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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Mike, could you please call the roll?

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Roll call Rules Committee.

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 John
Giuffre?
LEGISLATOR GIUFFRE: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Vice Chairman
Howard Kopel?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Chairman Richard
Nicolello?

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


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum, sir.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So again, as we always do with do the contracts first on the Rules Committee. I'm not going to call E6-23 I'm going to recuse myself on that. So I'll save that for the end, and then that can be called when I'm out of the room.

So here we go: E7, E8, E9, E11, E12, E13, E14, E16, E17 of 2023. These are all resolutions authorizing the County Executive to execute personal services agreements or amendments to personal services agreements between the County of Nassau and Law Office of Vincent McNamara; Orrick, Herrington and Sutcliffe; Cuomo, LLC; Lamb \& Barnosky; Bond, Schoeneck; Nassau County Vocational Education and Extension Board; Bonadio \& Company; Mayer, Hoffman; and Nassau Energy; and E15 of 2003 is a Resolution authorizing the County Executive to

execute a sponsorship agreement between the County and Jovia Financial Credit.

Motion by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. That's before us.

First contract that we're going to call is with Emergency Management and it's E13 to 2023 with the VEEB.

MR. DELANEY: Good afternoon. Tom Delaney, Nassau County OEM. Here to talk about a contract renewal that is up for approval for VEEB, Vocational Education Extension Board.

We use Homeland Security grant funds to pay for specialized training that VEEB affords to members of our volunteer fire service. So this contract renewal is two things. One, the renewal. Two, we're making a partial incumbrance of $\$ 350,000$, as I said, all 100\% grant funded. Okay.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: This is grant funding that supplements the budgeted amounts for VEEB; is that correct?

MR. DELANEY: That is correct.


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. The grant funding, can you tell me how it compares to previous years?

MR. DELANEY: Actually, this year we had a little bit of funding left that had not been spent down. So we're encumbering $\$ 350,000$. Previous years had been $\$ 300,000$. Going forward, would expect to return back to $\$ 300,000$, unless, of course, we have funds remaining.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay.
How's it compared to previous
contracts? Are they're getting less grant funding, same, more?

MR. DELANEY: Well, like I said, this year we had a little bit of money left over in our grants that need to be closed out. We had a lot of delays in getting our grants spent down because of COVID and other supply chain issues. So that's why we're forwarding $\$ 350,000$ this year. But every other year it had been $\$ 300,000$. There's no decrease in the amount of funding that we are affording

to VEEB.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Is that right?
I mean, I was told that they were going down from $\$ 1.1$ million per year to $\$ 825,000$.

MR. DELANEY: That's because in the first three years of the contract, when I did it, I tried to be optimistic about the potential for funding. We could afford them and just put that allowance. I always budgeted a little more than I have to if $I$ can. But it doesn't mean that that's what they're going to get.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So in previous years, the the amount was $\$ 1.1$ million per year, and this year it's $\$ 825,000$ ?

MR. DELANEY: Well, again, the first three years that 1.1 represents what I would call an optimistic amount.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Right.
MR. DELANEY: This one now by reducing it, it brings it into a realistic value for what we can actually afford them over that full six year

period of this contract.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right. So at any point were they receiving \$1.1 million in funding from the grant?

MR. DELANEY: No. Again, that was just budgeted per se in the contract as being an optimistic value, if money became available that above the $\$ 300,000$.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So the $\$ 825,000$ is a more realistic number?

MR. DELANEY: Very much so.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Is that not just realistic, but is that a number that they're actually going to get?

MR. DELANEY: Well, they will. The incumbrance right now is actually for the third year of the original contract. It's just through a lot of, let's call it an oversight. We thought the contract expired at the end of December this year, but it expired at the end of December '21. The claim that they provide to us, I'm not making it up, the two claims are this thick (indicating).
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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Right.
MR. DELANEY: It's a lot to go
through to audit to ensure Comptroller's will accept it.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. So I'm just making sure that they're not actually receiving a decrease in funding as a result of this proposal.

MR. DELANEY: No, sir. And as you know, as long as I'm at the helm on the grant stuff here, I'm going to do the best I can to ensure that they stay funded at this level.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Does anyone else have any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Well, thank you.

MR. DELANEY: Thank you.
$\qquad$

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next contract is with the Comptroller's Office and the Bonadio group.

MR. CASOLARO: Good afternoon, Mr. Majority Leader, Legislators, my name is Charlie Casolaro, Chief Counsel to the Comptroller.

You have before you an amendment between the County of Nassau and the Bonadio Group for additional funding. The Bonadio Group helps Nassau County and the Comptroller's Office each year prepare its ACFR, which is Annual Comprehensive Financial Reports. That document is used in our auditing reporting.

There's an increase in funding for two reasons. One, the tightening of what we call GASB rules, Government Standards, Accounting Board. They've tightened some of their rules and made some deadlines a little tighter, adding more work for the Bonadio Group. And the depth and the level of the county and the complexity of the County's finances has also increased
the work on the Bonadio Group. And after speaking with the Comptroller's Office, they have asked for additional funding. The additional funding will be just $\$ 30,675$ for this year. The Comptroller's Office thinks that's not terribly significant. The Bonadio Group does good work and we'd ask for this amendment to be approved.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you. Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you,
Charlie.
MR. CASOLARO: You're welcome.
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## CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next contract

 is with Parks, E15, sponsorship with Jovia Financial.COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Good afternoon, Darcy Belyea, Parks Commissioner. This item is a sponsorship agreement between the County and a Jovia Financial Credit Union. It's a revenue producing agreement in the amount of $\$ 60,000$. Jovia was the title sponsor of the 2022 summer concert series at Lakeside Theatre in Eisenhower Park. And the term of this agreement ended on August 31st, 2022.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So this is an increase?

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Increase, Yes.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. And this
is for the concert series at Eisenhower?
COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Right. At
Eisenhower in the summer.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. There
was talk of trying to attain other sponsorships; this does not preclude us
from doing so.
COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Absolutely
not. The more the merrier.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay.
Any questions for Darcy? Minority
Leader Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How are you?
COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Good. How are you?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Good.
So if I understand this agreement, it's a revenue generated agreement.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Which I guess
that criteria is a little bit different than we normally do in the Legislature.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I asked a question because we noticed in the backup that there's no disclosure forms for any of the principals; can you elaborate on why.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Correct. So typically these agreements are used in
occupancy permit, which we don't typically bring before you. But I chose to simply because it's revenue and full transparency is the way to always go. And Jovia, as we know, is an entity whose principals are its account holders. So when they began the process of completing the principal questionnaires, they
realized it was unrealistic to have all of their account holders fill them out. So I referred it to the County Attorney's Office, and the affidavit was the route that was chosen to be taken in lieu of not being able to have every principal fill out the principal questionnaire. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So I understand your appreciation for transparency, but $I$ can't recall a contract or an agreement where we didn't provide the complete disclosures. So am I missing something? I understand that it's revenue generating and $I$ understand it's a use and occupancy agreement, but I'm not too sure --
$\qquad$ $15=$

MR. MONTEFINESE: I just wanted to step in. My name is Tom Montefinese. I'm from the County Attorney's Office. This is a unique agreement. It's kind of a hybrid. We process them as UNO's, we structure them as UNO's. They're really sponsorship agreements. Generally, these sponsorship agreements have not gone before the Legislature. We haven't required disclosure forms for these agreements. We took that model because this is revenue generating, and because it is structured as a $U \& O$ with the ordinance requiring there to be legislative approval because we're receiving the revenue, we did come before the Legislature on this. We said, hey, we've got to go in front of the Legislature.

That said, we still are considering this a sponsorship agreement. We have spoken to the IG's office, we've spoken to procurement. We're actually taking this under consideration because this is
such a unique kind of thing that we're encountering that we haven't really
contemplated this before, we're
considering putting into place policies and procedures to address this kind of agreement going forward. So we are going to take the IG under consideration. We were going to take suggestions from Procurement and address this going forward. But that's why we did accept the affidavit in lieu. We have Jovia, they're reputable, they've been working in Long Island for 84 years.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I guess what I'm asking is, or $I \prime m$ driving at is, that there are other principals at Jovia other than the one that's in the back up, correct?

MR. MONTEFINESE: Well, my understanding is that credit unions, all the members are principals; they're all considered principals.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: They have a board.
$\qquad$ $17=$

MR. MONTEFINESE: They have a board. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And that board is representative of multiple different people that make decisions. The account holders don't make the general decisions of the credit union, do they?

MR. MONTEFINESE: No, they don't. However, as I said before, we were modeling this after our previous the sponsorship agreements, which we didn't require --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Which agreements were those?

MR. MONTEFINESE: TD Bank, previously. And in previous years also, Jovia as well.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The one with TD Bank, $I$ don't recall it. When was that passed in the Legislature?

MR. MONTEFINESE: I don't believe it was. Because it's a sponsorship agreement, it wasn't structured in a manner that it was coming before the Legislature. It wasn't revenue producing.

The key difference here is that this one was revenue producing versus previous years where it wasn't revenue producing, which is why we went before the Legislature.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And I agree with that. I agree with that sense, 100\%.

So there has never been an agreement which has been revenue producing that's been a sponsorship agreement that has come to the Legislature?

MR. MONTEFINESE: Not that we have seen in the County Attorney's Office that we put before, that it's been structured in this manner. Like I said, this is a unique agreement. This is a unique circumstance. It's retroactive, as well, that we're looking at. So that's why going forward, we wanted to assess the situation because it came up and now we're looking to put policy in place, to put procedure in place, so that way going forward, we can see exactly how we're going to approach these agreements.

Because, hopefully, we're going to have a lot more coming down in the future.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But I would strongly suggest -- and I'm going to ask the IG come up as well -- I would strongly suggest that we just follow the format that's already there that's part of our law that disclosures are made for all principals.

MR. MONTEFINESE: So the key
difference here that, well, one, it would be everyone, all the members would have to disclose if we were going to have all principals disclosing. The affidavit was submitted, which, still the County did request these forms. They pointed out that Jovia pointed out, and we agree that this is a different agreement because of the sponsorship, because of the way it's structured. So our position was that the disclosure forms aren't required under this circumstance. We aren't required legislative approval.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So this is the

opinion of the County Attorney's Office that all of the account holders need to file a disclosure?

MR. MONTEFINESE: That's not what we're saying. What we're saying is based on the structure of this agreement, sponsorship agreements generally do not require disclosure forms. Because this particular sponsorship agreement is coming before the Legislature, we require we ask for the disclosure forms. Jovia pointed out, and they provided us with the affidavit. However, the affidavit and as we have done past precedent and historically, we didn't require the disclosure forms.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But those those agreements weren't revenue generating that are here before the Legislature.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, but they were still structured as sponsorship agreements, though.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah, but see,
$\qquad$
that's the thing, we require that disclosures are made when they're coming to the Legislature as well. What I'm trying to say is there has not been an agreement that has come to this

Legislative Body without the proper disclosures. We bring this up all the time.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, when
it's categorized as a contract, that's when we were bringing it before the Legislature, and that's when we're requiring the disclosure forms. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry, isn't this contract E15-23?

MR. MONTEFINESE: Well, it's being presented as a contract. The way the procedure and the process that we're going through is that we're seeking Legislative approval. However, we still are looking at it from the sponsorship agreement perspective. We're still looking at it as a sponsorship agreement. We're receipt of funds.
$\qquad$

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I don't think we're going anywhere. We're spinning around.

Who came up with the affidavit? Did your office come up with the affidavit? Did the Parks Department come with the affidavit? Who drafted the affidavit?

MR. MONTEFINESE: The affidavit was submitted by Jovia.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So they came up with their own form of what they were going to disclose?

MR. MONTEFINESE: Well, we just accepted that form. We accepted it in lieu, but we don't require there to be disclosure forms in this circumstance.

And as I said, this is a unique circumstance that we're encountering here because of the way it's structured, the way these sponsorship agreements historically have been presented to the County that we want to put in policy, we want to put in procedure to take into account for this. Because it's different.


It is slightly different than our regular run of the mill contract, our regular run of the mill U\&Os, where we're constantly receiving revenue. Where we issue the U\&O and there's a constant flow of this revenue. That's not what's happening here. It's a one off. We go in, they provide the sponsorship, we provide the marketing, they're giving us the revenue and that's it. Once it's over, it's over.

Now we're kind of in this situation where we want to address these contracts. Hopefully, like I said, we're going to have a lot more going forward.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I don't want to get into hypotheticals. Obviously, I mean, many of us know Jovia up here. We know them as a credit union that's established in the county. I believe they have branches in Westbury. I haven't banked there, but I'm familiar with them. But say for example, somebody else wants to enter into a sponsorship agreement
with the County, someone that's maybe not
that reputable, someone that has, you
know, a speculative past, and that person
finds this contract or this agreement, a loophole where, "I don't have to disclose all the principals of where I generate money. I don't have to disclose the criminal history, if any, with other levels of government". I just think that's that's setting up a really bad precedent.

MR. MONTEFINESE: Well, I think, as
I have said before, this is not going to be setting precedent on that term. Jovia has been is been in the county for 84 years they've been operating on Long Island. This is a reputable vendor. There's no adverse information that has come up on this vendor.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But we don't know that, though. How do we know that? Explain to me how we know that.

MR. MONTEFINESE: So the IG did investigate.


LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So now I'd like to bring up the IG, because we don't know that.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: Good afternoon.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How are you, Jodi?

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: I'm good, Minority Leader. It's nice to see you.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Good to see you as well. So you did a background check on Jovia and you didn't see anything in their --

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: No.
Actually, we hadn't seen these types of agreements in the last four years and almost one month now. And we were told that they weren't priorly styled as contracts. They were styled as some sort of resolution that doesn't make it through my office. But at the end of the day, we always do our checks. So we absolutely did a background check to see

if anything was going on or anything we should be concerned about accepting money from that particular company. We didn't find anything.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. And your check was based off of what Jovia disclosed or did you go deeper?

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: Oh, no, no, no. We did our own checks. With every vendor that we review, we have several checks, going into about a dozen checks in all different places to see if anything we need to be concerned about here in the County.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Now, in regards to the disclosures, Jodi, because I noticed you recommended, yes; generally, when it comes to disclosures, we've seen a more healthier product of disclosures that indicates a whole wealth of information. This was very limited. But I noticed your office recommended, yes. Just connect the dots for me.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: I will.

I absolutely will.
So initially, our office had concerns about this item. We were concerned about a possible precedent setting that a vendor could just say, no thanks, we're going to do an affidavit instead. We were also concerned about the possibility that it would carry over into other revenue contracts for the County, that if the the company is giving us money, we're not going to stick with the disclosure forms that the Chief Procurement Officer in the County spent a lot of time working on. So we were concerned about that.

We did have some meetings. Well, we had a meeting with the representatives from the County Attorney's Office and the Chief Procurement Officer, and we spoke with the Parks Commissioner. It appears that this is going to be somewhat of a discreet transaction in the sense that the vendor, or the company, is going to provide the county money for a concert

series that occurred last summer. So it's retro, too, which makes it even more fun.

So at this point, we went through everything and we landed on that from what we heard from the County Attorney's Office, they had assurances to us that this was not going to be a precedent. This was not going to go forward as, "never mind the disclosure forms". And we also suggested and recommended to them that the next time something like this happens, a sponsorship agreement like this, that they should have a policy in place to address it so that we're not sitting around going, where are the disclosure forms? There should be a process that should be followed.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah, I would think the process would be to -- one, I still haven't got a clear understanding on why the board can't file disclosures, but that's number one and that's the question $I$ guess anyone can stand up and answer.

But the next question I have is I think we need to have a standardized approach so that we're not caught trying to figure -- this is a retro contract, number one. So they provided, I'm guessing, this contract is really just for us to accept the money.

MR. MONTEFINESE: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So this is passed already. So in essence, if this Legislative Body votes no, we're basically saying no to $\$ 60,000$, also. Even though this is long gone already. They got what they wanted last summer for free, basically, if I'm understanding this correctly. So it really puts this Legislative Body in a really tough spot. Because, one, we don't want to say no to $\$ 60,000$, but at the same time, no, we don't want to accept $\$ 60,000$ and $I$ don't know who the principals are. I don't know who the board of directors are. I don't know their connection to anyone else. We don't know any of that. I don't know if
any of them have been brought up on criminal charges. Nothing. Nothing. We don't know anything. So it puts us in a really difficult spot.

So I'm concerned. From your office, you've recommended that we accept this. But at the same time, we don't have the information to be able to make, I think, a very sound decision because we don't know who those principals are.

MR. MONTEFINESE: I mean, I
understand that. I was informed by I believe I'm sorry, Robert, the chief procurement officer, that Jovia can't Jovia is principals can't donate and things like that; am I wrong?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Mr. Cleary, please. Come to microphone.

INSPECTOR GENERAL FRANZESE: Because one of the forms was the political contribution form. So this might be a better answer than what I have.

MR. CLEARY: Robert Cleary, Chief Procurement and Compliance Officer.
$\qquad$ $31=$

I just want to mention that we did vet the vendor before presenting the Item and found no adverse information as was said. We didn't review disclosure forms but they are in New York City Passport, including principal questionnaires and other information, they were clean. They have no cautions. There's no signs of any reason to be concerned about this vendor. It's a highly regulated industry.

As Jodi was just mentioning, there are prohibitions for federal credit unions regarding political campaign contributions, although I cannot speak to the particulars in this particular case. And in this particular case, the transaction, effectively, the responsibility of the vendor, is to hand a check to us that doesn't bounce. They're not receiving anything beyond the advertisement that, as you said, was already provided.

So this is a fundamentally different kind of animal, $I$ think, in a lot of ways
than than the contracts were generally talking about.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So it sounds like to me, based on what I'm able to surmise, that in this particular case, we just didn't follow the disclosures because this is a revenue generating contract, and obviously Jovia is an entity that we didn't feel fit perfectly into that into us being able to get those level of disclosures.

So, one, I would strongly suggest and recommend that we come up with a standardized process in terms of how we're going to get disclosures for these types of agreements. Because what we got today, an affidavit from one principal is not sufficient. We voted for and put forward this legislation to make sure that transparency was there, even when the County is generating revenue, not just when it's when we're we're making expenditures. So from our standpoint, we need to see it on both ends. And it
clearly was not given on this end.
Second, our Legislative Office would need to be a part of if there's any changes to the actual legislation to make this more standardized, we want to be able to work with the Majority as well as with the County Executive to make sure we do so. But today, as of right now, I'm having a hard time voting yes for this because I don't know all the principals. And I think we have in some cases chose expediency because this is a late contract over transparency, and that's never going to be acceptable in the history of this county as it pertains to different levels of corruption.

So I'm going to recommend to my side that we vote against for the reasons that we have indicated before. And at the same time, I'm going to recommend to the County Executive that we put forward agreements, whether they're revenue generating or similar ones to this, because it sounds like to me there are

more retro agreements coming. And if
there's going to be more retro
agreements, then we need to see a standardize and approach those pretty quickly.

MR. CLEARY: I'm not aware of any retro agreements similar to this one that are coming, although I can't state unequivocally that there are none. This is the only one that I'm aware of. We do believe that a policy should be established. Going through this process, we've identified that the fact that we don't have a policy has caused this problem. This is a very unique situation that we tend to avoid as well.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Mr. Cleary, in some ways, $I$ agree with you that we don't have a standardized policy. But instead of doing more, we chose to do the absolute minimum. So, since we don't have an actual standardized policy, rather than trying to get disclosures from the board, rather than to do a deeper dive

and ask them for some of the very tough questions that come up in some of the disclosures in regards to history, we chose not to. We accepted an affidavit from them, from one principal, indicating everything's all good. Their form, really. It's Jovia's form, not even ours. So it may have omitted questions that we normally indicate on our disclosure.

MR. CLEARY: Well, I don't want to rely, generally speaking, on New York City's information, but as I said, they are in Passport. There is a lot of information in there. And there were there were no adverse events to report in that system.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I understand.
Okay. Nothing further, Presiding Officer.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you. I think we all agree that a policy has to be developed on the standardized practice for receipt of sponsorships going forward.
$\qquad$ $36=$

Having said that, we've had the review from the County Attorney's office, from Mr. Cleary, from the Inspector General. You're dealing with a federal credit agency that's highly regulated. The possibility of a conflict is not as high, it's not the same. They're not receiving a financial benefit from the County. They're not receiving funds for goods or services provided. And the concern I have is if we adopt a hyper technical interpretation of some of our requirements, you could be in a position of discouraging monies that people might want to donate to our county because they're going to have to go through a cumbersome process that everyone who does it complains about.

So again, in this case, the principals are every member of the Federal Credit Union. So to be in full compliance, do we have to get every count holder? If not, then you're dealing with a board of directors that has a number of

people, as well as executive management, supervisory committee, and are they all going to want to go undergo this process? For example, campaign contributions, they can't make them. They're members of federal credit unions. So we're going to force them to go through that process. And, ultimately, again, my my concern would be if we if we do this hyper technical requirement for every possible scenario, regardless of how it actually operates, are we going to discourage people from making sponsorships? Are we going to deprive the county of revenues that would help offset the tax burdens of our taxpayers?

But I do agree completely with the with what has been said by the Minority Leader as well as by Mr. Cleary and the County Attorney, that there has to be a policy that has to be a directives that we would like to see before you go forward. So before any further one of these contracts or agreements is

considered, we'll have to see that from the from the County Attorney's Office, etcetera.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: That became very apparent to us through this process. And I also just want to comment that there is no further retroactive coming forward with regard to a sponsorship agreement. And I initially was not going to put it before the Rules, but then on advice of the County Attorney's Office, that's why we're here. And then as we went through the process, the need for a policy became a very apparent to us. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay, thank you. Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.) CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay, Darcy. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right. We'll continue with the rest of the contract. But before we do that, why
$\qquad$
don't we vote on this right now? Again, this is an E15-2023 contract with Jovia Financial Credit Union. All in favor signify by saying.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Aye.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR GIUFFRE: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Nay.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Nay.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Nay.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Passes by a vote of 4 to 3.


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Public Works, E16 and E17. We have Mayer, Hoffman, as well as Nassau Energy.

MR. CASOLARO: Majority Leader, again, Charlie Casolaro, Chief Counsel to the Comptroller. E16 is a Comptroller contract tied in with the Department of Public Works. Mayer, Hoffmann are the external auditors for the County. They provide our annual mandated audit, provide our financial management letter, provide our single federal audit that's required and other services.

This is an amendment to increase the amount of money for additional services to assist the Department of Public Works. They have state contracts and grants that require audits separate and apart from the county audits. And working with them, we've negotiated with Mayer, Hoffman to increase their contract by the sum of $\$ 60,000$. It is needed, and I'll ask Commissioner Arnold if he would say anything further.
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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: You have the next contract is with Nassau Energy LLC. COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: I'm going to call up Josh Meyer to present the Item. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Hello, Josh.

MR. MEYER: Good afternoon, Chairman. How are you?

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Good.
MR. MEYER: Good afternoon,
Legislators. Josh Meyer, outside counsel for the County. West Group Law, 81 Main Street, White Plains, New York 10601.

Before you today is an operation and maintenance agreement with Nassau Energy LLC to operate and maintain the County's district energy system and the central utility plant, which is located across from the Coliseum and the Marriott Hotel across Charles Lindbergh Boulevard. That's to provide hot and chilled water to air to provide heating and cooling to nine customers within the county. Those customers are the Coliseum; the Marriott; Nassau Community College; the three
museums: The Cradle of Aviation, the Firefighters Museum and the Children's Museum; as well as Nassau University Medical Center; the Aquatic Center; and the County's technical services building.

This is basically a continuation in a sense that Nassau Energy's operated the County's district energy system pursuant to a lease for the last 25 years. So this is a short term operation and maintenance agreement allowing the County to negotiate possibly a longer term agreement with Nassau Energy or go back out to the market.

Just by way of finances, the cost to
the County would be $\$ 9.9$ million annually. $\$ 6.6$ million of that would be reimbursed by the non county customers. So cost the County $\$ 3.3$ million annually. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Is one of the reasons that it's a short contract is because there's potential development of the Coliseum property itself that would increase the increase the demand for
energy?
MR. MEYER: Yes, in part. So after the 25 year lease that was entered into with Nassau Energy, we did come back and it was extended by two additional two years to continue negotiations. We actually came back one other time for a six month extension, and we've been month-to-month with Nassau Energy since that time. Obviously, COVID happened. Prices increase based on the previous agreements that we had negotiated with them. But it's also in turn to determine what happens across the street at the Coliseum site.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any other questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No. All right. Thank you, Josh.

MR. MEYER: All right. Thank you very much.
$\qquad$

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next contract is with the County Attorney's Office. Brian, you're not going to talk about E6 yet. The first contact with Vincent McNamara. We're going to do it later.

MR. LIBERT: So E7?
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Yes.
MR. LIBERT: E7 is an amendment to a contract with the Law Office of Vincent McNamara. This amendment adds \$73,000, bringing it to a total of $\$ 200,000$. If you have any questions, happy to answer the same.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No. Go on, move on.


MR. LIBERT: E8 is an extension to a contract with Orrick and Andy Persich from Budget is going to speak to that as it's really Budget's contract.

MR. PERSICH: Good afternoon. This is an extension in Terms for Orrick, our bond counsel. They provide numerous services for us especially during a bond deals, and they can been here have been here as long as $I$ can remember.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: No. Thank you.


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next one's with Cuomo LLC.

MR. LIBERT: Yes, this is a contract is a new contract with Cuomo LLC for $\$ 81,950$ to handle the trial in the case known as Michael Smith.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Did the trial take place already? Because I'm looking at the term which was to commence on July 1st, 2022.

MR. LIBERT: The trial did not take place. The file was very active and being handled by our office, but a determination was made to send it out. Some work has commenced, but very limited to my understanding. Just some conferences and the work is really the trial in chief is what they were brought on for.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: It seems to me that we constantly get these contracts after the commencement date. I'm asking the County Attorney's Office to provide us a list of contracts where the term has
commenced, but you have yet to bring it to the Legislature. So whatever is out there pending, I'd like to see that list. Because we'd like to get these things up to date as much as possible. And it just seems like there's a never ending supply of cases in which you come to us for approval of firms that have done work for six months, eight months or longer.

MR. LIBERT: I believe that your
statement is accurate and $I$ will advise the County Attorney and we will provide the list. And I would just add that the fine people that spoke before me, the Director of Procurement and the IG, are sort of familiar with the myriad of procurement steps that our office has to go through. And then of course, we need to balance that with our statutory obligation to defend the county vigorously and zealously, which we do, of course. So those two issues do come into play, but $I$ will certainly advise the County Attorney, as you requested.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right, thanks.

Sure. Go ahead.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just a quick note. And $I$ know this may not directly pertain to this particular contract, but I'm going to bring it up in the same vein, because it does have some type of connection. It was stated to us that Deputy County Executive Fox -- and I know this one has not reached trial or anything of that magnitude yet. But going down the road and figuring out where it will end up, it was specified to us by Deputy County Executive Fox that she would be able to provide to this Legislative Body in Executive Session a resolution of what has transpired between the officer and the County in terms of how we go forward. I'm looking fast forward into when, hopefully not in this case, but in general, when the Legislature has to vote on the settlement. For far too long, we when are
listening to the settlement, we don't hear the resolution on the employee side in terms of what is done to provide corrective action to make sure that does not happen again. Because it seems like some of these cases, it's the same actions over and over again. So it's nothing for us to do today, per se, because $I$ know this situation is a little bit different, but I figured I would bring it up because, obviously, it's an agreement that's that's centered around Nassau County Police Department. And I just want to make sure that we bring that note back to the Deputy County Executive that we are still waiting for that information when it comes up in Executive Session to make sure that we hear some type of corrective action resolution. MR. LIBERT: Understood.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any other questions on that one?
(Whereupon, no verbal
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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Okay. The next two, Lamb \& Barnosky and Bond, Schoeneck.

MR. LIBERT: These are two what I'll categorize as on-call labor contracts. These are similar in vein to the contract we did for Bee Ready earlier this year. At this time, no money has been expended on these contracts.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any questions on these two contracts?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All right.
Thanks, Brian.
MR. LIBERT: Did you want me to wait for E6?

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Yes, it'll be a couple of minutes.
$\qquad$
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## CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public

 comment on the contracts that have been called thus far?MS. MEREDAY: Meda J. Mereday.
Unfortunately, the taxpayers don't get the access to all of the information in the background details that you all have. Just a couple of comments, and I appreciate Minority Leader Kevan Abrahams asking some questions with regard to particularly that Jovia contract, because again, I do feel that there is a need for initial directives and some idea as to how the taxpayer funds are being allocated and resources. Even though we're talking about sponsorships, there are ways that we can proactively bring in additional funds that won't make it to too much of a hardship for those who want to provide that resource. But also we need more protections, clearly, with the background that's been happening here, and the fact that even in this documentation we have a number of
compromise and settlements.
I've asked this question of this
Body previously with regard to exactly how much money has been compromised and settled in the last couple of years. And I think that is information that the public should be aware of. Again, that might be something that Newsday should be asking and promote that to the public.

I also am concerned about the fact, again, that Minority Leader Abrahams brought to the forefront about the corrective actions that we seem to be settling on the same types of issues. If we're not learning from our mistakes and moving forward in a proactive way, that is of grave concern. So those are my points with that regard.

And again, I'm still not hearing or at least not seeing the active participation or outreach for the service disabled, minority women businesses and providing opportunities for same to be able to procure with these various
contracts for the County. We have a $\$ 3.3$ billion budget and it still concerns me that the issue of diversity and inclusion is elusive here. So equity is also something that could be a potential far reaching goal.

That brings to mind, I've seen that there have been additions and supplements to various budgets, and I am again
encouraging this Body to look at addressing the increase of funding that our Veteran Services Agency needs. As I had brought to this Body over a year ago before the PACT bill was enacted, now that it's in place, our veteran Services Agency, very hardworking, very dedicated, but the thousands of veterans that we have need more support services, high level staff, to address these issues, to bring that research and development funding to this area to better serve our residents. So it would be ideal if we could do that before there becomes a significant incident, or because of the
$\qquad$ $56=$
billions of dollars of funding that's being allocated outside of this region, we're going to once again miss out on the opportunity that we need to do for our our heroes and sheroes who have served this country so well.

So again, the accountability again,
I'm requesting a listing of the actual settlements and where those settlement funds are actually coming from and if we have depleted that particular account. Again, the outreach for the diversity. I'd like for somebody to say that this contract has been awarded to a service disabled veteran business or a minority and women veteran business, and they have an opportunity. They are the ones that largely create the jobs for their related constituencies.

The notion about potentially the development process at the Coliseum, let's just leave that up to the needs of the people and not the misguided directives of the Administration. Thank
$\qquad$
you .
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you. Any
other public comments hearing?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Hearing none, I'm going to call the following contracts for a vote:

E13, E14, E15, E16, E17, E7, E8, E9, E11 and E12. All in favor signify by saying aye.
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor with, "Aye.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: They carry unanimously.

Now I'm going to turn things over to Presiding Officer Kopel. Before I do that, just to correct the record, one of the contracts that $I$ called for a vote right now was E15, which actual had



LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thanks. Okay. There's one remaining contract which is E6, authorizing execution of a personal services agreement between the County Attorney and the Law Offices of Vincent De McNamara. And there's a motion by Legislator Schaefer, seconded by Legislator Bynoe.

Now, I would note for the record that the Presiding Officer has left the left the room. He will not be participating in any discussion or debate on this Item, nor will he participate in any vote.

Mr. Libert?
MR. LIBERT: Good afternoon, Legislators. Brian Libert, Deputy County Attorney. This is an amendment to a contract with the Law Office of Vincent McNamara for a series of cases which we sort of refer to globally as Dutch Broadway.

As I said, this is a continuation of a contract. This amendment adds
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$\$ 314,741.72$ to the contract, bringing the total to \$554,741.72.

If you have any questions, I'm more than happy to answer the same.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Anyone?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No. Okay.
Hearing none. All those in favor of E6, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee present at this time respond in favor with, "Aye".)

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That Item is unanimous.

The Rules Committee will now be in recess and we'll proceed to Public Safety.
(Whereupon, Rules Committee is in recess, 2:36-3:52 p.m.)


1
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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: I'm going to
call the Rules Committee back into
session. We have a number of items on the Consent Calendar, which went through Committees earlier, and those items include Items 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, $48,49,51,52,55,56,57,58,59,60$, 61, 62, 63, 64 and 66. So I'll take a motion for those items moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams.

Before we vote on them, we need a motion to suspend the Rules moved by Legislator Schaefer, second by Legislator Giuffre. All in favor of suspending the rules, signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee present at
this time respond in favor
with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed? (Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Now we can vote
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on the items on the Consent Calendar. Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public
comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor
signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee present at this time respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries
unanimously.
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resolution authorizing the County
Executive to execute an inter municipal agreement with the Garden City Park Water Fire District in relation to a project to provide funding for the purchase of a new vehicle extraction and rescue equipment.

I'll make that motion seconded by Legislator Giuffre. Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee present at
this time respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
$\qquad$
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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Item 41 is a local law to amend Section 6-2.6 of Title A of Chapter six of the Administrative Code of Nassau County in relation to reducing the number of years volunteers need to serve to receive the partial exemption from taxation for volunteer firefighters and volunteer ambulance workers. Moved by Minority Leader Abrahams, seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel. Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor
signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee present at
this time respond in favor
with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?



CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Item 46, a resolution to exchange a horse previously donated by the county of Nassau to the by the Nassau County Police Department Foundation, to the County Police Department for a horse of of equivalent value offered by Indian Head Ranch to the Nassau County Police Department. Motion by legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, seconded by Legislator Giuffre.

Inspector Field, I think we need to know about this one. First, what is a horse of equivalent value mean?

INSPECTOR FIELD: The commanding officer of our Mounted Unit or delegate takes a look at the horse to make sure that it's about similar to what we need specifically for our functions.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So what happened here, though, that we're swapping out these horses?

INSPECTOR FIELD: From my understanding some horses are more suitable to the training and the actual

operations of the Police Mounted Unit. A couple of things would be dealing with crowds, being able to handle loud noises, confined areas and spaces, being able to take direction, and things like that.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: That explains it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So it's a bad horse. So where is the bad horse going to go?

INSPECTOR FIELD: Pepper is going to be relocated to I believe it's the Indian head ranch in Suffolk County where they're going to take care of Pepper and make sure that they're taking all the responsibility of his well being.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: There's some legislators up here whose spouses take care of kittens. Maybe they'll take a horse.

INSPECTOR FIELD: I'm sure he'll be well taken care of.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Where is
Indian Head Ranch? Because $I$ know it used

to be right in Woodbury, right on Jericho Turnpike. But they closed down. There's condos there.

INSPECTOR FIELD: I believe it's in
Deer Park. No Central Islip, Deer Path Road.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you. INSPECTOR FIELD: Thank you. 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 present at
this time respond in favor
with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Carries
unanimously.
-
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$$
\text { CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Item } 50 \text { is a }
$$ Resolution authorizing the County Executive to execute and inter municipal agreement between the County and the New York State Office of Information Technology Services and the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services to provide endpoint detection and software response Software. Motion by Legislator Bynoe, seconded by Legislative Schaefer.

MR. JACOVINA: Good afternoon. Joe Jacovina, Deputy Commissioner,

Information Technology.
Number 50-23 is a Resolution
authorizing an intergovernmental
agreement on behalf of Nassau County Department of Information Technology and various agencies and the New York State Office of Information Technology Services and the New York State Division of

Homeland Security and Emergency Services to provide endpoint detection and response software called CrowdStrike.

CrowdStrike is an EDR that provides for a cyber security wall to prevent, detect, and capture malware. An EDR, Endpoint Detection and Response tool, is an integrated approach to the endpoint protection that combines real time continuous monitoring and endpoint data analytics with rule-based automated responses.

I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Thank you.
MR. JACOVINA: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee present at
$\qquad$ $73=$

-

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Number 53 is a resolution requesting the Legislature of the State of New York to enact in the governor to approve an act, to amend a chapter of the laws of 2022 relating to authorizing the Assessor of the County of Nassau to accept from the Mineola Union Free School District an application for exemption of real property as proposed in legislative bills Numbers S38940-A and A9981-A. This was filed by the Majority and this corresponds to bills that were introduced by Assemblyman Ra and Senator Thomas. And if we have any questions, please let us know. We'll get them to you before the next Full Legislature.

Motion by Legislator Giuffre, seconded by Legislator Schaefer. Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public
comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal



CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Number 54-23 is a Resolution to confirm the County Executive's appointment of Anthony LaRocco to the position of Sheriff of the County of Nassau. Motion by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Legislator Schaefer.

Any debate of discussion? Usually, when we get to the appointments, the Committees are generally the opportunity to tee them up for the Full Legislature in which the individuals appear and answer questions. Most of these came late last week, some Friday and actually some today. But, in any event, any debate of discussion on 54 with the sheriff? Sure, Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you.

I want to just express that we did have a hearing. It was it was held by Chairwoman Denise Ford. And there were a number of concerns that we were told we would be getting updates on. Some are


Capital, which I can understand have just been filed, such as the HVAC and roof as was addressed today. So we're okay with that.

But there were a number of other things that we were assured that we would be given responses to. One of them is regarding the maintenance employees and how many were assigned to the jails and what their assignments were as far as cleaning, especially the HVAC system.

There were questions regarding visitors and how we were going to try to be addressing their facilities as far as those that had to wait outside.

We were also asking about the overtime, which we were also told we were going to get a report on, or more information on.

And to be honest, my concern was, acting Sheriff LaRocco was not familiar with a number of the programs that we we really fought for, in my opinion, from different types of rehab for not only the
the inmates, but also just different mental health programs that we had put into place. I found that he wasn't aware of them. His statement on the record was that he hadn't visited all the buildings.

So I really, as a legislator, I am concerned about his actual role with running the jail. It sounds to me that he is not involved with day in and day out operations and policies, and I'm honestly concerned with some of the sub members there that might be in turn doing more than the sheriff as far as running the jail.

And I know I kind of came down hard on Deputy County Executive Fox during the hearing, and $I$ know that some of the other legislators didn't approve of that, but we've already lost one person this year, December or January. And I was here when we were losing many, many people. And we all work together to correct that problem, in my opinion, by by switching the healthcare program. But I don't want
to see it go back. And we are responsible for these people's lives. It's something that I am upset about that I do take serious. I wanted the answers to these questions. We were told we would get them. And the follow up, I haven't received any follow up from from Deputy County Executive Fox or anyone else.

At this point, we're going to vote no. But I would think it would be good to get the answers to a number of these questions provided prior to the Full Legislature, regardless of what my personal vote is, just so that we're all informed. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public
comments?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying, "Aye".
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RULES COMMITTEE 02.06.2023 CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Next two items are municipal agreements, 67 and 68.

These are Resolutions authorizing the County Executive to enter into municipal agreements with the village of Sea Cliff in relation to a project to procure and install playground equipment, as well as Glen Cove, in relation to improvements to the Veterans Memorial Monument Park moved by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, seconded by legislator Bynoe.

Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public comment?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee present at
this time respond in favor
with, "Aye".)


CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So the next number of appointments are 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75. These are Resolutions to confirm the County Executive's appointment of Gennaro Cesarano to Assessment; Arnold Palleschi the Bridge Authority; Louis Digrazia to Sewer and Storm Water Finance; John DeGrace, the Nassau County Community College Board of Trustees; Dana Durso to the Nassau County Planning Commission; Anthony Licatesi to the Nassau County Bridge Authority; and John DeGrace to the Board of Trustees. They called John DeGrace twice because his two separate Resolutions.

Motion by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Legislative Schaefer. Any debate or discussion?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Any public
comment?

```
        (Whereupon, no verbal
        response.)
```
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CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: All in favor signify by saying, "Aye".

CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Aye.
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR GIUFFRE: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those
opposed -- you're abstaining,right?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: So passes by a vote of four in the affirmative and three abstentions.

Motion to adjourn Legislator Giuffre, seconded by Legislator Schaefer.

All in favor of adjourning signify by saying, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee present at
this time respond in favor
with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: Those opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN NICOLLELO: We're



| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{4 5}[1]-63: 7 \\ & \mathbf{4 6}[1]-69: 2 \\ & \mathbf{4 7}[1]-63: 7 \\ & \mathbf{4 8}[1]-63: 8 \\ & \mathbf{4 9}[1]-63: 8 \\ & \mathbf{4 : 0 8}[1]-86: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 33:5, 33:11, 34:7, } \\ & \text { 50:17, 55:25, 70:4, } \\ & 70: 5 \\ & \text { Abrahams }[7]-4: 13, \\ & \text { 6:6, 14:7, 54:10, } \\ & \text { 55:12, } 63: 12,67: 11 \\ & \text { ABRAHAMS }[40]-2: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 6,54: 19 \\ & \text { additions [1] - } 56: 9 \\ & \text { address }[5]-17: 6, \\ & 17: 10,24: 14,29: 15, \\ & 56: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 11,18: 14,19: 25, \\ & 21: 8,21: 19,21: 24, \\ & 23: 21,26: 18,33: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$200,000 [1] - 46:12 |  |  |  |  |
| \$30,675 [1] - 12:6 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23,35: 2,35: 4, \\ & 35: 8,38: 25,45: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \$ 300,000[4]-7: 9, \\ 7: 10,7: 24,9: 9 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | addressed [1] - 78:4 | 82:3, 82:6 |
| $\$ 314,741.72[1] \text { - 62:2 }$ |  |  | addressing [2] - | ahead [1]-50:4air $[1]-43: 22$ |
| \$350,000 [3]-6:20, | 5 | 4:14, 14:8, 14:11, | 56:12, 78:15 |  |
| 7:8, 7:22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 15,14: 19,15: 17 \\ & 17: 15,17: 24,18: 3 \end{aligned}$ | adds [2]-46:11, 61:25adjourn [1]-85:14 | allocated [2] - 54:16, |
| \$554,741.72 [1]-62:3 |  |  |  |  |
| \$60,000 [5] - 13:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 50-23[1]-72: 16 \\ & \mathbf{5 1}[1]-63: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 13,18: 18,19: 7, \\ & 20: 4,20: 25,21: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adjourned }[2]-86: 2 \text {, } \\ & 86: 5 \end{aligned}$ | allowance $[1]-8: 11$allowing ${ }_{[1]}-44: 12$ |
| 30:13, 30:20, 30:21, |  |  |  |  |
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| listening ${ }_{[1]}-51: 2$ | 64:12, 65:20, 67:21, 71:16, 73:24, 76:5, | $45: 9,45: 10$ <br> month-to-month [1] | Nay [6] - 40:11, 40:12, | 68:4, 69:2, 69:20, |
| listing [1] - 57:9 | $79: 12,82: 22,85: 18$ | $45: 10$ | 40:13, 81:7, 81:8, | 70:7, 71:10, 71:14, |
| lives [1] - 80:3 | Memorial [1] - 82:10 | months [2] - 49:10 | 81:9 | 1:20, 71:23, 72:2, |
| LLC ${ }_{\text {[5] }}-5: 20,43: 3$, $43 \cdot 16,48: 3,48: 5$ | mental [1] - 79:3 | Monument ${ }_{[1]}$ - 82:10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { need }[17]-7: 18,21: 3, \\ 27: 14,30: 3,33: 25, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 73:13, 73:16, 73:18, } \\ & 73: 22,74: 4,74: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 43:16, 48:3, $48: 5$ local ${ }_{[1]}-67: 3$ | mention [1] - 32:2 | Most [1] - 77:14 | $34: 4,35: 4,39: 14$ | $5: 2,75: 23,76: 3,$ |
| $\text { located [1] }-43: 18$ | mentioning [1] - 32:12 | Motion [6]-69:9, | $49: 19,54: 13,54: 22$ | $6: 9,76: 12,77: 2,$ |
| look [2] - 56:11, 69:17 | Mereday [1]-54:5 | 2:11, 75:18, 77:6, | 56:19, 57:5, 63:13, | 80:17, 80:20, 80:24, |
| looking [6] - 19:19, | $21,54: 5$ |  | 67:7, 69:12, 69:18 | 1:2, 81:6, 82:2, |
| 19:22, 22:22, 22:24, | merrier [1]-14:4 | 63:10, 63:14, 65:9 | needed [1] - 41:23 | 82:16, 82:20, 83:2, |
| 48:9, 50:21 | META [2] - 3:15, 3:21 | Mounted [2]-69:16, | needs [2] - 56:13, | 83:5, 84:2, 84:22, |


| 85.2, 85:4, 85:8, | 77:7, 84:17 <br> officer [3] - 31:15, 50:20, 69:16 <br> OFFICER [1] - 1:9 Offices [1] - 61:6 OFFICIAL [1]-1:25 offset $[1]-38: 16$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | Plains [1] - 43:13 <br> Planning [1] - 84:12 <br> plant $[1]-43: 18$ <br> play [1]-49:24 <br> playground [1]-82:8 <br> point [3] - 9:4, 29:4, 80:10 <br> pointed [3]-20:17, $20: 18,21: 13$ | ```principal [6] - 15:9, 15:15, 15:16, 32:7, 33:18, 36:6 principals [13] - 14:22, 15:7, 17:17, 17:22, 17:23, 20:10, 20:15, 25:7, 30:22, 31:11, 31:16, 34:11, 37:21 priorly [1] - 26:20``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85:11, 85:22, 85.25 |  |  |  |  |
| 43:23 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { p.m }[3]-1: 21,62: 25, \\ & 86: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| noises [1] - 70 |  |  |  |  |
| [1] - 44:19 |  | PACT ${ }_{[1]}-56: 15$ <br> Palleschi [1] - 84:7 |  |  |
| none [3]-35:10, 58:7 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Palleschi [1] - 84:7 <br> Park [4]-13:13, 65:5, |  |  |
| normally [2] - 14:17, | OMB [1] - 3:1 |  |  |  |
|  |  | PARKS [1] - 3:6 |  |  |
| Notary ${ }_{[1]}$ | on-call [1]-53:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks [4] - 13:3, 13:6, } \\ & 23: 7,28: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 20:18, 21:13 } \\ \text { points }[1]-55: 19 \end{gathered}$ | [1] -55:17 |
| note [3]-50:6, 51:16 | once [2]-24:11, |  | POLICE [1] - 3:12 | actively [1] - 54: |
| 10 | one [27]-8:22, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 23:7, 28:21 } \\ \text { part }[3]-20: 8,34: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Police }[5]-51: 14, \\ & 69: 5,69: 6,69: 9, \end{aligned}$$70: 2$ | em [2]-35:16, |
| no | 18:18, 19:2, 20:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:3 } \\ & \text { partial }[2]-6: 20,67: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | 79:24 |
| Nothing [2] - 31 | 8, 26:19, |  |  | procedure [3] - 19:23 |
| nothing [2]-36 | 29:23, 30:6, 30:19 | partial [2]-6:20, 67:7 <br> participate $[1]-61: 14$ | $70: 2$ |  |
| 51:9 | 31:21, 33:13, 33:18 | participating [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { policies [2] - 17:5, } \\ & 79: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| no | 35:8, 35:11, 36:6, | 61:13 | policy [10]-19:22, | procedures [1] - 17:6 <br> proceed [1] - 62:22 |
| 27:18, 27:23 | 38:24, 44:21, 45:8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 23,29: 14,35: 12, \\ & 35: 15,35: 20,35: 23, \end{aligned}$ | process [13]-15:8, |
| no | 50:12, 51:24, 58:23 | participation [1] - 55:22 |  | 16:6, 22:19, 29:18, |
| number [14]-9: | :13, | $\text { particular }[7]-21: 10,$$27: 4,32: 16,32: 17 \text {. }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 15,35: 20,35: 23 \\ & 36: 22,38: 22,39: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18,38: 4,38: 8 \\ & 39: 6,39: 14,57: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4, 29:23, 30:6 | 79:20 |  | 36:22, 38:22, 39:15 political [2] - 31:21, |  |
| 54:25, | 6:19, | 33:6, 50:7, 57:12 | $32: 14$ |  |
| 67:6, 75:2, 77:24, |  | 54 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { position }[3]-20: 21 \text {, } \\ & 37: 14,77: 5 \end{aligned}$ | procure [2] - 55:25, |
| 6, 78:23, 80:12 | 2 | 32: |  | 82:7 |
| 84 | [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { passed }[3]-18: 20, \\ 30: 11,60: 2 \end{gathered}$ | possibility [2]-28:9, $37 \cdot 7$ | Procurement [5] - |
| Number [2] - 72:16, | ted [1] - 4 |  |  | 17:10, 28:14, 28:20,31:25, 49:16 |
|  | ] - $38: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { passes }[2]-40: 14 \text {, } \\ & 85: 11 \\ & \text { Passport [2] - 32:6, } \\ & 36: 14 \\ & \text { past }[2]-21: 15,25: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 7 \\ & \text { possible [3] - 28:5, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Numbe | operating [1] - 25:17 |  | $38: 11,49: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { procurement }[3] \text { - } \\ & 16: 24,31: 15,49: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| num | :14 |  | possibly [1] $-44: 13$ <br> potential [3]-8:10, |  |
|  |  |  |  | roducing [5] - 13:10, |
|  | operations [2] - 70:2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { past }[2]-21: 15 \\ & \text { Path }[1]-71: 6 \end{aligned}$ | potentially ${ }_{[1]}$ - 57:21 | 19:10 |
| ob |  | pay [1]-6:16 | practice [1] - 36:23 <br> precedent 51 - $21 \cdot 15$ | product ${ }_{[1]}$ - 27:20 <br> program [1] - 79:25 |
| obvious | 78:24, | pending [1] - 49:4 |  |  |
| 33 | opportunities [1] | people [7]-18:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { precedent }[5]-21: 15, \\ 25: 12,25: 15,28: 5, \end{gathered}$ | program [1] - 79:25 <br> programs [2] - 78:23, |
| Obviously ${ }_{[1]}$ - 45:11 | 55:24 | 38:2, 38:14 | 25:12, 25:15, 28:5, 29:8 | 79:3 |
| occupancy [2] - 15:2, | opp | 79:2 | preclude [1]-13:25 <br> prepare [1]-11:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { prohibitions [1] - } \\ & 32: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5:2 | 57:18, 77:11 | people's [1]-80.3 |  |  |
| occurred [1] - | opposed [14] - 40:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pepper }[2]-70: 12 \text {, } \\ & 70: 15 \\ & \operatorname{per}[4]-8: 5,8: 17,9: 7, \end{aligned}$ | present [11]-43:5, | project [2] - 65:6, 82:7 <br> projects [1] - 42:5 |
| OEM [2] - 3:4, 6:11 | 58:16, 62:16, 63:22 |  |  |  |
| OF [2] - 87:4, 87:6 | 64:16, 65:24, 67:25 |  | 65:21, 67:22, 71:17, 73:25, 76:6, 82:23, | promote [1] - 55:10 |
| offered [1]-69:8 | :20, 74:4, 76:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { per }[4]-8: 5,8: 17,9: 7, \\ & 51: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | property [2]-44:24, |
| Office [20]-5:18, | 6, 83:2, 85:9, | perfectly ${ }_{[1]}-33: 10$ | 85:19 |  |
| 11:3, 11:13, 12:3 | 85:22 | period [1]-9:2 | presented [2]-22:18, | $75: 10$ |
| 12:7, 15:13, 16:4 | optimistic [3] - 8:9, | perod | 23:22 | proposal ${ }_{[1]}$ - 10:9 <br> proposed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 75:10 |
| 14, 21:2, 28:19 | . | rsich [1]-47:3 | presenting [1] - 32:3 |  |
| 29:7, 34:3, 39:3, | dinance [1] - 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERSICH [2] - 3:11, } \\ & \text { 47:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Presiding [10] - 4:5, } \\ & 6: 4,36: 19,58: 22, \end{aligned}$ | protection [1] - 73:7protections [1] - |
| 12, 46:3, 46:10, | original ${ }_{[1]}-9: 18$ |  |  |  |
| 48:24, 61:20, 72:6, | [ick [3] - 5.19 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 4,36: 19,58: 22, \\ & 60: 4,61: 11,63: 11, \\ & 67: 11,77: 7,84: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 54:22 } \\ & \text { provide [20] - 9:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 72:21 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { office [9] - 16:23, } \\ & 23: 6,26: 23,27: 23 \end{aligned}$ | outreach [2] - 55:22, | personal [4]-5:15, | PRESIDING [1] - 1:9 <br> pretty $[1]$ - $35: 5$ | 15:21, 24:9, 28:25, |
| 28:3, 31:6, 37:3, |  | 5:17, 61:4, 80:15 | etty [1] - 35:5 | 41:12, 41:13, |
| $48: 14,49: 18$ | 57:3, 78:16 | 22:23 | previous [7] - 7:4, | 7:8, 48:24, 49:13, |
| OFFICE [3] - 3:5 | 㖪:318:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pertain }[1]-50: 7 \\ & \text { pertains }[1]-34: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 13,8: 15,18: 10 \\ & \text { 18:16, 19:3, 45:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 50:17, 51:4, 54:21, <br> 65:7, 72:9, 72:24 |
| 10 | oversight [1] - 9:20 |  |  |  |
| Officer [13]-4:5, 6:4, | overtime [1] - 78:18 | place [8]-17:5, 19:22, | Previous [1] - 7:8 | provided [5] - 21:13,$30: 6,32: 23,37: 11,$ |
| 28:14, 28:20, 31:25, | own [2]-23:12, 27:10 |  |  |  |
| 36:20, 58:22, 60 |  |  | previously [3] - 18:16, $55 \cdot 4,69 \cdot 3$ | 80:13 |
| 61:11, 63:11, 67:12, |  | -27:1 | Prices [1] - 45:12 |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { providing }[1]-55: 24 \\ & \text { PUBIC }[1]-3: 14 \\ & \text { Public }[5]-41: 2,41: 9, \\ & 41: 17,62: 22,87: 8 \\ & \text { public }[13]-54: 2, \\ & 55: 8,55: 10,58: 4 \text {, } \\ & 64: 6,65: 14,67: 15 \text {, } \\ & 71: 10,73: 18,75: 23, \\ & 80: 20,82: 16,84: 22 \\ & \text { PUBLIC }[2]-3: 8,3: 19 \\ & \text { PULITZER }[9]-2: 12 \text {, } \\ & 4: 4,4: 9,4: 12,4: 15, \\ & 4: 18,4: 21,4: 24,5: 3 \\ & \text { purchase }[1]-65: 7 \\ & \text { pursuant }[1]-44: 9 \\ & \text { put }[10]-8: 11,19: 15, \\ & 19: 22,19: 23,23: 23, \\ & 23: 24,33: 19,34: 22, \\ & 39: 11,79: 3 \\ & \text { puts }[2]-30: 17,31: 4 \\ & \text { putting }[1]-17: 5 \end{aligned}$ $\begin{aligned} & \text { questionnaire [1] - } \\ & \text { 15:16 } \\ & \text { questionnaires [2]- } \\ & \text { 15:9, } 32: 7 \\ & \text { questions }[20]-10: 16 \text {, } \\ & 12: 12,14: 6,36: 3 \text {, } \\ & 36: 9,42: 10,45: 18 \text {, } \\ & 46: 13,47: 13,51: 24 \text {, } \\ & 53: 10,54: 11,62: 4 \text {, } \\ & 73: 11,73: 13,75: 15 \text {, } \\ & 77: 14,78: 13,80: 6 \text {, } \\ & 80: 13 \\ & \text { quick }[1]-50: 5 \\ & \text { quickly }[1]-35: 6 \\ & \text { quorum }[1]-5: 3 \end{aligned}$ <br> Ra [1] - 75:14 <br> Ranch [2]-69:8, 70:25 <br> ranch [1] - 70:14 <br> Ranking [1] - 4:12 <br> rather [2] - 35:23, 35:25 <br> reached [1] - 50:12 <br> reaching [1] - 56:7 <br> Ready [1] - 53:7 <br> real [2]-73:7, 75:10 <br> realistic [3]-8:24, <br> 9:11, 9:14 <br> realized [1] - 15:10 <br> really [12]-16:7, 17:3, 25:11, 30:7, 30:17, <br> $30: 18,31: 5,36: 8$, <br> 47:5, 48:18, 78:24, | 79 |  |  | second [1] - 63:15 seconded [12] - 6:5, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | reason [1]-32:10 |  |  |  |
|  | re | request [1] | return [1] - 7:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:8, 63:11, 65:9, } \\ & 67: 11,69: 10,72: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | requested [1] - 49:25 | revenue [18] - 13: |  |
|  | $36: 24$ | $75: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:13, 15:4, 15:23, } \\ & 16: 13,16: 17,18: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 19,77: 7,82: 11 \\ & 84: 18,85: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 13, 16:17, 18:25, |  |
|  |  | $\text { require }[7]-18: 12$ |  | Section [1] - 67:3 <br> Security [3]-6:15, |
|  | receiving $[7]-9: 4$, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 9,21: 11,21: 16 \\ & 22: 2,23: 16,41: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 19,24: 5,24: 7, \\ & 24: 10,28: 10,33: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $72: 8,72: 23$ |
|  | $10: 8,16: 17,24: 5$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22: 2,23: 16,41: 19 \\ \text { required }[5]-16: 11, \end{array}$ | $33: 22,34: 23$ | security [1] - 73:3 |
|  | $32: 21,37: 9,37: 10$ recess $[2]-62 \cdot 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:22, 20:23, 41:14, } \\ & 42: 6 \end{aligned}$ | revenues [1] - 38:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { see }[13]-19: 24,21: 25, \\ 26: 10,26: 12,26: 14 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | requirement [1] | view [3] - 27:11 | $26: 25,27: 13,33: 25$ |
|  | $33: 14,34: 18,34: 2$ |  | RICHARD [2] - 1:8, 2:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 4,38: 23,39: 2, \\ & 49: 4,80: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requirements [1] - } \\ & 37: 14 \end{aligned}$ | Richard [1] - 4:24 <br> road [2] - 42:4, 50:14 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recommended [4] - } \\ & 27: 18,27: 23,29: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seeing [1] - 55:21 } \\ & \text { seeking [1] - 22:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | requiring $[2]-16: 15$,22:14 | Road [1] - 71:7 |  |
|  |  |  | Robert [2] - 31:14 | seem [1] - 55:14 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { record }[4]-58: 23, \\ & 59: 3,61: 10,79: 5 \end{aligned}$ | rescue [1] - 65:8 <br> research [1] - 56:21 | 31:24 |  |
|  |  |  | role [1] - 79:roll [1] - 4:3 | $\text { send [1] }-48: 15$ |
|  |  |  |  | sense [3]-19:8, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reducing [2] - 8:23, } \\ & \text { 67:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resolution }[4]-5: 24, \\ 72: 3,72: 16,77: 3 \end{gathered}$ | [1] [1] - 4:3 | 28:23, 44:8 |
|  |  |  | $\text { [1] - } 78 \text { : }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { separate [2]-41:19, } \\ & 84: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | referred [1] - 15: | $50: 19,51: 3,51: 20$ | om [2]-5:11, 61:12 |  |
|  |  |  | ute [1] - 15: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { series }[4]-13: 12, \\ & 13: 20,29: 2,61: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | Resolutions [3] 82:4, 84:4, 84:16 | rule-based [1] - 73:9 | serious [1] - 80:5 |
|  |  |  | Rules [19]-4:5, 5:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { serve }[2]-56: 22,67: 7 \\ & \text { served }[1]-57: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 39:11, 58:14, 62:13, |  |
|  | regardless [2] - 38:12 | resource [1] - 54:21 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { served }[1]-57: 6 \\ & \text { service }[3]-6: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 5:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 21,62: 24,63: 3 \\ & 63: 14,63: 19,64: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $55: 22,57: 15$ |
|  |  | respond [11] - 58:14 | 65:21, 67:22, 71:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Services [6] - 56:13, } \\ & 56: 16,72: 7,72: 9, \\ & 72: 21,72: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $73: 25,76: 6,82: 23$ |  |
|  | regular [2]-24:2, 24:3 regulated [2] - 32:11, | 65:22, 67:23, 71:18,74:2, 76:7, 82:24, | 85:19, 86:4 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { services }[9]-5: 16, \\ 5: 17,37: 11,41: 14, \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 85:20 | rules [3] 11:19 |  |
|  |  | Response [1] - 73:5 | ES [1] - 1:1 | $41: 16,44: 6,47: 9$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | reimbursed [1] - 44:19 | 45:20, 47:15, 52:2, <br> 53:13, 58:6, 58:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { running [2]-79:9, } \\ & 79: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 56:19, 61:5 <br> session [1] - 63:4 |
|  |  |  |  | Session [2] - 50:18, 51:19 |
|  | relation [4]-65:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 13,58: 6,58: 18 \\ & 62: 8,62: 18,63: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Ra[1]-75:14 | relation [4]-65:6, |  |  | setting [3]-25:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ranch }[2]-69: 8 \text {, } \\ & 70: 25 \\ & \text { ranch }[1]-70: 14 \\ & \text { Ranking }_{[1]}-4: 12 \\ & \text { rather }[2]-35: 23 \text {, } \\ & 35: 25 \\ & \text { reached }{ }_{[1]}-50: 12 \\ & \text { reaching }[1]-56: 7 \\ & \text { Ready }[1]-53: 7 \\ & \text { real }[2]-73: 7,75: 10 \\ & \text { realistic }[3]-8: 24 \text {, } \\ & \quad 9: 11,9: 14 \\ & \text { realized }[1]-15: 10 \\ & \text { really }[12]-16: 7,17: 3 \text {, } \\ & 25: 11,30: 7,30: 17, \\ & 30: 18,31: 5,36: 8, \\ & 47: 5,48: 18,78: 24, \end{aligned}$ |  | $65: 13,65: 17,66: 2,$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | S | settlement [3]-50:25, |
|  |  | 72:25, 73:15, 73:2 | scenario [1] - 38:12 | 51:2, 57:1 |
|  |  | 74:6, 75:22, 76:2, | SCHAEFER [6] - 2: | settlements [2] - 55:2, |
|  |  |  | 17, 70:24, 71:8, | 57:10 |
|  |  |  | 81.3, $85: 5$ | settling [1] - 55:15 |
|  |  | 84:21, 84:25, 85:24 | Schaefer [8] - 4:1 | everal |
|  |  | responses [2] - 73:10 | 1:8, 63:15, 72:1 | der |
|  |  |  | $7: 8,84: 18$ | Sheriff [2] - 77: |
|  |  |  | 85:15 | 8:2 |
|  |  |  | Schoeneck [2] - 5:2 |  |
|  |  | : | 53:3 | 79: |
|  |  | rest [1] - 39:2 | School |  |
|  |  | result [1] - 10: | S |  |
|  |  | retro [5] - 29:3, 30:5 |  | 44:22 |
|  |  |  | Se | side [2] - 34:18, 51:3 |


| SIELA [1] - 2:10 | spouses [1] - 70:19 | surmise [1] - 33:6 | training [2] - 6:16, | Unit [2] - 69:16, 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Si | SS ${ }_{[1]}-87: 5$ | su | 69:25 | University ${ }^{\text {[1] }}$ - 44:4 |
| significant [2] - 12:8, | staff [1] - 56:20 | su | transaction [2] | unless [1] - 7:10 |
| 56:25 | stand [1]-29:24 | 63:16 | 28:23, 32:18 | UNO's [2]-16:6, 16:7 |
| signify [13] - 40:5, | standardize [1] - 35:5 | Sutcliffe [1] - 5:20 | transcription [1] - | rrealistic [1] - 15:10 |
| 58:11, 63:17, 64:11, | standardized [6] - | swapping [1] - 69:22 | 87:1 | up [28] - 6:12, 9:24, |
| 65:19, 67:20, 71:15, | 30:3, 33:15, 34:6, | switching [1] - 79:24 | transparency [4] | 17:18, 19:21, 20:6, |
| 73:23, 76:4, 80:25, | 35:20, 35:23, 36:23 | system [4]-36:17, | 15:5, 15:19, 33:21, | 22:8, 23:5, 23:6, |
| 82:21, 85:3, 85:16 | Standards [1] - 11:19 | 43:17, 44:9, 78:12 | 34:1 | 23:12, 24:19, 25:11, |
| signs [1] - 32:9 | standpoint [1] - 33:24 |  | transpired [1] - 50:19 | 5:20, 26:3, 29:24, |
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