blanket purchase order is $\$ 2.65$ million. It's general funds funded. The term of the blanket order shall be for one year with an option to renew for up to four one year terms plus a two month extension. And that's it.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right. Any questions on this contract? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I just note that the Inspector General seemed to have some questions. She was unable to locate the low vendor's response to the memo the contract page. Can we just -- if she's on the meeting, maybe we could just
-- if this has been cleared up, that would be great.

MS. FRANZESE: Jodi Franzese, Office of Inspector General.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Jodi, would you mind? Hi. We just have in our notes from your office -- I assume -that you were unable to locate the low vendor's response to the memo in the contract package with respect to contract number A-40-22, Hempstead Ford Lincoln.

MS. FRANZESE: Yes, I believe that that issue that we put in the contract review statement was addressed properly.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: And there was one other question that one of the vendors principals failed to disclose all entities of which they are principal owners and/or officers.

MS. FRANZESE: Yes, that was also addressed.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you very much.

MS. FRANZESE: All right. I'm glad I was here.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Thank
$\qquad$ $15=$
you. Any other questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you, Inspector.

Next contract is with the Parks Department starting with E-128 Discover Long Island.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Good
afternoon, everyone. Discover Long Island presenting an amendment number four to an original contract dated January 1st, 2015, for a promotion agreement. It's a one year renewal for the year 2022 for Discover Long Island to market Nassau County serving as our tourism promotion agency under the Hotel/Motel Tax law. This contract allows for Nassau County to conduct another RFP for a tourism promotion agency. Payment is the formula outlined in the tax law, which you're all familiar with 66 and two third percent of 25\% of tax receipts received by the County. The estimated amount for 2022 is

approximately $\$ 975,000$.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Has Discover
Long Island been providing services to the County throughout 2022?

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Even without the contract?

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. What's
the plan for next year?
COMMISSIONER BELYEA: We are in final review of a new $R F P$ and we hope to get that out in the next two weeks or so and then bring before you our findings.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you. Any questions on this contract? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can I ask the Inspector General to return to the podium? I'm sorry.

Thank you. I guess if these issues are resolved, like after the report is issued, it would just help us to save time just to have the update. But, I know

that you mentioned that this contract had exceeded the number of amendments allowed under the original contract.

MS. FRANZESE: Yes. Actually, at around noon, 12 to 12:30, my office sent out a list of all of the the legislative items that had reportable results, but they were then addressed. I hoped that it went to everybody.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Oh, great. So I'm working without that right now. We're trying to locate that.

MS. FRANZESE: I could probably
e-mail the legislators, but I'm not sure you really want my e-mails.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I would
take it, but $I$ can't make that decision.
So as far as the one thing that concerned me was the vendors' principals fail to disclose the entity of which they were principal owner/officers, has that have been resolved?

MS. FRANZESE: Yes.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay.

All right. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you.
Okay. Any other questions before we are ready to move to the next contract. Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi. How are you? Commissioner, just one quick question: For the RFP that's going to go out, do you always do -- is it a one year contract you're seeking or do you do beyond that?

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: I'd like to have it beyond so that we can look to build something. But again, we're in final review. We're looking at intervals so that we could renew it based on performance.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Okay. Thanks.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next contract is U-6.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Nassau Pop Symphony Orchestra. Presenting a
contract for services with Nassau Pops Symphony Orchestra Inc. This was a result of an RFQ seeking musical performances of various genres -- I promise this is the last one for 2022 -- to provide entertainment in our parks. This is commencing retroactively to June 8th and will terminate on December 31, 2024, with the option to renew for one more two year period. And again, this will enable us to not have to bring those individual contracts before you every year when booking our entertainment. It's for one two hour performance at a cost of $\$ 4,000$ performance, and it's funded by the Hotel/Motel Tax Grant Fund.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. All
right. Thank you very much.
COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: I'm sorry. Any questions on that?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No.

Next contracts are with Public Works, E-123 -- I'm sorry, actually that was tabled.

So the first one will be E-125.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Good
afternoon. Ken Arnold, Commissioner of Public Works E-125 and 126 are the same item just with two different vendors, one's with LiRo, ones with Savin. They're both contract amendments to increase the capacity for our on-call construction management contracts associated with road and bridge work. We're increasing the capacity by $\$ 1.5$ million.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any questions on these two contracts?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: So E-127 is also a contract amendment with the Greenman-Pederson Inc. There are our road and bridge design on-call contract and again, we're increasing their capacity by
$\qquad$
\$1.5 million.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any questions on $\mathrm{E}-127$ ?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No. Thank you.
The remaining contracts with the County Attorney's Office.

MR. LIBERT: Good afternoon. Brian Libert from the County Attorney's Office.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Start with E-116.

MR. LIBERT: This is a contract with the law firm Leventhal, Mullaney \&

Blinkoff. It's for the services for the Board of Ethics. The services are being provided by Steve Leventhal. If you have any questions, I'm more than happy to answer the same.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Just in terms of the effective dates, it terminates July 31, 2022. So what is the plan going forward?

MR. LIBERT: My understanding, based
on discussion with the board's counsel is that there is a process underway. I do not want to be hasty and speak to the result of that process without knowing for sure. But my understanding is that there is a contract headed the way of the Legislature to cover those services and that in between now and then, none have been performed.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. So since July, Mr. Leventhal has not been providing legal advice to the Board of Ethics.

MR. LIBERT: That's my understanding is the board has not had any official meetings besides to convene for the purposes of the procurement, which I just mentioned.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right. Any questions? Minority Leader Abrahams.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm trying to understand this is a retroactive contract that goes back four years and four months, correct?
$\qquad$

MR. LIBERT: Well, I would just say that that term retroactive contract legally is sort of insignificant, although I understand to the Legislature it is important. But yes, it is an old contract.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Why would you say it's insignificant?

MR. LIBERT: Well, to me in the charter, that term, retroactive doesn't come up, although it often comes up on the record over here. So legally, if you ask for my legal analysis, I'm not sure what the impact of it is, but that would be for you to determine, of course.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, okay. So it's up to this Legislative Body or this Rules Committee to determine whether or not we pay a contract where the work started four years ago.

MR. LIBERT: I don't know that that's under this contract. I guess that's a matter to take up with the County Attorney's Office, which I would
be happy to take up at a different time. But I'm not sure that it's the issue of this contract, but that's my understanding of the Rules Committee's role.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let me just make sure I'm clear. Maybe I'm not clear.

Is this contract paying Leventhal,
Mullaney \& Blinkoff for services that were rendered in the past?

MR. LIBERT: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So for our
purposes, for what we do on this
Legislative Body, it's a retroactive contract because it wasn't approved before Mr . Leventhal or anyone at his firm provided the services.

MR. LIBERT: Correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So if I'm understanding this correctly, the contract going forward is $\$ 60,000$ per year.

MR. LIBERT: That's not going
forward. That is to cover the work that
was completed in the time that the contract was not ratified.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Got it. But then there's a retro number, and by our calculations, it's $\$ 320,000$.

MR. LIBERT: I do not believe that's correct at all. I do not believe that Mr. Levinthal ever did that much work for the County. I will double check that, and I'm happy to do that. But that would be shocking to me. I believe that the number was under $\$ 100,000$. That's just speaking off the cuff.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I think the confusion is the contract is for 60?

MR. LIBERT: Correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But it has a contract maximum of 320 .

MR. LIBERT: I can confirm that with the municipal transactions team. But what I can say easily for the record and without any doubt, is that the work was performed under this contract is already performed, and we're not asking the

legislature for any additional future authorization under this contract. There may be something future presented that would be presented not under this contract. And I can state that without any capitulation for the record.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I mean, according to our backup, it says the amount is increasing by a maximum of $\$ 60,000$, so that the amended maximum shall be $\$ 320,000$.

MR. LIBERT: It may be that the original maximum -- I would have to check this with the municipal transactions team
-- it may be that the original contract was for that amount, so that it's now rising to that. But again, this office, the County Attorney's Office, is not asking for additional authorization for future work. Period. End of statement. That's not what this request is for. If that's how it reads, I think that that may be something miscommunicated in the paper rather than what we're actually

looking at. Because it's $\$ 60,000$ hours of work that was completed. Period. End of statement. So that's what it is.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So if I'm working off of -- and maybe this item needs to be tabled so we can get the proper answers -- if I'm working off the $\$ 320,000$ number, how many meetings have there been in the last four years to warrant that level of money?

MR. LIBERT: I'm not counsel to the Board of Ethics, so I don't have that information. I'm just the outside counsel coordinator. And I could of course, I could get the Legislature that information. But I myself do not have it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So doesn't the Board of Ethics they meet, what, quarterly, Monthly?

MR. LIBERT: Again, I'm not the counsel to the board, so I just wouldn't stand here and speculate. It would make me look even dumber than $I$ look right now.
$\qquad$

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, you don't look. You're doing your best, and we appreciate that (laughter). Yeah, I just think it obvious. It seems like there's some outstanding questions if we can table this matter.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Before we get to table it, some of the other Legislators have questions.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, okay. Sure. I didn't realize.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Brian, so the other question is: Why four years without coming to us?

MR. LIBERT: So my understanding, Legislator, is that there were a number of mini bid processes during that time. So in the beginning of the last administration, again, not being an expert on the County Board of Ethics, this is just sort of from memory and public record, the Board of Ethics was reconstituted. So at the time it became reconstituted, the board had to meet and
they actually had to make that selection. So in order for a procurement to be completed, the board itself actually had to convene. And my understanding is, in the beginning of the prior
administration, i.e. four years and six months ago or four years and ten months ago, that board was not fully convened. I understand that during that time there were periods by which it did convene and Mr. Leventhal advised them, but there was never a time that they completed that RFP and then moved it forward to this Body. So during that four years the board was meeting, Mr. Leventhal was providing services, which he was advised of in writing was at his own peril. And now we are here with this contract. If that answers your question.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: To some extent. At what point was the was the hourly negotiated?

MR. LIBERT: Well, that would have been pursuant to the county's RFQ, I
believe. I'd have to go back and double check that. But that would be my
understanding that any contract left would be left to the County's RFQ panel. In that rate, when you say negotiated, it's not as if County Attorney or anybody from County Attorney gets on the phone and sort of directly negotiates it. There's a qualification process for that. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Right. But at what point was it said, let's use that word instead?

MR. LIBERT: I would have to look backwards. But whatever that original contract was during the prior
administration, so more than four years and ten months ago, whenever that was. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: This is really not a good process here. I mean, it's it's self-evident.

MR. LIBERT: I am aware, yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Is the next one going to be done in advance?

MR. LIBERT: The next one is
currently in process. Like I said, I don't want to speak to what's going on with it because I'm not sure if the process is complete. And I know that that's sort of a delicate thing, but I know that it is directly in process. I am aware of that and I can speak to that and I believe it is in process and headed towards this Body imminently. And I will mention for the record relative to your questions, that the board, to my understanding, has been instructed not to have any substantive meetings until this Body considers this contract or the new contract, I should say.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. We're going to do a motion to table in a moment, but the Rules Committee will come back after the rest of the committees and we can call you back up. So we want to one of the things we want to know is how much, in fact, has he has he billed under the contract for those years? And we understand he's not just performing

services while meetings are taking place. My understanding is if an issue gets sent to the committee, he will look -- the Board of Ethics -- will look at something or render an opinion for them, correct?

MR. LIBERT: That is my
understanding. To my knowledge. I'm not sure that that has happened in the last ten months, although that would be confidential, of course. But in the past, it is my understanding that that has gone on.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So you're going to get back to us with the numbers?

MR. LIBERT: I mean, I can speak I can get you the exact number, but I know because I prepared this, this number that is sitting in front of you is very close to the exact dollar amount that's owed. It's either a slight bit more or a slight bit less. But it is not more, obviously, because this is the authorization that we're asking for. It's between 50-60,000.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Well, that's I
mean, that's where the confusion is, because you're increasing the maximum amount to 320,000 . So we need to know what is it? Was it 50? Was it 60 was a 320,000?

MR. LIBERT: That $I$ can speak to as we stand here now, I can clarify. I need to get clarification from the Municipal Transactions Group as to why it's going up to 320,000 . That's the first I'm hearing that number. But as the person who sees the invoices, the amount that is owed is between 50 and 60,000 One hundred percent.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Right. So maybe just get that clarification for us.

MR. LIBERT: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: And come back up later. Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi, Brian. I just have a quick question for you, and $I$ apologize if $I$ missed it, if you said this already. Has there been a time now that there's been a lapse in the ability
of the Ethics Board to issue an opinion on something because of an RFP not being fulfilled or anything?

MR. LIBERT: No, no, it's been okay.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: All right. I just wanted to make sure there wasn't a time where his contract stopped and then if someone needed an opinion, they couldn't get it.

MR. LIBERT: No, I would say. Mr. Leventhal has been humble in providing the services and understanding the risks that are associated with that, and in the meanwhile has been doing what needs to be done without taking on any unnecessary risk. But the Board has been able to perform its business.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: And one of the things I want you to come back with and tell us when the last amendment was.

MR. LIBERT: I most certainly will.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Quick
$\qquad$
question. It's a quick question here, Brian. If the maximum amount of the contract is going from 260 or going up 60,000. And from my estimation, that would be the previous contract was at 260,000. Has all that money been spent?

MR. LIBERT: If my logic is correct, yes, but I but that is what I will in fact, check for the Legislature. It's a valid question. And again, that 320 number is new to me. It is certainly not future work. So that I have to check on. I wouldn't speak to it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: For the amount of money that he's billed the County, assuming that is correct, that 260; that contract was approved when?

MR. LIBERT: That's the same question the Presiding Officer just asked and I will get that answer. If I understood your question and the Presiding Officers question are exactly the same. And what I understood you to be asking is please tell us about that prior

amendment and I will find out in between. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I understand that there may be times where he provides opinions as well, but $I$ would like to get to understand how many meetings took place while that previous amendment was in place.

MR. LIBERT: I don't know that that information is going to be forthcoming in between now and when you un table the item because it's going to require at least some phone calls on my part. I'm happy to do whatever you ask, of course. The Legislature, you know, I do what you ask. I'm just not sure that that
information will be forthcoming in the next few hours here, but $I$ will endeavor to get it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I guess what I'm asking is that if this firm billed this to the tune of $\$ 260,000$ during a period of time, I like to know that it's more than three or four meetings a year. MR. LIBERT: Yes. We can confirm. I
mean, I there are I guess I should say this for the record, they're not subject to disclosure, but I myself am in possession of the invoices, so I can certainly look at that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Thank
you. So motion to table, moved by Minority Leader Abraham, seconded by Legislator Bynoe. All in favor of tabling signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: It's tabled. And we'll move on to the next one. MR. LIBERT: E-118 R. Yes. Is a contract with Lewis Johs Avallone Aviles for the Rochester matter. If I can answer any questions and more than happy to do that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Where are we with this particular case?

MR. LIBERT: So it's always a little difficult to speak publicly about
litigation. So I will just speak to what I know is publicly available, and then I would say if the Legislator has further questions, I should answer those in Executive or refer them to counsel. But just generally speaking, this case was in Federal Court and the Federal Court did dismiss most of the claims. It was then removed to State Court, more or less, and there was some expectation that it would be more or less ending in State Courts. And as of yet, that is not materialized. So, therefore, we seek this amendment. The expectation was that once it got out of Federal Court, there would be a hope it would go away. It did not. So it continues now and we seek this amendment to continue litigating in State Court.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, I mean, I don't know if this is something and you tell me if I'm going down a path where we should be saying this on the record, but we're increasing the contract to $\$ 150,000$ more, the new maximum is going to be 489.

I guess what I'm asking is, are you going to have to come back to us for another 150,000 at a later point? Or are we seeing this new maximum of 489? That's going to be the new ceiling.

MR. LIBERT: I'm glad you asked that question, Legislator. I believe that we-this is the truth. We really try to make everyone abide by the budgets. I am the one who collects these budgets. I speak to counsel directly. I say, look, please be honest with us because it is me who's going to be standing here explaining this again if we need it again. So the hope is no, but as anyone who litigates knows, litigation is not an exact science and sometimes things happen. But that's that's the goal. That's truly the goal. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: And the other questions on this contract?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No.
Let's move to E-119, which is with the Law Office of Vincent McNamara.

MR. LIBERT: Sure. This is a
contract with the Law Offices of
McNamara, for a matter called Rolja (phonetic). There are several defendants, including the County. It is a very complex litigation and also involves significant injury to the plaintiff. Again, speaking on public record, the gentleman was crushed by a vehicle. So his injuries are very significant and, therefore, it has been sent out due to these also these other legal complicating issues. If you have any questions, more than happy to answer the same.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Brian, with this one, the original contract amount, if I'm understanding this correctly, was \$250,000?

MR. LIBERT: Yes. This particular contract, $I$ believe when we came before the legislature, we had actually said
that we would be back for more money. I'm nearly positive because $I$ was involved in that process. And this case is very complicated, again, for reasons that might be best explained in Executive Session. But we knew and I believe we said at that time that we would be seeking additional money on this case. There was an expectation of that, and I believe counsel made us aware from the get go.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. The only reason why we wanted to ask you questions about it is because the contract increase went up three fold to 760. The increase I'm sorry -- four fold. The increase is $\$ 766,887.32$. Very exact number, by the way -- for a new maximum of $\$ 1,016,887.32$. So it just it jumped up quite a bit. If I'm understanding this correctly, the Legislature would not have a chance to see anything in terms of what's billable between now and the $\$ 1,016,887$. But it just seems like it's
jumping up quite a bit. So that's why we wanted to make sure. We got to understand that one, obviously, this contract is enough to be able to provide outside counsel for this particular service. But then two, just to get an idea from you in terms of this, I mean, I don't know if we need to go into

Executive Session at this time, but understanding the scope a little bit better.

MR. LIBERT: I'm going to answer your question, but $I$ think actually it might be best to bring all of these into Executive Session. When I say all of these County Attorney Contracts, it appears that there may be a series of questions that probably would be privileged for purposes of the record, and I would be more than happy to answer them. I think that's probably the best way. I can say specifically in this instance, this case is very complicated, and not only is it complicated by the
$\qquad$
injury, there are a number of statutory insurance issues. And it's funny that you mentioned the exact budgeting because a counsel has been very good about budgeting for the County in the past, and he tries to be exact. So I think he's done that and it does stick out as kind of funny, I have to admit. But I believe it's an honest number. So it's coming up high. But the truth is this litigation is is potentially very dangerous. So without going down any further rabbit holes that might be dangerous, I would say that's the best answer to your question.

And let me add this. I'm the person who reviews these budgets. I go over them with the County Attorney. I do not wish to stand here and be embarrassed. I don't wish to present something that is embarrassing. So if $I$ thought that it wasn't reasonable, I wouldn't be standing here.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Brian, are you coming to our Executive Session later?
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MR. LIBERT: I come wherever I'm invited, Legislator.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just in the interest of time. I mean, definitely we'll move forward. I mean, we trust your responses. And from that standpoint, we're prepared to vote for it at this moment. But if you can give us the brief in Executive Session because of the sensitive matter, then if that's okay, Presiding Officer.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Yeah. I mean, I think there's two other contracts for legal services with the West Group that might require some discussion in

Executive Session. Also one dealing with the crime lab, which we're about to bring up, and the other one with family court that in terms of the status. And so those might be also for Executive Session items.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Do you want to do those now before we consider these contracts or do you want to do them later
$\qquad$
and pass them through?
(Whereupon, brief off the
record discussion.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: What we'll do is we will wind up tabling these contracts and then hear your presentation in Executive Session with the others later on.

MR. LIBERT: Very good. I remain available.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right, so what we'll do is this, E-119, E-121, E-122. Those are the ones. The other two are with the West Group Law and maybe the one with Vincent McNamara, we will table those for now and discuss them in Executive Session later and then come back.

MR. LIBERT: Very good. Standing by, Legislator.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right.
Motion of by Legislator Schaefer seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. All in favor of tabling those items signify by saying
$\qquad$ $46=$
aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
Rules Committee respond in
favor.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Tabled. You still have a couple more to go. Bee Ready E-120 and U7.

MR. LIBERT: I lost my train of
thought. I apologize (perusing). We have two different contracts on. I just want to make sure I speak to the right one.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: The first one
is to represent the County to defend
various matters as requested by the County Attorney's Office within the areas of employment, that labor law, etc.

MR. LIBERT: Very good. Thank you, Legislature. So this is a contract with Bee Ready Fishbein Hatter \& Donovan for labor services for County Attorney and also for the Office of Labor Relations. So if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay, so this

is not negotiations. This is handling grievances and those types of things, correct?

MR. LIBERT: This is, I believe all of that. I believe it includes all of that work. I'm not intimately involved, but I believe it includes all of that work.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Meaning
both negotiations and grievances, etc.
MR. LIBERT: That is my
understanding. All right. Questions?
Minority Leader Abrams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Brian, this
contract is for $\$ 3.5$. Million, right?
MR. LIBERT: That is my
understanding. I don't think it's \$3.5
million. I don't think that's correct.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Yeah, it is. It says maximum out $\$ 3.5$ million.

MR. LIBERT: Not the initial incumbrance, but that is correct.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. And this is for -- just explain to me the time
$\qquad$
frame. This is work that Bee ready provided starting back from January?

MR. LIBERT: Some work has been performed as of January, but I do not believe it's significant. I can get you the exact number, but my understanding is that there were negotiations underway already and Bee Ready had stepped into some of those.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah, we'll definitely want to --

MR. LIBERT: To be perfectly clear, it is not $\$ 3.5$ Million of of old work.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No. That part I understand. It's whatever was utilized between that period of time and then it's going forward, I believe. Is it five years?

MR. LIBERT: I can double check the term, but I believe so.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: It just seems to me -- why would we why would we be doing a contract that's related to contract negotiations with labor
agreements that extends past the County Executive's term? Well, I think it's both.

First, I wouldn't speak to anything about the term that is something that a boring attorney like me probably wouldn't want to get involved in. But with regard to what Peter Bee's office is doing, my understanding is they're handling also grievances and the negotiations. So if the negotiations should complete at some point, there would still be ongoing issues with the unions that would need to be handled.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, and I get
that. It is definitely the ongoing
issues that are related to other labor agreements that need to be resolved, whether it's with the PBA, the correction officers, CSEA, whatever the union collective bargaining unit is. However, I'm just asking a question because if I'm reading the contract correctly, the term ends in 2027.
$\qquad$ $50=$

MR. LIBERT: That's my understanding.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The County Executive term ends in 2025. Why would it go beyond? Maybe that's a question that we have to ask to someone else, but why would it go beyond if it's related to labor agreements? Because it seems like not knowing what the future will bring in terms of the next county executive or the current county executive, it seems like it's tying that person's hands to having a contract to the tune of three and a half million dollars two years into that next person's term, or maybe not. Who knows?

MR. LIBERT: I can't speak to why, but I can speak to that it is not tying anybody's hands because, of course, at any time anybody can not utilize the services that are there and available. So if the county executive, whoever that person would be in that moment were to not use those services, then the money
would not be drawn down on.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. I see your point. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. I mean, I would add one thing. The benefit that I could see of having a longer contract is it fixes the rates.

MR. LIBERT: That is also correct. There is a change in the rates here over in the new contract. So that is a very valid point, Legislator. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I just think before we go forward with the three and a half million dollar possible exposure, we just need to have the answers of the questions that Minority Leader requested. And also if you could take a look at the services described in the contract, it doesn't mention negotiations with the unions or anything like that.

MR. LIBERT: It's a very broad
contract. The way it's written. The County Attorney can assign work as needed. There have been prior contracts that have used this similar language. So that would sort of be the view on that. I'm happy to double check that for you. But that's my understanding. That I knew before I stepped up here.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Yeah, I
think the service paragraph, paragraph number two should state, especially if contract negotiations are included in this, and if the rate is the same for that, then we need to know all that before we approve it, because what could happen is we could approve this and then say, okay, we need you to negotiate this. And they would say, no, that's a different rate or something. So we need to make sure that if you're saying up here that they're going to be negotiating with the unions for contracts that that's actually covered under this, because it doesn't it's not listed and it really has
$\qquad$
to be.
MR. LIBERT: I'm happy to go over it with the Municipal Transactions Team, but I believe that there's an understanding of the services that are to be performed on the County side. If the Legislature would seek clarification, of course, as always, we would do whatever the Legislature would ask, but I don't think that we would have presented it with the concept that it was unclear.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I would read paragraph number two. In my opinion, it doesn't clearly state a number of the things that you mentioned up here as it covering. And we know with all contracts, it has to be in writing for it to be worth anything.

So again, I just think for three and a half million, I'm not saying it's not worth it, but there's just a lot of questions for that much money.

MR. LIBERT: So the only question
that I have -- (perusing) I'm just
looking at the language of the contract. I would just say from my view, the services section is quite broad. I understand that there could be different readings under the law. I'm looking at the language and to me it appears pretty broad. But I understand the Legislator may have its own opinion about that, and I totally understand that.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I mean, it's similar to what we just faced with the prior contract with Leventhal. If it's not clearly stated in the contract, we can't say, oh, that should be covered. We don't have it in writing, so we really need it as clear as possible before we go forward with anything.

MR. LIBERT: I would just point out the Administration's view of it, is that the clause and such other services as required by the County Attorney and Office of Labor Relations would include certainly the settlement negotiations and any labor-related matters.
$\qquad$ $55=$

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We need we need it to state -- if this is going to negotiate a contract or anything like that, it has to be listed in the services. Otherwise, look what just happened 10 minutes ago at the Leventhal contract. It's going to happen again.

MR. LIBERT: Frankly, Legislator, I think those are vastly different. They're not related.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: As my counsel just mentioned, if you're if you're saying it's going to negotiate contracts with unions and then $I$ just looked at this and it doesn't say that, it's just conflicting from your testimony to this contract. I don't want it to come back and hurt you, honestly, because you're up there saying that it will cover this. Yet the services doesn't say that. So we can't go back -- well, we can go back and check the record and say, well, the attorney from the County Attorney's Office said that it did and it doesn't.

So he might want more money for negotiating contracts.

MR. LIBERT: I think, Legislator, it's the legislator that's offering that testimony. I've made the opposite testimony. I've said that it appears to me that it's covered. But if the legislator wishes to clarify that, you may clarify.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: When
you got up here originally -- we can read the record if you want. You mentioned what the contract did when Presiding Officer asked you, one of the things you mentioned was negotiating with unions. So before we say that and we go on your word, and I'm doing this for your benefit, we need to have it in writing because it is not what is matching with the contract in writing the services. You can just give us an amendment of the services if you want.

MR. LIBERT: I believe that there's a misunderstanding about the reading of

the contract, Legislator, and I don't believe that it's an accurate representation of what I've said.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Brian, Just refresh my memory. When we did the Dellaverson contract, I recollect the language was very specific to what Mr. Dellaverson was going to do, wasn't it?

MR. LIBERT: I don't remember. I remember standing here and I remember having to learn to pronounce Mr. Dellaverson's name. Which I still think I haven't done.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. I guess what I'm asking -- the question is if Mr. Bee's firm Bee Ready and Fishbein is going to provide services on behalf of collective bargaining and negotiating, to me, there's been a precedent with the Dellaverson contract. Now, granted, you know, Dellaverson was hired by NIFA to be able to provide those services for them directly. But the precedent started with the previous county executive putting
that forward in that contract.
MR. LIBERT: Legislator, I could not agree more. And, in fact, there's a second contract with Lamb \& Barnosky, which is quite similar and was handled in quite a similar manner. So I agree with you that there is precedent to do this, and that is not a new and novel concept.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So I would also point out that the Dellaveron was hired to do one thing and one thing only, negotiate. And what Bee Ready is doing here is negotiating, but they're also the myriad grievances and challenges and legal procedures that go on with all of our collective bargaining units is included within this. I personally don't have a problem with the language of the contract.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Brian, what was the cost of the Dellaverson contract?

MR. LIBERT: To my understanding and
I trying to be very frank, I honestly don't remember. What $I$ remember is that
this Body --
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: \$25,000 a
month. Whether he worked every day that month or did nothing. Taxpayers are still paying for.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Which we voted against. So $\$ 25,000$ per month, whether he did something or did nothing. This contract is for three and one half million, correct?

MR. LIBERT: Correct. But that work will only be paid in arrears. It will only be paid if Mr. Bee or his firm actually performs.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The difference is the Dellaverson was paid regardless, as we said. But this contract, he's only going to be paid in arrears.

MR. LIBERT: I would say that's at least one difference, but yes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So so we don't have a concrete understanding or idea of what we're going to pay. Based on the amount of work that Mr. Bee does,
$\qquad$
what's his hourly rate in comparison to what Mr. Dellaverson's hourly.

MR. LIBERT: His hourly rate is to \$275 per hour for partners. I can double check the associate rate, but $I$ know for partners is $\$ 275$ an hour.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How would that compare to the Dellaverson contract?

MR. LIBERT: Well, of course, as pointed out by the Presiding Officer, Dellaverson wasn't charging an hourly rate at all. He just wanted to charge a retainer to be present.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And no hours were provided by Dellaverson?

MR. LIBERT: No.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I understand.
So \$275, how does that compare to
previous contracts over the years?
MR. LIBERT: I will say, actually --
Just to answer your question directly, it is a slight increase. And when I say slight, they're going from 225 to 275, which is all in the paperwork. It's
already filed with the Clerk. When I say they, that would be Peter Bee. But anybody who practices law in this room knows that those are very, very modest rates. They really are.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So I guess, based on your testimony, our concern is going to continue to be making sure that we outline the services in the contract. I mean, obviously, this is something that the administration doesn't want to do. We understand. But going off of what previous administrations have done, they have outlined it very clearly. The services that are going to be provided, especially as it pertains to labor negotiations.
(Persuing) Yeah, I'm just reading through it again as I'm talking. I just don't. All right. I don't have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay.

MR. LIBERT: And then the last one is going to be U7-22. And this is for a

case called Fayngersh. This is also with Peter Bee, Bee Ready Fishbein Hatter \& Donovan. This case, is a U because it is below 25,000. It is a very small matter. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Any questions?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No other questions on $E-120$, $I$ would like to put a motion forward to table that matter.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Do we have a second. Seconded by Legislator

DeRiggi-Whitton. All in favor for the motion to table signify by saying aye. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Aye. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Aye.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Nay.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Nay.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Nay.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Nay.
Table fails. There's still one more contract to consider, which is with Berkman, Henoch, E-124. It's a case of

Rothschild versus the County of Nassau.
MR. LIBERT: Thank you. This is for Rothschild. It is a new case. It was bid and procured. If you have any questions, I'm more than happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Any questions on this contract?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Hearing none. I think you're off the hook for now. We'll see you again.

MR. LIBERT: Standing by.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Well, you're going to do more than stand by, right?

MR. LIBERT: I mean to of course. I'll go look at the information now. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. All right. So I pulled the ones that we tabled out, and I'm going to call the other contracts at this time. Actually, they include: A-44-22, E-84, A-39, A-40, $E-128, \mathrm{U} 6, \mathrm{E}-125, \mathrm{E}-126, \mathrm{E}-127, \mathrm{E}-118$, E-120. All right. I'm going to actually
take that out. This is not going to include E-120 and U7.

Let me start from the beginning: $A-44-22, E-84, A-39, A-40, E-128, U 6$, E-125, E-126, E-127, E-118, U7 and E-124.

Those contracts are before the
Legislature any debate or discussion or public comment on those?

MS. MEREDAY: Meta Mereday. With regard to this whole process, I just challenge sometimes the rationale. Well, I understand the rationale. I just challenge how it goes out, and then we don't hear about these things until well after the fact and the money, you know, as well as the horse is already out of the barn.

I have more issues with the contracts that were tabled at this point. Those of you are going to approve or disapprove, it's not going to positively impact the continued disservice within the underrepresented communities. I'm just asking those of you who are
representing our interests, since we pay the second highest property taxes in the country, just to be mindful of the limited resources that you seem to continue to distribute to friends, relatives and others who are not providing the services to the communities at large.

Just looking at today's headline about helping out Long Island's homeless veterans, you know, and we have a viable facility that's underutilized at NUMC that could address that. These are the things that challenge me. My questions have to do with a number of these contracts or the previous contracts, and we're talking about legal contracts. And most residents don't know how much money we expend in lawsuits against the County. Just looking at that last contract that was tabled with regard to the -- I didn't see anybody who closely resembled me or my interests on that firm. The lack of diversity, the lack of inclusion and

lack of equity in our veteran population and our minority population and with women continues to appall me. And the fact that there's very little that comes out of this Body in support of that continues to trouble me. So that's why I wanted to stand today, because it seems that my voice, you know, it may carry, but it doesn't really resonate to actually make much of a difference. But that doesn't stop me from throwing the rock into the stagnant water to ideally create a ripple.

And for anyone who might be looking for possibly some diversity, because professional services continues to be an arena that lacks diversity, inclusion and equity, someone might want to look into the Minority Corporate Council Association, which is 25 years old. It's not a minute old, but they represent entities that are focused on hiring and retaining corporate counsel of color and diverse representation. So that's just

one area.
But again, there are subcontracting opportunities that this county continues to fail to look into to bring some representation that is more diverse and inclusive. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Thank
you. Any further debate discussion from the Legislators?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Hearing none. All in favor of the contracts I called signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: They carry unanimously.

Now E-120 is the contract Bee Ready and Fishbein, all in favor of that
contract signify by saying aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Aye.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Nay.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Nay.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Nay.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: That contract passes by a vote of 4 to 3 .

We're going to put the Rules
Committee in recess. We will be returning to some of those contracts later. But in the meantime, the other committees will go.
(Whereupon, Rules Committees
recess, 2:10 p.m. to 3:20 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: I'd like to
call the Rules Committee back into order session. The first item that I'm going to call is E-116-22. First, I need a motion to un table, moved by Legislator Rhoads seconded by Legislator Schaefer. This is
the Leventhal contract motion to un table. All in favor signify by saying aye.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Aye.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Nay.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Nay.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Nay.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: The motion to
un table passes by a vote of 4 to 3. Then
we're going to vote on the contract
itself. So all in favor of E-116 signify by saying aye.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Aye.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Nay.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Nay.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Nay.


Passes by a vote of 4 to 3 .
Now I need a motion to un table
E-119 contract with the Law office of
Vincent McNamara and E-121 and E-122 with
the West Group Law PLLC moved by
Legislator Rhoads seconded by Legislator
Bynoe. All in favor of un tabling signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries
unanimously.
And now on the contracts themselves.
119, 121, 122, all in favor signify signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
unanimously. A motion to suspend the Rules, moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Legislator Schaefer. All in favor of suspending the Rules signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed? (Whereupon, no response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries unanimously.

So we have the Consent Calendar. Items that went to other committees. It's been agreed by both sides and no further debate of discussion is required on these items: 342-22, 343, 344, 345, 348, 349, $351,352,353,354,355,356$.

And then on the Addendum 359 and 371. Any further debate, discussion, any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
$\qquad$
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response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor
signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries
unanimously.
Number 346 is a resolution to confirm the County Executive's appointment of Richard Corbett to the position of Commissioner of the Office of Emergency Management. Motion by Legislator Rhoads, seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Mr. Corbett will be invited to appear before us at the next legislative meeting. If you want to arrange to meet with him separately, obviously Chris will work that out with you. But in the meantime, this is just teeing it up for the Full Legislature.

Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public comments?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries unanimously.

Number 347 is a resolution
authorizing the County Executive to execute an amendment to the Municipal

Cooperation Agreement between the County and the Town of Hempstead for monitoring piping plover nesting areas at Nickerson Beach. Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer

Kopel, seconded by Legislator DeriggiWhitton.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Good afternoon again. Darcy Belyea, Parks Commissioner. As you mentioned, we're amending a Municipal Cooperation Agreement that dates back to 2015, expired at the end of last year. I did present it to the Town in February and they just passed it on September 20 th on their town board. But this basically allows the Town of Hempstead to continue to conduct monitoring and habitat management for the piping plovers and other endangered species that nest at Nassau County's Nickerson Beach. We're exercising the first of two one year renewals, second one's already in the works for 2023 with a term of January 1st, 2022, to the end of this year. The cost to the County is just $\$ 12,000$ and as $I$ mentioned, it'll be retroactive. The work has already been performed for this year. We're beyond the nesting stage.


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay.
Legislator Schaefer.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Just have a quick question: What department at the Town manages that?

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Conservation and wildlife in the town. I think it was on the agenda, but it was tabled several times.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I want to thank you for doing this. My parents actually drive down there to, like, hear them or something every year. It's a big DeRiggi outing.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: It really is a big deal. I'm told that professional photographers come from all over the world to take pictures of these birds.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I've seen it. Yeah, it's very cool.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: I started a new job this year and have time to go see the birds, but next year (laughter).
$\qquad$ $76 \xlongequal{ }$

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I haven't seen them either.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right. Any further questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you. All in favor? Signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of

Rules Committee respond in
favor.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed? (Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries unanimously.

Item 350-22. A resolution amending Resolution 448-2001 as amended and titled Designated Banks and Trust Companies for the deposit of monies received by the County Treasurer. Moved by Legislator Schaefer, seconded by Legislator Rhoads.

MR. CHIANG: Good afternoon. Gentlemen. Thank you, ladies. So the

Treasury Department, we do an annual
check of all the banks that we have we do business with. So this year we're basically removing some companies that's been merged or acquired by larger companies, and we're keeping some of the companies that merge with bigger companies already on our list.

We're adding two additional banks. Hanover Bank, which is a local bank based in Mineola, New York. We wanted to make sure that we have some exposure to smaller banks, community banks, to give them some of the County's deposits. Of course, they have to be competitive with the national banks as well. We're also adding US Bancorp, which is a large bank based out of the Midwest.

So basically just housekeeping items. If you have any questions.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. Just just a quick one. So the qualification, does it matter if they have a State or a Federal Charter?
$\qquad$ $78=$

MR. CHIANG: No. As long as our deposits are safe and liquid. All of our deposits have to be backed by securities or treasuries. And also it's liquid. And then we try to maximize the yield on the deposits. So these banks that are allowed to deposit we make sure that they're competitive with other banks.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And what is the typical float overall? The typical amount that's sitting in these accounts overall.

MR. CHIANG: Well, it depends on the size of the bank, if it's a big bank --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Overall.
MR. CHIANG: All of our deposits combined, \$2.3 billion.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any other questions or comments?

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Just a quick question. Hanover Bank. How many branches do they have? I didn't even know they were still around.


MR. CHIANG: They have nine branches, one in Mineola and a few branches in the city.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Are they only in New York or are they --

MR. CHIANG: Only in New York. They're a Community Bank.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Okay, great.
MR. CHIANG: We try to diversify our deposits to smaller banks if we can help them.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: How often do you do this?

MR. CHIANG: We do this housekeeping every year. This is my first year here. So I'm going to be doing this every year.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: It's once a year.

MR. CHIANG: Yeah. Right now we have 20 banks on the list and every year we reevaluate. We also do background checks on all of the banks, make sure that --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: This is for just those two banks or for all those banks.

MR. CHIANG: Well, we go through the list of banks and then we do our due diligence on them every year.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: This item now.
MR. CHIANG: This item, we took off a couple of banks and we added two banks.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any other questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you,
David.
MR. CHIANG: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any debate or discussion, any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
Rules Committee respond in
favor.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed? (Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

## CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries

unanimously.
Number 357 is a resolution
authorizing the County Executive to execute an Inter-municipal agreement with the Freeport School District. Moved by Legislator Rhoads, seconded by Legislator Bynoe. Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
Rules Committee respond in
favor.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Number 358 is a resolution authorizing the County

Executive to execute an Inter-municipal
Agreement between the County and the Town of Hempstead. Moved by Minority Leader

Abrahams, seconded by Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton. Any debate or discussion?

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: I see Inspector Fields. You have been here all day. I don't know if you want to jump in and say a word or two.

INSPECTOR FIELD: William Field, Inspector with Police Department. It's pretty simple. Just a municipal agreement between the Town of Hempstead and the County to have some auxiliary police vehicles park at the Echo Park location.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you. Any debate, a discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public comments?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of

Rules Committee respond in favor.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries unanimously.

Legislator Rhoads makes a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Legislator Bynoe. All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members
respond in favor with aye.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: We are adjourned.
(Whereupon, Rules Committee meeting is adjourned, 3:36
p.m.)
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