

PRESENT:

MEMBERS :

| Yaron Levy | Board Member |
| :--- | :--- |
| Matthew T. Meng | Board Member |
| Monolita Mitra | Board Member |
| Lauren Moriarty | Board Member |
| Paolo Pironi | Board Member |
| Jason B. Steinberg | Board Member |
| Ruka Anzai | Board Member |


| Paul Spezio, Esq. | Committee Attorney |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greg Hoesl, Planner | DPW |



1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes from June 18, 2024 Meeting
3. Review and Vote on Recommendation for Lease of Properties
A. NCPC OSPAC File \# 2-2024

Section: 44, Block: F, Lot(s): 351,
411, 412 \& 415 Nassau Veterans Memorial Coliseum
1255 Hempstead Tpke., Uniondale, NY 11553
Uniondale, Town of Hempstead
***Coliseum Lease for a Portion of the Nassau
County Veterans Memorial Coliseum Site
Between the County of Nassau and LVS
HOLDCO 2, LLC***
4. Introduction of New Properties
A. NCPC OSPAC File \# 3-2024

Section: 15, Block: 204, Lot(s): 14 100 Gordon Dr., Syosset, NY 11791 ***Grant Easement***
5. Old Business
6. New Business
7. Review of Open Space Fund Balance
A. Open Space Fund Balance as of July 1, 2024 - \$2,016,114
8. Confirm Next Meeting Date of Wednesday, August 14, 2024, at 4:00 P.M.
9. Adjournment

The Nassau County Open Space and Parks Advisory Committee (the "Committee") will hold a public meeting on Tuesday, June 18, 2024 at 4:00pm in the Parks Department Conference Room located in the Parks Administration Building in Eisenhower Park in East Meadow. The
meeting will be streamed live on
Https://www.nassaucountyny.gov/5694/OSPAC.
The Committee notifies the public that the meeting
Concerns the Nassau Veterans Memorial Coliseum ("Coliseum"), which is located at 1255 Hempstead Turnpike, Uniondale, NY 11553. Specifically, the meeting will introduce and discuss a proposed lease between the County and LVS NY HOLDCO 2, LLC ("Sands") (a subsidiary of Las Vegas Sands Corp.)
For Section: 44 Block: $F$, Lot (s): 351, 411, 412 and 415. That lease will provide Sands site control over the Coliseum site and provide for Sands to operate the Coliseum. A copy of the lease will be made available to the public at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting on the OSPAC website at the following link:
Https://www.nassaucountyny.gov/5694/OSPAC. While Sands intends to seek to develop a Casino at the Coliseum site, the proposed lease does not authorize the Coliseum site to be developed or used for a casino, and any such authorization will occur, if at all, through a separate lease in the future That will be subject to public comment. This notice is being provided in accordance with an order of the New York Supreme Court, Nassau County.


CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I'd like to call the meeting to order of OSPAC. I'd like to entertain a motion to approve the minutes of June 18th.

MEMBER LEVY: I'll make a motion.
MEMBER STEINBERG: I'll second. CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I got a motion. I got a second. All in favor? (Whereupon, all members of the OSPAC Committee respond in favor with, "Aye".)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, there was no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any
abstentions?
(Whereupon, there was no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.
Next order of business is -- you
want to pick that up?
PLANNER: Sure. I guess I'll run through it again real quick.

This is an application Nassau County


```
is requesting permission to enter into a
lease with Las Vegas Sands Corporation to
allow for the Sands to obtain site
control over the Coliseum site, and
provide for Sands to operate the
Coliseum.
```

The proposed lease term shall not exceed 42 years. Operation of the site will include all aspects of day-to-day maintenance and operation, such as booking musical acts and/or athletic teams to use the Coliseum as an event venue, maintaining the parking lot, etcetera.

While Sands intends to seek to
develop a casino at the Coliseum site, the proposed lease does not authorize the Coliseum site to be developed or used for a casino, and any such authorization will occur, if at all, through a separate lease in the future that will be subject to public comment. A copy of the proposed lease has been made available on our website.


give us a quick rundown, not that we haven't heard it before.

MR. MEYER: Sure. I just want to make sure there's audio.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: It says at the top in red that everyone can hear.

MR. SPEZIO: Can we take five minutes, please. I apologize. There's technical issues.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.
We're going to take five, again, for technical issues. This is like a repeat of the last meeting we had. I suggest that the County get its technical act together.

MEMBER LEVY: I'll second that.
(Whereupon, a brief recess is taken to address IT issue.)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Okay. We're good. So I think we were up to Josh.

MR. MEYER: That's it.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Give us a brief.

MR. MEYER: Yes. Very brief.

Josh Meyer, West Group Law, representing the County on this proposal before you today. We are before OSPAC on File Number 2-2024. We were previously before this Board on June 18th to just give a brief introduction on it. On June 20th, the Planning Comission held a public hearing. The transcript of that public hearing came back to this Board for their review.

As Greg said, just as a quick reminder, this lease and this proposal, the parties to this lease are the County and LVS HOLDCO 2, LLC determine the lease is 27 years, with three five year renewals. For a total of 42 years.

It's a very limited lease as to what the tenant can do. It provides for only the operation of the Coliseum, as well as, maintenance, repair, and replacement, and the ability to host events on the site. It differs from the prior lease in several ways. The tenant cannot renovate or expand the Coliseum in any way under
this lease. The lease explicitly
provides that it does not authorize any development or any redevelopment of the site in any manner, and the lease only permits the tenant, again, to operate the Coliseum in host events at the site.

Following any recommendations from this Body to the Planning Comission, the Planning Comission will take this up on July 18th, and then it will be forwarded to the legislature for final approval on August 5th.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Thank you, Josh.

MR. MEYER: You're welcome.
MR. SPEZIO: Also, I'd like to
inform the members of the public --
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Would you introduce yourself?

MR. SPEZIO: My name is Paul Spezio, I'm Counsel to OSPAC.

I just wanted to let everybody here know why this Board exists. It was created to advise the Nassau County

Planning Comission on matters of preserving, protecting, restoring, and/or enhancing open spaces, parks, areas of recreational, cultural, archaeological, habitat, or historical significance, and areas of environmental sensitivity. That is the extent of the statutory jurisdiction.

Also, if you guys do have relevant questions to the matter that is being reviewed here, right now, please, just speak one at a time to be courteous to our stenographer, and also when called upon by the Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Thank you, Paul.

All right. Anybody on the Committee have any questions about what's in front of us?

MEMBER MENG: Actually, I'd like to address it to Josh.

Shouldn't there have been a request for proposal to see who might be able to operate the lease; or that is not
necessary?
I know there was just this one organization, but wouldn't you normally put it out for bid?

MR. MEYER: Right. As you know, it was terminated by the Court following litigation from Hofstra. It's not necessary to -- the County is not required to go out and procure this under their statutory permission, so they can lease property at public or private sale to any individual without procuring it. Since they had already moved forward with Las Vegas Sands on this, and it was determined by the Court, it seemed appropriate to reenter into this lease, which is what this is doing, with Las Vegas Sands.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Thank you, Josh. Did that answer your question? MEMBER MENG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Anybody else have any questions?
(Whereupon, there was no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: No?
(Whereupon, there was no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.
I'm going to open it up to public comment, by the goodness of my heart, but please keep it brief, as it's sort of warm in here and we have other business. If you have a question you want to ask, or you have a quick thing about this, ask it.

MS. JACOBS: Pearl Jacobs, I'm president of the Nostrand Gardens Civic Association in Uniondale. I'm also a resident of Uniondale, and a member of "Say No to the Casino Civic Association".

If you would be so kind to -- may I make my public comment, I was not available to make the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I will as
long as it's relevant to what's in front of us, which is not the casino.

MS. JACOBS: Just the lease.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Just so you
and $I$ are clear, what's in front of us is taking the existing lease, which OSPAC voted back in 2015, I believe, which is just to operate the building. The County doesn't operate the building. So that operation, and please correct me if I'm wrong, the operation of that building needs to be done by an organization that knows how to run concerts, etcetera, etcetera, to maintain the building. That lease is being offered to the Sands.

That's all it is to best of my
knowledge, and I've read through all the paperwork. It's not saying that they can do a Casino there. It's not saying they can tear down the Coliseum. They can't build anything on the property.

As far as $I$ see in what's the lease, and $I$ read the lease back in 2015 when they originally --

MS. JACOBS: No, I understand, but, you know, the lease process they're, you know, speaking about now is 42 year --

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Well, it's 20, 20, and two, 20, 20, but that's to operate it. It's not -- I don't want to be beat a dead horse, but it's not to do what was originally was proposed, which, I believe, you guys are very concerned about. I totally understand.

MS. JACOBS: Well, like I said --
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: What we're going to vote on is this lease not -- I just want to finish, and then I promise I'll come back to you.

MS. JACOBS: Okay. Well, like as I said, as the lease agreement -- like I said, there's, you know, just to say 42 years is, you know, it's concerning, okay. What they want to do with it, you know, like I said, I'm not going to the casino issue. That's not the point here but as a resident of Uniondale --

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Very

understandable. If during that period of time -- and I can speak to this because we've done other leases. The Coliseum is not the only place that the County
leases. There's leases all over the place. I don't know how many we have but there's a lot.

If they want to do something that is outside the lease, they have to go back to the County. They can't just
arbitrarily do whatever the hell -- do whatever they want.

MS. JACOBS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: It's just
really to operate the building. I can't stress that enough.

MS. JACOBS: Okay. Well, you know,
if they operate the building or, you know, whatever they want to do with the lease, but, you know, we're talking about a residential concern.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Right. It
will remain what it is today, which you could say is good, bad, or indifferent,
but that's all it's going to be.

MS. JACOBS: Okay. Well, I'm not speaking on it but $I$ know the intent. I'll leave that there.

MR. JACOBS: Yes. A couple -CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I'm sorry. I think this gentleman was next but I will come back to you.

MR. JACOBS: Absolutely.
MR. ROLSTON: Hi, Steven Rolston. I
live in Baldwin. Do you need a street address? 823 Stenton Avenue. My name spelled is $R-O-L-S-T-O-N$, Steve Rolston. Just two questions; does anyone in the room have a 42 year lease? No one gets a 42 year lease and more concerning --

MEMBER MORIARTY: Well, in my community we actually -- there's a 99 year lease on a property. I live in Long Beach.

MEMBER PIRONI: So a standard on a commercial -- on any kind of commercial lease is around 99 year lease. I lease
commercial property and it's a pretty standard way of going about --

MEMBER LEVY: Industry standard. MEMBER PIRONI: Industry standard. Thank you.

MR. ROLSTON: Okay. So you've answered -- only second question.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Sure.

MR. ROLSTON: My understanding is
Sands can do whatever they want after three years. They can sublet it to anyone they want with no jurisdiction anymore from Nassau County. That's the most important and troublesome part of the lease, if $I$ understand that section correctly. Is it true that after three years they can do whatever they want with the property?

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I don't believe so, but hold on.

MR. MEYER: So it can be sublet to other entities, and again, with the same restrictions that they can operate the Coliseum and nothing more.

MR. JACOBS: I think there are no restrictions. They can sublet to anyone they please, because --

MR. MEYER: They can sublet to whoever they choose --

MR. JACOBS: Nassau County is giving up control.

MR. MEYER: With certain
restrictions but they can only operate the Coliseum. You're still subject to the terms of the lease. There's no development, redevelop, or anything else. That's operation of the Coliseum and the Coliseum can go dark as well, so that's the extent of what they can do. Even if you sublet it to someone, they're still subject to the terms of the lease.

MR. ROLSTON: Okay.
MR. MEYER: So you can't do any development or redevelop.

MR. ROLSTON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.
MR. JACOBS: Yes. Okay. A couple of questions.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Your name?
MR. JACOBS: Chris Jacobs,

Uniondale, New York. A couple of
questions: Based on the fact that the lease is just stating that it's suppose to just be to lease out the Coliseum, the building alone, $I$ also know that there will be an impact outside of it because if they host things, just like the Islanders there and stuff, there are cars, and things such of that nature. So my question is: Are they required to do environmental -- even if they want to lease the building, is there supposed to be an environmental review based on the fact that there will be impacts environmentally to happen?

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I don't believe so, but I'll turn it back to the attorney. If you see how the Coliseum is done today -- so when they have a concert -- the last concert $I$ saw there was Tina Turner. She was good.

MEMBER PIRONI: Why is everybody
laughing?
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Well, I'm proud. You have two choices; you can go under or you can stay above.

Anyway, so cars went in there and cars go in there today when there's an event, so that's not changing. The lease is inclusive of the parking lots, etcetera, etcetera. Otherwise, you couldn't run the Coliseum.

MR. JACOBS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Unless you keep it as a dead building.

MEMBER PIRONI: So my opinion would be, it's a standing building that has been there for who knows how long. The capacity hasn't changed. It think it actually went down when they redid it. CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: It went down.

MEMBER PIRONI: Yeah, it went down so there's no reason for that kind of study.

MR. JACOB: The second part of my
question was, because of development that has taken place there like Sloan

Kettering, which gets hundreds of patients a day, and $I$ see hundreds of cars, there's a slightly different environmental impact on it. As opposed to $I$ remember when $I$ was younger, it was the Coliseum alone just with the Marriott next to it, but now they have other entities there. The Marriott has more traffic going in there now, so $I$ was just wondering would they need to do, like, there would have to be a difference as opposed to the last time it was used versus this time, because the development that takes place on this property is a different thing.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I don't believe Sloan Kettering, and correct me if I'm wrong, is inclusive in that piece of the lease.

MR. MEYER: That's correct. Sloan
Kettering --
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: We voted on
that a while back.
MR. JACOBS: I know but they share a property with them.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: But they can't use those facilities.

MR. JACOBS: Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where's the microphone? They're having trouble hearing.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: So when Sloan Kettering took that piece of property and spun it out, they didn't do and environmental impact study. It was chopped off.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: So it's, actually, less property than it was back to your point.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.
MR. JACOBS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any other
questions from the public?
MR. KRUG: Comment.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Yes.
MR. KRUG: George Krug, Garden City.
Yes, I understand that we're
supposed to be talking narrowly about this lease that provides for operating control. I would just hope that this panel does observe what's plain in front of us.

There's a reason why only the sands was asked to operate this facility. It's generally good business practice to have multiple entities weigh in on something that's this big, and this important.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I think that was addressed already.

MR. KRUG: The address to that was that it's not required by statute. It's good business practice.
(Whereupon, there was crosstalk.)
MR. KRUG: You wouldn't hire
somebody to do your bathroom over without seeing other bidders.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.:
Unfortunately, the County is not a

business.

MR. KRUG: Okay. Again --

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: You and I could possibly do that in our business.

MR. KRUG: -- underscoring why this is the Sands bid and the Sands alone.

MEMBER PIRONI: So, I understand where you're coming from and what you're saying, but that's -- at this point, that's conjecture. We can't foresee the future.

MR. KRUG: But, again, this is not a jury. You're not being asked to ignore all outside information. It's clear that the Sands --

MEMBER PIRONI: But we do have a purview though that we have to stay by. MR. KRUG: I hear you. My comment is, I hope that you don't ignore the context of this. That this does put the Sands in a stronger position as they buy for a casino license.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I don't want to argue with you on this, but this

doesn't do anything for the Sands because the Sands has to: A, get a license from New York State, and B, they have to come back and do all the things. They have to do the environmental study, they have to present the plans, they have to deal with OSPAC who asked for open space in the previous plan. All that is going to come back to us, and that's the opportunity that if you're against it, or for it, to voice your opinion. What's in front of us right now is -- somebody has got to operate that building.

MR. KRUG: Agreed.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: We'll lose a fortune and we can't afford it, the County.

MR. KRUG: The County is in a pickle, I agree. One they got themselves in. The Sands isn't the only possible solution. It just so happens that they're the ones being asked to solve this problem. I hope the Board doesn't ignore that context.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I'm not sure they were asked as much as they volunteered.

MR. KRUG: But anyway, those are my comments.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Yes, ma'am.
MRS. KRUG: I'm Lynn Krug,
Mr. Krug's wife.
MR. KRUG: Garden City also.

MRS. KRUG: Garden City, New York.
I'm a resident. I want to know what the phrase "transition payments" means?

Doesn't this phrase tell you that this lease is meant to transition to another lease where Sands can operate a massive casino? Would you like to opine on that?

MR. MEYER: There's no real intent behind that. The transition payments are from the prior lease to this lease, and that's all that that really means. It's not to a future lease because those payments are to be made now, not in relation to any future lease. So that's what's in the existing lease, and it's

basically from the prior lease to this lease. That's all.

MRS. KRUG: Well, I do have a second question. The Supreme Court said the lease was invalid, so we assumed that whoever was operating the casino when the lease was invalid was squatting on the property. So how can you explain that you're doing a lease now when for so many months there was no lease?

MR. MEYER: The County has been under a Use and Occupancy Permit with Las Vegas Sands since that time.

MRS. KRUG: But suppose I went there and fell and broke my leg, or had a car accident on the property and got damaged; who would be holding the ball on this if there was no lease?

MR. MEYER: Under the Use and
Occupancy Permit, Las Vegas Sands had insurance and were required to have insurance on the property. The Use and Occupancy Permit allowed them to remain on the site and operate the Coliseum, but


```
that's only a temporary solution for
that. The lease -- that's the point of
entering into this lease, it's a more
formal and long term manor of allowing
Las Vegas Sands to remain on the property
and operate the Coliseum.
```

    CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Thank you,
    Josh.

MS. KIELY: I have a question. I heard somebody -- Monica Kiely, Garden City. I'm with "Say No to the Casino". I heard somebody at the table say, oh, well I didn't really read the lease. I read the lease.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Whoa, whoa, whoa.
(Whereupon, there was crosstalk.)
MEMBER MORIARTY: I don't think anybody said that.

MEMBER LEVY: Who said that? Can you point at somebody that said that, please? Is there a record of that?
(Whereupon, there was crosstalk.)
MS. KIELY: Okay. Did you read the
lease?
MEMBER MORIARTY: Yes.
MEMBER PIRONI: Yes.
MEMBER LEVY: Yes.
MS. KIELY: Great.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Yes.
MS. KIELY: Okay. Did it trouble you at all?

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Wait. If you have a comment about the lease and what's going on, fine. Accusing us of not doing our duty is really --

MS. KIELY: I'm sorry. My hearing is not great.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I got to
tell you, this group volunteers --
(Whereupon, there is crosstalk.)
MS. KIELY: I apologize to you.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Ma'am, I
pointed this out before in the previous meeting. We all volunteer our time for this. We've dealt with it numerous times. We're giving you an opportunity to speak to it, but to accuse somebody
and say that you heard somebody at the table say what you said, is not fair. It's not fair to the Committee.

MS. KIELY: I apologize and I'm glad that everyone has read the lease.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Okay.
MS. KIELY: So did it trouble you, at all, that the lease is for site control and operations continuing at the Coliseum? The lease is 42 years in length and the Sands has right the right to go dark at the Coliseum after two years.

So, obviously, to me reading it, I said okay, this is all about site control. This is because they do -- they are in the business of developing casinos. That's what they want. Now they have site control of the Coliseum's 72 acre property for 42 years. Does that trouble anyone here?

You're taking an extremely narrow view saying we need an operator, and they're saying we might not want to
operate it after 24 month, but we'll -CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Josh -- I'm going to stop you. Josh, can you speak to the history of how we got in that mess in the first place?

MS. KIELY: I know the history.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.
Well, then the point is, a lot of people have taken on the Coliseum and bagged it. That's why we're here sitting where we are.

MR. SPEZIO: Ma'am, sorry. Paul Spezio here, Counsel. I read the statutory jurisdiction of this Board. Statements from the Board outside of that jurisdiction are, technically, out of order. So you're asking about something that they're not really -- it's not within their purview.

Again, this is not the place for those comments. Anything else pertaining to what they have to review is more than welcome, okay. Please. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All right.

With that said, if nobody else has any comment and the Board doesn't have any comment, I'll entertain a motion. MEMBER PIRONI: I'd like to make a motion.

MEMBER MORIARTY: Second.

MEMBER PIRONI: Move that based upon
this review --

MRS. FLANAGAN: I'm sorry. I came in a little late because $I$ was at work. Can I make a brief comment?

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: You can make a brief comment as long as it's focused on the existing lease moving over to the Sands and not casinos.

MRS. FLANAGAN: Well, this is a
lease to a casino business so it's hard to separate the two, sir, frankly.

I appreciate all of your work. I'm
Mary Carter Flanagan. I live that 64
Harvard Street. I'm the Mayor of Garden
City. Like you, I'm a volunteer so I
thank you all for your time, and I realize these jobs are not easy. I just
want to make sure as you consider this, and I think you need to see it for what it is, and I realize the purview of this group, but you can't have your blinders on and eyes closed as to what is happening here.

We have submitted our written statement, which I'm sure you'll review, which goes to the environmental issues on topic segmentation. I just urge you not to make the same mistake that was made last time. It's a serious matter. It's the heart of Nassau County. It is a stones throw from many communities, including the one that $I$ represent, and the Village of Garden City wholeheartedly and unequivocally opposes this project.

By transferring the lease, you're
opening the door to a project that will have long term implications on the environment of Nassau County, as well as other future --

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I commend you for your volunteering. I was deputy
mayor of my village, so $I$ can greatly appreciate your position.

MRS. FLANAGAN: Yeah, so.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: You missed my little speech in the begin of this.

If the Sands was to go ahead with the casino, or any other thing for that matter, other than what the Coliseum is today, they would have to come back to the County, and that would start the whole mechanism all over again, including coming to this Board. At that time, the relative points you brought up and the point you're making about environmental impact, depending on what they were presenting, that would be addressed at that point in time.

This is, take it what it is, and just let somebody else run it.

MRS. FLANAGAN: So, I mean, just to
-- I'm sure you'll read everything that
was submitted, but we make the point --
the segmentation issue, I think you're
all familiar with it. I don't think
you're right. I don't think you are taking -- you'll make your decision.

I just urge you all to do the right thing here. To listen to what to the Court said before. Let's not go down the wrong road a second time and, kind of, show the constituents of Nassau County that you will stand up and do the right thing.

I recognize the incredible political pressure behind this casino, absolutely. I'm one of the few people speaking out against it, so $I$ just urge you to, please, do the right thing here and say no.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Thank you.
All right. We had a start of a motion.

MEMBER PIRONI: Yeah, I'll start from the beginning again.

Base upon this review of the proposal, OSPAC finds that the proposal has no impact on County open space, or parks, or any areas of cultural
archaeological habitat or historic or
otherwise environmentally sensitive
nature. That's my motion.
MEMBER STEINBERG: Second. CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: All in
favor?

MEMBER MORIARTY: Aye.
MEMBER LEVY: Aye.
MEMBER STEINBERG: Aye.
MEMBER ANZAI: Aye.
MEMBER PIRONI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, there was no verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any
abstention?
MEMBER MENG: I'll abstain, if I
may.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Okay. One abstention. Motion passes.

MEMBER PIRONI: Chairman, I have a
second motion. Move that OSPAC recommend
that the Nassau County Planning
Commission recommend the proposal to the

Legislature.

MEMBER STEINBERG: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: I have a
second. All in favor?
MEMBER MORIARTY: Aye.
MEMBER LEVY: Aye.
MEMBER STEINBERG: Aye.
MEMBER ANZAI: Aye.

MEMBER PIRONI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any opposed?
(Whereupon, there was no verbal

```
response.)
```

CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: Any
abstention?

MEMBER MENG: I'll abstain again.
CHAIRMAN FUMANTE, Jr.: You're going to abstain again?

MEMBER MENG: Yes.
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I, STEPHANIE QUINTERO, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify:

That the above is a correct transcription of my stenographic notes.

I further certify that $I$ am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or by marriage and that $I$ am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 10th day of July, 2024.

Stephanie Quintero
Stephanie Quintero
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