1. Legislative Calendar

   Documents:

   11-23-20.PDF

2. Proposed Ordinances

   Documents:

   PROPOSED ORD. 103-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 104-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 105-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 106-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 107-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 108-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 109-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 110-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 111-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 112-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 113-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 114-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 115-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 116-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 117-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 118-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 119-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 120-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 121-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 122-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 123-20.PDF
   PROPOSED ORD. 124-20.PDF

3. Proposed Resolutions

   Documents:

   PROPOSED RES. 147-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 148-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 149-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 150-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 151-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 152-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 153-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 154-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 155-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 156-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 157-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 158-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 159-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 160-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 161-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 162-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 163-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 164-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 165-20.PDF
   PROPOSED RES. 166-20.PDF

PROPOSED RES. 166-20.PDF

4. Documents For 11-23-20 Meeting

    Documents:

    ER 29-20.PDF
    RES. 166-A-20.PDF
    ER 30-20.PDF
    RES. 166-B-20.PDF
    ER 31-20.PDF
    ORD. 124-A-20.PDF
    ORD. 124-A-20 APPENDIX.PDF
    ER 32-20.PDF
    ORD. 124-B-20.PDF

5. Full Legislative Committee 11-23-20

    Documents:

    FULL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, 11-23-20.PDF

L E G I S L A T I V E C A L E N D A R

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE — MINEOLA, NEW YORK
TENTH MEETING — NOVEMBER 23, 2020
TENTH MEETING OF 2020 — LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR 1:00PM

Please be advised that public attendance is permitted at this meeting, but due to health and safety concerns associated with the COVID-19 virus and New York State requirements restricting public gatherings, the maximum capacity of the Peter J. Schmitt Legislative Chamber is limited to fifty people, inclusive of elected officials, staff, and attendees. Passes will be distributed on a first come first served basis beginning one half hour prior to meeting and attendees will be given an opportunity to sign in to address the Legislature for a maximum of five minutes. Attendees will be subject to temperature checks prior to entering the chamber, and must adhere to social distancing guidelines and wear a mask while they are in the chamber.

This meeting will also be available for viewing online at http://www.nassaucountyny.gov/agencies/Legis/index.html As in-person attendance is limited, public comment on any item may be emailed to the Clerk of the Legislature at LegPublicComment@nassaucountyny.gov and will be made part of the formal record for this Legislative meeting.

While this meeting is open to the public at a reduced capacity, the Nassau County Legislature is committed to making its public meeting accessible to individuals with disabilities. If, due to a disability, you need an accommodation or assistance to participate in the public meeting or to obtain a copy of the transcript of the public hearing in an alternative format in accordance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Legislature at 571-4252, or the Nassau County Office for the Physically Challenged at 227-7101 or TDD telephone no. 227-8989.

EVERY LEGISLATIVE MEETING IS STREAMED LIVE ON
http://www.nassaucountyny.gov/agencies/Legis/index.html

1. **ORDINANCE NO. 103- 2020**

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 73-2014, AS AMENDED BY ORDINANCE NO. 21-18 AND ESTABLISH DISCOUNTS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATION AND MUSEUMS. 353-20(LE)

2. **ORDINANCE NO. 104–2020**

AN ORDINANCE TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL PAY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF HOUSING FOR OVERTIME WORK PERFORMED IN CONNECTION WITH THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE TRANSFER OF THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM TO THE COUNTY OF NASSAU UTILIZING CARES ACT FUNDING FROM NEW YORK STATE'S DIVISION OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY RENEWAL. 347-20(HI)

3. **ORDINANCE NO. 105-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES. 318-20(OMB)

4. **ORDINANCE NO. 106-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. 319-20(OMB)

5. **ORDINANCE NO. 107-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. 320-20(OMB)

6. **ORDINANCE NO. 108-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. 321-20(OMB)

7. **ORDINANCE NO. 109-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. 322-20(OMB)

8. **ORDINANCE NO. 110-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATION AND MUSEUMS. 323-20(OMB)

9. **ORDINANCE NO. 111-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATION AND MUSEUMS. 324-20(OMB)

10. **ORDINANCE NO. 112-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT. 328-20(OMB)

11. **ORDINANCE NO. 113-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT. 329-20(OMB)

12. **ORDINANCE NO. 114-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. 330-20(OMB)

13. **ORDINANCE NO. 115-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. 331-20(OMB)

14. **ORDINANCE NO. 116-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. 334-20(OMB)

15. **ORDINANCE NO. 117-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. 335-20(OMB)

16. **ORDINANCE NO. 118-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. 336-20(OMB)

17. **ORDINANCE NO. 119-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. 338-20(OMB)

18. **ORDINANCE NO. 120-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES. 340-20(OMB)

19. **ORDINANCE NO. 121-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT. 341-20(OMB)

20. **ORDINANCE NO. 122-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT, THE MEDICAL EXAMINER, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS. 342-20(OMB)

21. **ORDINANCE NO. 123-2020**

AN ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, THE CORRECTIONAL CENTER, THE FIRE COMMISSION, AND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. 346-20(OMB)

22. **RESOLUTION NO. 147-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED HAYES V. COUNTY OF NASSAU, ET AL.; DOCKET NO. 15-CV-0398, PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 283-20(AT)

23. **RESOLUTION NO. 148-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED ESTATE OF JOHN GLEESON, ET AL. V. COUNTY OF NASSAU, ET AL.; DOCKET NO. 15-CIV. 6487 (AD)(MRL), PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 284-20(AT)

24. **RESOLUTION NO. 149-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFFS, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED DESIREE BEHR AND STEPHEN BEHR V. COUNTY OF NASSAU, INDEX NO. 009553/10 PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 285-20(AT)

25. **RESOLUTION NO. 150-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO PARTICIPATE IN A TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PROVIDING FOR THE RESTRIPING OF VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS, CAPITAL PROJECT H6215313G, PIN 0761.23, AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SAID AID FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK. 309-20(PW)

26. **RESOLUTION NO. 151-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE VILLAGE OF NEW HYDE PARK IN RELATION TO A PROJECT TO PROCURE AND INSTALL AN EMERGENCY GENERATOR AND RELATED ITEMS. 310-20(CE)

27. **RESOLUTION NO. 152-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD IN RELATION TO PROVIDING LIFEGUARD SERVICES AT NICKERSON BEACH. 333-20(PK)

28. **RESOLUTION NO. 153-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST MEADOW UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT TO PURCHASE AND INSTALL NEW PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT. 345-20(CE)

29. **RESOLUTION NO. 154-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO AMEND THE 2019 HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN AS AMENDED AND TO FILE AN APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL ASSISTANCE WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT. 343-20(HI)

30. **RESOLUTION NO. 155-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE A GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATION AND MUSEUMS, AND THE CORNELL COOPERATIVE EXTENSION NASSAU COUNTY. 344-20(PK)

31. **RESOLUTION NO. 156-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ADOPTION OF THE RETENTION AND DISPOSITION SCHEDULE FOR NEW YORK LOCAL GOVERNMENT RECORDS (LGS-1). 317-20(CC)

32. **RESOLUTION NO. 157-2020**

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION 387-2008, AS LAST AMENDED BY RESOLUTION NO. 421-2019, TO DESIGNATE NEWSPAPERS TO PUBLISH AND IDENTIFY THE REAL PROPERTY, LISTED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER, LOCATED WHOLLY OR PARTLY IN THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD, TOWN OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD, TOWN OF OYSTER BAY, CITY OF GLEN COVE AND CITY OF LONG BEACH, ON WHICH REAL ESTATE TAX LIENS ARE SUBJECT TO SALE BY THE COUNTY TREASURER FOR UNPAID TAXES, PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 337-20(TR)

33. **RESOLUTION NO. 158-2020**

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL ZONE OF ASSESSMENT TO INCLUDE REAL PROPERTY IN THE VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE. 348-20(PW)

34. **RESOLUTION NO. 159-2020**

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE DESIGNATED PARKING FOR VETERANS AT COUNTY BUILDINGS OR FACILITIES AND PARKS. 352-20(LE)

35. **RESOLUTION NO. 160-2020**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020. 295-20(OMB)

36. **RESOLUTION NO. 161-2020**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020. 325-20(OMB)

37. **RESOLUTION NO. 162-2020**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020. 326-20(OMB)

38. **RESOLUTION NO. 163-2020**

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020. 327-20(OMB)

39. **RESOLUTION NO. 164-2020**

A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A WARRANT DIRECTING THE TREASURER OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO PAY TO THE SUPERVISORS OF THE SEVERAL TOWNS AND TO THE TREASURERS OF THE SEVERAL VILLAGES AND CITIES WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, THE SUMS AS APPORTIONED BY THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE BASED ON A REPORT FILED BY THE COUNTY TREASURER AND THE COUNTY CLERK, SHOWING DEPOSITS FROM MORTGAGE TAXES FOR THE PERIOD OF ONE YEAR COMMENCING OCTOBER 1, 2019 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2020; PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. 306-20(LE)

40. **ORDINANCE NO. 124-2020**

A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $41,666,467 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND FURTHER PROVIDING FOR A REDUCTION OF $40,000,000 OF BONDS PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED FOR THE CAPITAL PROJECT IDENTIFIED HEREIN. 349-20(PW)

41. **RESOLUTION NO. 165-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE A DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION AND WESTERN BAYS CONSTRUCTORS IN RELATION TO THE BAY PARK DIVERSION PROJECT. 350-20(PW)

42. **RESOLUTION NO. 166-2020**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE MODIFICATION AGREEMENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT AGREEMENT AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION IN RELATION TO THE BAY PARK DIVERSION PROJECT AND ADDITIONAL WORK. 351-20(PW)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN **that the Nassau County Executive has executed the following personal service contracts, copies of which are on file with the Office of the Clerk of the Nassau County Legislature. These contracts are listed for informational purposes only.**

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Eleni Barrere. $.01.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000029.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Children's Speech and Rehabilitation Therapy. $.01. RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000106.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Taddonio, Susan, DPT. $.01.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000104.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Barry & Florence Friedberg JCC. $.01.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000112.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Keep Moving Forward. $.01.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000117.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Rehabilities Physical Therapy, PLLC dba Leap Physical Therapy. $.01. RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000101.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Access 7 Services, Inc. $.01.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000115.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Home Care Therapies, dba Horizon Health Care Staffing. $.01. RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000087.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services and Royal Events Group, Inc dba DH@ Chauffeured Transportation. $50,000.00. RE: OFA DH@ Unmet Needs. ID# CQHS20000044.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Housing and Intergovernmental and Village of Freeport (CV). $677,000.00. RE: CDBG-CV Covid-19. ID# CQHI20000052.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Housing and Intergovernmental and Eagle to Serve. $20,000.00. RE: CDBG. ID# CQHI20000038.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Housing and Intergovernmental and Village of Sea Cliff (CV). $6,500.00. RE: CDBG-CV Covid-19. ID# CQHI20000053.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Nassau BOCES. $.01.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000099.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Health and Tiegerman School. $.04.
RE: Preschool Services. ID# CQHE20000107.

County of Nassau acting on behalf of Human Services and Charles Evans Center, Inc.
$627,168.00. RE: Chemical Dependency. ID# CQHE20000109.

THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

WILL CONVENE THE NEXT

COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2020 at 1:00PM

AND

FULL LEGISLATURE MEETING ON

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2020 AT 1:00PM

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 103 -2020

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 73-2014, AS AMENDED BY ORDINANCE NO. 21-18 AND ESTABLISH DISCOUNTS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATIONS AND MUSEUMS.

WHEREAS, veterans with a forty percent or greater service-connected disability are eligible for the New York State Lifetime Liberty Pass, which provides pass holders free or discounted use of facilities operated by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation; and

WHEREAS, this Pass is administered by New York State and is free of charge; and

WHEREAS, in recognition of this brave population's patriotism and sacrifice for our nation, Nassau County wishes to provide its residents who are New York State Lifetime Liberty Pass holders with certain benefits related to its Department of Parks, Recreation, and Museums; now, therefore

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau as follows:

Section, 1. § 6 of Ordinance No. 73-2014, as amended by Ordinance No. 21-18, shall be amended to read as follows:

§ 6. Admission tickets and Leisure Passports. A non-transferable ticket or otherwise evidence of payment is required to admission to and use of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums. Resident discounts are available to holders of Leisure Passports. Leisure Passports are valid for three years. Proof of Nassau County residency is required for a renewal Leisure Passport. Except for golf, Leisure Passports are not required for children 12 years of age and under. Leisure Passports are required for persons 10 years of age and older for resident discounts for activities and services relating to the County's golf courses. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other section of this Ordinance, Nassau County residents who hold the New York State Lifetime Liberty Pass shall not be charged a fee where they would otherwise be charged a "resident" daily or seasonal, individual or vehicular fee for admission to and use of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department. A Lifetime Liberty passholder shall not be required to hold a Nassau County Leisure Passport to enjoy this entitlement, and the Department shall not charge resident holders of the New York State Lifetime Liberty Pass a fee for parking in connection with the same.

§2. Severability.

If any provision of this Ordinance or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held unconstitutional or invalid, the constitutionality or validity of the remainder of this ordinance and the applicability of such provision to other persons or

circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

§3. SEQRA Determination.

This Legislature, being the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) lead agency, hereby finds and determines that this law constitutes a Type II action pursuant to Section 617(c)(20), (21), and/or (27) of Title 6 of the New York Code of Rules and Regulations (6 NYCRR) and within the meaning of section 8-0109(2) of the New York Conservation Law as a promulgation of regulations, rules, policies, procedures, and legislative decisions in connection with continuing agency administration, management and information collection.

§4. Effective Date.

This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 104 - 2020

AN ORDINANCE TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL PAY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF HOUSING FOR OVERTIME WORK PERFORMED IN CONNECTION WITH THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE TRANSFER OF THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM TO THE COUNTY OF NASSAU UTILIZING CARES ACT FUNDING FROM NEW YORK STATE'S DIVISION OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY RENEWAL.

WHEREAS, in response to the national COVID-19 public health emergency, Congress passed the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act ("CARES Act") earlier this year to provide necessary funding to address certain critical needs throughout the United States; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the CARES Act, Congress has allocated funding to address increased costs for Public Housing Authorities that administer Housing Choice Vouchers ("HCV"); and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") issued Notice PIH 2020-08, titled CARES Act – HCV Program Administrative Fees, and has disbursed additional administrative fees to NYS Homes and Community Renewal ("HCR"); and

WHEREAS, HCR is making new resources available to Local Administrators to support initiatives that will both address the increased cost of program operations while also providing

direct assistance to voucher families impacted by the current crisis; and

WHEREAS, Nassau County is the Local Administrator for the New York State Housing Trust Fund Corporation ("HTFC") Public Housing Authority and administers HTFC's HCV program in the County; and

WHEREAS, on August 3, 2020, HCR notified Nassau County's Office of Housing that HUD approved the transfer of the Town of Hempstead's HCV program to HTFC, and that the Town of Hempstead's 423 Annual Contribution Contract units would be transferred to Nassau County's Office of Housing, serving as a Local Administrator under HTFC's HCV program; and

WHEREAS, overtime work by Office of Housing employees has been necessary in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic, and has been required to process the additional Town of Hempstead files and pay landlords on time, and further overtime work is expected through December 31, 2020 for additional functions related to the transition; and

WHEREAS, HCR has allocated funding to Nassau County for reimbursement of administrative fees in connection with COVID-19 and has also authorized use of the CARES Act administrative fees allocation for overtime for Office of Housing employees in connection with both the COVID-19 pandemic and the transfer of the Town of Hempstead's HCV program; and

WHEREAS, the County believes it is appropriate to provide additional pay to certain officers and employees of the Office of Housing for overtime work performed in connection with both the COVID-19 pandemic and the transfer of the Town of Hempstead's HCV program to the County utilizing CARES Act funds from HCR; now therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED, by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. Notwithstanding any provision of Ordinance 543-1995, as amended, or any other Ordinance, officers and employees of the Office of Housing may receive additional pay for

a) time worked in excess of their regularly scheduled full-time work week, during the period from March 27, 2020 through December 31, 2020, to the extent such work relates to the COVID-19 pandemic, and

b) time worked in excess of their regularly scheduled full-time work week, during the period from August 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020, to the extent such work relates to entering information or otherwise processing files corresponding to the transfer of the Town of Hempstead's Housing Choice Voucher ("HCV") program to the Office of Housing HCV program,

to the extent the costs of such additional pay are eligible for reimbursement through allocated CARES Act funding from New York State's Division of Housing and Community Renewal. Eligible Office of Housing officers and employees shall be paid such additional pay at their regular rate of pay, as defined in Section 2 of this Ordinance, for hours worked in excess of their weekly schedule of 33.75 hours, but less than 40 hours, for the weekly period. Such officers and employees shall be paid such additional pay at the rate of 1.5 times their regular rate of pay, as defined in Section 2 of this Ordinance, for hours worked in excess of 40 hours for the weekly period.

§ 2. Definitions.

For the purposes of this Ordinance, unless otherwise provided, the following definitions shall apply:

(a) "CARES Act" means the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act passed by Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States on March 27, 2020, and all subsequent amendments therteto.

(b) "Officer" or "Employee" means an individual in the employ of the Nassau County

Office of Housing who is not in any negotiating unit in the County represented by an employee association recognized or certified by the Nassau County Public Employment Relations Board.

(c) "Regular Rate of Pay" means the rate of pay determined by multiplying the eligible Office of Housing officer or employee's annual regular salary by the fraction below:

$$\frac{1}{262 \times 6.75}$$

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that the adoption of this local law is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) and (27) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 105 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Social Services.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
21,126,770	100% Funded Positions	GRT	SS	AA	12,990,886
		GRT	SS	AB	8,110,884
		GRT	SS	DD	25,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6

N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 106 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the District Attorney's Office.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 19, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
1,281,434.64	NYS Office of Victim Services	GRT	DA	AA	895,534.74
				AB	274,374.51
				BB	47,600.00
				DD	53,775.39
				DE	10,150.00

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6

N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 107 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Community Development.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
4,147,918	US Department of Housing and Urban Development	GRT	HI	AA	200,000
				AB	100,000
				DE	3,727,918
				HH	120,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 108 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Community Development.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
6,500,000	US Department of Housing and Urban Development	GRT	HI	AA	100,000
				AB	50,000
				DE	6,170,000
				HH	180,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 109 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Community Development.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
9,564,934	US Department of Housing and Urban Development	GRT	HI	AA	300,000
				AB	150,000
				DE	8,864,934
				HH	250,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 110 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
163,300	Hotel/Motel Tax Account Historical Building Restoration – GRT-PK-98-(9800)	GRT	PK	DE	163,300

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this

supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 111 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
570,000	Hotel/Motel Tax Account – GRT-PK-97-(9700)	GRT	PK	AA	300,000
		GRT	PK	AB	270,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this

supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 112–2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Emergency Management.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
498,124	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	AA	320,725
		GRT	EM	AB	165,399
		GRT	EM	DD	12,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 113–2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Emergency Management.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 19, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
292,840	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	DD	292,840

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section

617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. (“routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment”), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 114 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Health.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 14, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
70,000	NYS Office of Children and Family Services	GRT	HE	AA	39,494
		GRT	HE	AB	17,906
		GRT	HE	DD	12,600

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6

N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 115 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Health.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 14, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
145,955	NYS Department of Health	GRT	HE	AA	105,524
		GRT	HE	AB	40,431

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this

supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 116 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Police Department.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 14, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
425,009	Federal Emergency Management Agency	GRT	PD	DD	425,009

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section

617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. (“routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment”), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 117 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Management and Budget.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 26, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
$537,731	Indigent Legal Services	GRT	BU	DE	$537,731

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this

supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 118 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Management and Budget.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 26, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
$537,731	Indigent Legal Services	GRT	BU	DE	$537,731

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this

supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 119 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Management and Budget.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 14, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

BABU20000015

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
$47,940,678.70	COVID-19 Fund (COVID-19 CARES Act)	COV	ES	AA	$28,500,000
		COV	ES	AB	$9,500,000
		COV	ES	BB	$1,000,000
		COV	ES	DD	$3,000,000
		COV	ES	DE	$5,940,678.70

BABU20000016

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
$5,000,000	COVID-19 Fund (FEMA Pandemic)	COV	ES	AA	$1,000,000

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
		COV	ES	AB	$500,000
		COV	ES	BB	$500,000
		COV	ES	DD	$1,000,000
		COV	ES	DE	$2,000,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 120 – 2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to an appropriation ordinance in connection with the Department of Human Services.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 14, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
375,000	NYS Office of Mental Health	GRT	HS	DE	375,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section

617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. (“routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment”), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 121 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Emergency Management.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 19, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
130,097	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	BB	130,097

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section

617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. (“routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment”), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 122 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Emergency Management, the Health Department, the Medical Examiner, and the Department of Public Works.

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

BAEM20000010

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
40,000	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	HE	BB	5,000
		GRT	HE	DD	5,000
		GRT	HE	DE	30,000

BAEM20000011

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
767,520	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	AA	19,000
		GRT	EM	AB	5,246
		GRT	EM	BB	15,500
		GRT	EM	DD	662,981
		GRT	EM	DE	64,793

BAEM20000012

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
357,816	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	AA	240,688
		GRT	EM	AB	117,128

BAEM20000013

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
40,800	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	ME	BB	1,000
		GRT	ME	DD	39,800

BAEM20000014

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
190,000	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	PW	BB	15,000
		GRT	PW	DD	175,000

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 123 –2020

AN ORDINANCE supplemental to the annual appropriation ordinance in connection with the Office of Emergency Management, the Correctional Center, the Fire Commission, and the Police Department

WHEREAS, Nassau County has received certain revenue; and

WHEREAS, such funds have not been otherwise appropriated; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has recommended the appropriation of such funds not otherwise appropriated; and,

WHEREAS, this supplemental appropriation is within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, as follows:

Section 1. There is hereby appropriated from monies not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money to the following accounts:

BAEM20000002

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
70,000	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	CC	BB	55,000
		GRT	CC	DD	15,000

BAEM20000003

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
160,860	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	FC	AA	25,000
		GRT	FC	AB	5,860
		GRT	FC	BB	128,000
		GRT	FC	DD	2,000

BAEM20000004

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
416,555	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	PD	AA	110,000
		GRT	PD	AB	29,854
		GRT	PD	BB	194,360
		GRT	PD	DD	82,341

BAEM20000005

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
1,090,547	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	AA	19,000
		GRT	EM	AB	5,246
		GRT	EM	BB	531,094
		GRT	EM	DD	275,000
		GRT	EM	DE	260,207

BAEM20000006

TOTAL AMOUNT (in dollars)	**SOURCE OF FUNDS**	**APPROPRIATED TO:**			
		FUND	**DEPT. CODE/Index**	**OBJ. CODE**	**AMOUNT** (in dollars)
911,696	NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	GRT	EM	AA	618,353
		GRT	EM	AB	293,343

§ 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

§ 3. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this

supplemental appropriation ordinance is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

§ 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 124- 2020

BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $41,666,467 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND FURTHER PROVIDING FOR A REDUCTION OF $40,000,000 OF BONDS PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED FOR THE CAPITAL PROJECT IDENTIFIED HEREIN.

WHEREAS, this bond ordinance is necessary to authorize bonds for the purpose of funding project(s) contemplated by capital budgets as provided in Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, all necessary Federal, State, County and local permits, approvals and determinations of environmental impact for the purpose or purposes hereinafter referred to have been obtained or will have been obtained prior to the expenditure of proceeds of obligations to be authorized pursuant to this ordinance; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED, by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds (2/3rd) of the total voting strength of the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, New York, as follows:

Section 1. A capital expenditure for financing the cost of Project 9E200 062 – Environmental Bond Act, Project 97105 – Case Management, and Project 3B116 – Bay Park Outfall District Structure Pipeline Rehabilitation in the County of Nassau (hereinafter referred to as the "County"), is hereby authorized upon recommendation of the County Executive, the amount of such capital expenditure for Project 9E200 062 to be $135,000, and for Project 97105 to be $1,531,467, and for Project 3B116 to be $40,000,000 which shall be financed with the proceeds from the issuance of $41,666,467 bonds.

Section 2. The County may issue its bonds in the aggregate principal amount of $41,666,467 pursuant to the Local Finance Law of New York (hereinafter referred to as the "LFL") in order to finance such class of objects or purposes (hereinafter referred to as the "Purpose") described in Section 1 hereof.

Section 3. The County Legislature has determined and hereby states that the estimated aggregate maximum cost of such Purpose, including preliminary costs and costs incidental thereto and the financing thereof, is $41,666,467. The plan of financing includes $41,666,467 to be raised by the issuance of bonds authorized by this ordinance, and the levy and collection of taxes on all the taxable real property of the County to pay the principal of said bonds and the interest thereon as the same shall become due and payable.

Section 4. The County Legislature hereby determines that the period of probable usefulness of the Purpose for which $135,000 of said $41,666,467 bonds authorized pursuant to this ordinance are to be issued for Project 9E200 062, within the limitations of subdivision 19(c) of paragraph a. of Section 11.00 of the Law, is 15 years, and the period of probable usefulness of the Purpose for which $1,531,467 of said $41,666,467 bonds authorized pursuant to this ordinance are to be issued for Project 97105, within the limitations of subdivision 32 of paragraph a. of Section 11.00 of the Law, is 5 years, and the period of probable usefulness of the Purpose for which $40,000,000 of said $41,666,467 bonds authorized pursuant to this ordinance are to be issued for Project 3B116, within the limitations of subdivision 4 of paragraph a. of Section 11.00 of the Law, is 40 years.

Section 5. Subject to the terms and conditions of this ordinance and the LFL, and pursuant to the provisions of the LFL, the powers and duties of the County Legislature relative to authorizing the issuance of and to sell bond anticipation notes in anticipation of the issuance and sale of the bonds herein authorized, including renewals of such notes, is

hereby delegated to the County Treasurer, the chief fiscal officer. Such notes shall be of such terms, form and contents, and shall be sold in such manner, as may be prescribed by said County Treasurer, consistent with the provisions of the LFL.

Section 6. All other matters except as provided herein relating to the bonds herein authorized including the date, denominations, maturities and interest payment dates, within the limitations prescribed herein and the manner of execution of the same, including the consolidation with other bond issues, and also the ability to issue bonds with substantially level or declining annual debt service, shall be determined by the County Treasurer, the chief fiscal officer of such County.

Section 7. The faith and credit of the County are hereby irrevocably pledged for the payment of the principal of and interest on such bonds and notes as the same become due and payable. An annual appropriation shall be made in each year sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds and notes becoming due and payable in such year.

Section 8. The validity of such bonds and bond anticipation notes may be contested only if:

1) Such obligations are authorized for an object or purpose for which said County is not authorized to expend money, or

2) The provisions of law which should be complied with as the date of publication of this ordinance are not substantially complied with, and an action, suit or proceeding contesting such validity is commenced within twenty (20) days after the date of such publication, or

3) Such obligations are authorized in violation of the provisions of the Constitution.

Section 9. This ordinance shall constitute a statement of official intent for purposes of Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2. Other than as specified in this ordinance, no monies are, or are reasonably expected to be, reserved, allocated on a long-term basis, or otherwise set aside with respect to the permanent funding of the object or purpose described herein.

Section 10. This ordinance, which takes effect immediately, shall be published in summary in the official newspaper of said County together with a notice of the Clerk of the County Legislature in substantially the form set forth in paragraph a of Section 81.00 of the Local Finance Law.

Section 11. It is hereby determined pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that the Purpose identified herein is a Type II action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(2) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required. A record of each such determination shall be maintained in a file, readily accessible to the public, at the office of the Clerk of the Legislature.

Section 12. Ordinance 101-2013 is hereby amended to reduce the bonds authorized therein for Project 35121 – Wastewater Facilities Storm Restoration by $40,000,000 from $120,745,000 to $80,745,000.

Section 13. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the

members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of said Legislature.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 147- 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED *HAYES V. COUNTY OF NASSAU, ET AL.*, DOCKET NO. 15-CV-0398, PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

WHEREAS, Bobby Hayes (the "Plaintiff") commenced an action against the County of Nassau (the "County") entitled *Hayes v. County of Nassau, et al.*, Docket No. 15-CV-0398, alleging certain violations of his rights and the County has agreed to make payment to the Plaintiffs in the amount of $125,000 in full settlement of all possible claims the Plaintiff may have against the County arising from the incident upon which the action is based; and

WHEREAS, the County Attorney has caused an investigation and analysis to be made of the said action and as a result thereof recommends that it be settled in the amount set forth above; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Attorney be and is hereby authorized and directed to settle the said action in the amount as indicated above, provided that, if any payment arising from said action is to be made from the proceeds of a borrowing, that a bond ordinance to finance such settlement is adopted by this Legislature and any borrowing pursuant to such bond ordinance is approved by the Nassau County Interim Finance Authority, if such approval is required; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the County Treasurer be and is hereby authorized to pay a maximum of $125,000 by check or checks payable as directed by the County Attorney, said check or checks to be delivered to the County Attorney and thereupon delivered to the attorneys for Plaintiff upon receipt of a Settlement Agreement and Limited Release; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 *et seq.* and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this settlement is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(29) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 148 - 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED ESTATE OF JOHN GLEESON, ET AL. V. COUNTY OF NASSAU, ET AL., DOCKET NO. 15 CIV. 6487 (AD)(MRL), PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

WHEREAS, the Estate of John Gleeson (Plaintiff") has initiated an action against the County of Nassau (the "County") entitled *Estate of John Gleeson, et al. v. County of Nassau, et al.,* Docket No. 15 Civ. 6487 (AD)(MRL), alleging certain violations of the plaintiff's decedent's rights, and the County has agreed to make payment to the Plaintiff in the amount of $450,000 in full settlement of all possible claims the Plaintiff has made against the County arising from the matter upon which the action is based; and

WHEREAS, the County Attorney has caused an investigation and analysis to be made of the said action and as a result thereof recommends that it be settled in the amount set forth above; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Attorney be and is hereby authorized and directed to settle the said action in the amount as indicated above, provided that, if any payment arising from said action is to be made from the proceeds of a borrowing, that a bond ordinance to finance such settlement is adopted by this Legislature and any borrowing pursuant to such bond ordinance is approved by the Nassau County Interim Finance Authority, if such approval is required; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the County Treasurer be and is hereby authorized to pay a maximum of $450,000 by check or checks payable as directed by the County Attorney, said check or checks to be delivered to the County Attorney and thereupon delivered to the attorneys for Plaintiff upon receipt of a Settlement Agreement and Limited Release; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 *et seq.* and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this settlement is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(29) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 149 - 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFFS, AS SET FORTH IN THE ACTION ENTITLED *DESIREE BEHR AND STEPHEN BEHR V. COUNTY OF NASSAU,* INDEX NO. 009553/10 PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY LAW, THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE.

WHEREAS, Desiree Behr and Stephen Behr (the "Plaintiffs") commenced an action against the County of Nassau (the "County"), entitled *Desiree Behr and Stephen Behr v. County of Nassau*, Index No. 009553/10, alleging damages arising out of personal injuries resulting from an accident, and the County has agreed to make payment to Plaintiffs in the amount of $150,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees in full settlement of all possible claims Plaintiffs may have against the County in the above titled action; and

WHEREAS, the County Attorney has caused an investigation and analysis to be made of the said action and as a result thereof recommends that it be settled in the amount set forth above; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Attorney be and is hereby authorized and directed to settle the said action in the amount as indicated above, provided that, if any payment arising from said action is to be made from the proceeds of a borrowing, that a bond ordinance to finance such settlement is adopted by this Legislature and any borrowing pursuant to such bond ordinance is approved by the Nassau County Interim Finance Authority, if such approval is required; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the County Treasurer be and is hereby authorized to pay a maximum of $150,000 by check or checks payable as directed by the County Attorney, said check or checks to be delivered to the County Attorney and thereupon delivered to the attorneys for Plaintiffs, Desiree Behr and Stephen Behr, upon receipt of a Settlement Agreement and Limited Release; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 *et seq.* and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this settlement is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(29) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NUMBER 150-2020

AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO PARTICIPATE IN A TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PROVIDING FOR THE RESTRIPING OF VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS, CAPITAL PROJECT H6215313G, P.I.N. 0761.23, AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SAID AID FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK.

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau has identified the above transportation improvement project intended to improve the safety and/or efficiency of traffic flow on various roads throughout Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, this project and associated funding to advance this project has been identified and approved as part of the County's four year Capital plan; and

WHEREAS, this project for transportation related improvements in Nassau County are eligible for federal aid funding under Title 23 U.S. Code, as amended, and the New York State Highway Law and Budget Bills applicable thereto, calls for the apportionment of costs for the program to be borne at the ratio of 80 percent Federal funds and 20 percent non-Federal funds; and

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau has been approved to receive Aid on the above project; and

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau has approved of and desires to advance these projects by making a commitment for 100 percent of its local share of the cost; and

WHEREAS, personal service agreements and/or contracts required to further advance these projects will be submitted for Legislative approval, now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature hereby authorizes the participation of the County in the project not on the State Highway System, and it be further

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature authorizes the County of Nassau to pay in the first instance 100 percent of the of the project cost, or portion thereof, and it be further

RESOLVED, that the County Executive of the County of Nassau be and is hereby authorized to execute agreement numbers PIN 0761.23 on behalf of the County of Nassau with the New York State Department of Transportation in connection with the advancement or approval of this Project and providing for the administration of the Project and the municipality's first instance funding of project's costs and permanent funding of the local share of the Project costs eligible for Aid and all Project costs within appropriations therefore that are no so eligible,

and it is further

RESOLVED, that the County Executive of the County of Nassau be and is hereby authorized to execute all necessary additional agreements, supplemental agreements, certifications or reimbursement requests for the Federal Aid and/or Marchiselli Aid on behalf of the County of Nassau with the New York State Department of Transportation in connection with the advancement or approval of all phases of this Project and providing for the administration of the Project and the municipality's first instance funding of project's costs and permanent funding of the local share of the Project costs eligible for Aid and all Project costs within appropriations therefore that are no so eligible, and it is further

RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be filed with the New York State Commissioner of Transportation by attaching it to any necessary Agreement in connection with the Project, and it is further

RESOLVED, this Resolution shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 151 – 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE VILLAGE OF NEW HYDE PARK IN RELATION TO A PROJECT TO PROCURE AND INSTALL AN EMERGENCY GENERATOR AND RELATED ITEMS

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau (the "County") and the Village of New Hyde Park (the "Village") are authorized, pursuant to Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law to enter into intergovernmental agreements; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of the County and Village in procuring and installing an emergency generator and related items for the Village (the "Services"); and

WHEREAS, the Village has agreed to accept funds from the County in furtherance of the Services; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Village believe it to be in the best interest of the taxpayers of their respective municipalities to authorize intermunicipal cooperation with respect to the mutual covenants set forth in the proposed Agreement, on file with the Clerk of the Legislature; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Nassau County Legislature authorizes the County Executive to execute the said agreement with the Village, in relation to the aforesaid Services; and be it further

RESOLVED that pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), 8 N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 *et seq*. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County said Project is a "Type II Action" within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 152 – 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD IN RELATION TO PROVIDING LIFEGUARD SERVICES AT NICKERSON BEACH

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau (the "County") and the Town of Hempstead (the "Town") are authorized, pursuant to Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law to enter into intergovernmental agreements; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of the County and Town in furthering the availability of lifeguard personnel and first aid services (the "Services") at Nickerson Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Town has agreed to accept funds from the County in furtherance of these Services; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Town believe it to be in the best interests of the taxpayers of their respective municipalities to authorize intermunicipal cooperation with respect to the mutual covenants set forth in the proposed Agreement, on file with the Clerk of the Legislature; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Nassau County Legislature authorizes the County Executive to execute the said Agreement with the Town, in relation to the aforesaid Services; and be it further

RESOLVED that pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), 8 N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 *et seq*. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County said Project is a "Type II Action" within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 153 – 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST MEADOW UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT TO PURCHASE AND INSTALL NEW PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT.

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau (the "County") and the East Meadow Union Free School District (the "District") are authorized, pursuant to Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law to enter into inter-governmental agreements; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of the County and District to purchase and install new playground equipment for the District; and

WHEREAS, the District has agreed to accept funds from the County in furtherance of this purpose; and

WHEREAS, the County and the District believe it to be in the best interest of the taxpayers of their respective municipalities to authorize inter-municipal cooperation with respect to the mutual covenants set forth in the proposed Agreement, on file with the Clerk of the Legislature; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Nassau County Legislature authorizes the County Executive to execute the said agreement with the District, in relation to the aforesaid purchase and installation; and be it further

RESOLVED that pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), 8 N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 *et seq*. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County said Project is a "Type II Action" within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 154 - 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO AMEND THE 2019 HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN AS AMENDED AND TO FILE AN APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL ASSISTANCE WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

WHEREAS, the Nassau County Office of Community Development is the overall administrative agent for the Federal Community Development Block Grant ("CDBG"), HOME Investment Partnership ("HOME"), and the Emergency Shelter Grant ("ESG"), programs funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"); and

WHEREAS, each year, Nassau County must submit to HUD an annual plan, the HUD Action Plan, outlining the proposed use of funds received through such programs; and

WHEREAS, in 2019, Nassau County submitted to HUD its annual plan for its 45th Program Year CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding ("2019 HUD Action Plan"); and

WHEREAS, HUD approved Nassau County's application for funding for its 45th Program Year and awarded funding for the CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act ("CARES Act"), HUD has made available additional funds to supplement Nassau County's HUD allocation, administered through the Office of Community Development, for two programs CDBG-CV and ESG-CV; and

WHEREAS, in order to be eligible for additional funds available pursuant to the Federal CARES Act, Nassau County must submit to HUD an amended 2019 HUD Action Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Community Development now seeks to amend the 2019 HUD Action Plan to outline the proposed use of additional funds made available pursuant

to the Federal CARES Act through the CDBG-CV and ESG-CV programs and to submit that amended Action Plan to HUD; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County of Nassau, acting by and through the Office of Community Development, is authorized to file an amended 2019 HUD Action Plan to serve as an application for additional funds from HUD made available pursuant to the Federal "CARES Act"; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the County Executive is authorized to execute any grant agreements or other documentation in relation to the receipt of such grant funds.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 155– 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE A GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATION AND MUSEUMS, AND THE CORNELL COOPERATIVE EXTENSION NASSAU COUNTY

WHEREAS, Nassau County ("County") has received funding from the State of New York pursuant to State Tax Law section 1202-q, and appropriated said funds to the Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums("Department") in accordance with said law in order to support programs and activities relevant to the enhancement of cultural in the County; and

WHEREAS, the Department has determined that funding shall be awarded to the Cornell Cooperative Extension Nassau County, an existing not-for-profit organization located within the County for the continuation and enhancement of cultural growth in the County; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Nassau County Legislature authorizes the County Executive to execute the said agreement with the Cornell Cooperative Extension Nassau County.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 156 - 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ADOPTION OF THE RETENTION AND DISPOSITION SCHEDULE FOR NEW YORK LOCAL GOVERNMENT RECORDS (LGS-1).

RESOLVED, by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau that *Retention and Disposition Schedule for New York Local Government Records (LGS-1)*, issued pursuant to Article 57-A of the Arts and Cultural Affairs Law, and containing legal minimum retention periods for local government records, is hereby adopted for use by all officers in legally disposing of valueless records listed therein; and be it further

RESOLVED, that in accordance with Article 57-A:

(a) Only those records will be disposed of that are described in *Retention and Disposition Schedule for New York Local Government Records (LGS-1)*, after they have met the minimum retention periods described therein; and

(b) Only those records will be disposed of that do not have sufficient administrative, fiscal, legal, or historical value to merit retention beyond established legal minimum periods.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 157 – 2020

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION NO. 387-2008, AS LAST AMENDED BY RESOLUTION NO. 421-2019, TO DESIGNATE NEWSPAPERS TO PUBLISH AND IDENTIFY THE REAL PROPERTY, LISTED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER, LOCATED WHOLLY OR PARTLY IN THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD, TOWN OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD, TOWN OF OYSTER BAY, CITY OF GLEN COVE AND CITY OF LONG BEACH, ON WHICH REAL ESTATE TAX LIENS ARE SUBJECT TO SALE BY THE COUNTY TREASURER FOR UNPAID TAXES, PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2008, the Nassau County Legislature passed Resolution No. 387-2008, designating newspapers to publish and identify the real property, listed by school district number, located wholly or partly in the Town of Hempstead, Town of North Hempstead, Town of Oyster Bay, City of Glen Cove and City of Long Beach, on which real estate tax liens are subject to sale by the County Treasurer for unpaid taxes, pursuant to the County Government Law of Nassau County and the Nassau County Administrative Code; and

WHEREAS, such designation by the Nassau County Legislature needs to be done annually: therefore, be it,

RESOLVED, that pursuant to § 5-37.0 of the Nassau County Administrative Code, the following newspapers printed in the County of Nassau are hereby designated by the Nassau County Legislature as the newspapers in which the County Treasurer shall publish and identify the real property, listed according to school district number, located wholly or partially in the **Town of Hempstead**, on which real estate tax liens are subject to sale by the County Treasurer for unpaid 2019/2020 school taxes and 2020 state, county, town, and other taxes:

NAME OF PAPER
Baldwin Herald
Baldwin/Freeport Tribune

Bellmore Herald/Life
East Meadow Beacon
East Meadow Herald
East Rockaway Tribune
Fives Towns Jewish Times
Five Towns Tribune
Floral Park Bulletin
Franklin Square Bulletin
Franklin Square/Elmont Herald
Freeport Baldwin Leader, The
Garden City Life
Garden City News
Garden City Tribune
Hicksville Illustrated News
Island Park Tribune
The Jewish Star
Levittown Tribune
Long Beach Herald
Long Beach Tribune
Lynbrook/East Rockaway Herald
Malverne/West Hempstead Herald
Merrick Herald/Life
Merrick/Bellmore Tribune
Nassau County Web Page
Nassau Herald (Five Towns)
Neighbor Newspapers
New Hyde Park Illustrated News
New York Trend
Newsday, Inc.
Oceanside Tribune
Oceanside/Island Park Herald
Rockaway Journal
Rockville Centre Herald
Rockville Centre Tribune
Seaford/Herald Citizen
The Gateway
Uniondale Beacon
Valley Stream Herald
Valley Stream/Malverne Tribune
Wantagh Herald Citizen
Westbury Times
West Hempstead Beacon

and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to § 5-37.0 of the Nassau County Administrative Code, the following newspapers printed in the County of Nassau are hereby designated by the Nassau County Legislature as the newspapers in which the County Treasurer shall publish and identify the real property, listed according to school district number, located wholly or partially in the **Town of North Hempstead**, on which real estate tax liens are subject to sale by the County Treasurer for unpaid 2019/2020 school taxes and 2020 state, county, town, and other taxes:

Floral Park Bulletin, Inc.
Glen Cove Record Pilot
Great Neck News, The
Great Neck Record
Jericho News Journal
The Jewish Star
Locust Valley Leader
Manhasset Press
Manhasset Times
Mineola American
Nassau County Web Page
New Hyde Park Herald Courier
New Hyde Park Illustrated News
Newsday, Inc.
Port Washington News
Port Washington Times -Island Now
Roslyn News
Roslyn Times
Syosset Jericho Tribune
The Gateway
Westbury Times
Williston Times, Williston Park Edition

and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to § 5-37.0 of the Nassau County Administrative Code, the following newspapers printed in the County of Nassau are hereby designated by the Nassau County Legislature as the newspapers in which the County Treasurer shall publish and identify the real property, listed according to school district number, located wholly or partially in the **Town of**

Oyster Bay, on which real estate tax liens are subject to sale by the County Treasurer for unpaid 2019/2020 school taxes and 2020 state, county, town, and other taxes:

Bethpage Newsgram
Farmingdale Observer
Glen Cove Herald Gazette
Glen Cove Record Pilot
Hicksville Illustrated News
Hicksville/Levittown Tribune
Jericho News Journal
Locust Valley Leader
Massapequa Post
Massapequan Observer, The
Mid-Island Times
Nassau County Web Page
Newsday, Inc.
Noticia
Oyster Bay Enterprise Pilot
Oyster Bay Guardian
Plainview/Old Bethpage Herald
Roslyn News
Syosset Advance
Syosset Jericho Tribune

and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to § 5-37.0 of the Nassau County Administrative Code, the following newspapers printed in the County of Nassau are hereby designated by the Nassau County Legislature as the newspapers in which the County Treasurer shall publish and identify the real property, listed according to school district number, located wholly or partially in the **City of Glen Cove**, on which real estate tax liens are subject to sale by the County Treasurer for unpaid 2019/2020 school taxes and 2020 state, county, town, and other taxes:

Glen Cove Record Pilot
Glen Cove Herald Gazette
Locust Valley Leader
Nassau County Web Page
Newsday, Inc.

and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to § 5-37.0 of the Nassau County Administrative Code, the following newspapers printed in the County of Nassau are hereby designated by the Nassau County Legislature as the newspapers in which the County Treasurer shall publish and identify the real property, listed according to school district number, located wholly or partially in the **City of Long Beach**, on which real estate tax liens are subject to sale by the County Treasurer for unpaid 2019/2020 school taxes and 2020 state, county, town, and other taxes:

Long Beach Herald
Long Beach Tribune
Nassau County Web Page
Newsday, Inc.

and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this renaming is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 158-2020

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL ZONE OF ASSESSMENT TO INCLUDE REAL PROPERTY IN THE VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE

WHEREAS, the State enacted Chapter 685 of the Laws of 2003 ("Chapter 685"), creating the Nassau County Sewer and Storm Water Resources District (the "District") of Nassau County (the "County") as a new single County-wide district; and

WHEREAS, upon enactment of Chapter 685, zones of assessment replaced each of the prior County collection and disposal districts to allocate financing costs and costs of the sewer and storm water resources facilities among the zones of assessment, with the initial zones of assessment substantially mirroring those of the related prior districts; and

WHEREAS, this Legislature by Resolution 59-A-2004 adopted the boundary description of the initial zones of assessment; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 685, the District consists of (i) one zone of assessment for areas of the District receiving storm water resources services, (ii) one zone of assessment for areas of the District receiving sewage collection and disposal services (the "Collection and Disposal ZOA") and (iii) one zone of assessment for areas of the District receiving sewage disposal, but not sewage collection services; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Village of Lawrence ("Village") entered into an intermunicipal agreement for the consolidation of sewer treatment resources and services dated as of January 16, 2008 (the "Original IMA"), which the parties amended as of July 1, 2009 ("Amendment No. 1", and together with the Original IMA as amended, the "IMA") and

WHEREAS, the County and the Village entered into a settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") to resolve certain disputes in connection with the IMA. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties entered into Amendment No. 2 to the IMA to provide for the consolidation of real property within the Village into the Collection and Disposal ZOA in the District as of January 1, 2021; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 685 further provides that this Legislature, by resolution, after holding a public hearing thereon upon notice published at least once in the official newspapers of the County at least ten but not more than twenty days before the day set forth for the hearing, may change either the allocation of the costs among such zones of assessment or the boundaries of such zones of assessment; and

WHEREAS, such hearing having been held in accordance with such notice; and

WHEREAS, a boundary description of the Collection and Disposal ZOA amended to include real property in the Village has been prepared and is on file with the Clerk of the Legislature; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED the amended boundary of the Collection and Disposal ZOA as contained in such description on file with the Clerk of the Legislature is hereby adopted and effective as of January 1, 2021; and be it further

RESOLVED that is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County that amending the boundary of a zone of assessment is a Type II Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 159 -2020

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE DESIGNATED PARKING FOR VETERANS AT COUNTY BUILDINGS OR FACILITIES, AND PARKS

WHEREAS, Nassau County is home to a large population of military veterans; and

WHEREAS, Nassau County strives to assist veterans in meeting their needs, through services provided by its Veterans Service Agency and other departments, as well as providing veteran-specific benefits; and

WHEREAS, veterans visit Nassau County facilities to obtain necessary services and interact with government officials; and

WHEREAS, veterans use the Nassau County Veterans Leisure Pass throughout the Nassau County parks system to enjoy beaches, pools, and open greenery at discounted fees; and

WHEREAS, it would be appropriate to designate two (2) spots at each County facility and County park per lot as dedicated parking for veterans in recognition of their sacrifices to protect our nation's freedom; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Commissioner of the Nassau County Department of Public Works is hereby authorized, empowered and directed to designate two (2) parking spaces for exclusive use by veterans at each building or facility owned, leased or otherwise under the control of Nassau County; and be it further

RESOLVED, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Commissioner of the Nassau County Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums is hereby authorized, empowered and directed to designate two (2) parking spaces for exclusive use by veterans at each County park with a total of at least 30 parking spaces in a single parking lot under his or her jurisdiction; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the two parking spaces designated for exclusive use by veterans shall be in addition to parking spaces designated for purple heart recipients or disabled veterans; and

RESOLVED, that the Commissioner of the Nassau County Department of Public Works and the Commissioner of the Nassau County Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums cause appropriate signs to be erected and pavement markings to be made to clearly mark the parking spaces and allow for the enforcement of the law; and be it further

RESOLVED, to the extent practicable, spaces designated for parking by veterans shall be located in the immediate vicinity of an entrance to each County building or facility and park, if applicable, and in no event shall veteran parking spaces be located closer to a facility entrance than those spaces designated for use by the disabled; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Director of the Nassau County Veterans Service Agency is authorized, empowered and directed to issue hanging tags as requested for vehicles operated by individuals who provide a DD Form 214 or a certified copy thereof for inspection; and be it further

RESOLVED, that Nassau County Public Safety shall enforce this resolution and issue a ticket for any vehicle parked in a veteran's reserved parking space without a Nassau County issued hanging tag or New York State veteran custom license plate; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a penalty for violation of this resolution shall not exceed one hundred dollars ($100); and be it further

RESOLVED, if any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section, or part of this law or the application thereof to any person, individuals, corporation, firm, partnership, entity, or circumstance shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unconstitutional, such order or judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation the clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section,

or part of this law, or in its application to the person, individual, corporation, firm, partnership, entity, or circumstance directly involved in the controversy in which such order or judgment shall be rendered; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this appointment is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and,. Accordingly, is a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is necessary; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution shall take effect immediately.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 160 – 2020

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 5, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has advised that a transfer of appropriations heretofore made has been requested in order to provide funds to meet certain expenditures authorized within the budget for the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, the transfer has been reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the County Executive; and

WHEREAS, the said transfer is known as BTCW20000049 as follows:

BOARD TRANSFER NO. 49

	CODE	**DESCRIPTION**	**AMOUNT**
FROM	PR-GRT-CE20-NYS-DD498	Shared Services – Grant Fund – General Expenses	$ 325,414.00
	TOTAL		**$ 325,414.00**
TO	PR-GRT-CE20-NYS-DE547	Shared Services – Grant Fund – Contractual Expenses	$ 325,414.00
	TOTAL		**$ 325,414.00**

WHEREAS, the said transfers of appropriations are recommended by the County Executive in said communication and are within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature does hereby authorize the said transfers of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020, as hereinabove set forth; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said resolution without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said resolution is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this budget transfer is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is a class of actions which does not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 161 – 2020

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 14, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has advised that a transfer of appropriations heretofore made has been requested in order to provide funds to meet certain expenditures authorized within the budget for the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, the transfer has been reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the County Executive; and

WHEREAS, the said transfer is known as BTCW20000050 as follows:

BOARD TRANSFER NO. 50

	CODE	**DESCRIPTION**	**AMOUNT**
FROM	HE-GRT-L200 (X9) - AA98Z	Health Department – Grant Fund – Salaries	$ 591.00
	HE-GRT-L200 (X9) - DD498	Health Department – Grant Fund – General Expenses	$ 923.00
	TOTAL		**$ 1,514.00**
TO	HE-GRT-L200 (X9) – AB10F	Health Department – Grant Fund – Fringe Benefits	$ 1,514.00
	TOTAL		**$ 1,514.00**

WHEREAS, the said transfers of appropriations are recommended by the County Executive in said communication and are within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature does hereby authorize the said transfers of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020, as hereinabove set forth; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said resolution without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said resolution is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this budget transfer is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is a class of actions which does not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 162 – 2020

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has advised that a transfer of appropriations heretofore made has been requested in order to provide funds to meet certain expenditures authorized within the budget for the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, the transfer has been reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the County Executive; and

WHEREAS, the said transfer is known as BTCW20000053 as follows:

BOARD TRANSFER NO. 53

	CODE	**DESCRIPTION**	**AMOUNT**
FROM	HE-GRT-C100-AA98Z	Health Department – Grant Fund – Salaries, Wages & Fees	$ 403.00
	TOTAL		**$ 403.00**
TO	HE-GRT-C100–AB10F	Health Department – Grant Fund – Fringe Benefits	$ 403.00
	TOTAL		**$ 403.00**

WHEREAS, the said transfers of appropriations are recommended by the County Executive in said communication and are within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature does hereby authorize the said transfers of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020, as hereinabove set forth; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said resolution without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said resolution is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this budget transfer is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is a class of actions which does not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 163 – 2020

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE WITHIN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2020

WHEREAS, the County Executive, by communication dated October 21, 2020, addressed to the County Legislature, has advised that a transfer of appropriations heretofore made has been requested in order to provide funds to meet certain expenditures authorized within the budget for the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, the transfer has been reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the County Executive; and

WHEREAS, the said transfer is known as BTCW20000052 as follows:

BOARD TRANSFER NO. 52

	CODE	**DESCRIPTION**	**AMOUNT**
FROM	PB-GRT-77Y9NYS- DD498	Probation Department – Grant Fund – General Expense	$ 2000.00
	PB-GRT-77Y9NYS- DE548	Probation Department – Grant Fund – Contractual Services	$ 8500.00
	TOTAL		**$ 10,500.00**
TO	PB-GRT-77Y9NYS– AA97Z	Probation Department – Grant Fund – Salaries	$ 10,500.00
	TOTAL		**$ 10,500.00**

WHEREAS, the said transfers of appropriations are recommended by the County Executive in said communication and are within the scope of Section 307 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature does hereby authorize the said transfers of appropriations heretofore made within the budget for the year 2020, as hereinabove set forth; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said resolution without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said resolution is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature; and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that this budget transfer is a "Type II" Action within the meaning of Section 617.5(c)(20) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R. ("routine or continuing agency administration and management, not including new programs or major reordering of priorities that may affect the environment"), and, accordingly, is a class of actions which does not have a significant effect on the environment; and no further review is required.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 164 -2020

A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A WARRANT DIRECTING THE TREASURER OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO PAY TO THE SUPERVISORS OF THE SEVERAL TOWNS AND TO THE TREASURERS OF THE SEVERAL VILLAGES AND CITIES WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, THE SUMS AS APPORTIONED BY THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE BASED ON A REPORT FILED BY THE COUNTY TREASURER AND THE COUNTY CLERK, SHOWING DEPOSITS FROM MORTGAGE TAXES FOR THE PERIOD OF ONE YEAR COMMENCING OCTOBER 1, 2019 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2020; PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY AND THE NASSAU COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE.

WHEREAS, the County Treasurer and the County Clerk have heretofore filed with the Clerk of the Nassau County Legislature their joint report showing that the sum of $ 31,910,682.14 is the net amount to be credited to the various tax districts in the County of Nassau, in accordance with section 5-1.2 of the Nassau County Administrative Code for the period commencing October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Nassau County Legislature in pursuance of said section of the Nassau County Administrative Code is required to issue its warrants for payment to the respective tax districts of the County of seventy-five percent of the amounts credited in the quarterly reports for the period commencing October 1, 2019 and ending on September 30, 2020 as apportioned as required by the aforesaid section; and

WHEREAS, the Nassau County Legislature in pursuance of the said section of the Nassau County Administrative Code is required to issue its warrant, based upon the entire amount, less expenses, collected for such mortgage taxes during the entire preceding year ending September 30th, after having first deducted all amounts theretofore paid to the various supervisors and treasurers during the tax period covered by the said warrant; and

WHEREAS, the aforesaid section of the Nassau County Administrative Code further requires that the said warrant to be issued by the Nassau County Legislature shall direct payment of the net amount of such taxes as finally apportioned, to the respective supervisors and village and city treasurers; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the sum of $ 31,910,682.14 being the net amount collected as above, is hereby apportioned among the respective tax district of the County of Nassau as follows, less all amounts heretofore paid to the various supervisors and

treasurers covering the tax period commencing October 1, 2019 and ending September 30, 2020.

To the Supervisor of the
Town of Hempstead the sum of $ 13,974,844.49

To the Village Treasurer of the Incorporated
Villages in the Town of Hempstead

VILLAGE	NET AMOUNT
ATLANTIC BEACH	$ 36,991.27
BELLEROSE	$ 9,131.18
CEDARHURST	$ 89,756.62
EAST ROCKAWAY	$ 73,985.59
FLORAL PARK	$ 112,675.88
FREEPORT	$ 331,608.71
GARDEN CITY	$ 511,693.14
HEMPSTEAD	$ 366,416.21
HEWLETT BAY PARK	$ 22,044.24
HEWLETT HARBOR	$ 20,212.96
HEWLETT NECK	$ 5,741.26
ISLAND PARK	$ 28,430.49
LAWRENCE	$ 116,536.36
LYNBROOK	$ 167,368.60
MALVERNE	$ 71,517.29
MINEOLA	$ 448.83
NEW HYDE PARK	$ 28,246.15
ROCKVILLE CENTRE	$ 329,522.65
SOUTH FLORAL PARK	$ 5,172.62
STEWART MANOR	$ 15,616.53
VALLEY STREAM	$ 268,413.85
WOODSBURGH	$ 8,466.24

To the Supervisor of the
Town of North Hempstead, the sum of $ 4,382,520.52

To the Village Treasurer of the Incorporated
Villages in the Town of North Hempstead

VILLAGE	NET AMOUNT
BAXTER ESTATES	$ 12,396.10
EAST HILLS	$ 99,399.33
EAST WILLISTON	$ 23,555.93
FLORAL PARK	$ 13,014.63
FLOWER HILL	$ 79,709.25
GARDEN CITY	$ 727.42
GREAT NECK	$ 127,550.23
GREAT NECK ESTATES	$ 41,285.15
GREAT NECK PLAZA	$ 91,002.07
KENSINGTON	$ 14,596.84
KINGS POINT	$ 144,121.01
LAKE SUCCESS	$ 119,530.54
MANORHAVEN	$ 39,657.89
MINEOLA	$ 223,631.54
MUNSEY PARK	$ 43,627.70
NEW HYDE PARK	$ 41,106.47
NORTH HILLS	$ 124,566.12
OLD WESTBURY	$ 93,393.25
PLANDOME	$ 26,665.23
PLANDOME HEIGHTS	$ 11,106.52
PLANDOME MANOR	$ 18,901.65
PORT WASHINGTON N.	$ 33,887.38
ROSLYN	$ 48,826.97
ROSLYN ESTATES	$ 15,908.34
ROSLYN HARBOR	$ 22,774.31
RUSSELL GARDENS	$ 12,252.31
SADDLE ROCK	$ 16,976.58
SANDS POINT	$ 98,964.51
THOMASTON	$ 34,605.01
WESTBURY	$ 107,348.02
WILLISTON PARK	$ 48,166.66

To the Supervisor of the Town of Oyster Bay, the sum of $ 6,849,898.11

To the Village Treasurer of the Incorporated Villages in the Town of Oyster Bay

VILLAGE	AMOUNT
BAYVILLE	$ 62,167.18
BROOKVILLE	$ 164,390.34
CENTRE ISLAND	$ 17,555.05
COVE NECK	$ 11,212.55
EAST HILLS	$ 638.77
FARMINGDALE	$ 91,220.95
LATTINGTOWN	$ 77,906.82
LAUREL HOLLOW	$ 58,164.82
MASSAPEQUA PARK	$ 110,560.14
MATINECOCK	$ 48,577.40
MILL NECK	$ 37,110.70
MUTTONTOWN	$ 105,370.24
OLD BROOKVILLE	$ 70,051.53
OLD WESTBURY	$ 116,559.43
OYSTER BAY COVE	$ 53,430.66
ROSLYN HARBOR	$ 3,526.79
SEA CLIFF	$ 57,125.33
UPPER BROOKVILLE	$ 69,859.68

To the City Treasurer of the City of Long Beach, the sum of $ 723,088.76

To the City Treasurer or comparable Financial officer of the City of Glen Cove, the sum of $ 375,650.25

and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk of the Nassau County Legislature shall execute on behalf of the Legislature a warrant, in pursuance of Section 5-1.2 of the Nassau County Administrative

Code, directing the County Treasurer to make payment of the aforesaid sums to the respective officials set forth herein.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 165 – 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE A DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION AND WESTERN BAYS CONSTRUCTORS IN RELATION TO THE BAY PARK DIVERSION PROJECT.

WHEREAS, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("DEC") is authorized to enforce the environmental laws of New York State pursuant to Environmental Conservation Law ("ECL"), Title 6 of the Official Compilation of the Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York ("6 NYCRR"), and orders and permits issued thereunder;

WHEREAS, Nassau County (the "County") is a municipal corporation of the State of New York, having offices at 1550 Franklin Avenue, Mineola, New York. The County Department of Public Works is an agency of the County. The County owns and is responsible for the County's municipal wastewater treatment plants, including the Sewage Treatment Facility at Bay Park ("Bay Park WWTP") and the Wastewater Pollution Control Plant at Cedar Creek ("Cedar Creek WWTP");

WHEREAS, DEC and the County entered into an administrative Order on Consent dated June 29, 2011 (Case No. R1-2100517-46) (the "2011 Order") addressing violations of the County's State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("SPDES") permit, and requiring the County to perform operational and repair work on settling tanks, prepare an infrastructure assessment plan for the wastewater treatment infrastructure, submit a process flow diagram identifying the replacement of certain equipment, and complete an environmental benefit project for a feasibility study, among other requirements. The County has completed many of the tasks required by the 2011 Order;

WHEREAS, DEC and the County entered into an administrative consent agreement in December 2017 (such agreement, the "Bay Park Agreement"), including the Cooperative Agreement incorporated into the Bay Park Agreement as Exhibit 1, to modify and replace the 2011 Order, and to identify and incorporate the uncompleted tasks required by the 2011 Order, as well as additional work, including the Bay Park Diversion Project, to repair, rebuild and create resiliency at the Bay Park WWTP;

WHEREAS, the Bay Park Diversion Project will eliminate the discharge of treated wastewater effluent from the Bay Park WWTP into Reynolds Channel by diverting the effluent to the Cedar Creek WWTP, and then through the ocean outflow pipe and into the ocean;

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of the Bay Park Agreement and the Cooperative Agreement, the County and DEC agree that the most efficient method to accomplish the Bay Park Diversion Project is through the authority of the DEC under the Infrastructure Investment Act (Part F of Chapter 60 of the laws of 2015, as amended), allowing the DEC to utilize design-build contracts for capital projects relating to New York State's physical infrastructure to correct health and safety defects;

WHEREAS, the County and DEC are authorized, pursuant to Article 9, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution, to enter into inter-governmental agreements;

WHEREAS, the County and DEC previously negotiated and entered into a tri-party design-build professional consulting services contract with AECOM USA, Inc. in relation to the Bay Park Diversion Project; and

WHEREAS, the County and DEC are mutually interested in proceeding with the Bay Park Diversion Project and additional work in accordance with the Bay Park Agreement and Cooperative Agreement, and, in furtherance thereof, the County and DEC have negotiated a tri-party design-build contract (the "Design-Build Contract") with Western Bays Constructors, a Joint Venture comprised of John P. Picone, Inc. and Northeast Remsco Construction, Inc., a copy of which agreement is on file with the Clerk of the Legislature.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Nassau County Legislature hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute the Design-Build Contract, a Type II action under ECL § 8-0105(5) and 6 NYCRR § 617.5(c)(35), and to execute any and all other instruments or ancillary agreements and to take such other action as is necessary to effectuate and carry out the purposes of the Design-Build Contract.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 166 – 2020

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE MODIFICATION AGREEMENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT AGREEMENT AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION IN RELATION TO THE BAY PARK DIVERSION PROJECT AND ADDITIONAL WORK.

WHEREAS, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("DEC") is authorized to enforce the environmental laws of New York State pursuant to Environmental Conservation Law ("ECL"), Title 6 of the Official Compilation of the Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York ("6 NYCRR"), and orders and permits issued thereunder;

WHEREAS, Nassau County (the "County") is a municipal corporation of the State of New York, having offices at 1550 Franklin Avenue, Mineola, New York. The County Department of Public Works is an agency of Nassau County. The County owns and is responsible for the County's municipal wastewater treatment plants, including the Sewage Treatment Facility at Bay Park ("Bay Park WWTP") and the Wastewater Pollution Control Plant at Cedar Creek ("Cedar Creek WWTP");

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2018 DEC and the County entered into a consent agreement (such agreement, the "Bay Park Agreement"), including the Cooperative Agreement incorporated into the Bay Park Agreement as Exhibit 1, to establish milestones and schedules for the County to continue to repair and rebuild equipment at the Bay Park STP and tributary pump stations; implement biological nitrogen removal ("BNR") infrastructural improvements at the Bay Park STP; abate sanitary sewer overflows in the vicinity of Barnes Avenue by redirecting wastewater flow from the Village of Hempstead ("VOH Flow Diversion"); continue to provide resiliency to ensure operational continuity at this facility during extreme storms such as Super Storm Sandy; and remove effluent from the Western Bays ("Bay Park Conveyance Project") by conveying the Bay Park STP treated discharge through an unused, historic steel aqueduct along Sunrise Highway to the Cedar Creek WPCP for disposal through the Cedar Creek ocean outfall;

WHEREAS, the County and DEC desire to enter into a Modified Agreement (the "Modified Bay Park Agreement") to modify the terms of the Bay Park Agreement to: (i) advance the Bay Park Conveyance Project; (ii) clarify the County's water quality improvement obligations; and (iii) address modifications and violations of the Agreement compliance schedules and permits;

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau (the "County") and DEC are authorized, pursuant to Article 9, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution, to enter into inter-governmental agreements; and

WHEREAS, Nassau County and DEC are mutually interested in the Bay Park Diversion Project and additional work as are more particularly set forth in the Modified Bay Park

Agreement, a copy of which agreement is on file with the Clerk of the Legislature.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Nassau County Legislature hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute the Modified Bay Park Agreement, a Type II action under New York State Environmental Conservation Law §8-0105(5) and 6 NYCRR§617.5(c) (35), and to execute any and all other instruments and to take such other action as is necessary to effectuate and carry out the purposes of the Modified Bay Park Agreement.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION NO. 29 – 2020

AN EMERGENCY RESOLUTION DECLARING AN EMERGENCY FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION UPON A RESOLUTION RATIFYING A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT MAKING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND THE SUPERIOR OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, INC.

WHEREAS, the Honorable Laura Curran, County Executive, has submitted to this County Legislature a written recommendation dated November 16, 2020, pursuant to the provisions of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation refers to an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon a resolution ratifying a memorandum of agreement making certain amendments to the collective bargaining agreement between the County of Nassau and the Superior Officers Association of the Police Department of the County of Nassau, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation is that the County Legislature adopt a resolution declaring that an emergency exists in Nassau County the nature of which is to take immediate action upon the aforesaid resolution; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature hereby declares that an emergency exists within Nassau County, the nature of which is to consider and to take immediate action upon the aforesaid resolution before this Legislature.

RESOLUTION NO. 166-A-2020

A RESOLUTION ratifying a Memorandum of Agreement making certain amendments to the collective bargaining agreement between the County of Nassau and the Superior Officers Association of the Police Department of the County of Nassau, Inc.

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau entered into a Collective Bargaining Agreement (the "CBA") with the Superior Officers Association of the Police Department of the County of Nassau, Inc. ("SOA") which sets terms and conditions of employment for employees in the negotiating unit; and

WHEREAS, the County of Nassau and the SOA (collectively, "the parties") have agreed to a Memorandum of Agreement (the "Memorandum of Agreement") dated September 8, 2020 (attached hereto) making certain amendments to the CBA; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the act of the Director of Labor Relations for the County of Nassau in executing the Memorandum of Agreement by and between the County of Nassau and the SOA is hereby ratified.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION NO. 30 – 2020

AN EMERGENCY RESOLUTION DECLARING AN EMERGENCY FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION UPON A RESOLUTION DECLARING A CAPITAL BUDGET EMERGENCY PURSUANT TO §310(D) OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the Honorable Laura Curran, County Executive, has submitted to this County Legislature a written recommendation dated November 23, 2020, pursuant to the provisions of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation refers to an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon a resolution declaring a capital budget emergency pursuant to §310(D) of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation is that the County Legislature adopt a resolution declaring that an emergency exists in Nassau County the nature of which is to take immediate action upon the aforesaid resolution; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature hereby declares that an emergency exists within Nassau County, the nature of which is to consider and to take immediate action upon the aforesaid resolution before this Legislature.

RESOLUTION NO. 166-B-2020

A RESOLUTION DECLARING A CAPITAL BUDGET EMERGENCY PURSUANT TO §310(D) OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, the County Executive may propose, at any time subsequent to the passage of the ordinance approving the Capital Budget, an ordinance to amend the Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive has proposed an amendment to the 2019 Capital Budget for the following projects to be identified as: "Project 50702 – Police Department Taser"; "Project 50703 – Police Department Body Cameras"; and "Project 55001- Probation Department Equipment"; and

WHEREAS, such amendments to the 2019 Capital Budget would provide for additional programs, projects or activities and, pursuant to Section 310(d) of the County Government Law of Nassau County, may be approved only if the County Legislature, by thirteen affirmative votes, declares a capital budget emergency; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature hereby declares that a Capital Budget Emergency exists within Nassau County; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature may now consider and take action on such amendment to the 2019 Capital Budget.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION NO. 31 – 2020

AN EMERGENCY RESOLUTION DECLARING AN EMERGENCY FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION UPON A BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $15,855,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the Honorable Laura Curran, County Executive, has submitted to this County Legislature a written recommendation dated November 23, 2020, pursuant to the provisions of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation refers to an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon a bond ordinance providing for a capital expenditure to finance the capital project(s) identified herein within the County of Nassau and authorizing $15,855,000 of bonds of the County of Nassau to finance said expenditure pursuant to the Local Finance Law of New York and the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation is that the County Legislature adopt a resolution declaring that an emergency exists in Nassau County the nature of which is to take immediate action upon the aforesaid bond ordinance; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature hereby declares that an emergency exists within Nassau County, the nature of which is to consider and to take immediate action upon the aforesaid bond ordinance before this Legislature.

ORDINANCE NO. 124-A - 2020

BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TO FINANCE THE CAPITAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED HEREIN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU AND AUTHORIZING $15,855,000 OF BONDS OF THE COUNTY OF NASSAU TO FINANCE SUCH EXPENDITURE PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL FINANCE LAW OF NEW YORK AND THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY.

WHEREAS, this bond ordinance is necessary to authorize bonds for the purpose of funding projects contemplated by capital budgets as provided in Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, all necessary Federal, State, County and local permits, approvals and determinations of environmental impact for the purpose or purposes hereinafter referred to have been obtained or will have been obtained prior to the expenditure of proceeds of obligations to be authorized pursuant to this ordinance; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED, by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds (2/3rd) of the total voting strength of the County Legislature of the County of Nassau, New York, as follows:

Section 1. A capital expenditure for financing the cost of various objects or purposes, as described in the preambles hereto and identified under the heading "Project" on Appendix A attached hereto and incorporated herein, in the County of Nassau (hereinafter referred to as the "County"), is hereby authorized upon recommendation of the County Executive, the amount of such capital expenditure to be $15,855,000 which shall be financed with the proceeds from the issuance of $15,855,000 bonds.

Section 2. The County may issue its bonds in the aggregate principal amount of $15,855,000 pursuant to the Local Finance Law of New York (hereinafter referred to as the "LFL") in order to finance such objects or purposes or classes of objects or purposes (hereinafter referred to as the "Purpose") described in Section 1 hereof.

Section 3. The County Legislature has determined and hereby states that the estimated aggregate maximum cost of such Purpose, including preliminary costs and costs incidental thereto and the financing thereof, is $15,855,000. The plan of financing includes $15,855,000 to be raised by the issuance of bonds authorized by this ordinance, and the levy and collection of taxes on all the taxable real property of the County to pay the principal of said bonds and the interest thereon as the same shall be come due and payable.

Section 4. The County Legislature hereby determines that the periods of probable usefulness (each, a "PPU") of each component Project of the Purpose for which said $15,855,000 bonds authorized pursuant to this ordinance are to be issued, within the limitations of the applicable subdivision of paragraph a. of Section 11.00 of the Law identified under the heading "LFL" on Appendix A attached hereto and incorporated herein, are identified under the heading "PPU" on said Appendix A.

Section 5. Subject to the terms and conditions of this ordinance and the LFL, and pursuant to the provisions of the LFL, the powers and duties of the County Legislature relative to authorizing the issuance of and to sell bond anticipation notes in anticipation of the issuance and sale of the bonds herein authorized, including renewals of such notes, is hereby delegated to the County Treasurer, the chief fiscal officer. Such notes shall be of such terms, form and contents, and shall be sold in such manner, as may be prescribed by said County Treasurer, consistent with the provisions of the LFL.

Section 6. All other matters except as provided herein relating to the bonds herein authorized including the date, denominations, maturities and interest payment dates, within the limitations prescribed herein and the manner of execution of the same, including the consolidation with other bond issues, and also the ability to issue bonds with substantially level

or declining annual debt service, shall be determined by the County Treasurer, the chief fiscal officer of such County.

Section 7. The faith and credit of the County are hereby irrevocably pledged for the payment of the principal of and interest on such bonds and notes as the same become due and payable. An annual appropriation shall be made in each year sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds and notes becoming due and payable in such year.

Section 8. The validity of such bonds and bond anticipation notes may be contested only if:

1) Such obligations are authorized for an object or purpose for which said County is not authorized to expend money, or

2) The provisions of law which should be complied with as the date of publication of this ordinance are not substantially complied with, and an action, suit or proceeding contesting such validity is commenced within twenty (20) days after the date of such publication, or

3) Such obligations are authorized in violation of the provisions of the Constitution.

Section 9. This ordinance shall constitute a statement of official intent for purposes of Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2. Other than as specified in this ordinance, no monies are, or are reasonably expected to be, reserved, allocated on a long-term basis, or otherwise set aside with respect to the permanent funding of the object or purpose described herein.

Section 10. This ordinance, which takes effect immediately, shall be published in summary in the official newspaper of said County together with a notice of the Clerk of the County Legislature in substantially the form set forth in paragraph a of Section 81.00 of the Local Finance Law.

Section 11. It is hereby determined pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), 8 N.Y.E.C.L. Section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County that each Project identified on Appendix A attached hereto, if any, and incorporated herein as "Type II", if any, under the heading "SEQRA" is a "Type II Action" within the meaning of Section 617.5(c) of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and, accordingly, is of a class of actions which do not have a significant effect on the environment and no further review is required. A record of each such determination shall be maintained in a file, readily accessible to the public, at the office of the Clerk of the Legislature.

Section 12. This ordinance, including Appendix A, may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of said Legislature.

Appendix A

Project	Project Title	Amount	PPU	PPU LFL	SEQRA	SEQRA SECTION
50210	Live Scan Replacement	$2,750,000	5	11.00.a.32	TYPE II	617.5(c)(25)
50617	Police Department and other Agencies Bullet Proof Vests	$450,000	5	11.00.a.86(a)	TYPE II	617.5(c)(25)
50619	Police Department Ambulance Replacement	$1,175,000	10	11.00.a.27-a	TYPE II	617.5(c)(25)
50622	Police Department Specialty Vehicle Replacement	$1,595,000	3	11.00.a.77	TYPE II	617.5(c)(25)
50686	Police Fleet Replacement	$7,750,000	3	11.00.a.77	TYPE II	617.5(c)(25)
50696	Local Municipality Interoperable Radio Syatem	$1,000,000	10	11.00.a.25	TYPE II	617.5(c)(2), (25), (20)
61144	Nassau County Shared Mobility Plan	$60,000	5	11.00.a.62(a)	TYPE II	617.5(c)(27)
50702	Police Department Taser	$300,000	5	11.00.a.32	TYPE II	6.17.5(c)(31)
50703	Police Department Body Cameras	$500,000	5	11.00.a.32	TYPE II	6.17.5(c)(31)
55001	Probation Department Equipment	$275,000	5	11.00.a.32	TYPE II	6.17.5(c)(31)

$15,855,000

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION NO. 32 – 2020

AN EMERGENCY RESOLUTION DECLARING AN EMERGENCY FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION UPON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 174-2018 AS AMENDED, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE COUNTY OF NASSAU FOR THE FIRST YEAR OF THE FOUR-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN, TO COMMENCE ON JANUARY 1, 2019, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 310 OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the Honorable Laura Curran, County Executive, has submitted to this County Legislature a written recommendation dated November 23, 2020, pursuant to the provisions of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation refers to an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon an ordinance to amend Ordinance No. 174-2018 as amended, adopting the Capital Budget for the County of Nassau for the first year of the four-year Capital Plan, to commence on January 1, 2019, pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County; and

WHEREAS, the said recommendation is that the County Legislature adopt a resolution declaring that an emergency exists in Nassau County the nature of which is to take immediate action upon the aforesaid ordinance; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the County Legislature hereby declares that an emergency exists within Nassau County, the nature of which is to consider and to take immediate action upon the aforesaid ordinance before this Legislature.

ORDINANCE NO. 124-B–2020

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 174-2018 AS AMENDED, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE COUNTY OF NASSAU FOR THE FIRST YEAR OF THE FOUR-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN, TO COMMENCE ON JANUARY 1, 2019, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 310 OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2019, pursuant to Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, the Nassau County Legislature by Ordinance No. 174-2018 approved and adopted the Capital Budget (the "Capital Budget") of the County of Nassau for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 2019 and ending December 31, 2019; and

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2019, pursuant to Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, the Nassau County Legislature by Resolution No. 202-2018 approved and adopted the four-year Capital Plan for the County of Nassau for the fiscal years beginning January 1, 2019 and ending December 31, 2022 (the "Capital Plan"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 310 of such County Government Law, the County Executive may propose, at any time subsequent to the passage of the ordinance approving the Capital Budget, an ordinance to amend the Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive, based upon a review of the Capital Budget priorities by the Nassau County Department of Public Works, proposes that the amounts described herein be authorized in the Capital Budget for certain projects as hereinafter set forth in Appendix A attached hereto and incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Management and Budget has recommended this amendment to the capital budget with respect to the amendment contained in this ordinance; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau as follows:

Section 1. The Capital Budget, as adopted by Ordinance No. 174-2018 and later amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(i) under the column heading, "Public Safety", project title, "50702 – Police Department Taser", the amount listed under the column heading "Cumulative Budget (Pre 2019 Budget)", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "Expenditures Through 2018", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "Carry Forward", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "2019 County Debt", shall read "$300,000", the amount listed under the column heading "2019 County Self-Funding", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "2019 Non-County", shall read "$0" and the amount listed under the column heading, "2019 TOTAL", shall read "$300,000"; and

(ii) under the column heading, "Public Safety", project title, "50703 – Police Department Body Cameras", the amount listed under the column heading "Cumulative Budget (Pre 2019 Budget)", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "Expenditures Through 2018", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "Carry Forward", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "2019 County Debt", shall read "$500,000", the amount listed under the column heading "2019 County Self-Funding", shall read "$0", the amount listed under the column heading "2019 Non-County", shall read "$0" and the amount listed under the column heading, "2019 TOTAL", shall read "$500,000"; and

(iii) under the column heading, “Public Safety”, project title, “55001 – Probation Department Equipment”, the amount listed under the column heading “Cumulative Budget (Pre 2019 Budget)”, shall read “$0”, the amount listed under the column heading “Expenditures Through 2018”, shall read “$0”, the amount listed under the column heading “Carry Forward”, shall read “$0”, the amount listed under the column heading “2019 County Debt”, shall read “$275,000”, the amount listed under the column heading “2019 County Self-Funding”, shall read “$0”, the amount listed under the column heading “2019 Non-County”, shall read “$0” and the amount listed under the column heading, “2019 TOTAL”, shall read “$275,000”.

Section 2. This ordinance may be modified to allow for the correction of any mathematical and/or typographical errors subsequent to any approval and adoption of said ordinance without the necessity for a vote to be taken by the County Legislature or by the members of any Standing Committee of said Legislature if said ordinance is passed by the affirmative vote of a majority of said Legislature.

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect immediately.

NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

FULL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

RICHARD NICOLELLO,
Presiding Officer

1550 Franklin Avenue
Mineola, New York

Monday, November 23, 2020
1:20 P.M.

A P P E A R A N C E S:

RICHARD NICOLELLO,
Presiding Officer

HOWARD KOPEL,
Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer

DENISE FORD,
Alt. Deputy Presiding Officer

STEVEN RHOADS

DEBRA MULE

C. WILLIAM GAYLOR III

VINCENT MUSCARELLA

ELLEN BIRNBAUM

LAURA SCHAEFER

THOMAS MCKEVITT

KEVAN ABRAHAMS,
Minority Leader

ROSE MARIE WALKER

JOHN FERRETTI, JR.

JOSHUA LAFAZAN

ARNOLD DRUCKER

JAMES KENNEDY

DELIA DERIGGI-WHITTON

CARRIE SOLAGES

SIELA BYNOE

MICHAEL PULITZER,
Clerk of the Legislature

LIST OF SPEAKERS

META J. MEREDAY.....12
AMY MARION.....17
JONATHAN GUNTHER.....22
TATUM FOX.....28
CHRIS NICOLINO.....36
RICK FRASSETTI.....51
ANDY PERSICH.....61
COMMISSIONER PATRICK RYDER.....97
KEVIN CREAN.....144
KEN ARNOLD.....189
JANE HODAK.....201
JODY FRANZESE.....202
CHIEF WALSH.....223
JOHN BUDNICK.....229

Full Legislature/11-23-20

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Let's get started. We have a lot to do today. We will, start things off by having Legislator Laura Schaefer lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you. Welcome to the Nassau County Legislature. We are going to be doing a number of things today.

First off we are going to have a point of personal privilege, followed by a public comment period for the Full Legislature, and then going to break, go into the Rules Committee just for several minutes to tee up some items of legislation that are on our Full Legislative calendar and go back to the Legislature.

When we do so, we will be hearing the emergency items first. So let's go to point of personal privilege. Actually, why don't we call the roll first?

Could you call the roll, please?

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you, Mr. Nicolello. Deputy Presiding Officer Howard Kopel?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer Denise Ford?

LEGISLATOR FORD: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Siela Bynoe?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Carrie Solages?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Debra Mule?

LEGISLATOR MULE: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator C. William Gaylor III?

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Vincent Muscarella?

LEGISLATOR MUSCARELLA: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Ellen Birnbaum?

Full Legislature/11-23-20

LEGISLATOR BIRNBAUM: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Delia DeRiggi-Whitton?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator James Kennedy?

LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Thomas McKevitt?

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Laura Schaefer?

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator John Ferretti, Jr.?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Arnold Drucker?

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Rose Marie Walker?

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator

Joshua Lafazan?

LEGISLATOR LAFAZAN: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Steven Rhoads?

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Present.

CLERK PULITZER: Minority Leader Kevan Abrahams?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Presiding Officer Richard Nicolello?

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: We have a quorum, sir.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Let's go to the point of personal privilege and I would like to introduce Legislator Rose Walker.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer. This is always one of the special parts of our meeting usually every month. Unfortunately due to COVID we have not had one. This is the first we have had since back in March, actually February was probably the last full meeting we had.

But I'm very, very proud to be able to honor these two individuals not only because of their expertise and all they did on this day but I've known both of these young men since they were little boys and now they're grown up and here they are fire fighters and hold a rank in their departments. I can't thank them enough. I will tell you a little bit about what happened.

September 28th at 5:24 in the morning, 911 received a call from a neighbor of a fire at Sutherland Road in Hicksville. First arriving Engine 3's crew, aware of the upgraded situation, they did say too that they thought people were trapped in the home. So a signal ten was transmitted at 5:31 in the morning.

The first arriving crew was Engine 3's crew, aware of the upgraded situation. Once on scene, they started a search. Forcing in a rear door, they were met with moderate smoke as the fire intensified.

Captain Chris Moskis, Jr. and

Lieutenant Andrew Nimsick teams made entry and split up. Moskis and Nimsick found the occupant, a 90 year old female, in the kitchen suffering from the now heavy smoke and quickly removed her outside, quickly evaluating her and handed her off to EMS personnel.

The victim was transported by County Medical Center by police ambulance. And as far as we know the victim was stable and hopefully she is to fully recover.

The two and a half old story wood house sustained heavy damage. Fire operations were under the command of chief of the department, Gary Lewis.

Because there was a person trapped, he did reach out to other departments so we did have nearby Jericho and Syosset departments and Bethpage as well as Westbury and Plainview stood by for Hicksville.

I just want to thank these two young men, due to their bravery, all the training they had, they were able to get

into that home, save this woman, and, hopefully, like I said, a 90 year old woman has her own difficulties to begin with but now adding this stress to it, they were able to get her outside and bring her to safety and take care of her and do all that is needed to help her see a lot more birthdays hopefully.

Again, I want to thank Andrew and Chris, thank their families, thank our entire department and, again, remind everybody that these men and the women in our department, they do this without any paycheck. They run from their homes to help others and help their residents, their community. And, again, I can't thank Andrew and Chris enough. So, Legislator Schaefer, you want to say a few words.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Sure. I similarly want to say thank you so much the fact that it's volunteer, it's just amazing, you do this, you run towards danger.

It's truly a calling for you as fire fighters to want to do it, whether it's

volunteered or paid, it truly is a calling. Most people would not do that. So thank you for your service.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Legislator Drucker, did you want to add anything? Hicksville has three legislators representing our community.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you. I echo the sentiments of you and Legislator Schaefer. The bravery and the dedication that you exemplify each and every day is so encouraging and inspiring, that we owe a debt of gratitude to you that we could never repay but we could show our support for you and acknowledge you in every chance we get. We are grateful, we are thankful, and we wish you the best for the happy Thanksgiving to you and your family. Thank you

LEGISLATOR WALKER: And both of these young men, they followed tradition in their family because their dads are both in the fire department and Andrew's mom is in the ladies auxiliary as well as I'm in the ladies auxiliary. Many of the commissioners

over there and our chief, members of their families, their wives are also in the ladies auxiliary.

So, again, I thank you so much for being here and we are going to come down and present these citations. I would like to ask Arnie and Laura to come down for that.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We are going to proceed with the public comment portion of the meeting. The first slip I have is for Meta J. Mereday.

MS. MEREDAY: Good afternoon. Meta J. Mereday, Nassau County resident. A very distressed taxpayer with regard to just the ongoing challenges that continue to be unaddressed with the underserved communities within the county.

I'm very concerned with regard to distribution of resources. Whenever I read about the utilization of community development funds, when we are in communities that still have very few resources within them, and to know that

those funds which we were told previously were not available or not in the budget somehow seem to arrive for other purposes. That's very disconcerting for many of the residents of Nassau County.

Earlier today or still going on today the Thanksgiving distribution at Nassau County Coliseum is much needed because we have residents going through severe challenges.

It's unfortunate again that this county, which has such a large population of seniors and those with disabilities and inabilities to gather to these locations are once again left out of these types of distributions and processes when they have the greatest need, and it doesn't matter how many times we bring this up it doesn't seem to change.

The coordination, I'll hand it to the police officers and responders and the troopers that were trying to assist. I'm just hoping that all of those cars that are parked either they don't run out of gas or

cause any accidents with regard to how it was coordinated. I know that our law enforcement, they do the best they can with the resources and the information they are given.

So I'm also here with regard to the Bay Park project. Many of the residents in Baldwin or along that corridor will be impacted and are still very much uninformed about what is happening and will happen and how it will impact their daily life-style.

And, again, we are requesting that those on the South Shore of Nassau County get the same information, resources and due diligence that seems to occur on the North Shore.

There is still the divisiveness in terms of the information and resources, and, again, as it's been stated so many times, we are all supposed to be in this together because we all pay the second highest taxes in the country but the representation continues to be lagging and that is very sad for those who continue to

come here and try to challenge these sources and we often feel like we cannot speak out even though freedom of speech is our first amendment right.

I'm here again to get answers to the lack of inclusion, the lack of diversity and lack of investment into our projects, into our roads, into our infrastructure and the business development.

Lastly, I just want to discuss once again the business development and procurement activities that are going on in this county with the billions of dollars in projects that continue to lack inclusion of veteran businesses, minority businesses and women of color.

I don't know what has to happen because, again, I see that there are plaintiffs and lawsuits that once again the county has to negotiate to pay settlements. But I would hope that we would not have to go to court to get a fair share particularly for our veteran businesses.

I think the fact that once again

we are in 2020 and the biggest thing that I see on this agenda as it pertains to veterans is that you are going to vote to give them more county in parking spaces at county facilities. Again, where is the business development format for service-disabled veteran businesses so they can hire other veterans? So we can keep our veterans here? So that people of color minority and women business owners who have been the bedrock of this county get an opportunities not an occasional PPE distribution. They need jobs too. They need their homes secured. They need access to transportation and resources.

And, lastly, our seniors, who we are not doing enough for our seniors to provide supportive services especially if you're taking away the transports that they count for their nurses aids and assistants to come and help them.

I don't know how many ways, how many times that the voices of the people are not being heard. We're starting to be a one

and done with some of these elected positions here and if that's going to be the case to have a revolving door then that's what it's going to be what needs to be, but our voices will be heard.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you Meta. Amy Marion.

MS. MARION: Thank you. Good afternoon everybody.

Nassau County Executive Laura Curran is asking you all for an emergency approval of an eight and a half year Superior Officer's Association contract.

We urge the Legislature, and I'm here speaking on behalf of Long Island Advocates for Police Accountability, as well as on behalf of myself as a life-long Nassau County resident and criminal defense and civil rights attorney with over 33 years experience.

This emergency authorization requires a super majority as you all know. We urge you to reject this attempt of rushing the contract through for the

following reasons:

The Governor issued executive order 203 which requires adoption by the Legislature of police reform measures by April 1st.

Approval of a union contract prior to these reforms will preemptively nullify the possibility of reform issues, preemptively nullify the possibility of reform measures the people on the Legislature deem necessary to make the required changes to policing.

The county has not provided its police reform task force, both packs and CCT with the proper data required to determine the impact of the police budget on the county's finances.

I might also add that the data that has been published is no short of a joke. It is not data, and it conflicts with what the Department of Justice and DCJS has already published.

Like everything else associated with policing in Nassau County, this

indicates a further willingness to not operate in the shadows and to not operate with transparency.

While the County Executive asserts that the police reform efforts are moving forward, they are not. This attempt to lock in a union contract which would effectively lock out police reforms further indicates the disingenuous nature of the County Executive's perfunctory reform maneuvers.

We have been involved with this from the beginning. We are life long individuals who have expertise in this area. My group, Long Island Advocates For Police Accountability has civil rights advocates, as the regional director of the NAACP Night Clue, strong youth and all of the relevant stakeholders. The public defender's office, everybody is involved in this group.

We urge the County Legislature to vote no on this emergency approval. On September 27th, on behalf of LIPA, I drafted correspondence to the governor requesting

that a convener, that's a term of art that's used in the governor's guidance, the executive order was issued on June 12th, and we wrote on September 27th, because by that date, Nassau County had done nothing, and in the executive order it specifically said within the executive order, not to wait for the guidance that came out in mid August, but it specifically said in this June 12th executive order convene local stakeholders, key stakeholders.

Nassau County did not even convene the public defender that's written in the executive order. This is a problem. At Governor Cuomo's October 6th press conference, he said in no uncertain terms, and I'm quoting, many local governments have started the conversation about police reform. Not only do they have to have that conversation, they have to reinvent their police department, pass a law, he emphasized, reinventing it, and they have to do that by April, or, he said, they won't get state funding, there's no option.

He reinforced his commitment to police reform to the executive order and to the guidance. And Nassau County Executive Laura Curran said in a letter to one of her groups that she formed PAC that we plan to focus these meetings on the executive order and the substantive guidance, I'm quoting. She wrote that letter in an October 1st letter to Governor Cuomo responding to our letter and yet she is not doing that, because this effort here is absolutely against reform.

I have to tell you, I have been in these meetings. I'm the person who is behind and gets told everything by members of our group that are in those meetings. I'm the one doing the correspondence and ascribe, and, I have to tell you, the commissioner, Commissioner Ryder is lovely and he's there and he's partaking. His hands are tied. He is tied by unions.

We cannot have re-imagination and we cannot have reform which is a mandate from the governor and the governor says its

going to affect funding. This county cannot afford to have that affect its funding. I urge you all to vote no on this emergency measure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you, Amy. I would like to note for the record that we have received a number of emails this morning with respect to this topic and those emails, 20, 30, 40, whatever the number is, will be made part of the record. They were given to the clerk's office. They will be part of the record.

Jonathan Gunther.

MR. GUNTHER: Hello. I'm Jonathan Gunther. I'm the Nassau County Libertarian party executive chairman.

I have a few demands from this body. The first is the legislative meeting times. Most people work during Mondays and early at this time. I actually left my job early today losing pay just to be here.

The Town of Hempstead has meetings which I was at recently evening times. I request or demand this body work

on changing the times in which we can make it available for all people who can make it at night or the morning to be able to make that.

Transparency is important. I think this brings out more transparency in this body so that is one of my demands.

The second demand is for the Legislature to reach out to the local police department and ask for them to not enforce Governor Cuomo's unconstitutional authoritarian orders are limiting people in their own personal private homes.

Many sheriffs and police departments across this state have defied his orders in doing that and they will not be enforcing it. So I would like to see this body go up and talk to the local police here and let them know not to enforce these unconstitutional authoritarian orders.

Those are my two demands and I hope this body can adhere to these two demands. They are demands. They're not just me saying this is what I want. These

are constitutional problems that we are having by the state governor. We need to make sure that he is not clearly destroying the Constitution here with those orders. Those are my two demands. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Just as to the first issue with respect to night meetings. Actually we had intended this year to hold several night meetings in the Legislature. Then the pandemic hit and we had a meeting throughout but it limited really what we would have liked to have done.

So next year we will definitely be having more night meetings. We understand it's more convenient for many people to attend night meetings so we will be doing some of that.

MR. GUNTHER: Morning and night, both times are good. Some people can make it at night and some in the morning.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We are going to do both. That's the last slip that I have. What we are going to do is, we have

items with respect to Bay Park conveyance that are both on the Rules Committee and on the Legislature. So what we are going to do is break from the Legislature for a moment and go into the Rules Committee, pass the items so we can have a more full debate later on in the Full Legislature.

So I'm going to put the Legislature in recess.

(Whereupon, the Full Legislative Committee recessed at 1:43 p.m. and reconvened at 2:06 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We are going to go to the emergencies but first we have a number of items that it has been agreed by the Minority and Majority that they could be called on the consent calendar.

They went through committees several weeks ago and it's been determined that no further debate or discussion is needed on these items at this time.

I'm going to read the items now. Again, this is the consent calendar,

Number 1, Ordinance 103; Number

2, Ordinance 104; Number 3, Ordinance 105; Number 4, Ordinance 106; Number 5, Ordinance 107; Number 6, Ordinance 108; Number 7, Ordinance 109; Number 8, Ordinance 110; Number 9, Ordinance 111; Number 10, Ordinance 112; Number 11, Ordinance 113; Number 12, Ordinance 114; Number 13, Ordinance 115; Number 14, Ordinance 116; Number 15, Ordinance 117; Number 16, Ordinance 118; Number 17, Ordinance 119; Number 18, Ordinance 120; Number 19, Ordinance 121; Number 20, Ordinance 122; Number 21, Ordinance 123; Number 22, Resolution 147; Number 23, Resolution 148; Number 24, Resolution 149; Number 25, Resolution 150; Number 26, Resolution 151; Number 27, Resolution 152; Number 28, Resolution 153; Number 30, Resolution 155; Number 31, Resolution 156; Number 32, Resolution 157; Number 33, Resolution 158; Number 34, Resolution 159; Number 35, Resolution 160; Number 36, Resolution 161; Number 37, Resolution 162; Number 38, Resolution 163; Number 39, Resolution 164.

That's it.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So moved.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. All those items are before us. Any further debate or discussion?

(No verbal response.)

Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

The consent items carry unanimously.

Now we are going to the first emergency agenda. I'll call it. Clerk Item 356, a resolutions ratifying a memorandum of agreement making certain amendments to the collective bargaining agreement between the county and the Superior Officer's Association of the police department of Nassau, Inc. I need a motion to establish

the emergency.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So moved.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator Ford, seconded by Legislator Walker. We have a motion to establish the emergency. I would invite up somebody from the administration to explain the nature of the emergency.

MS. FOX: Good afternoon. Tatum Fox, deputy County Executive for public safety. Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Nicolello, Minority Leader Abrahams and fellow legislators.

The nature of this emergency is in regard to the contract between the county and the Superior Officer's Association.

The agreement was signed and executed in September and the reason it wasn't filed right away is we were waiting for the Aetna and NYSHIP health care rates to come out which did come out and not until November. Once those came out this was filed.

The reason we are asking for the emergency is because the contract still needs to be approved by NIFA and then the Comptroller needs time to implement the health care contribution savings which kick in on January 1.

It's my understanding NIFA is meeting tomorrow an also December 7th. So if we waited until the December leg calendar of the 7th and 14th, that pushes us past the NIFA meetings and lands us right in the holiday season. So rather than chance and lose savings, significant savings from the health care contributions, we ask that this be heard today.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: It's our understanding that this was agreed to, the contract was agreed to by the administration in early September and in fact ratified by the SOA on September 22nd. It is now two months later and is being presented to us as an emergency.

You gave us part of the reason for that that it was waiting for NYSHIP and

Aetna?

MS. FOX: Their health care rates of what we pay per employee.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Why would the contract itself wait for that; can not the contract be presented to us with terms and conditions without these rates?

MS. FOX: So the 2014 agreement that succeeds this provides for employees hired after 2014, they can pay 15 percent contributions for Aetna or -- I'm sorry, for Empire, 15 percent, or no contribution for the Aetna plan.

So it impacts that population of people. That's why we had to wait.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I understand that it would impact the calculations for the -- depending whether they were taking Aetna or NYSHIP, why would it delay consideration of the contract by the Legislature?

We had the entire month, the full cycle in October. We could have gotten it in committees in October and have considered

it at our full meeting of the Legislature.

MS. FOX: Well, the union and the county were still negotiating the impact of the union's position is that they still want to have available to employees a non contributory plan. So if the Aetna rates went up above 85 percent of NYSHIP, there would no longer be a noncontributory plan. And that was very important for them to have that to offer.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I understand a little bit more now. So in fact there was an open part of this agreement that could not be closed until the rates came out from NYSHIP and Aetna?

MS. FOX: We were working on a side letter, yes, between the parties to discuss the health care contributions that were tied to the waiting for the rates, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Just in the second part of that, the implementation of the contract. Obviously it has to be approved by NIFA; and if NIFA considers this

on December 7th or tomorrow night for that matter, what's the reason for the emergency? What has to be in place by January 1st?

MS. FOX: The contract. So this body approves, then NIFA needs to approve after you, not before you. So your next committee is the same day as their December meeting.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I understand that but why -- could not these, the savings, be calculated retroactively?

MS. FOX: It would be burdensome for the comptroller and IT, to be honest, to prorate and go back, it's very cumbersome.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else have questions? Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you. Hi Tatum. I'm not totally understanding your explanation as it relates to the health insurance rates.

I understand that we didn't know the health insurance rates but, first off, what are the rates; have they increased since last year, stayed the same?

MS. FOX: They did increase, for both Aetna and Empire. I don't have those rates. That would be HR. I could get you them but I don't have them as I stand here.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When the union voted on this proposed contract back in September, were these rates available?

MS. FOX: No.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So they voted without knowing the rates, right?

MS. FOX: That's why we waited to file it because we waited to do a side letter.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: But the side letter is not what we are voting on here today, correct?

MS. FOX: It's not what you are voting on today but it impacts what you are voting on today. The language stayed the same but if Aetna went to, which it did, it went up, it will cause contributions. So the side letter says that the parties will agree to find a non-contributory plan.

Had the rates stayed flat, we

wouldn't have needed that side letter.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So Aetna, under this contract, Aetna is not offered as a free alternative to NYSHIP?

MS. FOX: The side letter says that it's a status quo until we find a non-contributory rate. That I'm going to defer to Chris Nicolino on the side letter.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So then, I wanted to understand, we found out the new rates but it hasn't changed anything in terms of what we are voting on, correct?

MS. FOX: Because of the side letter, right.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What happens if in year's forward the rates continue to increase or change?

MS. FOX: We will have to do the same thing.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: A side letter?

MS. FOX: Yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Again, though, this contract is going to be voted

on now for eight years, right?

MS. FOX: Right.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So these side letters are somewhat independent of what we're voting on, right?

MS. FOX: They shouldn't be because this year was a strange year with COVID. Normally the rates come out and we thought they would come when they normally come out which I believe August, and they didn't. So normally that comes out and then there is open enrollment for employees and they know, they have full disclosure what plan to pick based on what the rates are. That didn't happen this year. Everything got pushed back.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I understand what you're saying and maybe you can explain it to me or maybe somebody else can. I don't see why that held up the submission of that contract to the Legislature. I'm not connecting the dots.

MS. FOX: Sure. Chris from the Office of Labor Relations. He can talk

about that.

MR. NICOLINO: It's Christopher Nicolino. The problem is that the Aetna non contributory plan that we used to have, it raised their rates to the point where now it's going to cause us seek contributions bigger than 85 percent of the NYSHIP Empire plan.

So now we have to look for another, a new non contributory plan. That's the side letter. That's what we have agreed to with the SOA. It was influx and we didn't have those rates.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I understand that. Over the next seven and half years I'm assuming they will be influx as well.

MR. NICOLINO: Well, hopefully, we're going to find a non contributory plan that satisfies the county and its employees.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So we have this issue where Aetna is no longer a non contributory plan, and we have this contract that the union vote on two months ago prior

to knowing the rates and, my question is, why is one dependent upon the other? Why could we not voted on this contract a month ago and this side agreement goes into affect now?

MR. NICOLINO: We didn't know a month ago that it was going to be a non --

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Right, and we don't know a year from now what's going to happen with whatever other health insurance you come to an agreement on. We don't know. We're not going to come back. The contract is still going to be in affect.

Again, I'm not connecting the two. I understand that you are telling us that's why it was submitted in October, but just in my brain it's not making sense why one is dependent on the other.

MR. NICOLINO: We had to reach some agreement as to what we were going to do. Now that we know we don't have a non contributory plan. Is the county obligated to go out and find one, how is that going to work? What would they agree to? That's

that side letter that you see Ms. Fox was speaking of.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So, since September, when this was voted on by the SOA, that's been an ongoing negotiation between the administration and the SOA?

MR. NICOLINO: Correct.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you.

MR. NICOLINO: Hope that answered the question.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Schaefer.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: I have a question for whomever. In the two months that we have been waiting, or the SOA has been waiting, September to now, weren't there conversations about what's going on, what's holding it up? Was any of that discussed between the county and the SOA?

MR. NICOLINO: There were a lot of conversations but we were waiting to see what Aetna was going to charge us.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Did they know that? Did you tell them that that what

we're waiting for?

MR. NICOLINO: Yes, and there were continued discussions back and forth as to what our obligations were, how vested they were in trying to seek a non contributory plan, etcetera, and that was the subject of negotiations, continued negotiations.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We have several other legislators. First Steve Rhoads, then Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, and then Legislator Ford.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Just to follow up on the line of questions from my colleagues here, I'm still having difficulty why it was necessary for us to -- we don't have the signed agreement before us today, correct?

MR. NICOLINO: It's appended to your package.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's appended to the package but it's not actually part of the agreement we're voting on, correct?

MR. NICOLINO: It's referenced in that and it is a side letter agreed to by the parties, so it is part of that, part of the contract.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Side letters that are agreed to by the parties, these side agreements that you are referring to are agreements that occur throughout the course of the contract, there are issues that come up over the course of time that have to be the subject of negotiation outside of the scope of the contract that's existing at the time. This isn't a novel thing. This is something that happens on a routine basis, correct?

MR. NICOLINO: In Nassau more routine than other places, yes.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Right. So the notion that we had to wait for this side agreement in order to be able to present the initial contract to us, that's really a departure from what is the normal way we would handle these contracts, correct?

MR. NICOLINO: Well, usually MOAs

or side letters or other substantive agreements that modify, amend an existing collective bargaining agreement take place after the agreement is done and signed off on.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And in this case it could have been handled exactly the same way if the contract was presented to us a month ago when we voted on it, correct?

MR. NICOLINO: I don't know. I would have to address that to my colleague from the SOA as to whether or not they were willing to go forward with this agreement not knowing that a big piece of health care was unsettled to the point that it was. That was the issue. I'm glad that we came to an agreement as to how we were going to handle that going forward.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So what you are representing today is that this piece of information that you were waiting for could have blown up the entire agreement?

MR. NICOLINO: I'm not willing to say blown up the entire agreement but I'm

saying it was part of the party's meeting of the minds.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: But this part of the meeting of the minds occurred after the SOA had already ratified the contract so they voted on it.

The administration obviously agreed to it because they're coming to the Legislature for the ability to sign off on the agreement, correct?

MS. FOX: And they did vote on it, yes, sir. However, with the assumption that Aetna rates weren't going up, so when we discussed the rates might go up, it was like, wait a minute. What happens to the non contributory, and that's when the conversations began.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And once negotiated between the parties with respect to this side agreement isn't necessarily the issue that I have.

The issue that I have is the timing. Because now we've received correspondence from a number of individuals

concerned about the fact that we are accelerating through the emergency process, we are accelerating the consideration of the contract. Normally it would go through committees. Normally the Legislature would have the opportunity to consider it because it's going through the emergency process, the process is kind of rushed. Now we are in a situation where we really don't have a choice.

The contract has to be approved so it can be considered by NIFA based on NIFA's timing and based on the timing of the calendar of the Legislature. So if we don't approve the contract today, or if we don't take action with respect to the contract today and delayed it, NIFA now wouldn't be able to factor that into its considerations for the 2021 budget.

My concern is, is there a way or why wasn't it the case if we were able to consider this in the normal course of business and why are we again forcing an emergency upon us that we have no choice but

to accept?

This is separate and apart from what the actual terms of the contract are. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the administration leaving us no alternative but to do this by emergency because there didn't seem to be proper planning or in this case because you're saying that there had to be some sort of side agreement that had to be considered first which is routinely considered after agreements are already in place. That's my concern.

MR. NICOLINO: I understand that it was a question of not having all the data or the data changing after we had come to a meeting of the minds.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: When did we know those rates were changing?

MS. FOX: The only thing, again, I'm not from HR, but this is what I can tell you, is that the Aetna rep said, yes, the rates are going to go up, and Empire said yes, the rates are going up but they were

not able to commit, so we were waiting and waiting for them to say what that would be.

Again, if it went up but still stayed within at 85 percent of NYSHIP, it was not going to be an issue because we would have a non contributory plan.

As it turned out, it did go up above the 85 percent so that's why we have to go back to find a non contributory plan.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So all I'm looking for is an explanation to my constituents and I'm sure the other legislators are doing the same as to why it is that we have to circumvent the normal process to consider this by emergency, and that's the reason the administration is giving because you were waiting on something that could have been considered as a side agreement after it was already in play?

MS. FOX: Well, I don't think and I don't want to speak for the SOA, but I don't think the union and President Frassetti if you want to add in was comfortable not having that certainty.

So, yes, the timing, I'm not purporting it's ideal but it's where we landed and it's so close to the end of the year. We were waiting for the rates.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: But the fact of the matter is, it still is at this point in time with what's before us, in order to have this properly considered by NIFA we have to take action with respect to the contract today, that's why it's on by emergency?

MS. FOX: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Any other questions? Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Hi. I want to thank you for your updates. They have been very helpful.

I have a hypothetical question. What if the declaration of need is not passed by this body? Have you been advised what NIFA might do?

MS. FOX: I have not. I don't know if budget office has, but I have not personally, no.

Full Legislature/11-23-20

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Well, we've heard that there's a very good possibility that if the declaration of need is not passed and not on the calendar today as far as I have seen, that NIFA has said that they will not approve of this contract. So I really feel like we're doing an injustice to the SOA in the sense that we are -- if we do support this contract we don't have the okay from NIFA that it will go anywhere.

It's almost like -- I said today it's like giving them a check that we don't have the funds for. We really in my opinion really need to get this declaration of need going.

If it's not going to happen we need to hear about that because it sounds like it's something that we need to do first or at least in conjunction with these agreements.

Otherwise I don't know how we're going to get the money to pay for it. The governor is talking about possibly closing

down parts of Nassau County if a hotspot arises. We may be facing another economic turn in the wrong direction.

So I really think we will to pass that declaration of need. We do need to do it. It does not extend NIFA as a control period.

It will extend NIFA as far as the bond goes, but it doesn't not extend our control period. I think that that confusion has really caused a lot of problems for us and I just can't understand the controller calls it a no brainer. Everything I have read supports the idea of this re-fi and we really need that before we can promise.

The SOA spent so many hours negotiating. It's arduous and difficult. It's a very uncomfortable situation for them to be in and I feel before we can do that, before anyone can vote on this, you can't vote on this without the declaration of need in my opinion in an honest, otherwise I don't know how we are going to pay for it.

To think the sales tax is going

to increase, I can't -- not be as bad as predicted, I think that in the last two weeks since we have discussed that it made a turn for the worst.

So I understand politics, I know what the whole game plan is, I get it.

But we are in the middle of a pandemic. We are dealing with first responders that helped so many people during the pandemic. To play with their emotions right now is not something that I want to be part of. I think the two have to go together. The declaration of need and any contract we approve. Are you okay? Can we have you come up?

I understand that we all are taking the idea of police reform very seriously especially the police officers that I speak with. There's no one who has a bigger problem with a police officer not following the rules. I really believe that in Nassau County we are really blessed because I honestly think that whether it's the education, whether it's the training,

combination of all, we're ranked the safest county in the nation for a reason.

I think that your professionalism has been a big part of that and I know during COVID, I know the risks, I know the supervisors have really dealt with quite a lot.

Again, we discussed briefly that if we did come up with reforms you would be open to meet with us and discuss them.

Can you just give us your opinion on that?

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Can I just say one thing, before you go, what we are considering right now is the emergency, so we really haven't gotten into the substance of the contract. I think you can bring it up and have the answer to the same question, but I rather just focus on the emergency until we actually pass it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But this is part of that emergency. We have to feel that the opportunity to embrace and enact these reforms are there and once we

give the emergency you don't need super majority.

So I just want to make sure we're on the same page as far as the recommendations we get that we are going to be able to still work with you on that.

MR. FRASSETTI: Rick Frassetti for the Superior Officer's Association of Nassau County. I just told all of you before, I think we're in the forefront of police reform. We're the first large police organization in this county to have police reform in our contracts, example, body cameras. We wanted body cameras.

We are a transparent organization. We embrace body cameras and we show that by signing on the dotted line.

We are definitely open to discussions on other police reforms and always have been and always will be.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We were discussing this earlier and we run the risks of losing funding again if we don't abide by the recommendations.

Again, we need your word and I trust you on your word to work with us regarding whatever ideas that -- the problem is, we don't know all of the ideas and I understand that. I really am very happy with the body cameras. I know it's a major step in the right direction and, as we discussed, I think it's a deterrent for people to see a body camera, it's going to show even more all of what happens in situations, and I think it will help the police as well. I'm glad that you look at it that way also. It's really something that can protect the police department as well.

Again, I appreciate the importance of the body camera but I do understand the hesitation of boxing us in for any future reforms but I appreciate your word that you will come back to work with us as you have in past experiences.

MR. FRASSETTI: You have my word on that. I can't give you a blanket statement because I can't speak on something

that's not in front of me right now. Body cameras is separate. I don't think we can be any more transparent than body cameras. We're on camera, on film.

I'm total for body cameras where it shows, vindicates my members, 99.9 percent of the time and also de-escalate the situation.

Speaking on other police reforms, we don't make policy. The police commissioner makes policy, and I can't speak on that, we just follow the orders, we just follow the policy.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Ford and then a number of other legislators.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon. Thank you very much, President Frassetti, for laying out your feelings with regard to police reform and I think that is something that is very key to moving forward with policing here in Nassau County.

I thank the commissioner for

always having an open door and open mind in regard to the public and the police response to their needs. I thank you very much and I think there has been frustration in regard to as if it's not as transparent as it would be but I do believe that once it's presented to us and to the public it might be something that can be acceptable for everybody, especially Governor Cuomo.

But even with the political influences that we have, I just want to get off the other topic and let's stick to this item, the one we are voting on right now which is the emergency in regard to the passage of the SOA contract.

I guess we're here to vote on this but we don't even know if NIFA is going to pass this contract if we vote in favor of it, correct?

MR. FRASSETTI: That's correct. I would just point out that it was the same situation with the earlier contract regarding the detectives.

LEGISLATOR FORD: But I don't

think that came by emergency, and this is where the concern is. We are trying to look for transparency in everything that we do. Obviously policing is a hot topic everywhere throughout the United States, so it's not just Nassau County. We are blessed with a very good police department but we have to share the ills of everywhere.

I guess it was commented that the reason why we're doing this at this point is for the Comptroller's sake and everybody else with regard to the medical, whether or not, I don't know if I'm going to say this right or wrong, the Comptroller needed to know how much the medical costs and everything were going to be moving forward, right; am I correct?

MR. FRASSETTI: Well, it's a little different than that.

One of the pieces of this contract, and we addressed at length, if you decide to get to that today, but there are health care contributions that are built into this contract. The county would like

to start realizing them come 1-1-21. If there is not a contract in place it won't be able to. That's the crux of this emergency.

LEGISLATOR FORD: But in considering Aetna, like you were saying it's now within 15 percent of the NYSHIP --

MR. FRASSETTI: It's less than.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Less than 15 percent. During the course of this negotiation waiting on Aetna, did you at least look to see if there were any other medical providers that may fall above the 15 percent?

MR. FRASSETTI: My understanding is that in anticipation of this the human resources department within the county has been looking for months for the better part of 2020 for a no-cost alternative but it's not easy to find.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So hopefully it can be easily resolved. I'm not going to put you on the spot because I know it's all negotiations and whatever, so you've actually looked outside just to see just in

case there's a back up, correct?

MR. FRASSETTI: Yes.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Good day.

MR. FRASSETTI: Good day.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So I have significant concerns regarding this item being offered as an emergency. And the item, actually, the timing of the item is of significant concern as well.

So, as an emergency, this is being presented to us without even having a full report from OLBR. That's one of my concerns.

But my primary concern is that this is being offered as an emergency without the reform process being completed. So, I know that Rick just made some assertions and commitments on the record that his unit would be open to discussing

any additional reforms that would come by way of the community collaborative efforts and I appreciate that.

But, I got to tell you, I've lived through an experience here, since 2014 which this -- well, several of the members of this body put in a piece of legislation requesting body cameras back in 2014, and the administration at that time, the police commissioner, along with the County Executive said we'll pilot a program for body cameras, and it was met with opposition from the union.

So, here we are six years later and we finally have body cameras in a contract. But I would argue that while that's great, listen, I would like to take the wins when we see them. This is wonderful that body cameras is actually in this contract, but my concern is that we are silencing the voices of the community stakeholders who are hard at work working with this county administration along with the police commissioner to effect some

further reforms.

I feel as though, and I'll speak on the issue later because the Presiding Officer has made it very clear that he would like us to stay on topic the emergency.

I think that it's ill-advised that we would be presented something like this, and I think that based on the reforms not being in place and I think while I support the men and women of law enforcement, I work with them not only here in my capacity as a legislator but in my other capacity and I have respect for law enforcement, and, in fact, even considered a career in law enforcement, but I can't -- I'm tasked with two things here. I'm tasked with making sure our employees of the county, their needs are met, and I'm tasked with making sure that my community's needs are met.

We've heard a very loud resounding call for reform and I don't know exactly what those reforms will look like because the process has not been fully

completed because the process has not been fully completed.

I think today if we consider this by emergency we are silencing the voices of those who are working, silencing the voices of those who are committed to working with the police department to bring some level of reform so that policing feels a little different here in this county.

I think it's a disservice for us to consider this at this time. I have plenty of questions about the reform process but I will reserve it for the item but I will tell you that today I cannot vote in favor of an emergency. I think it's wrong that it's even presented to this body in this fashion for a host of other different reasons; the declaration of need is not in place, OLBR, but most importantly the reforms are not in place so for that reason I will be voting no on the emergency.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you,

Presiding Officer. Most of my questions have been asked and answered thankfully.

I just want to be clear on some the financials. Basically the emergency here has been predicated as you diligently explained based on the insurance, the health care contributions, and it's important to get it started by January 1st.

But, hypothetically, what would be the impact if by pushing it until December for the health care contributions to start being made, let's say in the middle of January, is that a significant affect? Can someone just answer that?

MR. PERSICH: Andy Persich. Office of Management and Budget. It will have impact on the budget if we don't realize the savings from January 1st.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Do you know how much of an impact?

MR. PERSICH: For the back years of '19 and '20, it's going to cost us approximately a million dollars this year.

When we make the lump sum payment

that's what it will cost us.

Then we have the built in savings for the health insurance and everything else in the 2021 budget. It will have an impact, financial impact. If it's not ratified 1-1 or 1-15, are we going to backdate it to 1-1? You know what I mean? The agreement is in place to start effective with all these contributions on January 1st.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: What happens when you backdate it to January 1st?

MR. PERSICH: The terms and conditions are at that point. That's a legal question. My point is, retroactively, we go back and collect health insurance from January 1st or January 15th or February 15th or whatever we decide.

So it's a question of when we do the collections of certain pieces of the health insurance.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So there's real dollars of an impact on the county budget by not starting it on January 1st.

MR. PERSICH: And the budget was

built around patters that were set initially by the DAI contract and then follow the -- it's pretty similar, not to the dollar or penny or anything else, but the pattern was built around that contract and this contract follows suit. So does the budget.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So it's a financial necessity right now?

MR. PERSICH: It stabilizes the county for eight years though too, the short term. The long term effect is that we have a stable labor agreement for eight years. So it's easier for me from a budget perspective to know what I have as opposed to the unknown.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Andy.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I just want to follow-up with Andy, stay there for a moment, on Legislator Drucker's question.

If I heard you correctly there are costs that will be associated with the contract and right now they would be in 2020. So if we delay this, you mentioned a

figure of a million dollars. That million dollars then hits the 2021 budget; is that what you are testifying?

MR. PERSICH: Theoretically if we delay it, the retro piece of this, for lack of a better thing, would have to be paid in one of the years, so -- we have, the million dollars I can cover this year. The next year has it built into the budget. That's what the unknown is in the years forward.

Again, from a planning perspective, how making a deal from a budgeting perspective makes life easier in the financial planning world so we can see what is looks like.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: This has been questioned extensively but just going back to Tatum, with respect to the Aetna rates going up, when did we learn that the Aetna rates were going up to an extent that it would no longer be non contributory?

MS. FOX: The exact date I'm not sure but it was soon after signing that we asked for the rates thinking they would

would normally have come out already and they didn't. Again, I'm sorry, I don't have someone from HR here. They were the office who was speaking with the health care representatives not myself.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: When was this side agreement signed, do you know? May be Chris can tell us. He's right there.

MR. NICOLINO: November 12, 2020.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We have a couple of more legislators but I really question whether or not you can put this on, you could have given this to us in time for committees on November 9th, whether or not the letter was in existence or not. I think you had the information that you needed with the rates going up. It could have gone through the regular process instead of us considering this by emergency.

None of the legislators are happy that we have to look at this contract via emergency.

Is the County Executive recommending this emergency?

MS. FOX: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Just one other point before I turn it over to Legislators Rhoads and Ferretti.

Whether or not we pass the emergency we still would be able to take this up in the course of the usual process of the Legislature in December. So whether or not we pass this by emergency today, we would not be delaying this contract past April anyway. The argument is being made we have this packet and other groups studying reforms, but whether or not we pass it by emergency, we would be still considering this in December and I would not think it would be a good option for this Legislature to postpone this contract into April, May, June of next year because quite frankly with vaccines on the horizon, things of that nature, the economics may change.

So right now the county is in a position where maybe they get a better contract for the county but if they wait six months, you may be looking at a vastly

different contract.

MS. FOX: That's 100 percent correct.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Rhoads waiting patiently and then Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I just wanted to briefly address a couple of the points and I know we are speaking about the emergency.

Two things. One, this Legislature passed a balanced budget that saved the taxpayers from borrowing that was proposed by the County Executive hundreds of millions of dollars. It did not extend NIFA's existence beyond 2025 which is currently forecasted. The County Executive's plan would have extended NIFA's existence through 2035 at a minimum, and the budget plan saved the taxpayers $237 million by borrowing only what the county needed to be able to meet its budget.

That budget was balanced, that budget would have accommodated this

contract, and the reason that a declaration of need even becomes part of the conversation is because the County Executive vetoed that budget plan and the minority caucus failed to override the County Executive's veto.

So, before we talk about whether a declaration of need is necessary, let's talk about why a declaration of need may be necessary, simply saying that we don't know what we would do with the alternative, we provided an alternative and it was rejected by the County Executive and the Minority.

But with respect to this particular contract and the timing, I just want to make sure I'm correct in my understanding, Rick, with what you were speaking about.

Obviously police reform is an important conversation. I've had some concerns about the way that discussions have been held specifically by the administration. We've asked for a list of who even the members are of PAC. We haven't

been provided with that information. I was essentially told it was none of my business.

We haven't had an indication other than what we've heard through the commissioner's community council meeting. It's not even its briefings as legislators but through the commissioner's community council we've only gotten some tidbits of some of what the police reform that the administration was discussing. So I understand the concerns.

However, I just want to make sure if this agreement is passed today, and I believe, Rick, you had indicated that there's a difference between changes in policy and I believe you used the term impact. So most of the reforms that theoretically could be implemented if they are simply matters of policy do not even have to be subject to a further side agreement or memorandum of understanding; is that correct?

MS. FOX: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's only

those issues which the union believe may be impact issues which require there to be some sort of side negotiation just like the memorandum of understanding that you reached with respect to Aetna, it would be negotiated as part of the side agreement?

MS. FOX: Correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So by passing this today, this does not foreclose the implementation of any police reforms that may come as a result of whatever process the administration is engaged in compliance with the governor's order?

MS. FOX: It would not at all.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: There's still a process to implement whatever changes may come?

MS. FOX: Absolutely. At any point in time.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Just explain to me, at some point over the last

five or six years, the Aetna health insurance became an option for all the unions, right?

MS. FOX: For people hired after 2014 for all unions.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: And that was a non contributory plan?

MS. FOX: Yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What was the basis for that, was there a memorandum of understanding?

MS. FOX: Yes, the basis for that was the 2014 memorandum of agreement did have language in there that the county would work with the union to find a non-contributory plan and, until one was discovered, people would not contribute.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: In this current contract that this Legislature is considering, doesn't it account for all memorandums of understanding from the previous contract that they will continue forward?

MS. FOX: Yes. So whatever

people contributed, okay --

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I'm not asking that. As it relates to health care, isn't any understanding from the previous contract continue forward into this contract?

MS. FOX: Yes, except the language said as 85 percent -- it didn't use the word Aetna, it said a plan that is 85 percent of NYSHIP.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Right. So the previous MOA from the previous contract carries forward this year in as much as the county will have to work with the SOA to find a non contributory option, correct?

MS. FOX: No. The healthcare -- that was only for 2014 employees. This applies to all employees who have never contributed yet. So it doesn't carry through for the majority of the population. That health care provision was only for 2014 forward. This applies to everybody.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So, in other words, let me make sure I understand.

Under the memorandum of agreement that was signed back in what year?

MS. FOX: '14.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So anyone hired from '14 forward would have a non contributory option?

MS. FOX: Correct.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Now, every member will have a non contributory option, correct?

MS. FOX: No. Just the 2014 people.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay, so then the previous memorandum of understanding from 2014 carries forward, right?

MS. FOX: Well, I was pointing, yes, it does carry forward for that population.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So if that carries forward, why was this rate increase such an issue? Either way, the county was going to be under that memorandum which would require them to work with the SOA to

have a non contributory option.

MS. FOX: Because there would be a length of time that the people not contributing were going to have to contribute and that's what in '14 was avoided and that's what's avoided now. They didn't want a window of seven months where someone would have to contribute where they wouldn't have had to under the prior agreement because the rates went up.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: We don't have a new health insurance company picked out yet, right, that has a non contributory?

MS. FOX: They are exploring.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So what happens if you can't find one in the next six or seven months?

MS. FOX: As it's explained, it's not a matter of not finding one, it's just finding the best one. There out there but they have, let's say, a higher deductible or higher copay.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I guess what I'm not understanding is, you had this

memorandum from 2014. Now you have a new memorandum which you're saying is the reason that we had to wait to entertain this contract.

I don't see the difference between the two. What's the difference between that 2014 memorandum and this one?

MS. FOX: This memorandum now requires all employees to contribute. That's the difference between the two.

If you're saying what's the difference between the 2014 and now, the difference is now the plan will require them to contribute which was not the intention. So we waited for the rates and this is where as I said time-wise how it landed with the information from Aetna and NYSHIP.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I know that you indicated earlier that this was a major concern of the SOA.

MS. FOX: It was both parties had the intention when we sat to have a non contributory plan. So when that wasn't going to be based on the plan, we were both

concerned it wasn't just one sided.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: But the SOA did vote on this, correct?

MS. FOX: With, again, with the assumption that there was a non contributory plan that was going to be going forward. No one at that time knew that Aetna was going to go up.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: That's still the assumption, right?

MS. FOX: Yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I agree with the line of questioning with Legislator Drucker, I think he made a solid point.

At this point this is an emergency because of the NIFA issue and the financial issue. But in my opinion this is a self created emergency by the administration, and I certainly hope that going forward as other contracts with the other unions going forward that this is not the course that the administration takes because I think I'm not alone up here to think that we could have entertained this in

October through the process that it should have been given. It's a shame that we're not going to.

But I do support the emergency because unfortunately we have no choice. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you, Presiding Officer. So there was comments made and actually the Presiding Officer was trying to lay out a timeline and so he stated that April of '21 will be a long period of time to wait for this contract to be ratified by this Legislature.

Tatum, for my clarification, how do you understand the process? Is it that you can't enact until April 21, or is it that it has to be on or before? I think you need to clarify that for the record.

MS. FOX: So, for the reform, it has to go out -- the draft plan for reform has to be published to the public at large, the entire county has to have access to the

plan to see it and read it, digest it.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I understand that. I already know the answer to the question I asked but I'll be more specific.

It's not that we can't enact or we can't put a plan before this body until April '21, it's on or before, is that accurate?

MS. FOX: Yes.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So it wouldn't be if we didn't call this by emergency today that we would have to wait until April '21?

MS. FOX: Because of the time, that's not -- the process is going to require us to probably make it as close to that date.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So I'm going to read, just as it is in the executive order, is that "we certify adoption of the plan to the state budget director on or before April 1, 2021." So on or before.

MS. FOX: There is too much that needs to occur in my opinion based upon all the meetings we were having.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Excellent. I'm happy you said that because if there is too much that needs to occur.

MS. FOX: I mean procedurally. It has to go out to the public, it has to come before this Legislature.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Right. But before it goes to the public, there's work that has to be done by that body; am I correct?

MS. FOX: It's being done.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: It's still underway.

MS. FOX: I'm not talking about substance, I'm talking about process.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: It's still underway though? The plan is still underway?

MS. FOX: It will be can be still underway after at public gets to comment on it. It's a fluid draft.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So in the event that between now -- since you stated on the record that there is still so much to

be done --

MS. FOX: Procedurally.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And even conceptually because there's still thoughts, concepts, in theory right now that are being evaluated for potential implementation, correct?

MS. FOX: What I would say is, we support law enforcement we support police reform, but they're not mutually exclusive. So you can put the contract forward. There is no reason to delay it based on police reform.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But I disagree wholeheartedly and I'm going to tell you why I do. I already used the body cameras as an example, that, we should have been able to implement body cameras back in 2014 met by opposition from the union.

So, what happens now, if someone in the PAC, the CCT, or even in the general public when you go out for public hearing on this document comes up with a concept for consideration, but we've already locked

ourselves into an 8 and a half year contract that would restrict us from being able to implement or not do it without it being very costly to the county because we would be negotiating really against ourselves because there really and truthfully is -- we're locked into an 8 and a half year contract and we would be at the mercy of the unions to open those contracts.

MS. FOX: I respectfully disagree and that at any time in the 8 and a half year term of any contract you can renegotiate if it needs to be negotiated, as President Frassetti said, the majority of reform will be based in policies and procedures which is managerial prerogative of the police department.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: There is impact. That's why there is impact negotiations. It's because the impact of the policy or the procedure then requires negotiation. Just like the body cameras. In theory, we could have implemented body cameras but there was an impact that was

tied to that deployment and the impact of that deployment was what stopped this county from being able to deploy body cameras.

So, just in theory if you look through the executive order, some of the things they tell us to look at and consider, how complaints will be reviewed and how disciplinary action will actually be implemented or disbursed.

That being said, I know that that would have to have an impact on negotiations.

MS. FOX: You do have to have impact negotiations on certain items, but you can still implement while you are having impact negotiations.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Why didn't we implement the body cameras?

MS. FOX: Because the county administration at the time, the unions wanted the policy changed.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So they can't be separate from each other as far as I understand, we couldn't deploy body cameras

and in the same breathe say that the policies -- there were to policies tied to is it?

MS. FOX: They could have.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But we didn't negotiate those.

MS. FOX: They could have but made a decision not to.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Because we knew we were in a contract and it's my understanding that we knew we were in a contract, it's going to be harder to negotiate things into a closed contract as opposed to a contract that the county would be seeking to extend.

I mean, that's just common sense to me. You can't tell me it's as easy to implement change to a contract that's signed, that's inked, or a contract that's still being negotiated. It applies logic for us to even sit here and even say that that is the case.

MS. FOX: It's actually, from a labor negotiation standpoint, it's easier

when you just have a limited scope to negotiate rather than the entire contract like we did now. I have, again, I respectfully disagree.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Okay. That's great that you say the overarching full contract. At this point you've ironed out most of your contract. The only things we would be talking about are the final points of reform. That would be the only thing we would be ironing out at this point.

Listen, I want to the men and women to have the benefits and I want the county to have the benefit of some of the advantages they have negotiated into the contract, but I also want the community, people marched in the middle of COVID in the hot sun because they wanted reforms. How do we close the door on that? How do we do that at this point in time?

MS. FOX: We are not. We're not at all.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: We are. I have experienced that. I've experienced it

here and I've experienced it my other capacities where we tried to later bring in or change policy, as simple as people swiping, doing a swipe pass saying they were for attendance at work, was a big situation.

MS. FOX: That's a mandatory subject of negotiation. You must, policy and procedures you cannot negotiations, don't necessarily land in a contract.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I totally disagree and I know that you'll make your assertions and I will make mine.

But at the end of the day, common sense is common sense to me. You have your contract laid out, you need some final points. Spend some time to identify the issues that the community wants to see and then negotiate it and then present the contract.

This is something that should be done that way. I feel like we are again putting, again, the cart before the horse. I see it way too often, we undertake these things without full consideration of the

impact to the community that we're here to serve.

I'm going to close by saying that we can hold this up, just for the members on this body, for clarification, we can hold this up and it doesn't have to take until April 2021, but it should take as long as it takes to make sure the reforms are baked into the contract. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Ford.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I guess to a certain degree I also share your frustration, Legislator Bynoe, in regard to this process but my take is a little bit different.

I know that you've been meeting in regard to the police reforms with these committees and I think Legislator Rhoads had indicated that we had asked for information. We don't know who's sitting on these committees, we don't know all the people involved.

We had asked in the past to be

included in this and that we have an understanding of what is being discussed.

Now, here we are, left in the dark on that. All of a sudden now despite the fact that perhaps this SOA contract could have come before us in October, much earlier than this, now it is the 12th hour so to speak.

It really is unfair to all of us who sit up here and as well as to all the residents of Nassau County when we're trying to be as open as possible to let the people know what is going on, what we're voting on and to find this here at the last minute, I think that I would have been more comfortable voting on this had I had a glimpse of what some of the recommendations for police reform of what these committees are suggesting to see if they will have any impact in regard to the contract we are voting on today or to know that it's just going to be policy or something that would not have to be basically baked into the contract but maybe it will have to be.

I really think that this really is a disservice. I, though, consider voting for the emergency to let it go through.

I understand in regard to this but I have to say that it is an uncomfortable feeling. I believe in our police and I think that they too also deserve more respect in having everything being open to the people that are going to help decide their contract and their future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I think we've had a full and fair debate and discussion.

I'm going to call for a vote. Are all legislators in our seats? I know some of us are at home.

All in favor of establishing the emergency signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(Nay.)

I've got three nays, one by Legislator Bynoe, Minority Leader Abrahams,

one by legislator Solages; is that accurate?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: So the emergency passes by a vote of 16 to 3.

Now that we have had a lengthy discussion, now it's time to go to the merits of the contract. The floor is yours.

MS. FOX: Okay. Thank you for your continued and ongoing support and thank you for hearing this by emergency though I respect all of your frustration and I understand it.

So jumping right in. The agreement between the county and SOA has similar scenes as the DAI. My plan was to give a very general overview and answer your specific questions if that's acceptable.

The term is the same, 8 and a half years, January 1 of '18 to June 30 of '26.

General wage increases. Same as the DAI, a total compounded rate of 15 point, I think it's 9-6 percent throughout the term.

Full Legislature/11-23-20

Additional appearances. All members below the rank of deputy inspector. That's sergeant, lieutenant and captain. They will work five additional appearances a year.

Employee health care contributions, two percent of base earnings and then that's in 2021, January 1 of 2021. Then that rates increases the following two years, 2.25 in '22, and 2.5 in 2023.

Termination pay cap. No change to termination pay cap for incumbents, but going forward those that promote after December 31, 2025 will have a 1.75 cap and those with initial higher dates after 2025 will have a 1.5 cap.

What's different, but, again, it's the same valuation as the DAI is a senior supervisor stipend. So members with at least six years of supervisor will receive a stipend effective January 1st and then July 1. January 1 and then July 1 thereafter.

Performance pay. Any member with

at least ten years as a supervisor and upon successful completion of supervisor training program will receive a performance pay stipend of $1,500.

Body worn camera program. This is now just background. The county issued a request for expression of interest in June. They got the most up to date information, with any technology with body cameras, it's ever evolving. That's the most up to date.

11 responses were received from vendors. They were invited in to give a presentation in September. Members of the three police unions as well as the District Attorney's Office, police department, information technology, budget office, Office of Minority Affairs and Shared Services were all included in those presentations. Eight vendors, eight presentations.

Of the 11 vendors, four happened to be on state contract. So the plan is to have the bid out early January of 2021. We are in the process of hiring a body camera

consultant to help manage all of this to keep us on track to get this implemented by the date in the contract which is September and that contract I believe was filed and will be presented to this body.

So that's a general overview. Now I'm happy to answer any specifics.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Do you in general have the amount of the budgetary impact of the contract on an annual basis?

MR. PERSICH: Andy Persich, Office of Management and Budget. For the back years, which is '19 and '20, it equates to about a million dollars. For '21 it's about $700,000. In '22 it's about $7 million. In '23 it's $15 million, and in '24 it's $26 million. '25 it's 40. And at the end the total cumulative cost is $55 million.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Can you go through those numbers again?

MR. PERSICH: I was reading the cumulative effect which was incorrect.

The first two years are a million

dollars. '21 is a small savings but not a lot. In '22 it's about 6.2. In '23 it's 8.4. In '24 it's 11 million. In '25 it's 14 million. In '25 it's $14 million. And in '26 it's $15 million. The cumulative effect over the eight years is approximately $55 million dollars.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: For the budget years '19 and '20 then, it will cost a million dollars. '19 is close. How do you go about paying that?

MR. PERSICH: We will pay it out of '20 money.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: 2020.

MR. PERSICH: 2021.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: In 2021 in fact there's savings?

MR. PERSICH: Correct.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Go ahead.

MR. PERSICH: But we did build some budget numbers in there as a result of that.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: What does that mean?

MR. PERSICH: It means that imbedded in the 2021 budget we built in a pattern of union contracts within inside the budget, so --

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: That would be important if there was cost?

MR. PERSICH: Pickup theoretically. We cost it out to be a little bit more.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: It's probably not for you, Andy, but will this contract reopen the detective's contract, do they have a reopen clause in there?

MR. NICOLINO: Chris Nicolino. No, it will not following the pattern established in the detective's contract, evaluation is the same.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: This contract provides for additional days to be served by superior officers, correct?

MS. FOX: Yes. Five a year.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: My understanding through speaking to President Frassetti is that this will give the

Superior Officers, A, an opportunity to spend time at the range.

MS. FOX: Correct.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: And also will give superior officers additional time for any training that might result as a result of this reform process; is that correct?

MS. FOX: Yes. Two of the five have been earmarked for change.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else have any questions? Thank you, Tatum. Legislator Schaefer then Legislator Bynoe and Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Hi. How are you? So two of the five days that additional days are mandated for training?

MS. FOX: It was agreed upon that they would be used for training.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: For whatever training is necessary at the time or how is that going to be determined?

MS. FOX: Whatever training at the time, so, yes, two full days so they can add in.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Is the training at the range mandatory or is that just an option?

MS. FOX: Mandatory. Any training is mandatory.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: And there is no training right now mandated for superior officers at the range?

MS. FOX: No.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: It will be one a year potentially?

MS. FOX: Correct.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: And once a year?

MS. FOX: Once a year.

LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: That's all I have right now.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Bynoe.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: This question is for the commissioner. Commissioner, can you tell me over the last year about how many times you received a communication from the PBA or any police union regarding any

opposition to changes that you were attempting to employ?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I don't have that number. I couldn't even guess.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But you received some?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: More than a handful?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Oh, yes. I think you all get the same copies.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Changes that you were trying to implement as it relates to their daily activities, correct?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So I'm just establishing that while they say it's a paramilitary style operation, that everything that you tried to implement does not get implemented?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: No. Not everything. Many things go through. It's when I change anything in the work

environment it has to be negotiated which is a process that we go through.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: It happens routinely. So thank you. That's the only question I have for you.

I'm going to turn my questions to, I want to talk a little bit about these groups that have been set up for reforms. Can you tell me the difference between PAC and CCT?

MS. FOX: So the PAC was established prior to the executive order and that was dealing with the community and we were going through the protests and dealing with the community and going through at protests and the police did a great job as the protesters got a chance to express themselves. That's how PAC began. It took a pivot to incorporate the executive order. What we did with PAC, we had presenters and open discussion.

The CCT is another group of community stakeholders, and remember this is all with social distancing and COVID. We

didn't meet in person. We switched to zoom. That's neither here nor there.

But CCT, they have subject matter experts for lack of a better word on the CCT and they break out into working groups and work on the governor's guidelines with questions.

So PAC is invited to view the CCT. The CCT is invited to hear the presentation. So there's an overlap, but they are two separate groups. The working groups are in CCT.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: But both are tasked with potentially coming up with some type of reform suggestions; correct?

MS. FOX: Yes.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And you said in PAC, primarily receiving presentations, and I suspect that that's in line with the executive order to the extent that there's a process where the county is supposed to provide an overview of its current policies?

MS. FOX: Yes. So, for instance, we've had civil service give a presentation.

We've had DSS, Mental Health give presentations.

The DA is giving a presentation at the next meeting. We've had the police department, professional standards did a presentation. So, yes, to give information into these departments so that they have a better understanding of what we currently do and how we can improve.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: During those discussions, is somebody in the room physically like tabulating so that they have an idea, recording and compiling suggestions that are bubbling up?

MS. FOX: Some of the presenters give us documents themselves. We hear the ideas, we talk about them with the PAC and we keep talking about them. So we all know what ideas have come up. A lot have been dealing with mental health. We let them know about the local law which was passed with the Health Committee. I thank the legislative body for passing that.

So the CCT had someone keeping

notes, but the PAC doesn't. Because it's more of a presentation. It's a different design.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Are you able to talk a little bit about what some of those suggestions have been?

MS. FOX: I would right here right now I would say I could tell you some of the ideas but I don't think it's appropriate because we are going to be putting it out to the public. But it's everything in the guidelines we are looking at every single question.

If you look at the governor's guidelines, all the topics that it hits, with training with recruitment, bias training, all those topics are being discussed. That would be my general answer. There is nothing in there that we're not talking about.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So what is the purpose of these town halls that are being held?

MS. FOX: Again, information out

so the community can hear. They're left up on Facebook so anyone can go back and hear them to begin to educate on what we currently do.

That's why when they hear that, we say now, how do you think it can be reformed or re-imagined.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So based on my review of the process as laid out by the governor, it looks like we're only -- it looks like they're seven steps and we are only on step number two.

MS. FOX: I don't have the phases in front of me to answer you. I wasn't prepared for that.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: We have yet to then, as far as I'm concerned, to involve the entire community in a discussion, correct?

MS. FOX: Can you repeat that?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Have we involved the entire community in a discussion? Because the town halls I viewed on Facebook, as you stated, they look like

presentations. They don't look like -- they're not open discussions.

MS. FOX: So we have input also from the commissioner's community council which is every legislative district. We have stakeholders on both on the CCT.

The whole point is, we can't talk to every person that lives in the county obviously. So we are going to put the plan up so that everyone can see it and give their input. We have to give a reasonable amount of time for that to happen.

So people will read the plan, the proposed draft plan, give the input, we have to go back, re-look at the plan and present it to this body. So also every one will have access to.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So in viewing those town hall style meetings, it looks as though certain questions are selected by maybe a member of the County Executive staff and then she's given those questions and then she answers, but there are a lot of questions left unanswered, and it appears

they're unanswered and, moreover, it appears, like I said, it's not a discussion. So it appears to me we are only at stage two of this work.

MS. FOX: We are not at phase two. Again, I don't have it committed to memory what the phases are.

But at every town hall the County Executive says, please check out our website and you can email us at, and then there's an email address for people to give input at any time through the website.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Earlier today Ms. Marion spoke on the record regarding her organization. Are you familiar with any -- I think there are several organizations as I understand it that are concerned about the police reform.

Have you meeting with those groups and having conversations?

MS. FOX: Some of those members are on the CCT but I don't recall who they are. But they have been communicating with letters and, like I said, some are on the

working groups.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: You can't today at my point give us any idea what they are talking about?

MS. FOX: I'm on PAC, that's not CCT.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: That certainly doesn't give me any comfort. You already know I'm in the position that I don't have a comfort level, but I think my comfort level is even dwindling.

MS. FOX: For example, we've talked about retraining CB ops when it comes to, and, I don't want to, again, there is a plan coming forward to this legislative body from the Mental Health Committee and that overlaps too with some of our reform.

I'm not on that committee. I don't want to speak to that. But we talked about retraining CB ops when it comes to mental health involving mobile crisis team more when is comes to calls. Bias training, reaching out to the community. More PAL, doing community events, having officers on

bikes in the community, get to know the community, get to know the people so that when you see them you have a relationship. Those are the types of things we talked about.

The collection of data is a big discussion. Having a better way to track summons, the traffic system that we use in the New York State system didn't have a field for rates. That's something we're changing. Those are some examples.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So there has been to talk at all about disciplinary action or complaints?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, there has been. There's been numerous conversations about training, and, again, not just with CCT, not just with CCC, and not with the PAC.

Several meetings with the Elmont community. I had one the other night with the Hicksville community. I've had two with Long Beach. I've had a couple in Great Neck and the mayor's association.

There's 1.4 million people in the county and we're reaching everybody we can now and they're going to get an opportunity to comment when the plan gets put forward. All of these comments, all of these conversations brings different ideas and suggestions.

This is about reform. That's about moving forward. We get stuck going backwards. We're trying to make change, real change. Change that will mean something to these communities and that's what we're trying to do.

But, again, in fairness to Amy is they have done a great job challenging us and we met most of the challenges, but, again, we're not required to collect the data that Suffolk County collected. We are not in a descent decree.

We collect the data that we collected. The suggestions going forward that the state system did not provide for us we are changing because that group made that suggestion.

Okay, we're all right with collecting. That's not an impact bargaining thing. That is a policy by the department on what we collect. That is a procedure by the department about what we collect.

Many of these things are policy. We don't like outcome sometimes because of what they are. We can't judge them on a broad picture. We have to look at the individuals. So when the comments come up about discipline, you're not disciplining enough officers. Again, the cart before the horse. Our horse is so far in front of the cart it's not even funny.

We check every box on what that governor has asked us. We've done all of that training.

The state requires 770 hours of training. We have done over 1200 for our cops and we do additional training, but we can do better, we can do more, and we listen to the reforms. Many of them I agree with. We are going to make changes going forward to do it better.

This department has been through hell in 2020 and they've answered everything that we have been tasked to do. I don't advocate for that union. I don't advocate for any union, but I do advocate for their members.

The service that the men and women have done, and I have been listening to this for the last couple of hours and I know there's a lot of behind the scenes and I get that. I'm just frustrated because they deserve a fair contract that they fairly negotiate. I have nothing to do with the negotiation but I do know what they went through.

I do know going forward that I'm telling them to come to work again when everybody is going to be back at home inside their doors, I'm asking them to come out and risk their lives and their families to do it again.

So, when we talk about reform, it's about moving forward. True difference in the communities. I agree with that, and

you know I am. And my cops agree with it. They did a phenomenal job with these protests. They went out there and knocked it out of the park. We weren't rolling around the streets and windows busted and fires. Again, that's also a credit to the protesters, that went peaceful and worked with us.

We got through it because we teach de-escalation, teach implicit bias. These are things that are not even in the state curriculum that we've already been teaching for years.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And, commissioner, you would already know, because you weren't the commissioner at the time, but you would already know that I know a lot of what you're saying is true because when Perf came in, we rolled up our sleeves. Many times we were in the same meetings regarding the de-escalation techniques. There were a lot of things that were changed well in advance of the executive order. I'm not disputing that. Nor am I disputing the

hard work of the men and women during 202. Nor am I refuting the fact that they are entitled to have a contract.

What I'm fighting for is that I think this whole body is entitled to is having a process that's not chaotic. Having a process that is not disjointed. One that can move this county forward, okay, properly in a way that -- in decency and in order in a way that the residents that we serve don't feel disenfranchised or silenced by this process and an opportunity for the men and women of law enforcement to get what they need.

This is not decency. This process is not being in decency and in order. That is been --

COMMISSIONER RYDER: By the small majority. They're the ones --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Maybe you are not hearing what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: We have been out doing this with the community forever.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I don't think

you're hearing what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that I feel that I'm placed in a disadvantage. I'm set up to not be able to support this contract today because of the way it was sent down. It's about timing.

I was set up to make this a no vote. My hands are tied on that because of timing. We could have done this in decency and order.

We knew we wanted a contract for our law enforcement and we were supposed to be committed to reforms. We should have done this in a way that no one was sitting out here disenfranchised and everybody was moving forward together.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Agreed.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: That's the problem today, not anything that happened in 2020. Not the work -- the satisfaction of my satisfaction with the men and women and especially during the year such as this, that's not for debate today. What's for debate today is the process and timing and it's bad.

Full Legislature/11-23-20

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I guess my question is for President Frassetti and the commissioner too. President Frassetti, you met with us, you talked about the distinction of your contract versus policy which is promulgated by the PD, Commissioner Ryder, and implemented but your contract is separate and apart.

But I would really like your commitment because we talked about that. We're all aware that police reforms are coming down the pike as mandated by the governor and we all talked about that today and I for one are eager to see these reforms and roll up our sleeves and make the necessary structural changes and improvements to implement these reforms that our county and country are crying out for.

But, are you prepared to commit on behalf of your members to embrace these reforms regardless of your contract?

I'm not talking about inconsistencies, but, contract aside, are you prepared to commit on behalf of your members that you are going to embrace reforms coming down the pike?

Maybe the commissioner can help you as well on this because we are talking about policy now, but you're also involved in policy even though you're involved in a union and a contract, your members also have to deal with policy, so are you prepared to commit for us today? I would like to hear your statement on that.

MR. FRASSETTI: I think it's obvious our commitment is already there by showing that we have body cameras in the contract. This actually gives us a seat at the table to make it more transparent and make the process go a lot smoother.

We are further committed to reform but I cannot comment on what you're asking exactly because I don't know what you're speaking about.

If you give me specific questions

I might be able to answer them, but until we see what's actually on the table I can't comment. But some things will be mandated to do no matter what.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'm not just talking about body cams, they're great, we all recognize how important that is in terms of going forward as the commissioner talks about. We talked about reforms about implicit bias, systemic racism, enhanced training, the incorporation and inclusion of healthcare professionals to deal with mental illness, addiction, domestic violence.

So these are the type of reforms that are more policy driven, but I would really like a commitment on the record that you guys are going to work together on this. We're not just passing a contract today in a vacuum.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: The men and women take an oath to protect and serve the people in this county, with all great risk to themselves and to their families.

They take that oath, not by race,

not by religion, not by creed, in fairness to all.

I will stand on the record today that I'm all for reform. Reform that protects both sides. Reforms that make a difference in fairness to the way people are treated in the streets of Nassau County.

But I also know this, from the data that we have, is that our cops do a hell of a job and do a great job in service, and that's why we don't have the complaints.

I'm not saying we should never be in fear of somebody not making that complaint because they're afraid of us, that's a problem, and we recognize that. Not that it's by our fault but it's something that we have to change. We are talking about that with the reform.

Again, I will stand on record. I'm the policy man. It comes from the top down. I make those decisions and they have to live with them.

If I change their work rules, they have a right to grievance that.

But most of the things we talk about today are not because of Nassau County it's because of the state civil service rules. They dictate how we hire and promote, not the police department.

We try to hire the best and we live within those rules and, again, I will stand by that. We will be all about the reform and make that difference.

Body cams, they don't come into play unless we put them out there. We're not even there yet. The approval of it is yes and that's now on me to do that and do it in the process that will be both agreeable to all of the unions to make it work.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you. President Frassetti, you indicated that but I wanted to be clear not just the body cam but some of the other policy reforms that are coming down and you certainly will embrace those, right?

MR. FRASSETTI: We are fully open to discussion, absolutely.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Another point he's trying to make is he is president of the union and really cannot, unless he actually sees the reforms, he can't commit but obviously he's shown his attitude and his working approach.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Which is what I was looking for.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Minority Leader Abrahams and Legislator Ford.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I appreciate it.

My question line of questioning is really tied to Commissioner Ryder.

First and foremost, I want to concur with Legislator Bynoe. I truly believe that the police department works really hard, the men and women, not just SOA and PBA and DAI, but the entire police department whether it's civilians or not work really hard towards making the best police department we have.

That being said, we do have many in our county that would like to see us move forward as it pertains to reforms.

Though whether you believe the police department, whatever, indifferent, we can always make it better. Especially when we have a congruent of people that actually believe it could be made better.

That being said, Commissioner, I do have a question for you. We talked a little bit about the reforms and what you are working on. Obviously there comes a point when this actually gets rolled out to the community at large so they can have an opinion on what is presented.

I always believe that this should be moved forward as a community's plan. I think anything short of that really doesn't carry the integrity or the justice that it deserves.

The community should be able to have input as well as be able to see some of their ideas implemented.

If you can explain to me how that

process can work going forward I would appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: So, yes, sir, thank you. I concur with just about everything you're saying. We have been out there in the community. I'm out three to four nights a week on different zooms. On the weekends it's zoom. Speaking to different groups about what reform is, about what we do and about what we want to modify and change going forward.

Those modifications is where we all live in. This is where we want to make change. That's the column that we're trying to lineup and get on the same page.

We can't reach everybody but we are doing that. The County Executive does more of a speaking and explaining process. The CCT does the working groups, the PAC does another.

My CCCs have been briefed three or four times already about what we're doing.

But we keep getting stuck about

the past. To move forward we have to come up with ideas and suggestions. Again, I give that credit to the CCT, they have come up with great ideas and we have made some of them already. The data we're putting out; how we are going to put this data out; the documents.

But it doesn't stop on April 21st. Reform is forever. We're always going to try to make our police department better. And I'm looking at the screen like I'm actually physically seeing you right now. I just realized that.

But that's what the reform is. I see it. I envision it. That we roll this document out. I believe in the month of December sometime. I believe then I present those modification and changes that are requested, suggest it back to the legislative body. The legislative body may want to have a public hearing on that or two and speak to their constituents and then they vote. When they vote, then that gets turned up to the governor in April.

Again, that's the process and it's a huge audience that we're talking to. There has been a lot of outcry and a lot of different issues that we are trying to address. That's what we're doing.

Listen, I can't speak what's on my sleeve any more than what I'm doing. We are really trying to make change.

But at the same time we have a great police department. We live in the safest county in America for a reason, but we don't want to make sure we get there violating anybody's rights.

We're going to look at everything. We're going to evaluate it and we're going to see what needs to be changed and training is the priority. This contract, if you approve it, gives me ability to training for the first time in, I don't know, 50 years in this department.

We don't have that ability. Every time we go to training it cost us money. Now we have the ability to train for the first time on implicit bias, bias

awareness, how we look at de-escalation and now the new changes and use of force. That's all part of positive change that makes our police department better. I hope that answers the question.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, commissioner, I appreciate your response and we all want to see how the police department can be made better.

But, as you know, and you and have had very frank discussions, there are folks in our county that fear the police. They have a distrust of police.

One of the things that myself and Legislator Bynoe proposed was a complaint hotline which basically wouldn't change in our opinion the disciplinary practices, those things will still be at your discretion, however, it will add a level of integrity and transparency.

Unfortunately that particular measure never saw the light of day in the Legislature.

But this is the type of thing

that community leaders are pushing for. Things that we have heard, adding more transparency, integrity, to the process.

I don't know if that's incorporated into your reforms, but I think this is what we are talking about.

Here is a measure that was proposed many months ago and I haven't seen anything whether it's from the administration or the majority that have talked about this particular measure, their thoughts on the measure, whether or not the measure should go forward.

The only thing I will say is, with respect to the Presiding Officer, was that he felt that he did not want to do anything in piece mail and wanted to do everything in one shot.

But can you speak to any -- can you inform us whether or not any measures like this in terms of adding transparency as well as more accountability to the process is incorporated into the reform plan?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Absolutely.

So what you put forward, you and I spoke about, and Legislator Bynoe spoke about, I will tell you this, some of that is being incorporated into our change. We didn't need legislation to have reform. Some of that works for us, it makes us better, it gives us better transparency, so we have done that.

The victim advocacy's now will accept complaints and how we are going to accept complaints anonymously, way that you can go on a website, way that you can do it by phone. There's follow-up so they get notified and they get told of the outcome and follow up going forward.

That's why I think the frustration is. This document is -- this fluid working document that we're doing, we keep taking pieces of change and we go back and enter it into the document.

I meet with my chiefs and we talk about it. Then I get with the analyst and I say, we need to incorporate this into the program and here is where we want to drop

this. We're all for that.

But recommendations are not fully absorbed but if we can pieces of it we start making it better.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So, commissioner, this is a more of a difficult question.

Obviously we talked a little bit about the need for the community to formulate in conjunction with the county the plan and I feel that they're actually participating in the plan and how it's developed.

However, I will say this. This hasn't been debated or discussed but I can tell you there are definitely segments of the district that I represent that are pushing for CCRB, civilian complaint review board.

That being said, that civilian complaint review board, if it was considered to be in the discussion of the reform plan, I know full well that plan would have to have some level of acceptance from the

unions.

But, however, we are considering a contract today and, as an example in the next couple of months, you hear a ground swell of support for CCRB, are we prepared to tell those people that they can't have it because the police department doesn't support it or because it's not in the collective bargaining agreement?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: The police department supports all fair reporting that comes forward to us. How the process is and who adjudicates and decides, the police department takes everything under advisement and we look at it.

Right now the way we do it in the police department, there are ways to make it better. I don't think those items that we talk about internally which have not been presented yet will have to have any union involvement. It's our decision. It's a policy decision.

But as far as going forward with CCRB and stuff, again, we listen to these

recommendations and we take them under advisement.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Commissioner, I understand the proposals you feel that you are putting forward and formulating before they get rolled tout to the community do not require any type of collective bargaining. I believe you when you say that.

However, I want to see what the plan looks like once it reaches 1,000, 10,000, 20,000 people and they start to opine on it.

What I'm asking is, if there's a ground swell of people that are pushing for reform and pushing for a CCRB because they believe that's the accountability that the county needs, then I'm asking you, would that be incorporated into the plan and if it was incorporated into the plan, how would it be incorporated into the plan when collective bargaining agreements are already ratified, they're already approved by the Legislature and done by NIFA?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Because any change going forward in the department we can always sit down and renegotiate. It's an MOU that we sit down and decide under a memorandum of understanding on how we are going to move forward with this item. Whatever that item is.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You feel and you're telling this legislative body that any particular reform that needs to be renegotiated can be renegotiated once the contract, even though the contract is approved by the Legislature, signed by the County Executive and approved by NIFA.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes, absolutely.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Then I go back to the back and forth between Tatum Fox and Legislator Bynoe.

I can't understand for the life of me that -- I am glad to see that the SOA has incorporated and have been leaders in regard to body cams in this particular contract. I just want to thank them for

that measure. It speaks volumes in terms of the direction they believe that transparency will provide to Nassau County residents. It begs the question on what exactly happened with the last police contracts and then how that pertains to the body cam measures that myself and my colleagues have put together in terms of trying to do a body cam pilot program.

At that time it sounded like the unions were not in support of it. And if the unions are not in support of a CCRB, how does this play out any differently?

MS. FOX: So it would work out differently depending on if it was a mandatory item of negotiation. If that's the case, regardless of the topic, we would have to enter into an MOA which would amend this contract at any point in time.

If it's just impact negotiations, we could implement it but we would be required to negotiate the impact of that with the union.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I understand

that you have to enter into a memorandum of agreement to be able to do that, but what I'm trying to say is, to judge the willingness of what the unions would do, the appropriate time would be now, when you're negotiating and give and take on both sides on a multitude of issues.

I'm sure the SOA basically had to get something in the agreement. It's a contract. It's something that's being negotiated. And I'm sure there was give and take for them to accept body cameras.

I'm glad they did. It shows the fortitude of their union but at the same time there is give and take.

Now you're saying you would come at a later point after the agreement is done to establish the MOA which, I'm guessing, if I'm understanding you correctly, the county would reopen the contract and potentially give something back in order to get something in that the community at large is looking for as part of the reforms?

I've only been in the county for

the last 18 years. I don't think I have ever seen that happen to a particular contract. If I could be wrong, but I don't think I've ever seen that. So I want to make sure I understand your logic correctly.

MS. FOX: I wouldn't call it reopening, we would not be reopening the entire contract. We would be amending, adding to it. If it requires mandatory negotiations because it's a term and condition of employment we would be required to do.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So basically you're saying that you would reopen it and, at the same time, you are expressing that the union -- you're not too sure what the union would support, but obviously you're stating for the record today that the union would basically -- they would have to deal with it is what you are implying which I don't think that's the case.

But if I understanding you correctly, you're not giving them anything

as part of the MOA because you are not reopening the agreement, or the contract, you're not giving them anything, so basically they're just going to have to accept whatever you are proposing.

MS. FOX: Respectfully, no, I'm not saying that. That's too hypothetical for me to answer what we would give in a concession for something. I just don't know. It's premature for me to answer that. But, again, it would have to be a mandatory item of negotiation.

So, if it's not, it doesn't touch the contract at all.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I actually respectfully disagree. Because, like I said before, this is not pie in the sky, this is not me making it up.

I believe Amy Marion, I know if she's still there, but I know she spoke on behalf of the group I'm talking about. They held a press conference on the steps of the Legislature and one of their reforms were CCRB. That's not hypothetical.

Now we are in the reality realm. If they garner the support for CCRB and we start to hear this at our community meetings when this gets rolled out, I have to tell you, it would be embarrassing if you're going to say to a large majority of people a reform they are seeking is not going to be incorporated into the reform plan, then what are we doing that for?

Look, I support the fact that we are doing community centers and officers on bikes. That's great, but, more importantly, I want to make sure I hear it from people that are pushing for the reforms. I want to hear what their priorities are.

It sounded like to me from the group that was there, one of their priorities was a CCRB and obviously we need to wait to see what the larger community anticipates and supports but I would want to see their support. I would want to see what the larger community supports and make sure it's incorporated into the reforms, no ifs ands or buts.

MR. NICOLINO: Chris Nicolino, director of labor relations. I'm reluctant to say on the record what is and what is not a subject of mandatory negotiation because our friends for the union are here and we often disagree on what those are exactly. But if it's a policy that's being implemented, I would maintain that it's something that we don't have to negotiate and if it's something that affects the terms and conditions of the workplace it is. I don't know where the CCRB would fit in on that spectrum. Certainly we can address it through an MOA if it was something that did need to be negotiated or address it through a policy modification if it was something that didn't have to be negotiated.

Nothing will be set in stone, in other words, by this contract and the signing off of this contract.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Chris, for saying that. Look, I'm using the CCRB as an example because that has been presented and documented whether it's by

Newsday reports or whatever.

What I'm ultimately saying is that there could be a group of reforms that if we're not cognizant of what they are right now, they can very well impact what the collective bargaining agreements this legislative body approves.

From that standpoint I will be voting no on the contract today.

But, thank you, Chris, and thank you Tatum and thank you, Commissioner, for your candor today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you. Legislator Ford.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very much, Presiding Officer. I'm a little confused with regard to the reforms and the process that we're going through. It appears to me that you have already brought some of these recommendations to the public or by zoom meetings.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: If somebody brings up use of force, and they talk about use of force, we saw what happened in

Minneapolis. We explained to them that we don't teach the choke hold. We never have. We teach a thing called the carotid restraint. But, under the new law, it has been removed. The last class. We put out a departmental order.

We don't have to wait until April to do that. As a matter of fact we can't wait until April. We made that change. That's already done. It's already in place. That is a modification for the use of force. There's many others that come with that. But that's an example of how some things we changed right away.

Mental health you know we have a committee. Commissioner McCummings has done an outstanding job with what we've been sitting down and having great meetings on it, how we can treat those people that need that service better and what we can do.

But some of the changes I've already implemented because I can't wait for the change to notice that I have a shortcoming. I have to fix that now. We

have done that.

So some of the recommendations that come forward, we have changed them already. Some of the recommendations that come forward we still meet and discuss on how we can do it and collection is one of the biggest and how we can do better on data collection. Again, that's what we're working towards.

When that all gets compiled for these working groups, it's going to go out. When it goes out, we're going to get more recommendations. Some we will take, some we won't. Some have already been in there, just not seen the right way. Then we can finish that document and present it back to all of you. You will get it at the same time the public gets it of course.

LEGISLATOR FORD: We were hoping we could see the recommendations prior to the public also because in case any of us have any recommendations as well.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: That might not be an issue, let me take a look at it,

but, again, it's a breathing document. If I gave it to you today, by the end of next week, I made numerous changes just in the last PAC meeting.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Because I guess you heard like from so many of the legislators, we're all a little frustrated because we have no idea what's been discussed. Basically what are the ideas, what are the recommendations at this point. Voting on something today. We don't know what impact it will have on the contracts should it be passed next year, these recommendations.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I can tell you, CCRB can be done as a separate deal on the side, and the cameras is already in the works, which is great. I don't know about the discussions with the PBA, I don't know that.

What I do know is this, the majority, almost all of the changes and reform have nothing to do with an item that I have to negotiate. There are policies,

there are procedures on how we train.

The only thing we are training would become, how I train, meaning I can't bring them in on a day off without paying them, so that has to be figured out. But if I have training days as I do in the SOA contract, I can bring them in now and train them.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Which is good. I guess with the reforms too you have had to incorporate basically the reform or the repeal of 50A, are those -- take part in these type of recommendations also?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I don't hear what it was.

LEGISLATOR FORD: 50A.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Yes. That's a law. That's not reform. That's do it, it has to be done.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So that's done and with in mind whatever recommendations the public has and everything like that, but what if all of a sudden we go through all this and we come up with our recommendations

and we think it's good and we send it up to the governor and he doesn't like what we did?

COMMISSIONER RYDER: I can tell you, and, look, I read the guide several times and I understand what's in it and I understand what we do, I don't know who wrote the guide but it wasn't directed at Nassau County Police Department. It's directed at a broader audience.

Not that there are some thing that we have to do better now, I agree. Some things we have to fix and do better, I agree. But it's written to cover the broad spectrum of all those 500 agencies in the state of New York.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I thank you and I do want to say that you have been rather progressive in approaching the police department with some of the reforms, so I respect you for that.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Any other legislators?

(No verbal response.)

The only thing I would add is just to amplify what Legislator Ford just said. Every institution, especially a paramilitary institution needs to be looked at on a regular basis. Reforms are always welcome. Physical training is always welcome and we'll see what comes out of this process.

But the discussion here has to be in -- the context of every department, it does have some flaws and missteps over the years but has been remarkably successful.

As you have said, proactive in terms of its training, in terms of how its members operate, the professionalism, the education.

So we will discuss before going forward and obviously something is going to be presented to us at one point. But let's not lose sight of the focus that this department in particular has been overwhelming successful.

COMMISSIONER RYDER: Thank you.

Full Legislature/11-23-20

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else? Anyone remote?

(No verbal response.)

Thank you very much. I'm going to call for a vote. All in favor of the contract signify by saying aye?

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(Nay.)

I believe it's a 16-3 vote. With Carrie Solages, Legislator Bynoe and Minority Leader Abrahams voting in the negative. So the contract passes. Thank you, Tatum and thank you, Commissioner. Thank you.

MS. FOX: Thank you everyone.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We are going to take a five minute break. We have a couple of things coming up and we need to discuss a couple of developments.

(A recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We still have some more emergency items to consider. We have a second emergency calendar. There

are three items on it, 290-2020.

We are going to hold off on the emergency items until we have the item.

Let's go back to the main calendar. Item 29, Resolutions 154, a resolution authorizing the county of Nassau to amend the 2019 housing and urban development action plan as amended, to file an application for additional federal assistance with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: So moved.

LEGISLATOR MULE: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator McKevitt, seconded by Legislator Mule.

MR. CREAN: Good afternoon. Kevin Crean, Office of Community Development. This item before is you is an amendment to the 2019 annual action plan, actually the second amendment. The purpose for the amendment is to add additional Cares Act funding that was awarded to the county under the Community Development Block Grant

Program and the Emergency Solutions Grants Program. The Block Grant Program has an additional $9.5 million and The Emergency Solutions Grant Program an additional $10.6 million.

So the amendment went through a five day comment period prior to it being on the legislative calendar under communities on November 9th. That time period has elapsed.

Once the Legislature acts on the action plan amendment we will submit the plan to Hud for their review.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Can you give me that breakdown again?

MR. CREAN: The CARES Act funding had several rounds of allocations in them. So there was a Community Development Block Grant CB round one, where the county received eight and a half million dollars and Emergency Solutions Grant round one, which had $4.2 million. Those were in our first amendment that was approved in April.

So then the second round for both

of these pots of money went just to states and territories. The third round then had additional allocations to entitlements such as Nassau County. So that included $9.5 million for the Community Development Block Grant Coronavirus, and $10.6 million in Emergency Solutions Grant Coronavirus.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: These are monies we're receiving that we ordinarily would not get?

MR. CREAN: That's correct. The rules governing these programs are the same as the general programs, except for the fact that Hud issued numerous waivers for several items and the funds have to be utilized to address, respond to, plan for or prevent the coronavirus spread.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: What kind of waivers?

MR. CREAN: Well, one of the waivers included the caps on public services for the Community Development Block Grant Program generally the program has a 15 percent cap on public services because the

coronavirus pandemic, the response includes many public services, for instance, including food bank distribution, emergency food, mental health, substance abuse, workforce development, those items all come under via category public services.

So, generally, the Community Development Block Grant Program is 15 percent cap on that. The cap was waived so we can provide much larger amounts of funding towards those items.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Focus on the portion that is slated to go for the grants for the restaurants.

MR. CREAN: So the proportion slated to go for the restaurants come under the category of economic development. Under the first round we had funding allocated for that as well, but the economic development fund went for the PPE distribution that was done several dates in Eisenhower Park for the businesses in general as they were reopening.

We also allocated funding through

the LEAC, Local Economic Assistance Corporation, which is a non profit along with the IDA, in conjunction with the boost of the New York Forward Program, we established a Boost Nassau Program through an allocation of $250,000 in economic development funds through the first round of block grant funding. We have leveraged $10 million through the National Development Council.

So they have now cleared $1 million in loans awarded under that program. So that came under the first round and that program is ongoing, Boost Nassau program.

In the second round of the Economic Development Funds have been targeted to assisting restaurants to recover from the pandemic. Those will be provided as grants, that's the anticipation.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Is that in the federal guidelines, requirements, regulations, is it specifically allocated by the feds?

MR. CREAN: It's an eligible

activity. It's been an eligible activity under the Block Grant Program. The assistance to for profit business is eligible. There are some requirement that go with that obviously, but we can provide the funds either through loans, loan guarantees, grants. It's up to the local municipality how they wish to provide those funds.

Every activity which is funded under the Block Grant Program also has a national objective in the program. Generally the most useful one is low moderate income benefit and you can do that through area benefits, so a lot of our downtowns that have census data that allows us to provide funding for downtown improvements, improvements of businesses, making sidewalk improvements, park improvements, that would be done on an area wide basis.

Then you have the limited clientele where you can actually identify the individuals that will be benefitting

such asa housing rehabilitation so the individual would have to have an income that applies.

In this case, economic development, the low moderate income benefit can be adjusted through job creation or job retention.

So, generally, the program requires that you have a minimum of one job created or retained per $50,000 in assistance.

The Coronavirus waivers actually increases that amount to $85,000. So you can provide a lot more funding with fewer jobs created.

Our program we're enacting is a $10,000 grant. It's very easy for restaurants to identify one low moderate income job $10,000 in assistance. So we are trying to set the bar low for these restaurants so as many restaurants can qualify as possible.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: And the total amount that's set aside for this

restaurant program is $2.5 million?

MR. CREAN: $2.5 million in allocation, yes.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: How did you arrive at this number? Could have been more or could have been less?

MR. CREAN: Could have been more, cover been less. We still have some funds that are budgeted but aren't specifically earmarked for specific projects yet. So the demand is so great, that we decided we may want to open up and do a second round if it's possible for us to move more money into that program.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Does it have to be restricted under federal regulations to restaurants, can it be other commercial activity with a low or moderate income employee?

MR. CREAN: It doesn't have to be restricted to restaurants though it can be opened up to other businesses. We thought to, because of the limited amount of money available, $10,000 really per restaurant,

we're really targeting 300 restaurants. We have to open it up to all types of businesses because it would be spreading the money too thing and it wouldn't really have an impact on the businesses in Nassau County.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Who is going to make the decision as to which restaurants are eligible.

MR. CREAN: The National Development Council, we are contracting with them to run the program. They have been running a similar program in a consortium of communities in Northern Texas. So we looked at the criteria they are using there and we made some changes to it so that it fits our needs here.

But, essentially, those applications that come in will be funded as they are completed. So the applications that come in are completed and are eligible, they will be funded through chronologically received.

Those that are incomplete, NDC

will work with them to make sure they're complete. We've also set it up so that there's a 25 percent set aside for restaurants that are owned by minority business enterprises or women owned business enterprises.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: What is this National Development Council, a private entity?

MR. CREAN: It's a not-for-profit that operates nationally. We have contracted with them already. So this is an amendment to their contract.

When we did our 2020 consolidated plan, our five year consolidated plan, we have been hearing from a lot of our consortium members that they wanted to establish a development program. This is something we spoke to the National Development Council about a year ago.

Our contract with the National Development Council actually includes the economic development component. We had planned to fund that with 2020 funds.

Then that was before the pandemic hit. That was already included in our contract with them.

We anticipated having to amend the contract to add funds to it at this time using 2020 funds.

Right now we are using the Coronavirus funds and trying to get to the specific need.

We found that a lot of our consortium members, although they have expressed a need and desire to have an economic development program, one, it wasn't fair to have different small programs operating in cities or towns or villages where businesses in other villages that did not have the capacity to run their own program would be shut out of that program so it was more practical to have a countywide program so that any business in Nassau County could apply as long as they were eligible.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Two more questions and I will be done.

Number one. What is it that prevents influence on the National Development Council in this selection process? For example there's a call and they say, I want a restaurant B to be covered. So these guys are outside of the influence members or whatever?

MR. CREAN: Is anyone outside of influence I can't say, but I think the way the program is set up, they will have an online application portal and the portal will rank the applications as they come in. They will be dated, they will be time stamped. It will be clear as to when the applications came in. We can provide some oversight as to how they're rating in the rank.

We will not have any oversight. We will not see the list of applications, the applicants that are on their list. We will be providing them with any instructions on what businesses other than the constraints the program set up.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: So the

restaurants themselves, their application will go to the National Development Council?

MR. CREAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: The county doesn't see that?

MR. CREAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: One last question. Are there restrictions on how the restaurants can spend the grant money?

MR. CREAN: We purposely worked with the NDC because initially we were thinking about helping businesses address the desire to have outdoor seating, maybe we can help them purchase heat lamps or tents.

As the season went on and we realized that a lot of businesses had already purchased heat lamps and we understood there were restrictions for heat lamps and tents placed on by the fire marshal and we heard from a lot of communities that there are restaurants in their municipalities that don't have access to parking lots because they are on the middle of a street, or their sidewalks are

not wide enough, we decided to make the program more general, so essentially as operating capital. They can use it to pay their staff, purchase food, pay their insurance, their rent, what have you. So that's purposely left very vague and making it more flexible for the restaurants themselves.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you. I appreciate it. Legislator Ford.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon, Kevin. I know that one of the requirements for a restaurant to be eligible is that they have to have been in business prior to March 9th of 2019, around that date, say March 1st, 2019.

My concern is also for the new businesses, the new restaurants. Is there any way -- I don't know if this is possible under this, if a restaurant say was ABC restaurant, and like say in April of 2019 the ownership changed. It's the same restaurant, same location. Owners changed from ABC to CD.

Is the new owner still eligible to be able to try to get the grant to get the five to $10,000?

MR. CREAN: I did get some clarification on that because we heard that question before.

The definition of in operation would include being incorporated. So even if they had not opened on March 1st, they would have had to file their incorporation papers months earlier. So even if they opened in August or September, in essence they would have been in by March 1st. In the case where a business changes hands, that's our intent as well. But this will be inclusive. We are trying not to restrict it so much.

But the businesses do have to show that they have seen a financial hit due to Coronavirus. That's part of the federal regulation for this Coronavirus money, that they would have had to seen a revenue drop off.

They do have to have a certain

number of months of receipts so they can demonstrate the change in the revenue from pre COVID to post COVID.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So then a restaurant that maybe would have been slated to open in May and found that they couldn't open, they wouldn't be eligible for this?

MR. CREAN: Technically, no, because they would not be able to show a drop in revenue. In May of 2020 you say?

LEGISLATOR FORD: Say they were going to open up May 2019 but because of --

MR. CREAN: No. May of 2019 they should be fine because they would have been incorporated, filed for permits. They would have been an entity already at that point by March. How far into the fall we go, it's then that you start to get a little bit more touchy.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So then any business that was slated to open this year, I'm losing my mind, but they would not be eligible?

MR. CREAN: Not in this current

program, no. But I think if we do see there is a significant demand for new businesses that we're not able to open we could adjust the program in the second run out. From what we're hearing, just given the last couple of days, this is very popular program. There's a lot of restaurants and municipalities are telling us that there is a high demand for this so we do expect to be oversubscribed for the two and a half million dollars and we will see how the other items in the budget goes.

We may be able to make some additional funds available, so we can make some changes to the requirements at that point.

LEGISLATOR FORD: I hope so because after Sandy there were grants that were given to businesses and unfortunately some of them that had opened, right before Sandy hit, were not eligible and sad to say I think two of them down in my area actually were both women owned businesses, they went under.

So I'm hoping that if the intent is to give them the assistance so they stay in business and they're economically viable, that even the new ones, we can find a path to help them so that they can continue to stay in operation and hopefully service us for many many years.

MR. CREAN: There was a lot of discussion and we just want to work out the parameters of the program. We also have to consider making it a priority or strictly for downtowns. So much of our Community Development Block Grant money over the last few years has gone to improving downtown revitalization projects.

But then there's going to be a lot of restaurants that are in shopping centers and strip malls that would have been shut out, so we are trying to make it as inclusive as possible but you have to draw the line at some point just so that there's some structure around the program.

But if see there are a lot of businesses that fall short we are willing to

listen to make adjustments.

LEGISLATOR FORD: You might hear from food truck people.

MR. CREAN: I did see another community working with food trucks since we were working on this, we were looking at the programs. I guess in different parts of the country food trucks are -- I know they're more popular particularly in Long Beach areas but yes.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else? Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Could you just tell us, I know that $2 million is going towards the restaurant program through the Community Development Block Grants but I understand there was $9.5 million received.

MR. CREAN: 9.5 and in the staff summary that I think you should have been provided with, it outlines the different pots of funding.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Can you just go through the remaining 7.5, the remaining 7?

MR. CREAN: Yes. So subsistence payments is earmarked for $4 million. That's something we are still trying to work out. But essentially subsistence payments is something that -- it's an odd concept, but it falls under -- it's listed under the ineligible activities under the Community Development Block Grant Program except for this allowance. So you can provide subsistence payments which would include paying for a rent arrears or paying for rental assistance for at least three months or for no more than three months.

The Coronavirus waivers I believe extended after four months. That's is something that we are looking to do.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Is that commercial or residential?

MR. CREAN: Residential. That's earmarked for $4 million.

Food banks, another million

dollars. We are now trying to determine the extent of the need because there were a lot of funding for food banks earmarked in the first round and a lot of that money is still not spent. But those vouchers are rolling in now so we will see where we are with that how that goes moving forward.

Health services $214,000. Mental health and substance abuse services $500,000. Both of those items also were included in the first round. So we will see where the need is or the demand for that is. It's possible there might be some unallocated money in those two pots as well.

Employment training and workforce development. We had a program in the first round with Nassau Community College to specifically train health care workers both as trying to identify those residents who may have been put out of work and now looking to change careers but also training more healthcare workers to address the pandemic, so that was something that we thought was specifically eligible.

So that's $500,000, and two and a half million dollars development fund and, under the planning line, that was $150,000 which was earmarked specifically for health disparity study for the minority communities. That RFP has been issued already. So that funding will be available when the responses come in and we have a chance to do them.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: So we're using community development Community Development Block Grant funding to do the disparity study?

MR. CREAN: Not the disparity study for businesses. There's two studies. This is specifically for health care, why the minority communities were hit harder by the Coronavirus, that's something we're looking to address; is it the availability of health care, is it the different types of jobs? We're just trying to get that study done to determine what the extent is and the causes for it and that will allow us to plan in the future to target those areas.

Then there's additional funding for administration as well, for the running of the program.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: What is at the funding for the running of the program?

MR. CREAN: $700,000.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Are we bringing on additional staff?

MR. CREAN: No. We tried, but Andy Persich wouldn't let us we're stuck with what we got.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Well, I guess the point is, what would be the point of spending an additional $700,000 on the program, not $700,000 on program administration, wouldn't that be better served actually going towards the program?

MR. CREAN: And it may end up going to the program. Right now our staff is spending an inordinate amount of time as you can imagine just trying to set up these two new programs so we can bill time to this program that would have been billed to our regular block grant, and that will carry

over to next year. So it gives us some flexibility.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: In looking through the breakdown, for example, we have $10 million going up to $20 million allocated with $10 million going towards essentially homeless prevention and housing relocation and stabilization services, and it's certainly important, no question about it, but it seems as though we've got a management information system for $325,000, OCD administration program for $420,000, and we have OCD administration which is $700,000 that we spoke about.

We have rapid rehousing and housing location stabilization services. Is that a -- I'm sorry, street outreach for $2.3 million to reach out to unsheltered homeless individuals and families.

Aren't these things that we're already doing though? I'm concerned that it seems as though we're spending an awful lot on programs, administration, sort of in-house costs that we could be devoting

towards providing actual relief.

MR. CREAN: What you are reading off of now is the Emergency Solutions Grants Program which is much more restrictive so that has to go towards addressing the needs of the homeless population and preventing homelessness.

We do have an existing Homeless Prevention Program that's run out of our office so there's additional COVID money going towards that.

Right now we're impacted by the eviction moratorium so we have not actually been able to spend any of that money from the first round or from our regular funding because of the eviction moratorium.

One of the requirements is that the individuals be at risk of homelessness through eviction, and through the moratorium no one has an eviction notice filed against them. We expect that to increase after January.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I guess my question is, why are we spending so much of

the $10 million that's being allocated towards homeless prevention, why are we spending so much on administrative costs as opposed to the actual programs?

MR. CREAN: The bulk of the administrative money for the homeless -- under the Emergency Solutions Grant Program will probably be contracted out to other entities who will carry out these tasks for us.

So the Rapid Rehousing Program is something that we have not funded in the last number of years. It's a Hud priority right now as a street outreach. We didn't allocate any money for street outreach in the first round, but we are hearing that there are additional homeless persons impacted because of the Coronavirus either through mental health issues or for loss of income.

So the street outreach will allow some of those entities, nonprofits that we work with to go out into the field and identify the homeless, provide them with

case management and hopefully get them housing. So that is something that we are working on right now.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: That's something that we don't do already?

MR. CREAN: Not our office. DSS does some of that and we are trying to coordinate with DSS. But, no, we don't do the street outreach. Our staff, we only have one person assigned to the emergency solutions grant program.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Is there a reason why DSS can't pick that up? In other words, why are two different departments trying to do the same thing?

MR. CREAN: We do try and coordinate. The Emergency Solutions Grant Program falls under our office because it's part of Hud's consolidated program. So the reporting to Hud, the action plan coordination is all done through our office.

We have discussed with DSS taking on some of those roles. They have other issues on their end. They do street

outreach but it's a civil service position, so it's just 9 to 5 during the week, and this allows us to go out on the weekends and evenings and respond to more emergency conditions that are authorized.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And, specifically, with the Community Development Block Grant Program, I notice, and it's great that we're helping restaurants, that's fantastic, it's a two part question, are we doing anything to push back on some of the new restrictions that have gone into place not permitting dining after 10 o'clock, not permitting gym operation after 10 o'clock?

I don't know if there's any more danger sitting down and having dinner at 9:30 then there is at 10:30 from COVID, so are we pushing back in any of those restrictions that are coming down from the state which would really help restaurants because they are really losing an entire seating theoretically?

MR. CREAN: That would be outside my purview, my jurisdiction, but I know the

County Executive has expressed her displeasure with those restrictions as have a lot of the restaurants, particularly the 10 o'clock closure of the in-house dining because they're losing that nine o'clock seating time frame.

I can't say what the County Executive or the administration may have done in response or to contact the Governor's office.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Is there any thought to going beyond restaurants? I mean, you have small businesses of all types throughout the county that have been dramatically impacted, and Legislator Ferretti followed up on gyms, you have the gyms, you have movie theaters, a whole variety of places that have been dramatically impacted by this that they are simply not going to be able to survive.

MR. CREAN: Yes. There was some consideration to them. We did hear that from some of our communities.

The restaurant industry, in

particular, is an easy category to make eligible because it's still block grant money so it still has to target low and moderate income jobs.

Restaurants I think will have an easier time qualifying for low and moderate income jobs.

Yes, for ushers at movie theaters are probably also lower income as are probably some of the workers at gyms, but they also have a smaller employee base.

We tried to guard against making the program too wide and too broad and then having very little impact. We thought the restaurant industry was something that we can make an impact with this kind of money that we did have.

As I mentioned, this is something that we were looking at doing even before COVID was to make an economic development loan program available.

Loans obviously with the return, refunnel that money and put it out for more loans and assist more businesses as you go

forward. That's something that we're still looking to do.

That's funding that we had available in 2020. With the onset of COVID, we are just trying to marshal our resources and address the current need. But the economic develop loan program is something that we still want to establish and that will be available to all businesses.

New businesses that would come in and bring new jobs to the county and businesses, that, one, are threatening to leave Nassau County because they have an offer somewhere else, they can stay here, purchase a piece of equipment, or maybe expand their business, but the requirement is that they either create or retain low moderate income jobs. That is something that is still going to be in place as that program goes forward.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Do we anticipate there being any additional grant funding available at some later time?

The issue is going to be, if in

fact we do have an additional shutdown at some point in time, even the businesses that manage to survive this first round, simply may not be able to survive the second round, and it seems as they we should be doing something to help those businesses and try to preserve those jobs.

MR. CREAN: Absolutely. The CARES Act was announced I believe in late March early April. It was announced at the time that there would be three rounds of block grant money.

The first round was supposed to be released on the same formula that the regular block grant money was released and that came forward pretty quickly.

This Legislature approved our plan for that in April. And then we were waiting for the second to be announced. The second round of Emergency Solutions Grant money was announced I believe some time over the summer, June or July, we kept being told that the second round of block grant money that would be coming to the county would be

announced shortly.

It wasn't announced until September 11th, so it was much delayed for whatever reason.

I don't why congress delayed in releasing it, or the administration, I don't know whose call that was. But that came out much later.

As you know, there is a lot of talk in Washington about another stimulus package, another round of funding, potentially to assist municipalities with their operating costs, also to assist businesses, but I think it would be with the political climate right now, it's going to be some time before they settle on anything. We're hopeful.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else want to be heard? Yes. Legislator Ferretti.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Hi Kevin. How are you?

MR. CREAN: Good afternoon.

Full Legislature/11-23-20

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So the $2.5 million dedicated to the restaurant industry, that's out of 9.5, the grant?

MR. CREAN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The total grant is 9.5?

MR. CREAN: Correct.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So the other $7 million is already allocated for other uses, correct?

MR. CREAN: It's budgeted for specific types of uses, but, as I mentioned, the food banks, subsistence payments, the subsistence payments is the one category that we are having discussions with the particular non profit to try to craft the policy around those programs.

The other items, the food banks, the health services, the mental health services, those are all categories that we funded in the first round.

Right now, even though we earmarked that money for those needs, we're waiting to see what the additional needs

are.

So if the needs fall short of our budget, those monies can be repurposed and we can get to other pots, including economic development.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: You indicated that the money that's dedicated right now to the restaurant industry could be changed, moved up, moved down, reduced or increased, correct?

MR. CREAN: Moved up or moved down?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Decreased or increased. So if in the future we find that instead of 300 restaurants, we have 400 restaurants. You can increase the amount of that grant, that 9.5, increase to 2.5 that's dedicated to restaurants to something else, right?

MR. CREAN: You mean to another economic development purposes other types of businesses?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: No, to restaurants. You say two months from now it

turns out the 2.5 wasn't sufficient to really help the restaurant industry. You want to do another $500,000. That would come out of that 9.5 total, correct?

MR. CREAN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So you would be taking from some other allocation that you currently have?

MR. CREAN: Yes, but, as I pointed out, those other allocations are not committed to any specific nonprofit or any other industry. So it's budgeted needs not necessarily commitment that we would be cancelling.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Right. But once in the event if we pass this, then it's in the administration's discretion to reallocate any amount in excess of the $2.5 million for restaurants, right?

MR. CREAN: That's right. We would just need to advise Hud of the change in the budget.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. So if the administration wanted to have a

similar grant to a different type of industry, bowling alleys, I know bowling alleys have been killed throughout this, closed until September completely, and now they were in operation in September and October but now they're being shut down at 10 o'clock. I don't know if you're an avid bowler like I am, but most of these bowling alleys survive on league bowling and league bowling, specifically money leagues, which tend to be at night, they don't get started until 830, 9 o'clock. So a lot of these leagues are out.

So, the bowling alleys, while they're allowed to stay open until 10:00, a lot of them I know they're not going to because they can't turn a profit.

So bowling alleys have really been decimated. Has there been any communication with bowling alleys, owners, in terms of them getting some portion of this?

MR. CREAN: Not from our office, and none of the consortium members we spoke

to raised the particular issue of bowling alleys.

They did mention businesses in general but not specifically bowling alleys. It is something we look at. It's the first, that would be to find out what their employee base is; low moderate income, and I'm sure -- I feel confident that they would have low moderate income employees based on the standards we have with the restaurants, if it's a similar type program, they would only have to identify one low moderate income employee that they would be saving that person's job. So it is a possibility yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I can tell you as an ex bowling alley employee it's definitely low moderate income.

But, in any event, I'm going to vote in favor of this. I want to help the restaurant industry as much as we can but I wish there was a little bit more communication with the Legislature before announcing this publically because I'm sure

we have a lot of good ideas here too and we're on the ground in these districts interacting with all these industries, whether they be bowling alleys or gyms or bakeries or whatever.

There are certainly a lot of other industries that are getting hammered as well.

Just going forward I would ask for the increased collaboration, but I will be supporting this. Thank you.

MR. CREAN: Legislator, thank you for your comment.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, Legislator Bynoe and then Legislator Walker.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Good evening, Kevin.

On the study for the health disparities in minority communities, I hope that we look at environmental impacts. Some of the communities are closely seated to -- in proximity to industrial areas.

I know in fact the Town of North

Hempstead is moving forward on a piece of legislation to try and encourage these owners to build out their establishments and encapsulate and mitigate some of the contaminants getting out. I hope you look at that. I hope that's part of the study.

MR. CREAN: Well, the RFP has been issued, so once the responses come back we will see how they believe they can address the study. We're working with the Department of Health on that as well. So I'm sure they'll have some input on that as well.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I know you spent some time on the street outreach. Let me just ask the question.

When they go out and do the outreach, the same funding could then pay for their shelter; is that the thought?

MR. CREAN: It's all part of the same grant program. The street outreach is specific data. There is very few activities that are -- activity categories in the Emergency Solutions Grant Program. You have

sheltering, homeless prevention, rapid rehousing, street outreach and HMIS is the Hud Information System that they're all required to use to collect data on homeless population.

So, like I said, those are very general broad categories. So the street outreach would be one specific eligible category. The rapid rehousing is technically another activity but it all falls under the Emergency Solutions Grant Program.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I guess I don't fully understand the use of the $2.3 million. I understand you want to employ your own team but I know that's not going to cost $2.3 million.

MR. CREAN: No, no. The $2.2 million for street outreach is not for our office. We actually have a couple of proposals right now, nonprofits so --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So you think it's going to cost --

MR. CREAN: Potentially the

purchase of transportation like vans, equipping them so they have plexiglass screens between the drivers and the passengers. That's all included. The street outreach themselves, the staff persons that would be going out to speak to the homeless, provide the case management to get their data so they can put that into the homeless management information system, HMIS system, so we can see what kind of benefits they may be eligible for.

This is something that we've worked with in the past on with like veterans affairs. A lot of the homeless population, or some may be homeless veterans, but until you identify them and find out what they may be qualified for, it's hard to hook them up with the different funding sources.

So that's part of the street outreach program. One of the proposals we have in the street outreach is from United Veterans Beacon House, specifically targets homeless veterans, but not exclusively. So

they do have to outreach to the general public.

We are in discussions with them now. We are just reviewing proposals. But one of the things we're looking at doing is to try and possibly fund two or three nonprofit organizations to provide the street outreach that would include on call services, so if we do get referrals from any of your offices or the villages or chambers of commerce that say they have noticed gathering of the homeless in different areas, that they can do target street outreach.

But also to do regular site visits to areas where people of the homeless are known to congregate and try to bring them back in the fold and identify potential housing locations for them.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So through your discussion you've actually answered another question which was were we going to give this contract to multiple entities. So thank you for answering that before even

asked.

The other question I have is in line with what Legislator Rhoads asked. I'm familiar with the hit team and I know they're out there. They're out of social services.

Listen, I know that the need has really increased since COVID so we do believe that we have a need to this large extent that we need to supplement the hit team?

MR. CREAN: I believe so, yes. But, as I think I mentioned, street outreach is not a category we have funded in the last couple of years.

We did fund the Long Island Coalition For the Homeless to do some street outreach a couple of years ago and some of that money is still being utilized.

But because of the pandemic right now, the demand is so much greater. I don't think the hit team can handle it all on their own plus as I mentioned being able to send out teams on the weekends and the

evenings, morning hours, is something that would not be able to be handled.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Any further debate or discussion?

(No verbal response.)

Thank you, Kevin, appreciate that thorough presentation. I'll call for vote on this. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Carries unanimously.

Before we go back to the emergency items let's cover the last items on this calendar which are 40, 41, and 42.

40 is an bond ordinance providing for a capital expenditure to finance the capital projects identified herein with the county and authorizing $41,666,467 of bonds of the county to finance such expenditure.

41 is a resolution authorizing

the County Executive to execute a design build contract with the State of New York Department of Environmental Conservation.

42 is a resolutions authorizing the County Executive to execute a modification agreement to the administrative consent agreement and cooperative agreement with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So moved.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator Bynoe, seconded by Legislator Ford. Put them all before us.

MR. ARNOLD: Good evening. Ken Arnold, Public Works. 349-20 is a capital bond ordinance. This item is mainly associated with providing sufficient bond ordinance to support the Bay Park conveyance project.

The department recognized when the final engineer's estimate was done. That additional bond ordinance beyond the $460 million we currently have would be

necessary. As we're getting financing through the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation, they require the applicant to provide bond authorization in the amount of all project costs.

The department made a decision at the time not to request additional authorizations based on an estimate but wait until the project costs were known.

Once the Design/Build contractors cost was finalized the total project cost has been set at $513.7 million of which $20 million will be provided directly by the State to cover easements/acquisitions. That leaves a total of $493.7 million of Bond Ordinance required for our EFC loan application.

The other projects included in this item are reauthorizations of two capital projects that expired but are still needed and also rescinding Bond Authorization associated with the Bay Park grants we received from Sandy.

Do you want me to read all three

items?

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Yes.

MR. ARNOLD: Item 350-20 is a contract with Western Bays Constructors. It is my pleasure today to present to you for consideration of this contract because once completed it will be transformational for the western bays.

The purpose of the Bay Park Conveyance project is to significantly reduce the discharge of nitrogen into Reynolds Channel and Long Island's Western Bays by eliminating regular discharge of the Bay Park Sewage Treatment Plant into the Channel.

This will stop the degradation and loss of valuable marshlands that provide resiliency and protection from waves and storm surge.

As the nitrogen influx into the Western Bays decreases, marsh species that traditionally absorb wave energy will return providing coastal protection to Nassau County's South Shore.

The replenishment of marshlands will prevent flooding, and unhealthy living environments. This will also lead to the resurgence of the region's marine life and an increase in recreational opportunities, both of which will have a beneficial economic impact to our community.

During my 34 career years in the Department, there has been a constant discussion on how do we remove the outfall from Reynolds Channel associated with this Bay Park Sewage Treatment Plant.

The challenge was always how you permit a second ocean outfall in the County and how is it paid for.

Throughout this time, the County looked at solutions but the work really began in earnest around 2012 when we performed a study on how Bay Park could meet future nitrogen limits.

The study completed in 2014 confirmed our concerns of the significant costs and the uncertainty of achieving required permits to add a new ocean outfall

or the substantial funding and additional property required to have nitrogen removal treatment to the current level of technology.

So in 2015 discussions started within the Department whether an existing retired water main that serviced NYC that the County owns running beneath Sunrise Highway could be utilized in any manner.

That initial concept of using this retired water main to move treated sewage from Bay Park to Cedar Creek and then maximize the capacity of the existing Cedar Creek ocean outfall is the contract in front of you today.

There has been a great deal of work done between 2015 and now including a 2017 report verifying that the retired water main can be utilized; completing the 30 percent design package, also known as the design criteria report; completing the Federal Environmental assessments that led to a finding of no significant impact; identifying properties requiring easements

and working through the States EDPL process; and holding both public and stakeholder outreach and holding meetings with affected legislators and representatives from the Towns, Villages and School Districts.

Initially the County was going to manage this project as a typical design/bid/build contract.

The County was ready to award a design contract when NYS approached us with an alternate format called Design/Build. Design/Build is a contracting process that NYS has found that saves time and money for projects of this size.

Recent examples of Design/Build in this region include the Tappen Zee Bridge, the Third Track, Kosciusko Bridge and Nassau Expressway projects.

At the end of 2017, the Department presented to this body the Bay Park Agreement that identified the County's obligation to do this project and a Cooperative Agreement that outlined the State's commitment to assist us in

Design/Build.

So today we are presenting a contract with Western Bays Constructors for a total of $439.4 million.

This contract will utilize the approved design criteria report, approved environmental work plan, and easements identified as I previously mentioned.

The treated effluent will connect to the existing ocean outfall at Cedar Creek. There will be no utilization of any treatment processes at Cedar Creek because of this project.

The project in summary includes the placement of an new effluent diversion pump station at Bay Park;

A 60 inch diameter microtunnel from Bay Park to Sunrise Highway;

Slip lining the existing retired water main along Sunrise Highway, what will result in a new pipeline within the retired water main;

A 60 inch diameter microtunnel from Sunrise Highway to the back end of the

Cedar Creek Plant;

The placement of an effluent receiving station and the replacement of the existing effluent pumps at Cedar Creek.

I will note that the effluent pumps being replaced at Cedar Creek are not needed for the project but works in parallel for what we're disturbing when we do the work. So we want to get that done today.

And, finally, a detailed investigation of the existing ocean outfall and associated diffusers and remedial repairs as required.

The procurement process follows the New York State policies consisting of two steps;

The first step is the Request for Qualifications, RFQ,

And the second one is the Request for Proposals, RFP.

The RFQ resulted in receiving Statements of Qualifications from five firms.

During the RFP process one firm

made a business decision to drop out. We received two proposals, Western Bays Constructors and a team made up of Skanska/Posillico/Micheals.

The evaluation of the proposals were completed utilizing both County and State staff and supported by our three engineering consultant teams that this body previously approved.

As I mentioned earlier, the evaluations and negotiations all followed the state policies associated with Design/Build contracting.

The proposal evaluation returned that Western Bays Constructors was the highest technically ranked firm and was also the lowest cost.

Their proposed cost is $18 million or four percent below our engineer's estimate.

The contract negotiations phase of the Design/Build contract also allows for the inclusion of Alternate Technical Concepts, or ATCs.

In short, one of the benefits of utilizing a Design/Build procurement model is the utilization of concepts developed by the proposing firms.

The proposing firms are encouraged to develop cost and time saving concepts which can be accepted or not.

Furthermore, accepted concepts developed by the non-selected firms, can also be utilized in the project.

So, in the case of this contract, an ATC was accepted which provided some cost savings but, more importantly, removed all surface work from being done at the East Rockaway Jr/Sr School property.

This contract includes a Project Labor agreement and is estimated to result in two 2,300 full time equivalent jobs during the three year period with an economic output of $275 million.

Additionally, the contract includes requirements of 23 percent MWBE and six percent SDVOB participation.

As a side note these percentages

will be a tremendous opportunity, as an example the Bay Park Sandy recovery work with 20 percent, has yielded $99 million being paid to MWBEs since its initiation and also $4.5 million in contracts in SDVOBs.

This contract is being funded by Federal, State and the County. The Federal government provided the County with a Hazardous Mitigation Grant for a total of $76.9 million. The State has provided a series of grants that in total sum to $62.1 million.

The County's obligation at this time is $354.7 million. The County's share will be financed through loans provided by the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation, EFC. The timing of these loans and the cash flow requirements from the County have been worked out with EFC to satisfy current concerns of OMB.

In closing, I would like to thank not only all of the legislators who have supported this critically important environmental project, but also the staffs

of both the Majority and Minority.

The Department has been in continued conversations and meetings with both staffs since the initiation of the proposal process to provide detailed information on the project and the contract before you today.

While the contract has only been filed for seven days, discussions and questions have been ongoing since this summer.

I also want to thank the Office of the Inspector General for their cooperation to make time, and, in many cases, on short notice to attend the numerous procurement meetings.

The Governor set a goal in January for this contract to be presented to you today.

I am very proud of the efforts of the Department and our consultant teams working with our state partners in achieving that.

Additionally, it would be

possible without the cooperation of your staffs, the Offices of the Inspector General, Legislative Affairs, Comptroller, Office of Management and Budget and the County Attorney.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ken. Will you or maybe Jane just address the new disclosures that were filed today?

MR. ARNOLD: Sure.

MS. HODAK: Good afternoon. Jane Hodak, Department of Public Works.

So the materials that were filed today were backed up to some of the previous filed disclosures.

We have reviewed those materials with the Office of Compliance, Robert Cleary. Those materials have also been review by the Office of the Inspector General.

None of the materials that have been shared with you today are materials that would give us pause to not consider these contractors to be responsible contractors.

They are the type of violations, they previously been described to us in some instances, and now they are just back up to those materials that have been previously been described. They are consistent with the type of violations of companies of this magnitude doing the type of work that they do.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We would like to ask our Inspector General Jody Franzese to come up.

MS. FRANZESE: Jody Franzese, Office of the Inspector General.

DPW brought us in relatively early regarding this review, I'm sure, so that they could get it done expeditiously.

My staff had access to -- sorry, reviewed project documents on this matter such as the RFP, the proposal evaluation plan, and the proposals.

My office also attended 15 meetings in the month of October for this matter. We observed the procurement management team evaluating vendor proposals.

We observed them preparing for and interviewing the vendors as well as negotiating the initial schedule of values with the vendor.

We also looked at the documents that were received this morning, around noonish this afternoon, Presiding Officer, and we didn't find anything that raised any red flags for us.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: So that means there's nothing in those new disclosures that require a hold on this particular item?

MS. FRANZESE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you.

MS. FRANZESE: And we submitted a form to the Legislature just indicating that we did not have any reportable results.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you. I will turn it over -- I'm sure the legislators have substantive questions, but I just wanted to emphasize the importance of a project of this magnitude in a well developed county, that there be more than

adequate community outreach.

I think we need a commitment from the Department of Public Works that there are going to be substantial resources put into community outreach and reaching out to the public and answering questions and resolving issues.

MR. ARNOLD: That was part of the RFP submittal. The contracting firm brought on a firm that is the same company doing the outreach for Third Track.

Additionally ECOM who is the owner's rep, this is between us and the state has Colladium on board to assist in all outreach so that is a big component of what we are doing for this project, because the project fails if we don't tell people what's going on.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you. Legislator Ford.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Good afternoon. Thank you very much for your presentation on this. I have to say that the zoom meeting presentation, I think it was last week or

something, was very well presented. It was a way of letting the public who were on, I believe over 70 people, I think it was, it was a great presentation. We actually got to see everything. We heard people's questions and their comments.

MR. ARNOLD: That was our consultant running the professional setup on that.

LEGISLATOR FORD: So if we can't have in person meetings, I would strongly keeping with that format. I thought it worked very well. Thank you on that.

My question then is this, I, like you, have been involved in urging something like this for a great many years.

Starting with the Western Bay study that was conducted way back when with the USGS survey and whatever.

It was my understanding that when we were going for this project, and I went to Governor Cuomo's announcement on this when we headed the JCC in Oceanside, I was led to believe that New York State was going

to provide more funding than what is indicated. I guess for this project, we're talking about $439 million, correct, and we are getting 76.9 million from the feds, an only 62.1 from New York State?

MR. ARNOLD: 62.1 plus the easement money that they're going to pay directly which is approximately upwards of another $20 million.

LEGISLATOR FORD: That easement, money is not in the total cost of 439?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct. Because it's outside the cost of the contract.

We are still chasing money for the project. We are working with the state, both the Department of Homeland Security and the EC to try to utilize the unused money at the Bay Park Sewage Treatment Plant. We believe there is an opportunity to add 30 to $60 million to this project from that program. So that's an ongoing conversation with them. Working through the details because they have different pools of money and different allocations and how they are

classified with litigation or other things.

So we are hopeful that that money from FEMA can be obligated towards this project.

LEGISLATOR FORD: And this cost, the $439 million is not including the cost of bringing Long Beach on board, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct. Long Beach is a totally separate project.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Okay. So then I hope that since New York State took credit for being such a great environmentalist for this project, that they will anti up a little bit more money than a mere $62 million, I mean considering that this benefit, not only will help the residents in Nassau County but all the surrounding communities, whether or not you are in the Rockaways, New York City, or Suffolk County, and I'm sure that just anybody who would travel and visit this area.

So I'm hoping that you don't have to chase too much that maybe they will decide to chase you to make sure they give

us more money because I really think that it really is -- I think New York State obviously in my mind is short changing us on this by not providing more funding.

I was under the impression that they were going to match it like 50 percent, so it would be less of a burden, not so much a burden, but it would just help the residents in Nassau County.

This is a very, very important project, and I have to commend everybody for all the hard work you've done on this.

As you said, this started in the previous administration and thankfully they found that Aqueduct under Sunrise Highway, otherwise it wouldn't just be $439 million, it would probably be looking at something like $600 million.

So, all of you, thank you very much because I really think you have done a great job, and just a lot of work and a lot of attention, I feel very comfortable with hopefully DPW will still oversee a lot of this.

I know New York State is trying to coordinate everything. But I really think I have more confidence in you guys than I have in New York State.

So I just hope that you will always be involved with this and watch over everybody in what they're doing because this is Nassau County after all.

MR. ARNOLD: The department's goal is to make sure it's built to the design criteria report and watching the finances.

LEGISLATOR FORD: Thank you very much. I really appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Mule and Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR MULE: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I will be enthusiastically supporting this project.

I had a couple of questions but I just want to say, Commissioner Arnold, you used the world transformational, and DCE Schneider I heard him say a number of times that this will be the most important

environmental project that we've done in many many years. I do believe both of those statements are true. It truly will change things for the better on so many levels from the point of view of just quality of life for people on the South Shore, recreational uses, boating, fishing, swimming, but then even to my mind more importantly environmentally that it will be able to rebuild the marshes and help prevent flooding. I just think this is a great great project.

I too was on the zoom call and I thought that it was run very well. But I will say that I won't add to Presiding Officer's call for more community outreach. I know you said that's on the horizon but I remember months ago we were told there would be a very robust presentation.

Of course, COVID changed everything and I understand that, but we did have a community member speak out about that earlier today that they didn't know too much about it.

We put out that there was this zoom meeting but of course much more needs to be done.

The other thing I heard you say was that there was a 23 percent MWBE, is that correct?

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR MULE: That sounds really good and I'm very pleased to hear that.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Legislator Rhoads.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Ken, great presentation. I also am going to be enthusiastically supporting the project as I have from the start.

I agree with my colleagues with respect to the need for additional community outreach. I know that's going to be taken care of. I know this process started with a meeting over at Wantagh High School in a thousand seat auditorium. That's not going to happen any time soon again, but perhaps

we can make better use of the zoom calls and get the word out there so that questions can continue to be answered.

I just wanted to confirm a couple of things. Just in your viewing the project design, as I have, there are a couple of concerns in the community that I just wanted to make sure have been addressed.

First of all, this system is an entirely closed system?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct. It is an under pressure pipe system and not open to the atmosphere.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Right, because one of the concerns obviously in the community is some of the odors around the Cedar Creek Sewage Treatment Plant.

Second is, not a single drop of untreated sewage is going to the Cedar Creek Plant. In fact, not a single drop of the treated effluent is going to the Cedar Creek Plant, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: It's getting connected to the back side of the plant to

use the ocean outfall.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Right. So it's going directly to the ocean outfall, and the plant will not be processing one drop more of anything as a result of the diversion plan?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct. That's why in my notes I outlined, even though we're doing the effluent pumps at Cedar Creek, that was because of convenience of having systems shut down while we're doing the conveyance project, that would make sense to do that now. It's not needed for the conveyance project because that would then be considered something connected to the plant.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Those are the tidal pumps, right?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, but the tide pumps are not being used for conveyance. Those are just the Cedar Creek tide pumps.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's an additional upgrade to the plant itself, just because we have an opportunity to do the

upgrade.

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: With respect to the ocean outfall pipe, you indicated during the presentation that any necessary approved repairs to the outfall pipe or to the diffusers are going to be made as part of this project to make sure they can handle the additional volume, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: That is correct, we have an allowance side to deal with those directly.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: And the pipe itself, even with the increased capacity is only going to be operating somewhere around 60 to 65 percent of its total capacity even with the additional flow?

MR. ARNOLD: Off the top of my head, I don't know that those are the exact numbers but --

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's far below 100 percent?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, below 100 percent. Correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Just finally, I know that Stonybrook did a study just to insure that there would be no impacts on the shore communities who are at risk of any treated effluent not properly integrating into the ocean water three miles out.

Administration is reading in the study the same as mine, that there would be no concern about a shoreline impact as a result of the increased effluent going out three miles out into the ocean?

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Again, Ken, thanks very much for your work on this and, again, let's make sure we continue to get the word out there into the community because it's an important project. I think the more people that know, the more people will appreciate the benefits of it.

MR. ARNOLD: And I'm open to any legislator, if you have any community group that we need to speak to, reach out to myself or my chief deputy Elisa Pica, and we will set up meetings that we have to set up

in addition to what we are already planning on doing.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I certainly will do that and also just to confirm, we do have additional money coming from FEMA, this $76.9 million coming from FEMA?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. That's the HMCP, yes, that's a hazardous mitigation loan, and that was money that was allocated early on in the project, yes.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: It's just like my colleague, Legislator Ford, early on in the project I was under the impression that the state was kicking in half the cost. So if we can make any further efforts to get our partners to pony up a little more --

MR. ARNOLD: It's a continuing conversation.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: -- it will free up the burden on the county taxpayers. And this is roughly half even at the $493 million, this is roughly half of the cost of the construction of the new ocean outfall assuming that we could get permission from

the federal government to even build one?

MR. ARNOLD: I would agree with that statement.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: Finally, even though this is going to move forward, we do have an understanding, and this is really more of a statement than a question, we do have an understanding that the Cedar Creek outfall pipe has another 50 year's worth of useful life.

I don't want to see 45 years from now, after I'm long gone, you will still be here, Ken, still working for the county, but 45 years from now, all of a sudden, someone wakes up and says, hey, wait a minute, the outfall pipe has only five years left of life on it, and it's only thing servicing Nassau County, one of the few things servicing Nassau County.

So there is a recognition that we need to plan for that eventuality probably starting now, whether it's additional technology for the denitrification of our effluent or some other alternative, we do

need to -- this is a short term solution to a long term problem. We do need to keep that in mind. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else?

(No verbal response.)

Thank you, Ken.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken, you want me to touch base on 351? It's the agreement that's modified that built on where we are today.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Okay.

LEGISLATOR RHOADS: I do believe that Mr. Budnick had a comment.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: There are no comments before. Mr. Budnick, you will have an opportunity when the meeting is over. We have a period before the meetings and then after the meetings we sit and wait for your comments.

Any other discussion or debate?

(No verbal response.)

All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Carries unanimously.

We just have some items on the emergency calendar. I think I would ask our clerk, Mike, to call 299, 300 and 301. Call the emergency.

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you. Emergency Resolution Number 30-2020, an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon a resolution declaring a capital budget emergency pursuant to 310-D of the County Government Law of Nassau County. Do you want them all?

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Yes, do them all at once.

CLERK PULITZER: Emergency Resolution 31 of 2020, an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon the bond ordinance providing for a capital expenditure to finance the capital project identified herein within the County of Nassau and authorizing $50,855,000 of bonds of the

County of Nassau to finance such expenditures pursuant to the Local Finance Law of New York and the County Government Law of Nassau County.

And, finally, Emergency Resolution 32-2020, an emergency resolution declaring an emergency for immediate action upon an ordinance to amend Ordinance Number 174-2018, as amended, adopting the capital budget for the County of Nassau for the first year of the four year capital plan to commence on January 1, 2019, pursuant to provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

Those are the three, sir.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So moved.

LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Motion to establish the emergency by Legislator Drucker, seconded by Legislator Kennedy.

Any debate or discussion on the emergency?

(No verbal response.)

Hearing none, all in favor of the emergency signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Now I will call the items, 299, 300, 301. 299 is a resolution declaring a capital budget emergency pursuant to Section 310-D of the County Government Law of Nassau County.

300 is a bond ordinance providing for a capital expenditure to finance the capital projects identified herein within the County of Nassau and authorizing $23,178,000 of bonds of the county to finance such expenditures.

301 is an ordinance to amend Ordinance Number 174 of 2018 as amended adopting the capital budget for the County of Nassau for the first year of the four year capital plan to commence on January 1st, 2019, pursuant to the provisions of Section 310 of the County Government Law.

We need a motion.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So moved.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Minority Leader Abrahams. It's before us, Ken.

MR. ARNOLD: Ken Arnold, Public Works. These items are capital amendments and budget amendments to allow bond authorization today for the police to public safety projects that showed some urgency of getting approved because of the purchase regs and other things they need to do between now and the end of the year in order to upgrade their fleet, live scan replacement, radios, ambulances and a host of other items.

In addition, in the amended, there is also the shared mobility bond ordinance authorization for $60,000 and that covers the gap that we have currently in the grant that we are processing.

With the police, if you have any specific questions on what they need and why

they require it.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Before we do that, I'm told I have to note with respect to Item 300, that was stamped into the Clerk's Office at 3:41 p.m. today.

And, lastly, on Item 40, which we just voted upon, to correct the record, the vote was actually 18 to 1, Legislator Solages had voted against and we didn't hear him because of the remote connection.

Chief Walsh, did you want to add anything?

MR. ARNOLD: So Chief Walsh can answer anything specific to the project on what the needs are.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: I know we were talking about bullet proof vests, talking about vehicles.

CHIEF WALSH: I'm specifically here to talk about the AFIS project, which is the live scan as well as the Motorola radio project. I don't know if there are any questions that you have.

The Motorola radio project, which

is an item on the capital project agenda here is for to start the process of replacing our 500 megahertz radio system. That's the radio system that's currently some of the legislators have heard about in regard to with regard to, we have a thing called troposphere [sic] ducting, which interferes and basically shuts down our radio system because the FCC has been selling licenses on our frequencies down south.

This was all borne out of the 2012 job creation and Tax Relief Act wherein the federal government is actually reallocating the spectrum of frequencies that we use to communicate on, they're reallocating that back to the television, and the television station broadcasts at a much much higher frequency of wattage power that we do.

We typically from our towers at about 140 watts, television stations broadcast at about 1.5 million watts.

When certain atmospheric

conditions take place, their signals bounce from Virginia, Newport Virginia, more specifically, and wipe our ability to communicate on our radio systems.

So this is the beginning of the process of replacing our radio system, 500 megahertz systems into what's called the seven and 800.

We began the process in 2014, we built out seven sites, or 700 site, and we also have recently replaced six sites on 800. Those will be brought together. We lose no money whatsoever. It's actually leveraged against what we are doing with this project and this money will start us in replacing our microwave antennae starting in early next year, very early. We will be ordering equipment in January and moving along over the next five years to replace the entire system. That's the radio project. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Obviously the radios are of crucial importance. Legislator Ford and I had a meeting with you

at headquarters a while back.

It can be a dangerous situation for our officers because the radios are not working because of this condition. They have difficulty calling for back up if they are out of their vehicles obviously.

So this is again of crucial importance to the county. Do you have a timeline as to how long this project is going to take? What progress we can make and what ultimately will and when ultimately it will be done?

CHIEF WALSH: The overall project is going to take about five years to complete. The reason I say that is it not only includes Nassau County but it includes all of the village police departments as well as the two cities they work off of our radios as well.

So the building of the actual system will be completed in about two and a half to three years, in that range, so that the system will be fully functional at that point. Then it's a matter of ordering

what's called subscribe, the actual radios themselves, to get put into the cars, and the portable radios that the officers use to communicate out in the field.

So it's a five year capital project and this is to get the project online and started. We have been working on this for probably about a year to get to the point where we can present it to the Legislature to get it moving.

So it's a little bit of an extended project to get done and you have to be very careful about how you actually implement this so that no village, neither the cities or none of our precincts are without communications while we are building it out.

It's a very complex project. I can talk in detail if you have specific questions, I have no problem getting into detail. Unfortunately it's all in my head.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: We are glad it's there. Anyone else have any questions?

(No verbal response.)

We're good.

CHIEF WALSH: The AFIS project, if you have any questions on that, the live scan replacement?

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Questions? I think we're good. You were here all day. We appreciate it.

Any other questions on any other part of the emergency?

(No verbal response.)

Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Carries unanimously.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Nay.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: There is a little bit of a delay. Is that Legislator Solages?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Anyone else besides Legislator Solages voting no?

(No verbal response.)

I don't hear anyone so the vote is 18 in favor, 1 against.

Mr. Budnick.

MR. BUDNICK: I just wanted to make suggestions that there might be a need for greater inter-comparability between not only the villages and city police departments here in Nassau County, but with state police, MTA police, and the New York State National Guard radio nets in case of an emergency. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Thank you. Motion to adjourn?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So moved.

LEGISLATOR WALKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN NICOLELLO: Moved by Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, seconded by Legislator Walker.

All in favor of adjourning signify by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Those opposed?

(No verbal response.)

Carries unanimously. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Full Legislative Committee adjourned at 5:26 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, FRANK GRAY, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby stated:

THAT I attended at the time and place above mentioned and took stenographic record of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter;

THAT the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcript of the same and the whole thereof, according to the best of my ability and belief.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 23rd day of November, 2020.

_____

FRANK GRAY