


RULES COMMITTEE 03.11.2024
everyone. Welcome to the session of the Legislature, Committees meeting. Legislator Koslow, would you be so kind as to lead us in Pledge?
(Whereupon, the Pledge of
Allegiance is said.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: We're going to convene a meeting of the Rules Committee. But before I do, I just want to welcome Wayne Wink, former legislator Wayne Wink, back as a counsel to the Democrats for the Minority. Appreciate seeing you here again.
(Whereupon, applause.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Mr. Pulitzer, would you please call the roll for the Rules Committee?

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Legislator Arnold Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Siela Bynoe?
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LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Ranking member
Delia DeRiggi-Whitton?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator James
Kennedy?
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator John Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Vice Chairman

Thomas McKevitt?

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Chairman Howard

Kopel.

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

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Thank you. We're going call all the contracts. We start out with contracts, then we will recess and do the other committees, and then we'll reconvene Rules.

So we'll start out with the

contracts. I'm going to call all of them together:

B4-24; B5-24, B6-24 and B8-24, which are Resolutions authorizing awards of contract in County of Nassau and respectively, GGG Construction; H \& L Contracting; W.H.M Plumbing and Heating; and IIT Inc.
E22-24; E26-24; E27-24; E28-24;
E29-24; E30-24; E31-24; E32-24; E33-24;
E34-24; E35-24; E36-24; E37-24; E38-24; E39-24; and U1-24, which Resolutions authorizing Personal Service Agreements or Amendments of Personal Service Agreements between Nassau County and, respectively: IIT; Top Key Court

Reporting; JKM Training; West Group Law; Lockwood, Kessler and Bartlett; Hardesty
\& Hanover Construction; Cameron
Engineering; De Bruin Engineering; Excel Reporting; G\&R Events; Smith Valuation; Genova Burns; Gannett Fleming Engineers; Calabrese \& Associates.

Motion on all of those is made by


Legislator Kennedy and seconded by Legislator Bynoe.

Before we start, I'll take a motion to untable E25-24. Motion on that by

Legislator Ferretti and seconded by
Legislator Drucker.
All those in favor of untabling E25, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. That is
untabled. Motion on E 25 is made by
Legislator McKevitt and seconded by
Ranking member Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.
Let's start out then with E22, which is Information Technology.

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


IIT Inc.; this is an amendment to renew the term of the agreement with IIT

Inc, by extending one year, the termination date from March 29th, 2024 to March 29th, 2025. IIT Inc. currently provides support for the IT Geographic Information System Team. The vendor is classified as MWBE. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Thank you.
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Probation; E27, JKM Training. I
understand the Inspector General still
has some issues on that. Will take a
motion to table. So moved by Legislator
Ferretti and seconded by Legislator Drucker.

All those in favor of tabling?
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: That is tabled.


Consumer Affairs. That would be E35.
COMMISSIONER CAPECE: Good
afternoon. Commissioner Capece. I'm here with counsel Mary Harkins. That contract amendment is for extending the contract for the hours we need for services when we have our hearings where we set fines and where we listen to arbitrations between a contractor and a consumer.

We were trying to clean up the 2021, 2020 Covid backlog. Backlog is a word I'm trying to eliminate being connected to Consumer Affairs. So we're trying to move it through. I need these additional hours to clean up cases. And we are putting more cases forward okay.

Any questions?
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any questions?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I have a question.

Commissioner Capece, how are you?
COMMISSIONER CAPECE: Good. How are

you?
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Good. Could you
tell us what the status of the backlog and what area this person would particularly --

COMMISSIONER CAPECE: Well, I will have counsel come up so I don't give the wrong numbers. We were backlogged -- some of this money is going for cases that we already have used their services for, to clean up the backlog. So we're basically cleaned up, but we're continuing to do more enforcement. We're getting more consumer complaints. So I want to keep a robust schedule so we don't have another backup.

MS. HARKINS: Just to that point, and when I started in 2022, we were doing about four hearings a week to get to the backlog. So those were hearings that were already held. Now we're just trying to pay for them. Right now, we're doing two hearings a week. That's our approximate number. The contract ends in May of ' 24.

We're just trying to pay all the monies that we owe on that contract. So we're looking to add the maximum of $\$ 30,000$. We only need to encumber $\$ 10,000$. Okay. Just to pay.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Okay. I'm just trying to get an idea of how many cases are in backlog.

MS. HARKINS: At this point, I don't
think we have a backlog on hearings. We've gone through them for the most part, not perfectly.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So this contract is being extended after the work was done?

MS. HARKINS: This contract ends in May of '24. It was a five year contract. It ends of May of '24. We have a new court reporter coming in June of ' 24.

COMMISSIONER CAPECE: The amendment is to pay -- we went over our contract number.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: That's not what I asked. I asked if the contract was now
being extended beyond after the work was done. That was the question. The first question was, how many cases do you think you have in backlog so that $I$ would understand where you were, the status of the backlog. Now you're saying they're not in backlog, that they were backlogged, but then you had the hearings and and you utilize the services without having come before the Legislature and had this contract extended. Am I correct now?

MS. HARKINS: Yeah. We were trying to get this amendment done in ' 22 , but it never got here till now. Yes.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Okay. It's been the interest and the concern of this Body that we don't do that. Right? That you come before us prior to engaging and having services rendered so that you don't run the risk of us saying no and not paying the vendor. So it's important that Departments that find themselves in that predicament, that they come to us


CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Next contract is with Parks. That would be E36, G\&R Events.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Darcy Belyea, Parks Commissioner. Personal Services Agreement, E36-24 with G\&R Events NY.

We conducted an RFP in April of last year seeking entertainment promoters and booking agents. Nine proposals were received and evaluated. This item is one of six that was selected to be awarded. Three have already been presented and approved by this Body.

The term of this agreement is for three years commencing on October 1st, 2023. Terminating on September 30th, 2026 with the option to renew for two one year additional periods. Payment on this contract shall not exceed $\$ 150,000$ per year, for the total potential value, not to exceed $\$ 750,000$ over the potential five year term. Funding is from the Hotel/Motel Tax Grant agreement. And I apologize in advance that this is
retroactive. We have not used the vendor, obviously, pending your approval. It got lost in the approval system in ESRS and forgot to follow up and ask that it be heard. So here we are today.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: But they haven't performed any services yet.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: They have not performed any services. But I would like to utilize them. So we're here.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: I guess no harm, no foul. Okay, good. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi,
Darcy.
COMMISSIONER BELYEA: Hi.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I just had a quick question. You said it was three out of six contracts for is it not only advertising but also for obtaining the entertainment, bands or whoever, Correct?

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: So this is not for advertising. This is just booking
agents for us to hire the talent.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay.
All right that's good. We were talking
about it, we're happy to see Hotel/Motel.
But money being used for this. All
right. So there's no advertising involved
in this. Okay.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: No, we use the agency contract for that.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: All
right. I was just trying to keep track of how much we're spending. All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BELYEA: I will add
that even though it says not to exceed \$150,000, we don't necessarily for each of these contracts put advisement in for the full amount. We're just advising what what we need to spend. We just need the ability from year to year to spend up to that amount. Just to be clear.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. Anyone else?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
$\qquad$ $16=$
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CHAIRMAN KOPEL: U1, which would be with the Public Administrator.

MS. MCCARTY: I am Deputy Public Administrator of Nassau County, Meagan McCarty. Good afternoon, and thank you to Presiding Officer Kopel and the Nassau County Legislature for having us today. The Nassau County Public

Administrator's Office is required pursuant to Surrogate's Court Procedure Act 1208.3, to conduct an annual audit of the office by an independent Certified Public Accountant. The audit must be filed with the Surrogate, the Attorney General of the State of New York, and the New York State Comptroller.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. Good job.
Arnie?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Hi. Just one quick question. Do you provide that annual report to the Legislature or just the AG and Comptroller?

MS. MCCARTY: It's not required for us to provide it to you. It's only

```
required for us to provide it to the
```

Attorney General of the State of New York
and to the New York State Comptroller and
filed with the Surrogate.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Would it be a
problem to provide us with a copy of that
report?

MS. MCCARTY: You know what? I
don't think it would be a problem, but I
am going to check with the Public
Administrator just to make sure.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Please get back
to us.

MS. MCCARTY: Absolutely. Will do, sir.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Thank you.


CHAIRMAN KOPEL: The next five are with the County Attorney. We'll start with E26, Top Key Reporting. Mr. Libert.

MR. LIBERT: Hello, Legislators. Brian Libert for the County Attorney's Office.

I believe E26 is a contract with Top Key Court Reporting. This is for court reporting services. This was pursuant to an RFP. Five contractors were responded. And as a result of the scoring and ranking, all five proposers were selected, and this is a contract for Top Key relative to that proposal.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: So you ranked five and all five got it.

MR. LIBERT: Correct.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. Any
questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: All right. Let's
move on, E28, E29 and E30, West Group Law.

MR. LIBERT: Yes, E28 is for what we identify as what we call the Coliseum Hub contract. This is for an amendment of $\$ 750,000$ to continue West Group's work relative to the Coliseum Hub.

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

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

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: E29.

MR. LIBERT: This is a contract also with West Group to continue their work on the phase one litigation of the Family Court construction. Again, this is a continuation amendment of a prior contract.

Happy to answer any questions if you have.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Anyone?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I don't
know if you can discuss this, but this is a lawsuit -- are we suing people doing work there, companies doing work there, what is the basis of the lawsuit?

MR. LIBERT: I would just say, relative to the point that you made, there's certainly a limit on what $I$ should and ought to discuss. But speaking very generically, my understanding of this lawsuit is that they are involved, West Group, in phase one of the design part of the lawsuit. In other words, there are some disputes with the first designer who's not involved in the project anymore. And further, they continue to help the County eliminate delays going forward. That is sort of part of the project. They're not the construction company, they are a law firm. So I think that's the answer.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay. I followed you. I don't know if that's part of the reason for delay that we've had with the construction end. All

right. We will let it go.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Brian, can you
be a little bit more specific? I mean, West Group's role as a defense attorney for the County? What is their role exactly? You're kind of being vague about litigation, but what is their exact role?

MR. LIBERT: Well, if we want to be very technical, I think they serve both roles. Of course, there are multiple lawsuits. Those of us who are lawyers have seen these papers where the caption extends beyond one page. So this is one of those scenarios. It's a little tricky. Yes, they're defending the county. Yes, they're counter suing. Are we plaintiffs? Are we defendants? It gets a little unclear. I think there's a little bit of both going on. I think they're helping the County to reduce the delays and ensure that any delays that did happen are uncostly.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay. In
$\qquad$
effect they are a legal representative of the County, whether it's on the plaintiff's side or the defendant's side. But they are representative of the County in a legal capacity in litigation.

MR. LIBERT: Absolutely.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I know there's a limit on what you can and cannot say on the record here. Can you provide us with a confidential memo?

MR. LIBERT: Absolutely.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'd appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay, E30.
MR. LIBERT: E30-24 is a new
contract for West Group to work with
Nassau Community College and Langone Medical. This is ongoing. I was told by counsel to not discuss too much details of this. But this is relative to a potential project at Nassau Community College and those negotiations are ongoing.

Happy to answer any questions you
might have.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Well, not really.
MR. LIBERT: I'll do my best.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: You can try. Go on.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Well, so you
start out saying you shouldn't, then you say you'll answer.

So we're being asked to retain an attorney to get involved in a deal that will happen potentially between NYU and Nassau Community College. I don't have any information on the potential project. It's in my legislative district, but it's impactful across the region.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Would you like to have an executive session?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yeah, we need to.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Brian, we're going
to have an executive session anyway
during the Finance Committee meeting, would you make yourself available then?

MR. LIBERT: Of course.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Meanwhile, I guess we're going to have to table this one.


Motion to table made by Legislator Bynoe and seconded by Legislator

DeRiggi-Whitton. All those in favor of tabling, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: E30 this tabled. E38 is your last one.

MR. LIBERT: Would that be with
Genova Burns?
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Yes. Genova Burns.
MR. LIBERT: Chief Deputy Hiller is on his way down the aisle.

MR HILLER: Good afternoon. My name is John L. Hiller. I'm the Chief Deputy County Attorney. And with me is Harrison Clewell, Associate with the law firm Genova Burns.

What we present before this
Legislative Body is a personal services
$\qquad$
contract between the Nassau County Attorney's Office and the law firm of Genova Burns.

The history of this is back in the beginning of the year, it became public knowledge that the Governor of the state of New York was in the process of presenting two legislative bills, a Senate bill and an Assembly bill in which the proposal at that time was to change the voting dates from even years, as in presidential election to odd years. And with that change would bring about the voting of the Nassau County Executive, towns and Comptroller's Office to an odd year versus the even year they are presently in. It was felt that as we as we heard --

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: From odd to even. MR HILLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: You just flipped it. It's okay. Go on. Please.

MR HILLER: From the even to odd. CHAIRMAN KOPEL: No. The other way
around.
MR HILLER: I'm sorry. From the even to odd.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: One of those.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: No, you
should have it right for the record. You're going from odd to even.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: I think we've got it.

MR HILLER: Excuse me. Voting for the County Executive, County Legislature would go from the odd years to the even years. The even years being the same as the federal elections and the state higher elections. It would result in amending several laws. This was a discussion at the time. It would be amending town laws, village laws, county laws, Municipal Home Rule laws. The initial impression was that this was an unconstitutional presentation. The Legislature, December 22 nd of last year approved that legislation. It's effective in year 2026 .

When we first recognized the process, the presentation to the Legislature, we felt that in the interests of the County of Nassau, we had to follow closely the developments of at that time proposals, and again, the center of our attention was the constitutionality of the proposals and the ultimate enactment of the proposals.

We looked at our panel of outside -we first looked inside, and we felt that in the County Attorney's Office, there was nobody that really possessed, including myself and the County Attorney, possessed the knowledge and the level of understanding of these constitutional issues. We then examined our panel of outside counsel, and we could not find on our panel any firm that had a history of examining and challenging at constitutional issues at this level.

We then went on a search of an attorney or a law firm that we felt would have possessed the background, the
reputation and the knowledge of these constitutional issues. And we came across and we knew of, because they're so well and highly regarded, this particular law firm. This law firm has a history, almost three decades of this type of representation of municipal bodies, municipal authorities, and the examination and challenging of constitutional questions at this level.

We were presented here an agreement that has had a little paperwork history backlog. Again, we go back to the beginning of the year, when we first realized of the pending legislation and the likelihood that this legislation would pass, and further likelihood that upon passing it, the Governor would sign it. So when we recognized that, we then, having settled on Genova Burns as the most preeminent firm in this area, we contacted them. We actually proposed to them a contract back in March of last year. And in our proposals, as you are
probably well aware, there's a tremendous amount of paperwork that goes in to getting these contracts in a form that we can present to this Body. It requires extensive disclosure forms.

This firm, by the way, has offices and practices in two states, New York and New Jersey. So when we began the process of formulating the contract and presenting the contract to this firm, the disclosure process took on quite a bit of work because of the different members of the firm and the two states. Finally, it was settled on we would just contract with the New York presence of the law firm.

In that process, it took more than six months from the receipt of the disclosures to getting the contract ready to present. The six months made the disclosures stale. So we had to go back to the firm and get updated in new disclosures. That brings us pretty much to where we are now, where we're seeking
an approval of a contract in the amount of $\$ 500,000$, with an initial encumbrance of a $\$ 150,000$.

Since it's a sole source, since
there was no other consideration once we found no other prospective law firm. It was advertised and published in Newsday. It was reviewed and approved by the Chief procurement officer, Mr. Cleary. We come before this Body seeking your approval of our contract.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Thank you. Arnie?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Mr.
Hiller. Appreciate the clarification.
It's comforting to us when the County
Attorney is coming before us to advance
the legal argument and understands the
actual legislation itself, that it's
going from odd years to even years. But
that's beside the point.
MR HILLER: Odd to even. Yes, sir.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: It's my
understanding that before the
Administration can procure or attempt to

ask this Body to approve contracts that there's a correlation between need, public want, necessity. What data did the County Attorney or the Administration for that matter, obtain to justify or lead them to the conclusion that a lawsuit is necessary on behalf of all of the taxpayers in Nassau County? Can you tell me that? Can you share that?

MR HILLER: I don't know exactly how
to frame an answer with respect to data.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Is data
relevant?
MR HILLER: We feel it was very
relevant. One of the highlights in a relevancy is that if you have a ballot that has all the federal high state elections and now the local elections, there's a term that I had not heard before. As a voter goes into the voting booth or the voting boxes as we know it now, there's a term that reflects the concern. It's called ballot fatigue. And there's an absolute concern that the
lower part of the ballot will not receive the actual attention of the upper, higher part of the ballot. And the importance at a local level could be lost by virtue of just the overwhelming form that's going to be presented to the voter.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: That's a conclusion. How did you reach that conclusion? Was there any data that supported that?

MR HILLER: It's a concern more than a conclusion, sir.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So we're asked to support a vote for a contract based on your concern?

MR HILLER: Yes, sir.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay, so you mentioned your panel. Who comprises your panel?

MR HILLER: A solicitation process that is published, at least now, on an annual basis, in which we invite law firms.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: That's not my
question. My question is who's on your internal panel? And then you had an outside panel. Who are they?

MR HILLER: The internal panel is the County Attorney.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Anyone else? MR HILLER: I believe officially he may seek advices from his staff, but the County Attorney is the one who would be the primary assessor of people that would be that would be solicited -- it's an open solicitation, it's published. But when the responses come in, it would be the County Attorney who would decide whether or not the response is sufficient, or poor choice of words, "worthy" to be placed on our panel.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Just to be clear, though, you mentioned a panel, so the panel just consists of one person.

MR HILLER: I don't know what the plural is for panel other than panels, but we refer to a panel as a classification of attorneys --


Excuse me.
(Whereupon, brief off the record discussion.)

MR HILLER: Mr. Libert says that I misunderstood your question.

As the responses come in internally, they are kind of sorted into categories. And those categories are what I'm -- my word is "panels".

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Do you know any members other than the County Attorney who or a member of these vertical panels?

MR HILLER: No, sir. When I'm using the word panel, it's the firms that are plugged in by topic or expertise.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'm not sure I understand how that is a panel.

MR HILLER: That was my poor choice of words.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So do you want to change the word to another word besides --

MR HILLER: Category?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So you consulted

a category?

MR HILLER: No. We reviewed the responses and placed them in categories.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So where were those responses. Was there a gathering?

MR HILLER: It's what's called a rolling solicitation. It's out there, for lack of a better word, to the world to reply.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: How many members of the world replied?

MR HILLER: I would say we have on the different again, not calling them categories, we have approximately -- I'm trying to visualize the spreadsheet -- we have approximately somewhere close to two dozen different categories.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Two dozen. Can we get that printout?

MR HILLER: Absolutely.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay.
A year ago, you mentioned that the County Executive, the Administration was looking to seek and engage outside

counsel for this.
MR HILLER: Initially, we became aware of the potential legislation and we felt that it should be examined. Yes.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Did any did any member of this Legislative Body or staff or anybody on this Body, were they made aware that the Administration was looking to do this?

MR HILLER: Not to my knowledge. So this was done in a cloud of secrecy a year ago.

MR HILLER: I wouldn't call it a cloud of secrecy.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay.
Based on your testimony, you stated that you have about two dozen responses in your solicitation of the world to comment on this.

MR HILLER: No, I said two dozen categories.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I asked you -okay, so of the two dozen categories, how many responses did you get from the
world?
MR HILLER: I can't tell you. Out ignorance $I$ can't tell you.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'm sorry.
MR HILLER: Out of ignorance, I can't tell you.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: That's not very comforting. You want this Body to approve money for law firm based on what? It's such an amorphous thing here.

MR HILLER: It's not amorphous if, in fact, it's an unconstitutional act of the Legislature.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: According to who?

MR HILLER: According to our scholarly thought process.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Entirely subjective. You have your own people you speak to. I'm sure that there are people that the other side can speak to that disagree. Would you say that?

MR HILLER: I would.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay, so based
$\qquad$ $39=$
on that speculation on your part, your expert's part, you're looking to have every single taxpayer pay for a contract to support an opinion about a piece of legislation that the Governor and the State Legislature approved.

MR HILLER: It's beyond opinion at this point. We feel the black letter -LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: You keep saying feel. You keep saying feel. We feel, we feel, we feel.

MR HILLER: I'll try not to use that word again. It was and it is our collective opinion that based on our understanding of the State and Federal Constitution, that this legislation is unconstitutional.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: All right. We keep going around in circles. Instead of feel, you said it's our collective opinion. It's kind of the same thing.

MR HILLER: I'm just trying to stay on the same page with you.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: But we're just
looking for empirical data to support why taxpayers should have to pay for this.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Arnie, would you allow me to jump in for a moment?

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I don't have any further questions. Let me finish my thing.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Sure. Of course. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So that's my comment. I think that the taxpayers, this entire Legislative Body deserve some sort of justification empirically as to why we should pay for this.

MR HILLER: Well, empirically, I think on its face, it merits our concern.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: On its face is according to your expert's opinion.

MR HILLER: That's correct.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Basically, what I
what I would respond to you is, my
feeling, and that is that $I$ want to get away from the constitutional question for
a moment here. And that is let's look at the effect on the County and on the voters. And that is a proper County concern. If we move it from -- and I think they started out with this --if they move the ballot years from odd to even, the County Legislature, for instance, will be so far down the ballot, nobody's going to even pay attention to it at all. The County issues, which are very important to all of us here, get lost. They get lost in the fight over the presidential election or the senatorial or the governor's election. Those are proper County issues. At that point, I think it is not only okay, it is necessary for the County to look into it and see if there is a proper and valid basis for challenging that change. And that is precisely what this firm here is being engaged to do. They're being engaged to make sure that we can indeed go into court and challenge on a constitutional or other basis, the
change in the ballot that is going to degrade the concerns of the County relative to other concerns that are going on. And that is and that is the reason for this contract, as I understand it. Would that be a fair statement? MR HILLER: Yes, sir. It's better spoken than I could.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: But you just basically elaborated and amplified what Mr. Hiller was saying, which is fine. Except again, and I respect your thinking, and I've heard this argument before, and I've heard both sides of the argument, and I respect what you're saying. But once again, it's an opinion. And you're now asking the entire Legislature, the Administration is asking the entire Legislature to approve something that may be just an opinion of a portion of certainly this Legislative Body and maybe a portion, the percentage of which of the countywide is unclear. Is that fair to say? I lost you again.
$\qquad$

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: It's okay. By the way, Mr. Ferretti, next.

We do that all the time. We approve contracts and and other items that a significant portion of the Legislature may disagree with. We do it all the time. That's our job. We vote.

Mr. Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Good afternoon, Mr. Hiller. How are you?

MR HILLER: Good afternoon, sir.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I want to make sure I heard you right. Is it a fair statement that in the Administration and the County Attorney's judgment, there's been an unconstitutional and illegal action taken by the State Legislature in passing this.

MR HILLER: Yes, sir.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: That's a yes?
MR HILLER: Yes, sir.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Okay. I would submit that it's our obligation if we feel something is unconstitutional to
pursue this. Let me ask you, are we the only county that has brought a lawsuit as a result of this?

MR HILLER: There's been no lawsuit brought. There is a coalition of counties that are in the process of commencing such a lawsuit.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Similar to us.
MR HILLER: Yes, sir. The only
difference is our county charter is a little bit more unique than the other counties that are anticipating litigation. So we're standing on our own two feet at this point. But there is absolute commitment by other counties to commence litigation.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So it's the opinion of the Administration and the County Attorney that the state law is unconstitutional. Can you elaborate on that a little bit?

MR HILLER: I'll defer to counsel here, since I already admitted my lack of expertise. I think I got a "C" in common
$\qquad$
law in law school, which was over 50 years ago.

MR. CLEWELL: Thank you, everyone. I want to stay pretty general just because I don't want to get into the internal legal strategy.

It is the enforcement of the County's rights under the county charter itself and under Article 2 of the New York State Constitution.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I can't help but think listening to this that especially since you've already encumbered $\$ 150,000$; is that correct?

MR HILLER: We are going to encumber it if the Legislature approves it at this time.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: That's not what I heard. Okay.

In my opinion, this is something that taxpayer money should not be paying for. I mean, if it's your preference to
hold elections on odd years rather than even, that's something that possibly a party should take up. Not Nassau County residents. When you look at some of the data, nearly 70\% of Americans favor voting local elections the same time national elections are held. And the voter turnout historically is also much higher on even numbered years, consistently with a higher voter turnout. Marschall versus Lippie, 2018. I have the notated studies and/or cases if you want them. Basically, the voter fatigue I think comes from having elections every year. Voter fatigue going down a ballot, I have never seen any empirical study showing that that would be a constitutional reason to try to fight this decision that the State made and the Governor signed. It used to be this way. I would have to say possibly misspoke during his speech. It was not always on odd years. Up until 1973, that's when they went to odd years. So having it on
even years, $I$ just think it's a preference as to how many -- there are studies that show certain geographical areas come out more on non-presidential years. I'm just afraid that right now we're asking the county taxpayers to pay for a lawsuit that might influence the possible results of elections based on what year we vote on. And just because one party doesn't like those results, doesn't mean that the taxpayers should have the burden of half $\$ 1$ million to be put on this.

I mean, look, if you have a problem or if someone's not happy with it, that's a real political issue. Not a governmental issue. It's political. It's basically based on the outcome. We have all this background. Again, I think that we're the only county right now that's opposing it. It's very clear what's happening. I'm not surprised that there was a lawsuit because I knew that people wouldn't be happy with this change. But I

never thought in a million years you'd be asking the county taxpayers to pay for it.

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Just to clarify point. It was not the case that we always held elections even numbered years. Until 1973, the County Executive and the District Attorney were held on three year terms, not four year terms. So, for example, county executive elections in 1961, 1964, 1967, 1970 and 1973 when we first won the four year term. So because of that odd three year cycle, some years would be odd, sometimes even, but it was not always even. And again, starting in '73 we went to four year terms on the odd cycle. Just clarify that.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can I just clarify? That's not what $I$ said. It's what the County Executive said in his speech.

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: I'm just correcting everyone that I'm a history
geek.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: That's right. It was three year terms, but it wasn't always an odd years, as he stated in his speech.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you. Hi. Good day.

You stated that we're out ahead of every other county because our charter is unique in some way.

MR HILLER: I said we are considering ourselves independent of the other lawsuits because we feel that in looking at our charter and looking at the charters and the other counties that are entertaining legislation, our charter is different and a little bit more unique. So at this point, our thought process is, if we commence the lawsuit, we will commence it on our own behalf and not align align Nassau County with the other counties that are considering litigation.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Okay. Can you describe, give some examples or
$\qquad$ 50
illustrate what makes us unique from the other counties?

MR. CLEWELL: Again, $I$ just want to be general here. I would say how the charter was created, the Nassau County charter was created under a different, for lack of a better word, precedent that some of these other charters were not. And as a result, it's afforded different rights accordingly.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So you're not being specific intentionally.

MR. CLEWELL: I just would prefer not to get into legal strategy. I'm happy to answer that in Executive Session.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: That's exactly it. It's going to trigger my request for an Executive Session. Because you stated, in some way, you're trying to protect the County in its attempt to bring this case to court. And we are the County, so we need to understand what the strategy is. Because I'm left outside of understanding
the strategy and outside of understanding the violation of the Constitution in your frame of mind. I'm left to ask who is the aggrieved party? And it's the aggrieved party that should be then bringing a case in court. And I need to understand how the County is the aggrieved party. So I'm requesting that we go to --

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Legislator Bynoe
moves for Executive Session -- moves to
table the item pending Executive Session.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Actually, I'm just thinking.
(Whereupon, off the record
discussion.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Legislator Bynoe moves to take this item into Executive Session.

MR HILLER: We're prepared to do that now.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Legislator McKevitt seconds. All those in favor of Executive Session, please say, "Aye".
$\qquad$
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(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Now we're going to Executive Session, into which I'm going to invite legislators only. No staff. Members of Rules only.
(Whereupon, Executive
Session, 2:08-2:21 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Rules Committee back. Rules committee back. And we're going to now take a vote on one item. One item only, which is item E38. All those in favor of item E38, please so indicate by saying aye.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Aye.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Aye.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Those opposed?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Nay.
$\qquad$

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Nay.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Nay.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: So it's 4 to 3.
That item passes.
Now what I'm going to do is out of order here I'm going to call another item which is we're going to take a motion now to untable E30. Legislator Ferretti moves to untable, Legislator McKevitt seconds. All those in favor of untabling E30, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: All right.
Legislator Kennedy moves for Executive Session on E30, that is seconded by Legislator Drucker. All those in favor of Executive Session for E30, for that item, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
$\qquad$ $54=$


CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. We're back.
The next group, the rest, will be with Public Works. Ken, sorry to keep you waiting, but here we go.

Go straight down the list. Start with B4-24.

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Good afternoon. Ken Arnold, Public Works.

B4 is a construction contract to make traffic safety improvements on Cuttermill Road in Great Neck. Five proposals were received, with GGG Construction as being the lowest responsible bidder at a bit of $\$ 2.22$ million, slightly above the engineer's estimate; $5 \%$ of the work will go to WBE.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Anyone have questions, just jump in. Anyone?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: I'll do five
and six together. So B5 and B6 are construction contracts associated with

the Department's 2024 resurfacing program. These two contracts account for about 80 lane miles of resurfacing. Both had six bidders each. In both cases, H\&L was the lowest possible bidder.

For B5, the bid was $\$ 6$ million, below engineers estimate, and the WMBE is at $17 \%$.

For B6, the bid was $\$ 5.69$ million, also below the engineer's estimate, WBE at $17 \%$.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. Keep on going as long as no one's asking questions.

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: The next one is B8, a construction contract for the rehabilitation of digesters at Cedar Creek Sewage Treatment plant. This project will reconstruct three of the nine digesters at the facility. Four bids received and WHM Plumbing and heating was the lowest possible bidder at $\$ 30.8$ million, slightly higher than the engineer's estimate. MWBE is at $0.5 \%$.

Next one is E 31 is a professional service --

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: E25.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Sorry. Yes. The untabled one.

E25 is a professional services contract with on call civil engineering design firms. The Department received 24 proposals. Review was done looking at four subcategories: Bridge, drainage, roadway and parks work. The top tech ranked firms in each subcategory was selected by the Technical Review Committee. GPI was selected for work associated with bridges. The contract has a multiplier of 2.75. It's a four year contract with a $\$ 10$ million cap.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Ken, do you remember why that was tabled?

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: I think there was information still from the IG that had to come, had to be resolved, which to my understanding it has been.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Okay.
$\qquad$

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Go on, please.
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: E31 is a
professional services contract for CMS services associated with the Cuttermill

Road safety project I mentioned earlier.
There were 15 responses to the
solicitation. LKB was technically ranked as significantly higher than the other proposals, and as such, the cost of 598 was accepted as the responsible bidder. The MWBE at $26 \%$.

E32 is a contract amendment for Hardesty \& Hanover related to CM services for the Bayville Bridge. The amendment is for six additional month extension and an increase of cost of $\$ 839,000$ for capacity.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can I just ask you what you're doing with the bridge now? I get asked all the time, even though it's not my district.

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: So we're on the second full closure of the bridge,
$\qquad$ $59=$
which is the mechanical replacement of the leaf, so that we could not do that with the bridge open. That's why we split into two pieces. I forget what leaf we're doing, but we're replacing the mechanicals on that leaf. This is a 35 day shutdown. There's incentives to get it done on time and penalties if they don't. And the last update I got, we are on schedule.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: In
other words, it's under the bridge. Or where are they doing the work?

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: It's the
mechanicals of the leaf itself. So they
take the leaf, they disconnect the leaf and they replace pieces and parts inside the leaf.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Next one's E33
is for professional design services
associated with the mitigation and
rehabilitation of sewage pump stations in

the City of Long Beach. This is being done as part of the IMA, where the County will be responsible for the operation of the collection and disposal of facilities of Long Beach once the diversion is completed.

Four firms submitted proposals, and Cameron was ranked as one of the highest technically ranked firms. The Technical Review Committee evaluated costs of the highest ranked firms, and determined that at a cost of 942, that Cameron was the best value. Combined WMBE is $24 \%$, and it should be noted that this is fully federally funded through FEMA.

E34 is a professional services contract search CM services for the Cedar Creek Digester Project I mentioned earlier. This contract covers both this phase of the digesters and additional phase that will be bid later next year. Each phase will be three digesters.

Seven firms submitted proposals and De Bruin, being the highest technically
ranked firm, was determined by the Technical Review Committee to offer the best value at a cost of $\$ 5.72$ million. MWBE for this project is $5 \%$.

E39 is a professional services contract for $C M$ services associated with our Long Beach Road Drainage and Traffic Safety Project. That construction contract went to this Body previously.

Thirteen firms submitted proposals and Gannett Fleming was determined by the Technical Review Committee to be the highest ranked firm and provided a sufficient cost proposal at a value of $\$ 807,000$. MWBE for this project is $21 \%$. CHAIRMAN KOPEL: All right. Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Did you do 37?
COMMISSIONER ARNOLD: Thirty seven is Kevin.
$\qquad$

RULES COMMITTEE 03.11.2024

Legislators. Kevin Walsh from the Office of Real Estate Services.

Item E37 is an amendment to one of our on call appraisal contracts with Standard (sic) Valuation Services. The contract is typically $\$ 20,000$ a year. We've added 100,000 cap to this contract to assist the Assessment Department with the appraisal of the UBS arena, which many of you probably know is a state owned property. Actually, Empire State Development owns it. The County Charter requires it to be assessed.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Notwithstanding that it's not taxed.

MR. K. WALSH: Correct.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any questions?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay. Thank you.
So we're going to vote first on just E30.

All those in favor of E 30 , please so indicate by saying, "Aye".

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Aye.
LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Aye.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Aye.
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Aye.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any abstained?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We're abstaining.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: All right. So it's 4-0-3.

All right. I'm calling the rest of them:

E22; E35; E36; U1; E26; E28; E29;
E30; E38; B4; B5; B6; B8; E25; E31; E32;
E33; E34; E37 and E39.
All those in favor of those items, please say, "Aye".
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(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Those items pass unanimously.

I am now putting the Rules Committee and recess.

Public safety is next.
(Whereupon, recess, $2: 45$
p.m.- 4:11 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Okay, we're back to Rules. First of all, there's a motion to suspend the Rules made by Mr. McKevitt, seconded by Mr. Ferretti.

All those in favor of suspending the rules, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in
favor with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal

response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Those items pass unanimously.

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: The Rules are suspended.

I'm going to call consent items on the main Calendar: $45,46,47,48,49$, $50,51,52,56 ;$ on the Addendum: 59, 60, 61, 62 .

All those in favor of those items, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor with, "Aye".)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Those items pass unanimously.

MR. LEIMONE: Did you call 54?
LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: I'm recused.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Now, 54. Legislator McKevitt is recusing himself. He did not take part in the discussion or debate and
$\qquad$ $66=$
will not vote.
(Whereupon, Legislator McKevitt leaves the Chambers.) CHAIRMAN KOPEL: All in favor of item 54, say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members present of the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye".) CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: That is 6-0.
Legislator McKevitt should come back now, please.
(Whereupon, Legislator McKevitt returns to Chambers.) CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Number 57 is a resolution to confirm the County Executive's appointment of Charles G. McQuair as Judge of the District Court. Motion by Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Legislator Bynoe.

Any debate or discussion on that? LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Are
they going to be here in person?
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Yes. That's what
I'm just asking, I suppose.
MR. LEIMONE: Chris Leimone. Yes.
They'll both be here at Full Legislature.
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: All right. Thank
you.
That being the case, all those in
favor of moving this on, please say,
"Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in
favor with, "Aye". )
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Unanimous.


RULES COMMITTEE 03.11.2024

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Number 58 is confirming the appointment of Robert Hughes, the Nassau County Vocational Education Extension Board.

There's a motion by Legislator Drucker, seconded by Deputy Presiding Officer McKevitt.

All those in favor of Item 58, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye". )

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: That item is unanimous.

Now all together 63, 64, 65 and 66, all in favor of those four items, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye". )

CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Those opposed?
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(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Those are passed unanimously.

That does it. Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer Ferretti moves to adjourn, Alternate Minority Leader Drucker seconds the motion.

All those in favor of adjourning, please say, "Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of the Rules Committee respond in favor with, "Aye". ) CHAIRMAN KOPEL: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.)
CHAIRMAN KOPEL: We are adjourned.
Thank you.
(Whereupon, the Rules
Committee is adjourned, 4:16
p.m.)
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| $\mathbf{s}_{[1]}-18: 10$ | Agreements ${ }^{\text {[2] }}$ | anyway $_{11}-25: 20$ | ARNOLD ${ }_{[11]}$ |
| admitted | 5:14, 5:16 | apologize ${ }_{(11}$ - | 2:10, 56:8, 56:23, |
| $45: 24$ | ahead $_{[1]}-50: 9$ | 14:25 | 58:5, |
| advance ${ }_{[2]}$ - | aisle $_{[1]}-26: 18$ | applause ${ }_{[1]}$ | 58:21, 59:4, |



| bodies $_{[1]}-30: 8$ | 4:2, 9:22, 10:3, | center ${ }_{\text {[1] }}-29: 8$ | 64:11, 64:14, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Body ${ }_{\text {[12] }}$-12:18, | 11:7, 11:14, | certain ${ }_{[1]}-48: 4$ | 64:17, 65:5, 65:8, |
| 14:14, 26:25, | 11:24, 12:17, | certainly ${ }_{[2]}$ - | 65:15, 65:24, |
| 31:5, 32:11, 33:2, | 13:5, 25:6, 25:18, | 22:8, 43:22 | 66:3, 66:5, 66:16, |
| 38:7, 38:8, 39:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 7,50: 24, \\ & 51: 12,51: 18, \end{aligned}$ | Certified ${ }_{(1)}$ - | 66:19, 66:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 41: 12,43: 2 \\ & 62: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 52:13, 54:3 | 18:13 | 67:13, 67:18, |
| booking ${ }_{\text {[2] }}$ - | C | CHAIRMA | 68:3, 68:7, $68: 1$ $68: 18,69 \cdot 2$ |
| booth $_{[1]}-33: 22$ | Calab | 1:10, 2:4, 2:5, 3:2, | 9:14, 69:17, |
| boxes $_{[1]}-33: 22$ | 5:24 | 3:9, 3:17, 4:17, | 69:25, 70:4, |
| Brian ${ }_{[3]}$-20:6, | Calendar ${ }_{[11}-66: 8$ | 4:20, 6:13, 6:16 | 70:15, 70:18 |
| 23:3, 25:19 | Cameron ${ }_{[3]}$ | 8:13, 8:16, 9:2, | Chairman |
| bridge $_{\text {[5] }}-58: 11$, | 5:20, 61:9, 61:13 | 9:21, 13:6, 13:9, | challenge |
| 59:22, 59:25, | cannot ${ }_{[1]}-24:$ | 14:2, 15:7, 15:12, | 42:24 |
| 60:4, 60:13 | $\mathbf{c a p}_{[2]}-58: 18$, | 23, 17:2, 18:2, | challenging |
| Bridge ${ }_{11}-59: 16$ | 63:9 | 18:18, 19:17, | 29:21, 30:10, |
| bridges $_{\text {(11) }}-58: 16$ | capacity ${ }_{[2]}-24: 6$, | 20:2, 20:16, | 42:20 |
| brief $_{[1]}-36: 3$ | 59:19 | $21: 10,21: 13$ | Chambers ${ }_{[2]}$ - |
| bring $_{\text {[2] }}-27: 14$, | CAPECE $^{[4]}$ - 9:4, | 21:22, 24:15, | 67:4, 67:17 |
| 51:22 ${ }^{\text {bringing }}$-52.6 | 9:25, 10:7, 11:21 Capece [2] | 25:3, 25:5, 25:16, | change ${ }_{[6]}-27: 11$, |
| bringing $_{\text {[1] }}-52: 6$ | Capece ${ }_{[2]}-9: 5$, | 25:19, 25:24, | 27:14, 36:22, |
| brings $_{[1]}-31: 24$ |  | 26:9, 26:12 | 42:20, 43:2, 48:25 |
| brought $_{[2]}$-45:3, | caption $_{\text {(1] }}-23: 14$ | 26:16, 27:20, | Charles ${ }_{[1]}-67: 20$ |
| 45:6 | case $_{(4)}$ - 49:6, | 27:22, 27:25, | Charter $_{[1]}-63: 14$ |
| Bruin ${ }_{[2]}-5: 21$, | 51:22, 52:6, 68:9 | 28:5, 28:9, 32:13 | charter ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 45:11, |
| 61:25 | cases $_{[7]}-9: 18$, | 41:4, 41:9, 41:22, | 6:9, 50:10, |
| Building $_{11}-1: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 19,10: 10,11: 8, \\ & 12: 4,47: 13,57: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 44:2, 52:10, 52:14, 52:18, | 50:15, 50:17, |
| burden $_{(1)}-48: 13$ | categories ${ }^{[77}$ - | 52:23, 53:5, 53:8, | 51:6, 51:7 |
| Burns ${ }_{[6]}-5: 23$, | $36: 8,36: 9,37: 4 \text {, }$ | 53:14, 53:20, | charters ${ }_{\text {[2] }}$ - |
| 26:15, 26:16, | 37:15, 37:18, | 53:24, 54:4, | 50:16, 51:9 check $_{11}$ - 19:11 |
| 26:23, 27:4, 30:21 | 38:22, 38:24 | 54:16, 54:19, | Chif |
| BY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:24 | category ${ }_{[2]}$ - | 55:4, 56:2, 56:18, $56 \cdot 22$ 57:13, | Chief ${ }_{[3]}$-26:17, 26:20, 32:9 |
| Bynoe ${ }_{[6]}-3: 25$, | 36:24, 37:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 22,57: 13, \\ & 58: 4,59: 3,62: 17, \end{aligned}$ | choice ${ }_{[2]}-35: 17$, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:3, 26:2, 52:10, } \\ & 52: 18,67: 23 \end{aligned}$ | Cedar ${ }_{[2]}-57: 18$, | 62:21, 63:16, | 36:19 |
| BYNOE ${ }_{[7]} \mathbf{- 2 : 9 ,}$ | 61:18 | 63:19, 64:2, 64:7, | Chris ${ }_{[1]}-68: 5$ |


| circles $_{[1]}-40: 20$ | collective ${ }_{\text {[2] }}$ - | Committee ${ }_{[24]}$ - | 12:18, 33:24, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City ${ }_{[11}$-61:2 | 40:15, 40:21 | 3:10, 3:19, 6:11, | $33: 25,34: 12,$ |
| civil $_{11}-58: 8$ | College ${ }_{[3]}$ - | 8:11, 25:21, 26:7, | $34: 16,41: 16,42: 5$ |
| clarification ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 24:18, 24:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 3,53: 14, \\ & 54: 14,55: 2, \end{aligned}$ | concerns ${ }^{2}$ $43: 3,43: 4$ |
| 32:15 | 25:12 <br> Combined | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 14,55: 2, \\ & 58: 15,61: 11, \end{aligned}$ | conclusion |
| clarify ${ }_{[3]}-49: 6$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Combined }_{[1]} \\ & 61: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 62:3, 62:13, 65:3, | 33:7, 34:9, 34:10, |
| 49:18, | comforting | 65:10, 65:22, | 34:13 |
| $-35: 25$ | 32:16, 39:9 | 66:14, 67:8, | conduct ${ }_{11}$ |
| classified $_{[1]}-7: 9$ | coming ${ }_{[2]}-11: 20$, | 69:23, 70 | 18:12 |
| clean $_{[3]}-9: 13$, | 32:17 | 70:22 | nducted ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 9:18, 10:12 | commence | COMMITTEES ${ }_{[1]}$ | confidential |
| cleaned $^{11}$ - 10:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:17, 50:20, } \\ & 50: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $-1: 4$ | 24:11 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { clear }_{\text {} 33}-16: 22, \\ 35: 20,48: 22 \end{gathered}$ | commencing | committees ${ }_{[1]}$ - 4:23 | confirm $_{[1]}-67: 19$ |
| Cleary ${ }_{[1]}-32: 10$ | 14:16, 45:8 | Committees ${ }_{[1]}$ - | confirming ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| CLERK $_{[8]}-3: 20$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { comment }_{[2]} \\ & 38: 20,41: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | connected |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 24,4: 3,4: 6,4: 9 \\ & 4: 12,4: 15,4: 18 \end{aligned}$ | Commissioner | $\begin{aligned} & \text { common } \\ & \text { [15:25- } \end{aligned}$ | 9:15 |
| Clerk $_{[1]}-2: 12$ | 9:5, 9:24, | Community | consent ${ }_{[1]}-66: 7$ |
| CLEWELL ${ }_{[3]}$ - |  | 24:18, 24:22, | onsideration ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ |
| 46:4, 51:4, 51:14 |  | 25:12 |  |
| Clewell $_{[1]}-26: 22$ | 10:7, 11:21, 14:5, | companies | $50: 13,50: 23$ |
| close $_{11}-37: 17$ | 15:9, 15:14, | company ${ }_{11}$ - | consistently ${ }_{(11)}$ - |
| closely ${ }_{11}$ - 29:6 | 15:17, 15:24, | 22:20 | 47:11 |
| closure $_{11}-59: 25$ | 16:9, 16:15, 17:3, |  | consists ${ }_{\text {ald }}$ |
| cloud $_{[2]}-38: 12$, | 8 8, | $10: 15$ | 35:2 |
| 38:15 | 57:16, 58:5 <br> 58:21, 59:4 | eted | Constitution |
| CM ${ }_{[3]}$ - 59:15, | $59: 24,60: 15,$ | 61:7 | 40:17, 46:11, 52:3 |
| 61:18, 62:7 | $60: 22,62: 22$ | comprises | constitutional ${ }_{[]]}$ |
| CMS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 59:5 | commitment $_{111}$ - | 34:19 | 29:17, 29:2 |
| coalition ${ }_{[1]}-45: 6$ | 45:16 | Comptroller $_{[3]}$ - | 0:3, 30:1 |
| Coliseum ${ }_{[2]}$ - | committee | 18:17, 18:23, 19:4 | 5, 42:2 |
| 21:4, 21:7 | $53: 15$ | Comptroller's | 47:19 |
| $\mathrm{collection}_{\text {[1] }}$ - | COMMITTEE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $-27: 16$ | nstitutionalit |
| 61:5 | 1:13 | ncern | $\mathbf{y}_{(1)}$ - $29: 9$ |



| defense $_{\text {(1] }}-23: 5$ | 2:8, 4:5, 15:15, | 31:6, 31:12 | 33:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| defer $_{[1]}-45: 23$ | 15:18, 16:3, | disclosures ${ }_{[31}$ - | 3:1 |
| degrade $_{[1]}-43: 3$ |  | 31:20, 31:22, |  |
| delay ${ }_{(11}-22: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 22,28: 6 \\ & 46: 14,46: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 31:24 | $5: 7,35: 19$ |
| delays ${ }_{[3]}-22: 18$ | -3 | $\begin{array}{r} 60: 17 \end{array}$ | 36:2 |
| 23:23 | 8:1 |  | 7:1 |
| -4:4 | 25, 59:20 | discuss 22:9, 24:20 | 37: |
| DELIA $_{\text {[1] }}-2: 8$ | 60:12, 60:20 | 22.9, 24.20 | 38:16 |
| Dem | de | 8, 36:4 | 39: |
| Departmen | $50:$ | 2:17, 66:25 | 40: |
| 58 | deserve $_{11}-41: 12$ |  | 0:19, 40:2 |
| Department's ${ }_{\text {(1] }}$ $-57: 2$ | $\operatorname{design}_{[3]}-22: 12,$ 58:9, 60:23 | utes ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 41:17, 41:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Departments }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 12:24 } \end{aligned}$ | designer 22:15 | District $_{[2]}-49: 9$ | 43:10, 44:23, 54:2 <br> Drucker $_{[6]}-3: 22$, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deputy }_{[6]}-6: 24, \\ & \text { 18:4, 26:17, } \\ & 26: 20,69: 7,70: 6 \end{aligned}$ | details ${ }_{(1]}-24: 20$ determined ${ }_{[3]}$ - 61:12, 62:2, 62:12 | district $_{[21}-25: 1$ <br> 59:23 <br> diversion $_{111}$. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:7, 70:9 } \\ & \text { during } \\ & \text { 47:23 - 25:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { DeRiggi }{ }_{[3]}-4: 4$ 6:20, 26:4 | Development ${ }_{11}$ $-63: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:6 } \\ & \text { done }_{[7}-11: 16, \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{4}$ |
| DERIGGI ${ }_{[21]}-2: 8$, | developments ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 29:6 | 12:3, 12:15, | E22 ${ }_{[2]}$ - 6:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4: 5,15: 15,15: 18 \text {, } \\ & 16: 3,16: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -29: 6 \\ & \text { difference } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 12,58: 10, \\ & 60: 9,61: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 64:21 |
|  |  |  | e22-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 1$ |
| 28:6, 46:14,$46: 21,49: 20$, | different | $\begin{gathered} \text { down }_{[4]}-26: 18, \\ 42: 9,47: 16,56: 6 \end{gathered}$ | $5_{\text {[5] }}-6: 8,6: 17$ |
|  | 31:13, 37:14 | $\text { dozen }_{\operatorname{sj}]}-37: 18,$ | 58:4, 58:7, 64 |
| 50:3, 53:25, |  | 37:19, 38:18, | E25-24 ${ }_{[1]}$-6:5 |
| $58: 19,58: 25$,$59: 20,60: 12$, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18,50: 18 \\ & 51: 7,51: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | E26 ${ }_{[3]}$ - 20:4, 20:8, |
|  | Digester ${ }_{[1]}$ | $38: 21,38: 24$ | 64:21 |
| 60:20, 64:15 |  | Drainage ${ }_{[1]}-62: 8$ drainage $_{111}$ - | E26-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 10$ |
| DeRiggi- | 61:19 <br> digesters | drainage ${ }_{[1]}-$ | 7 |
|  | 57:18, 57:21, | 58:11 <br> DRUCKER | E27-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 10$ |
| Whitton ${ }_{\text {[3] }}-4: 4$, 6:20, 26:4 | 61:21, 61:23 | DRUCKER ${ }_{[441}$ - 2:10, 3:23, 18:20, | $28_{[3]}-20$ |
| 6:20, 26:4 DERIGGI- | disagree ${ }_{[2]}$ | $19: 6,19: 13,23: 3$ | 21:3, 64:2 |
| DERIGGI- <br> WHITTON $_{[21]}$ | 39:23, 44:7 | 19.6, 19.13, 23.3, | 8-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 10$ |
|  | disclosure | 24:13, 32:14 | E29 ${ }_{[3]}-20: 24$, |


| 21:13, 64:21 | E39-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 13$ | enforcement ${ }_{[2]}$ - | exact $^{11}{ }^{11} 23: 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E29-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 11$ | Education ${ }_{[1]}$ | 10:14, 46:8 | exactly ${ }_{[3]}-23: 7$, |
| e30 ${ }_{[1]}-26: 12$ | 69:5 | engage ${ }_{[1]}-37: 25$ | 33:11, 51:18 |
| E30 ${ }_{\text {[9] }}$ - 20:24, | effect $^{[2]}$ - 24:2, | engaged ${ }_{[2]}$ - | examination ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 24:15, 54:9, | 42:3 | 42:22, 42:23 | 30:10 |
| 54:11, 54:21, | effective ${ }_{[1]}$ - | engaging ${ }_{[1]}$ - | examined $_{[2]}$ - |
| 54:23, 64:4, 64:5, | 28:24 | 12:20 | 29:18, 38:5 |
| 64:22 | elaborate ${ }_{[1]}$ | engineer's ${ }_{[3]}$ - | examining ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| E30-24 ${ }_{[2]}-5: 11$, | 45:21 | 56:16, 57:11, | 29:21 |
| 24:16 | elaborated ${ }_{[1]}$ | 57:25 | example ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| E31 ${ }_{[2]}-59: 4$, | 43:11 | Engineering ${ }_{[2]}$ - | 49:11 |
| 64:22 | election ${ }_{[3]}$ - | 5:21 | examples ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| E31-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 11$ | 27:13, 42:14, | engineering ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 50:25 |
| E32 ${ }_{[2]}-59: 14$, | 42:15 | 58:8 | exceed $^{[3]}$ - 14:20, |
| 64:22 | elections ${ }_{[11]}$ - | Engineers ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 14:22, 16:16 |
| E32-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 11$ | 28:15, 28:16, | 5:23 | Excel $_{[1]}-5: 21$ |
| E33 ${ }_{[2]}-60: 22$, | 33:19, 47:2, 47:7, | engineers ${ }_{[1]}$ - | except $^{[1]}$ - 43:13 |
| 64:23 | 47:8, 47:15, 48:9, | 57:8 | Excuse $_{[2]}-28: 11$, |
| E33-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 11$ | 49:7, 49:12 | ensure ${ }_{[1]}-23: 23$ | 36:2 |
| e34 ${ }_{[1]}-61: 17$ | eliminate ${ }_{[2]}$ - | entertaining ${ }_{[1]}$ - | Executive ${ }_{[17]}$ |
| E34 ${ }_{[1]}-64: 23$ | 9:15, 22:17 | 50:17 | 1:15, 27:15, |
| E34-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 12$ | Empire ${ }_{11}-63: 1$ empirical ${ }_{\text {12 }}$ - | entertainment ${ }_{[2]}$ | 28:12, 37:24, |
| E35 ${ }_{[2]}-9: 3,64: 21$ | $41: 2,47: 17$ | - 14:9, 15:22 | 49:8, 49:22, |
| E35-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 12$ | empirically | $\begin{gathered} \text { entire }_{[3]}-41: 12 \\ 43: 18,43: 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 16,51: 20, \\ & 52: 11,52: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { E36 }{ }_{[2]}-14: 3, \\ & 64: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $41: 13,41: 15$ | 43:18, $43: 20$ Entirely ${ }_{[1]}-39: 19$ | $52: 19,52: 24$ |
| E36-24 ${ }_{[2]}-5: 12$, | enactment ${ }_{[1]}$ - | especially ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 9,53: 12 \\ & 54: 20,54: 23,55: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $14: 7$ | e | 46:16 | executive ${ }_{[3]}$ - |
| E37 ${ }_{[2]}-63: 5$, | encumber ${ }_{[2]}$ | $\mathrm{ESRS}_{[1]}-15: 4$ | 25:17, 25:20, |
| 64:23 | encumbered ${ }_{111}$ - | Estate $_{[1]}-63: 4$ | 49:11 |
| E37-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 12$ | $46: 17$ | estimate $_{[4]}$ - | Executive's ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| E38 ${ }_{[4]}-26: 13$, | encumbrance ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 17,57: 8 \\ & 57: 11,57: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 67:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 53: 17,53: 18 \text {, } \\ & 64: 22 \end{aligned}$ | -32:3 | evaluated ${ }_{[2]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expert's }_{[2]}-40: 3, \\ & 41: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { E38-24 }{ }_{[1]}-5: 12$ | end ${ }_{[1]}-22: 25$ | $14: 11,61: 11$ | 41:18 |
| E38-24 ${ }_{[1]}-5: 12$ | $\text { ends }_{[3]}-10: 25$ | Events ${ }_{[3]}-5: 22$, | expertise ${ }_{[2]}$ |
| $\text { E39 }{ }_{[2]}-62: 6,$ | 11:17, 11:19 | $14: 4,14: 7$ | 36:16, 45:25 |


|  | 70:10, 70:14 <br> Federal $_{[11}-40: 16$ <br> federal ${ }_{[2]}-28: 15$, <br> 33:18 <br> federally ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 61:16 <br> feet ${ }_{[1]}-45: 15$ <br> felt ${ }_{5 \mathrm{l}=}-27: 18$, <br> 29:4, 29:12, <br> 29:24, 38:5 <br> FEMA $_{[1]}-61: 16$ <br> Ferretti ${ }_{[8]}-4: 10$, <br> 6:6, 8:7, 44:3, <br> 44:9, 54:9, 65:18, 70:7 <br> FERRETTI ${ }_{[00]}$ - <br> 2:6, 4:11, 44:10, <br> 44:13, 44:21, <br> 45:9, 45:18, <br> 46:12, 53:22, 64:9 <br> fight $_{[2]}-42: 13$, <br> 47:19 <br> filed $_{[2]}-18: 15$, <br> 19:5 <br> Finally $_{[1]}-31: 14$ <br> Finance ${ }_{[1]}-25: 21$ <br> fine $_{11}-43: 12$ <br> fines $_{[1]}-9: 10$ <br> finish $_{[1]}-41: 7$ <br> firm ${ }_{\text {[8] }}$ - 22:21, <br> 26:22, 27:3, <br> 29:20, 29:24, <br> 30:6, 30:22, 31:7, <br> 31:11, 31:14, <br> 31:17, 31:23, <br> 32:7, 39:10, <br> 42:21, 62:2, 62:14 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | frame ${ }_{[2]}-33: 12$, |
| extending ${ }_{[2]}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Franklin $_{111}-1: 16$ |
|  |  |  | full $_{[2]}-16: 19$, |
| Extension |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | fully ${ }_{11}-61: 15$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| facility ${ }_{(11}-57: 2$ |  |  |  |
| fact $_{[1]}-39: 13$ |  |  | ng |
|  |  |  | 37:6 |
| 43:25, 44:14 |  |  | -50 |
| 2 |  |  | neral ${ }_{[2]}-46$ |
| 42 |  |  |  |
| gue ${ }_{[3]}-33: 24$ |  |  | neral ${ }_{[3]}-8$ |
| 14, 47:16 |  |  | nerically |
| 6:8, |  |  | generically 22:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2,8: 9,8: 12, \\ & 4,26: 8,47: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 22:10 |
| 24, 53:4, |  |  | 26:15, 26:16, |
| 8, 54.11 |  |  | :23, 27:4, 30:21 |
| 5, 54:22 |  |  | ographic ${ }_{11}$ |
| 3, 64:5, 64:24 |  |  |  |
| 4, 65:19, |  |  |  |
| 23, 66:11, |  |  |  |
| 15, 67:5, 67: |  |  | GGG ${ }_{[2]}-5: 7$, |
| $68: 10,68: 14$, $69 \cdot 9.99 \cdot 13$ |  |  | 56:1 |
| 69:9, 69:13, 69:20, $69: 24$, |  |  | governmental |
| 69:20, 69:24, |  |  |  |


| Gov | heard $_{[7]}-15: 6$, | 28:11, | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27:7, 30:19, 40:6, | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 11,33: 15, \\ & 34 \cdot 12 \quad 34 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ | idea $_{[1]}-11: 8$ |
|  | 44:14, 46:2 | 21, 35:5, 35:8, | identify ${ }_{(1]}-21: 4$ |
| 2:15 | hearings ${ }_{\text {[] }}-9: 9$, | 22, 36:5, | $\mathbf{I G}_{[1]}-58: 2$ |
| GP1 ${ }_{[1]}-58: 15$ | 10:20, 10:21, | 36: | - |
| Grant $_{[1]}-14: 24$ | :24, 11:11, 12:9 |  | 4, 39:6 |
| Great $_{\text {[1] }}-56: 12$ | heating ${ }_{(11}-57: 22$ | 3 38:11 | 5:9, 5:1 |
| Grou | Heating $_{(11}-5: 8$ | 4, 38:2 | :3, 7:6 |
| 20:24, 21:15, | :2 | 39:6, | $\mathrm{gal}_{111}-44: 1$ |
| 22:12, 24:17 | 47:8, 49:7, 49: | 17, 39:24 | ustrate $_{11}-5$ |
| group $_{11}-56: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hello }_{[1]}-20: 5 \\ & \text { help }_{[2]}-22: 17, \\ & 46: 15 \\ & \text { helping }_{[1]}-23: 22 \\ & \text { hereby }_{[1]}-71: 10 \\ & \text { hereunto }_{[1]}- \\ & 71: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 40:8, 40:13 | IMA ${ }_{[1]}$ - 61:3 |
| Group's ${ }_{[2]}-21: 6$, |  | 41:1 | pactful |
| 23:5 |  | 43:8 | 25:15 |
| guess $_{[2]}-15: 12$ |  | 44:12, 44:20 | por |
| 25:24 |  | 44:22, 45:5, | 34: |
| H |  | 5:1 | important ${ }_{[2]}$ - |
| H\&L ${ }_{[1]}-57: 5$ <br> half $_{[1]}-48: 13$ <br> hand $_{111}-71: 14$ <br> Hanover $_{[2]}-5: 20$, <br> 59:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{H} \mathbf{i}_{[4]}-15: 15, \\ & 15: 17,18: 20,50: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | re |
|  |  | ${ }^{[1]}-16:$ | 28:21 |
|  | $\text { high }_{[1]}-33: 18$ | oricall | provemen |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 3,47: 10, \\ & 47: 11,57: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $47: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & -56: 11 \\ & { }_{[1]}-71: \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\mathrm{ry}^{5(5)}-27$ : | $[4]-5: 9,7: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { happy }_{[6]}-7: 9, \\ & 16: 5,21: 9,48: 16, \\ & 48: 25,51: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 47:11, } 57: 24, \\ \text { 59:10 } \\ \text { highest }_{[4]}-61: 9, \end{array}$ | $0,30: 6$ | 7:4, 7:6 |
|  |  | $13,49: 2$ | centives |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Happy }_{[2]}-21: 20, \\ & 24: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:12, 61:25, } \\ & 62: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 28:20 | 60:8 |
|  | highlights ${ }_{[1]}-$$33: 16$ | ot | ncluding |
| Hardesty ${ }_{[2]}$ 5:19, 59:15 <br> Harkins $_{[1]}$-9:6 |  | 24, 16:5 | 29: |
|  | highly $_{111}-30: 5$ | $\mathbf{r s}_{[2]}-9: 8$ | 59:18 |
| HARKINS $_{[5]}$ 10:18, 11:10, 11:17, 12:14, 13:4 | Hiller $_{[5]}$-26:17, |  | deed $_{[1]}-42: 2$ |
|  | 26:20, 32:15, |  | dependent |
|  | 43:12, 44:1 |  | 18:13, 50:13 |
| harm $_{[1]}-15: 12$ |  |  | dicate |
| rrison ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 26:19, 27:21 | 21:4, 21:7 | 53:18, 64 |
| 26:21 | 27:24, 28:3, | ghes ${ }_{[1]}$ - 69 | nfluence ${ }_{\text {11 }}$ - |





| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 8,30: 9 \\ & \text { must }_{[1]}-18: 14 \\ & \text { MWBE }_{[4]}-7: 9, \\ & 57: 25,59: 13,62: 5 \\ & \text { mWBE }_{[1]}-62: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:16, 31:23 } \\ & \text { New } \\ & \text { [11] }-1: 17, \\ & \text { 18:16, 18:17, } \\ & \text { 19:3, 19:4, 27:8, } \\ & 31: 8,31: 9,31: 16, \\ & 46: 10,71: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{N Y}_{[1]}-14: 7 \\ & \mathbf{N Y U}_{[1]}-25: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { one }_{[21]}-7: 4,8: 2, \\ 14: 11,14: 18, \\ 18: 20,21: 16, \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | obligation $_{[1]}$ -$44: 24$ | 25:25, 26:13, |
| N | NEW ${ }_{[1]}$ - 71:4 <br> Newsday ${ }_{[1]}$ - |  | $35: 21,48: 11,$ |
| name ${ }_{[1]}-26: 19$ |  | tain ${ }_{[1]}-33: 6$ | 58:2, 58:6, 61:9, |
| $\mathrm{Nassau}_{[16]}-5: 6$, | 32:8 | taining ${ }_{11}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 2,58: 6,61: 9, \\ & 63: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5: 16,18: 5,18: 7 \\ & 18: 9,24: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { next }_{[7]}-14: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:21 } \\ & \text { obviously } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\text { One }_{[2]}-33: 16$ |
|  | $20: 2,44: 3,56: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Obviously }_{(11]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 15:3 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $24: 22,25: 12$ | 57:16, 61:22, | October $^{11]}$ - | one's ${ }_{[2]}-57: 14$, |
| 27:2, 27:15, 29:5, | Next $_{44}-8: 2,9: 2$ | 14:16 | 0:2 |
| $33: 9,47: 4,50: 22$, $51: 6,69: 4$ | $\mathbf{N e X t}_{[4]}-8: 2,9: 2$ | - 27:13 | going |
| NASSAU ${ }_{[2]}-1: 2$, | nine ${ }_{[1]}-57: 2$ | 28, | 19, 24:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 71:6 } \\ & \text { national }{ }_{[1]}-47: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Nine ${ }_{[1]}-14: 10$ | :24, 28:4, 28:8, | open ${ }_{[2]}-35: 13$, |
|  | nobody ${ }_{[1]}-29: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:13, 32:20, } \\ & \text { 42:7, 47:2, 47:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 60.4 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{N a y}_{[3]}-53: 25, \\ 54: 2,54: 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 25,49: 14 \\ & 49: 15,49: 18,50: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 61:4 |
|  |  |  | inion ${ }_{\text {[9] }}-40: 5$, |
| nearly ${ }_{[1]}-47: 6$ | $\mathrm{n}_{[1]}-48:$ | Odd $_{[1]}-32: 22$ | $40: 8,40: 15$ |
| neces | presidential ${ }_{[11}$ - | OF ${ }_{[2]}-71: 4,71: 6$ offer $_{[1]}-62: 3$ | 0:22, 41:18, |
| 16:17 |  |  | 43:17, 43:21, |
| 速 | $48: 5$ | $\text { office }_{[1]}-18: 13$ | 5:19, 46:23 |
| 33:8, 42:1 | Notary $_{[1]}-71: 8$ <br> notated $_{[11}-47: 13$ | Office $_{[6]}-18: 10$, | Opposed ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| nece |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 7,27: 3,27: 16 \\ & 29: 13,63: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 69:14 |
| 33:4 |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| need ${ }_{[9]}-9: 8,9: 17$, | notes $_{\text {[1] }}-71: 12$ | officer $_{[1]}-32: 10$ <br> Officer ${ }_{\text {41 }}$ - 3.21 | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 13,8: 13,26: 9 \\ & 53: 5,53: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 11:5, 16:20, | Notwithstandin | Officer ${ }_{[4]}-3: 21$, $18: 7,69: 8,70: 7$ | $54: 16,55: 4$ |
| 25:18, 33:3 | Notwithstandin | OFFICER ${ }_{[1]}-1: 8$ | 4:11, 65:5 |
| 51:24, 52:7 | $\mathbf{g}_{\text {[1] }}-63: 16$ | offices ${ }_{\text {In }}-31.7$ | 5:24, 66:16, |
| negotiations $\mathrm{s}_{[1]}$ | num | fices $_{[1]}-31: 7$ |  |
| 24:23 | .25, 11.23 |  | $25$ |
|  | 67:18, 69:2 | $1: 24$ | opposing ${ }_{[1]}$ 48:22 option $_{[1]}-14: 18$ |
| $47: 17$ | numbered ${ }_{[2]}$ | officially ${ }^{[1]}$ - 35:8 |  |
| new ${ }_{[3]}$ - 11:19, |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:10, 22:7, } \\ & 32: 21,40: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { paperwork }_{[2]} \text { - }$ $30: 13,31: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 11,39: 20, \\ & 39: 21,48: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | parks ${ }_{[1]}-58: 12$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39: 21,48: 24 \\ \boldsymbol{p e r}_{[1]}-14: 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 16,45: 15, \\ & 49: 6,50: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\text { Parks }_{[2]}-14: 3 \text {, }$14:6 | percentage ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 43.23 |  |
|  |  |  | political ${ }_{[2]}$ -$48: 17,48: 18$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:6 } \\ & \text { part }_{\text {(10] }}-11: 13, \end{aligned}$ | perfectly ${ }_{11}$ - |  |
| outcome ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { part }_{\text {(0] }}-11: 13, \\ 22: 13,22: 19, \end{gathered}$ | 11:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{poor}_{[2]}-35: 17, \\ & 36: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $22: 24,34: 2,34: 4,$ | performed $_{[2]}$ - |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 2,40: 3,61: 3, \\ & 66: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 15:8, 15:10 | $43: 23,44: 6$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| 51:25, 52:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particular }_{[11]}- \\ & 30: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { person }_{[3]}-10: 5 \text {, }$ $35: 21,68: 2$ | possessed ${ }_{[3]}$ - <br> 29:14 29:16 |
| helming | particularly | 35:21, 68:2 <br> personal ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 29:14, 29:1 |
| 11:3 | 10:6 | 26:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { possible }_{[3]}- \\ & 48: 9,57: 6,57: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| owe ${ }_{[1]}-11: 3$ own $[13-39: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { parts }_{[1]}-60: 18 \\ & \text { party }{ }_{[5]}-47: 4, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $0: 2$ |  | 5:14, 5:15, 14:6 | $\text { possibly }_{[2]} \text { - 47:3, }$ |
| -63:13 | 48:11, 52:5, 52:6, | phase ${ }_{\text {5 }}$ - 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:22 } \\ & \text { potential } \\ & {[5]} \end{aligned}$ |
| owns ${ }_{[1]}-63: 1$ | 52.8 | $\text { 61:22, } 61: 23$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{p a s s}_{[4]}-30: 18, \\ & 65: 8,66: 3,66: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:21, 14:22, } \\ & 24: 22,25: 13,38: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | passed $_{[1]}-70: 4$ | pieces ${ }_{[2]}-60: 5$, | potentially ${ }_{(1)}$ - |
| $53$ | passes ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - $54: 5$ | 60:18 | 5:11 <br> practices ${ }_{11}$ |
| 65:14, 70:23 |  | placed $_{\text {[2] }}-35: 18$, | 31:8 |
| [2]-23:15 |  | 37:4 <br> plaintiff's | precedent ${ }_{11}$ |
| 40:24 | $\text { pay }_{101}-10: 23,$ | 24:4 | 51:8 |
| panel ${ }_{[15]}-29$ | 11:2, 11:6, 11:22, |  | recisely |
| 8, 29:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 4,41: 3,41: 14 \\ & 42: 10,48: 7,49: 3 \end{aligned}$ | plaintiffs ${ }_{\text {(1) }}$ | + |
| $\begin{aligned} & : 19,34: 20, \\ & : 3,35: 4,35: 5 \end{aligned}$ | paying ${ }_{[2]}-12: 23$, |  | edicament ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ |
| :18, 35:20, |  | Pledge $_{[2]}-3: 6$, | preeminent ${ }_{(1)}$ - |
| 1, 35:23 |  |  |  |
| 24, 36:15 | $14: 19$ |  | 51:1 |
| 36:18 | penalties | $\begin{aligned} & \text { plugged }_{[1]}- \\ & 36: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| [2] - 35:23, | 60:9$\text { pending }_{[3]}-15: 3 \text {, }$ | Plumbing ${ }_{[2]}-$ | eference ${ }_{\text {22 }}$ |
| 36:13 |  | $5: 8,57: 22$ | 46:25, 48:3 <br> prepared ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| panels" ${ }_{(11}-36: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pending }_{[3]}-15: 3 \text {, } \\ & 30: 16,52: 12 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| papers $_{[1]}-23: 14$ | 30:16, 52:12 <br> people $_{\text {[5] }}$-22:3, | plural $_{[1]}-35: 23$ point $_{\text {g }}$ - 10:18, |  |


| presence ${ }_{[11}$ -31:16 | 32:10 | provides ${ }_{[1]}-7: 7$ | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | a | ic ${ }_{[3]}-27$ | ranked ${ }_{881}$ - 20:16, |
| present ${ }_{41}$ - | 60.23, 61:17, $62 \cdot 6$ | 33:4, 65:1 |  |
| 26:24, 31:5, $31: 21,67: 8$ | 60:23, $61: 17,62: 6$ program 111 | Public ${ }_{\text {[8] }}$ - 18:3, | $61: 10,61: 12$ |
| 31:21, 67:8 | program ${ }_{\text {I1 }}$ - 57:3 | 18:4, 18:9, 18:14, | 62:2, 62:14 |
| presentation ${ }_{[2]}$ - <br> 28:22, 29:3 | Project ${ }_{[2]}-61: 19$, $62: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 11,56: 4,56: 9, \\ & 71: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Ranking ${ }_{[2]}-4: 3$, |
| presented | project $_{\text {[8] }}-22: 16$, | pl | 6:19 |
| :13, 30:12, $34: 7$ | 22:19, 24:22, | 32:8, 34:22, 35:13 | ranking ${ }_{\text {[1] }}-20: 13$ |
| presenting | 3, 57:20 | PULITZER ${ }_{\text {[9] }}$ - | rather $_{(1)}-47: 2$ |
| 27:9, 31:11 | 59:7, 62:5, 62:16 | 2:12, 3:20, 3:24 | $\mathbf{a c h}_{11}-34: 9$ |
| presently | promoters | 4:6, 4:9, 4:12, | ready $_{11}-31: 20$ |
| 27:18 | 14:9 | 4:15, 4:18 | real $_{[1]}-48: 17$ |
| presidenti | proper $_{[3]}$ - 42:4 | Pulitzer ${ }_{11}-3: 17$ | Real ${ }_{[1]}-63: 4$ |
| 27:13, 42:14, 48:5 | 42:16, 42:19 | pump ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$-60:25 | alized ${ }_{111}-30: 16$ |
| Presiding ${ }_{[4]}$ - | property ${ }_{(1)}$ | pursuant ${ }_{[2]}$ - | ally ${ }_{[2]}-25: 3$, |
| 3:21, 18:7, 69:7 | 63:1 | 18:11, 20:10 | 9:14 |
| 70:7 | proposal ${ }^{[3]}$ | pursue ${ }_{\text {(1) }}-45: 2$ | ason ${ }_{[3]}-22: 24$, |
| PRESIDING $_{[11}$ -1:8 | 20:15, 27:11 | put ${ }_{[2]}-16: 18$, | 3:5, 47:19 |
|  | 6 | 48 | receipt $_{[1]}-31: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { pretty }_{[2]]}-31: 24, \\ & 46: 5 \end{aligned}$ | proposals ${ }_{[11]}$ | putting ${ }_{[2]}-9: 19$, | receive $_{11}$-34:2 |
|  | 14:10, 29:7, 29:9 | $65: 10$ | ceived ${ }_{[4]}$ |
| previously ${ }_{(11}$ - | 56:13, 58:10 | Q | 14:11, 56:13, |
| 62:10 | 5 |  |  |
| printout ${ }_{11}$ - 37:20 | 6 |  | $5: 11,65: 13$ |
| Probation ${ }_{(1)}-8: 3$ | pr | 9:21, 20:20, 21:8, | cognized ${ }_{[2]}$ |
| problem ${ }_{[3]}$ - 19:7, |  | 21:10, 21:20, | 29:2, 30:20 |
| 19:10, 48:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { propc } \\ \text { 20:13 } \end{gathered}$ | :25, 30:1 | reconstruct |
| Procedure ${ }_{[1]}$ - | p | $1: 7,56: 19$ | 57:20 |
| Pr | $3$ | 63:19 | convene ${ }_{11}$ |
| process $_{\text {ge9 }}-27: 8$ | protect $_{[1]}-51: 21$ | $\mathbf{c k}_{[2]}-15: 19$ | 4:24 |
| 29:3, 31:9, 31:12, | provide ${ }_{51}$ | $18: 21$ | $\operatorname{cord}_{[4]}-24: 10$, |
| $31: 18,34: 21$, $39 \cdot 18,45 \cdot 7,50 \cdot 19$ | 18:21, 18:25, | $\text { quite }_{[1]}-31: 1$ | 28:7, 36:4, 52:16 |
| 39:18, 45:7, 50:19 | 19:2, 19:7, 24:10 | quorum | cused |
| procure ${ }_{[1]}-32: 25$ | provided ${ }_{[1]}$ - |  | 66:2 |
| procurement ${ }_{[1]}$ | $62: 14$ |  | recusing ${ }_{[1]}$ - |


| 66:24 | 20:9 | res | 51:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reduce $_{[1]}-23: 22$ | reporting $^{[1]}$ - | $6: 15,7: 13,8: 15$ | $\text { risk }_{[1]}-12: 22$ |
| refer $_{[1]}-35: 24$ | 20:10 | :8, 16:25 | $\mathrm{Road}_{[3]}-56: 12$, |
| reflects $_{[1]}-33: 23$ | representation | 0:22, 21:12 | 59:7, 62:8 |
| regarded $_{[1]}-30: 5$ | ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 30:8 | 1:24, 26:11 | roadway ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| $\text { region }_{[1]}-25: 15$ | representative | 16, 53:7, | 58:12 |
| rehabilitat | ${ }^{[2]}$ - 24:2, 24:5 | $4: 18,55: 6,$ | Robert $_{[1]}-69: 3$ |
| $-57: 18,60: 25$ | reputation ${ }_{[1]}$ | $: 21,62: 20$ | robust $_{[1]}-10: 16$ |
| related $_{[1]}-59: 15$ | 30:2 | 5:7, 66:2, 66:18, | role $_{[3]}-23: 5,23: 6$, |
| relative $_{[5]}-20: 15$, | request $^{[1]}$ - 51:1 | :12, 68:17, | 23:9 |
| 21:7, 22:7, 24:21, | reque | 69:16, 70:3, 70:17 | roles $_{[1]}-23: 12$ |
| 43:4 | 52:9 | responses ${ }_{[7]}$ - | roll ${ }_{[1]}-3: 18$ |
| relevan | required ${ }_{[3]}$ - | 35:14, 36:7, 37:4, | rolling ${ }_{[1]}-37: 8$ |
| 33:17 | 18:10, 18:24, 19:2 | 7:6, 38:18, | Rule ${ }_{[2]}$ - 28:20, |
| relevant $^{[2]}$ - | requires ${ }_{[2]}-31: 5$, | 38:25, 59:8 | 55:2 |
| 33:14, 33:16 | 63:15 | responsible ${ }_{[3]}$ - | RULES ${ }_{[1]}-1: 13$ |
| remember $_{[1]}$ | residents ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 56:15, 59:12, 61:4 | Rules $_{\text {[24] }}-3: 10$, |
| 58:20 | 47:5 | $\boldsymbol{r e s t}_{[2]}-56: 3$, | $18,4: 24,6: 1$ |
| rendere | resolution ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 64:19 | $8: 11,26: 7,53: 3$ |
| 12:21 | 67:1 | result $^{44]}$ - 20:12 | 53:11, 53:14, |
| renew ${ }_{[2]}-7: 3$ | Resolutions ${ }_{[2]}$ - | 28:16, 45:4, 51:10 | 53:15, 54:14, |
| 14:18 | 5:5, 5:13 | results ${ }_{[2]}-48: 9$, | 5:3, 65:10, |
| replace $^{[1]}$ - 60:18 | resolved | 48:1 | 5:16, 65:17, |
| replacement $^{[1]}$ - | 58:23 | resurfacing ${ }_{[2]}$ - | 5:22, 66:5, |
| 60:2 | respect $_{[3]}-33: 12$, | 57:2, 57:4 | 6:14, 67:8 |
| replac | 43:13, 43:16 | retain ${ }_{[1]}-25: 9$ | :13, 69:12, |
| 60:6 | respectively ${ }_{[2]}$ - | retroactive $_{[1]}$ | 9:23, 70:13, |
| replied $^{[1]}-37: 12$ | , 5 | 15:2 |  |
| $\text { reply }_{[1]}-37: 10$ | re | returns $_{[1]}-67: 17$ |  |
| $\text { report }_{[2]}-18: 22,$ | 6:11, 8:11, $26: 7$ | Review ${ }_{[5]}$ - 58:10, |  |
| 19:8 |  | 14, 61:11 | S |
| reporte | 5:22, 66:14, |  |  |
| 11:20 | 7:9, 68:13, |  | $59: 7,65: 1$ |
| REPORTER ${ }^{[1]}$ - | 9:12, 69:23 | $=\mathbf{P}_{[2]}-14: 8,$ | Safety ${ }_{[1]}$-62:9 |
| 1:24 | 70:13 | -14:8, |  |
| Reporting | responded $_{[1]}$ - | 0:11 | scenarios ${ }_{[1]}$ - $23: 16$ |
| 5:18, 5:22, 20:4, | 20:11 | ts ${ }_{[2]}-46: 9$ | 23:16 |


| ```schedule \(_{\text {[2] }}\) - 10:16, 60:11 scholarly \({ }_{[1]}\) 39:18 school \(_{[1]}-46: 2\) scoring \({ }_{\text {[1] }}-20: 12\) search \(_{[2]}-29: 23\), 61:18 second \(_{[1]}-59: 25\) seconded \({ }_{[9]}\) - 6:2, 6:6, 6:18, 8:7, 26:3, 54:21, 65:18, 67:22, 69:7 seconds \({ }_{[3]}\) - 52:24, 54:10, 70:9 secrecy \({ }_{[2]}\) - 38:12, 38:15 see \(_{[2]}-16: 5,42: 19\) seeing \({ }_{11}-3: 14\) seek \(_{\text {[2] }}-35: 9\), 37:25 seeking \(_{[3]}-14: 9\), 31:25, 32:11 selected \({ }_{[4]}\) - 14:12, 20:14, 58:14, 58:15 Senate \(_{[1]}-27: 10\) senatorial \({ }_{[1]}\) - 42:14 September \(_{[1]}\) - 14:17 serve \(_{[1]}-23: 11\) service \({ }_{[1]}-58: 3\) Service \({ }_{[2]}-5: 14\), 5:15 services \(_{[77]}-9: 9\), 10:11, 12:10,``` | $12: 21,15: 8$, $15: 10,20: 10$, $26: 25,58: 7,59: 5$, $59: 6,59: 15$, $60: 23,61: 17$, $61: 18,62: 6,62: 7$ Services $_{[3]}-$ $14: 6,63: 4,63: 7$ session $_{[3]}-3: 3$, $25: 17,25: 20$ Session $_{[1]]}$ $51: 17,51: 20$, $52: 11,52: 12$, $52: 20,52: 25$, $53: 9,53: 13$, $54: 21,54: 23,55: 8$ set $_{[2]}-9: 10,71: 14$ settled $_{[2]}-30: 21$, $31: 15$ seven $_{[2]}-61: 24$, $62: 22$ several $_{[1]}-28: 17$ Sewage $_{[1]}-57: 19$ sewage $_{[1]}-60: 25$ shall sh] |  | ```speech \(_{[3]}-47: 23\), 49:23, 50:6 spend \({ }_{[2]}-16: 20\), 16:21 spending \(_{11}\) - 16:13 split \(_{11}-60: 4\) spoken \(_{[1]}-43: 9\) spreadsheet \({ }_{[1]}\) - 37:16 \(\mathbf{S S}_{[11}-71: 5\) staff \({ }_{[3]}-35: 9\), 38:7, 53:10 stale \(_{[1]}-31: 22\) Standard \({ }_{[1]}\) - 63:7 standing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 45:14 start \(_{\text {[1] }}-4: 21\), 4:25, 6:4, 6:21, 20:3, 25:7 Start \({ }_{[1]}-56: 6\) started \(_{[2]}-10: 19\), 42:6 starting \(_{11]}-49: 17\) State \(_{122}-18: 16\), 18:17, 19:3, 19:4, 27:7, 40:7, 40:16, 44:18, 46:11, 47:20, 63:13, 71:9 state \(_{[4]}-28: 15\), 33:18, 45:20, 63:12 STATE \(_{[11}-71: 4\) statement \({ }_{[2]}\) - 43:7, 44:15 states \(_{[2]}-31: 8\),``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





