

**PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**  
**Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Public Safety Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Thursday, November 14, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.

**Members Present:**

***Legislator Kate Browning, Chairperson***

*Legislator Robert Calarco, Vice-Chair*

*Legislator DuWayne Gregory, Member*

*Legislator Kara Hahn, Member*

*Legislator William Spencer, Member*

*Legislator John M. Kennedy, Member*

**Members Not Present:**

*Legislator Tom Muratore, Not Present*

**Also in Attendance:**

*George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature*

*Sarah Simpson, Office of Counsel to the Legislature*

*Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature*

*Bobby Knight, Aide to Presiding Officer Horsley*

*Alicia Howard, Clerk's Office/Suffolk County Legislature*

*John Ortiz, Senior Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office*

*KelliAnne Sacchitello, Aide to Legislator Muratore*

*Paul Perillie, Aide to Legislator Gregory*

*Josh Slaughter, Aide to Legislator Browning*

*Lora Gellerstein, Aide to Legislator Spencer*

*Tom Vaughn, County Executive Assistant*

*Marie Berkoski, County Executive's Office*

*Ed Webber, Commissioner/SC Police Department*

*Mark White, Chief of Support Services/SC Police Department*

*Adina Beedenbender, Assistant to Commissioner/SC Police Department*

*Anthony Bocchimuzzo, Public Safety Dispatcher III/SC Police Dept.*

*John Hanley, Deputy Inspector/SC Police Department*

*Jim Roddin, Detective Sergeant/SC Police Department*

*Lou Tutone, Police Officer/SC Police Department*

*Robert Waring, Captain/SC Police Department*

*Michael Sharkey, Chief of Staff/SC Sheriff's Office*

*Christine Larkin, Senior Probation Officer/SC Probation Department*

*Robert Holley, Executive Director/Suffolk County Fire Academy*

*Jay Egan, Suffolk County FRES Commission*

*Gil Anderson, Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works*

*Patrice Dishopolsky, Director/SC Department of Probation*

*Joe Hawkins, Senior Vice President of Operations/ShotSpotter*

*Russ McCormick, Recording Secretary/SOA*

*Linda Russo, Office of the Suffolk County Medical Examiner*

November 14, 2013 - Public Safety Committee

Connie Corso, Budget Director/County Executive's Office  
Brian Sapp, County Executive's Office  
Lenny Latendresse, Intern/County Executive's Office  
Paul Llobell, Detective/Suffolk County SPCA  
Kevin McEvaddy, AME  
Thomas Brennan, Resident of East Northport  
Matt Harris, Community Activist  
All Other Interested Parties

**Minutes Taken By:**

Alison Mahoney, Court Reporter

**Minutes Transcribed By:**

Alison Mahoney & Lucia Braaten, Court Reporters  
Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

***(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:37 AM\*)***

***(\*The following testimony was taken by Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter & was transcribed by Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide\*)***

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, good morning. We will start our Public Safety Committee meeting. If everyone could please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by our Counsel, Mr. Nolan.

***SALUTATION***

And a moment of silence for those who defend our country.

***MOMENT OF SILENCE OBSERVED***

Thank you. Okay. And I see we only have one card, so what we'll do is we do have a presentation, so we'll -- we'll start with the card; we have a Matt Harris.

**MR. HARRIS:**

Good morning. Thank you. My name is Matt Harris. I live in Huntington Station and I'm here to talk about ShotSpotter. I live in the ShotSpotter zone.

I'd like to just preface this by saying that in the Spring of 2010, there were several, three or four high profile shootings that took place in and around the Jack Abrams Intermediate School. It prompted four of the seven school board members at that time to actually close our most efficient, newest school building to schoolchildren based on the fears of a group of parents that refused to send their children to big bad Huntington Station. Those of us that live in Huntington Station were quite upset at this and still are to this day.

The school has since been reopened as a stem school by invitation only. It has a small student population, not nearly as many as the school can handle. Our school district is busting at the seams. I want you to all know this because it's probably unprecedented, and I'm sure it made national news, that a public school was closed because of some shootings in the neighborhood. At that time, I lobbied the Town Board. I did not realize at the time that they really weren't the jurisdiction for paying for such a system, but I lobbied the Town Board in July of 2010 to bring ShotSpotter to Huntington Station. Legislator Cooper heard what I had to say at that time and he was, I believe, very instrumental in bringing the ShotSpotter system into Huntington Station and I still appreciate the fact that he was able to do that. And I do understand that it's also in other

areas, but please understand that Huntington Station and the people of Huntington Station asked for it first.

The reason I'm here to speak to you is I have been in contact with the principals of ShotSpotter. The reason I have contacted them is because I'm very disappointed in its operation. I understand how the system works. I am an engineer, I know about digital signal processing and I believe that the system should be working a whole lot better than it is. I understand the system has been working fairly well in places like Uniondale and Freeport for Nassau County Police. I did see the numbers of the efficiency back last year. I don't believe they released the efficiency numbers more recently, the last six or seven months. But from what I understand, the arrest rate due to gun violence has been very, very low with the ShotSpotter system, and based on the cost and the amount of effort that was put into getting the system installed in Huntington Station and, of course, elsewhere in Suffolk County, my question to all of you is what's wrong with the system and what needs to be done to make it right? Because I want to see it made -- made properly work.

I can tell you that at my home in Huntington Station, I still today routinely hear gunfire late at night. It -- the system, I've been told, cannot differentiate between firecrackers and gunshots, which I think is kind of silly; it should.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Mr. Harris, your time is up, and obviously, as you see, we do have a presentation of ShotSpotter. I don't think there's anyone here who disagrees that we're not happy with the results that we're getting.

**MR. HARRIS:**

Thank you very much for your time.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You know, and at the same time, I have the North Bellport community and at the same time when -- when the discussion was going on in with Huntington, Bellport was also talking about ShotSpotter. So we do have the presentation and I'm hoping you'll be able to stick around and watch it.

**MR. HARRIS:**

I'm here at the invitation of Dr. Spencer who is well familiar with it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harris. And we have another speaker; Thomas Brennan.

**MR. BRENNAN:**

Good morning. Dr. Spencer asked me to come to attend the meeting after I had called his office to bring a matter to his attention. I didn't expect to speak this morning, or I would have dressed appropriately for the Committee, but, well, here I am.

The reason I'm here is my son was involved in a minor vehicle action -- accident in East Northport and during the exchange of information that was done by the Police Officer, a summons was issued to him as an uninsured motorist. The fact is that he presented the insurance card to the Police Officer at the time and she noted that on the exchange information, yet a summons was still issued for uninsured motorist. We sent in the information to the Traffic Violations Bureau and didn't get a response back prior to the appearance date on the summons, so we responded to the Traffic Violations Bureau on that date to present the case and we were told that it was dismissed, *you obviously should not have been receiving a summons*, yet a \$50 fee was still attached and we had to pay regarding the -- an administrative fee attached to that. I just thought I should bring to the Committee, as I brought to Dr. Spencer's attention, I think that's an unfair and unjust fee that's

being imposed on motorists who, in fact, have not violated any rule, regulation of the traffic violation -- of the Traffic Bureau or the State of New York's traffic laws. And I just ask the Committee to consider it and if they could review the matter and see how the Traffic Violation's Bureau is doing that.

I was informed by the -- by the person at the office -- at the window at the Traffic Violations Bureau that even if they had received the letter and addressed it that way without us coming to the court, we still would have been assessed a \$50 fee simply for what they call an administrative processing. It just seems to me not -- not right that a motorist would be issued a summons that they, in fact, are not guilty of, then they have to pay a \$50 fee simply to supply the Traffic Violations Bureau with income. Thank you for considering my -- my plea.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, thank you, Mr. Brennan. And I see Lora's here. We certainly do need to bring this up, because I -- I don't know why you would be paying that \$50 fee. I -- I absolutely agree with you.

**MR. BRENNAN:**

I just would also like to point out, if I may, that when I called at Dr. Spencer's office, one of the people of his staff informed me that she also had to pay this fee in -- in a very similar manner. So I'm sure I'm not -- I'm sure we're not the only people.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You're not, and I've had constituents call my office about similar situations. It did come up at our budget hearing process a couple of weeks ago where we had the Director of the Traffic Violations Bureau here and I've been in discussion with Counsel about trying to draft a change to that. It's going to require a change in our Local Law.

**MR. BRENNAN:**

Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you, Mr. Brennan.

Okay. Just when we thought we had no more cards, we have two more cards. Christine Larkin.

**MS. LARKIN:**

Good morning. I'm Christine Larkin, I'm the Vice-President of the Suffolk County Probation Officers Association. I would like to start off by saying thank you for working with us and moving the \$300,000 slotted for part-time workers at Probation to now be slated to hire new hires as Probation Officer trainees. That would enable us to hire about seven Probation Officer trainees. This is a start to closing our gap of 50 Probation Officers less than 2009. The next step is to work on getting those SCIN forms signed in order to be able to hire those trainees in 2014. We need to see that money used as new hires and not lost or moved to other parts of the budget. We look for your continued support to help in making sure we get a class of trainees in 2014.

Last meeting I spoke of the vehicle situation in Probation and how we are in need of replacement vehicles and to be given our broken vehicles back in a timely manner. I would again like to thank you for listening and working to hire three new mechanics and getting the word out there that this is a problem. I am hopeful that the mechanics are able to get hired and that this will help in our situation. That, of course, as you know, is only a piece of the problem and the aging fleet that needs a concrete plan to get replacement vehicles to Probation. Something such as a percentage of vehicles of 130,000 miles or more replaced each year would be a start. Please help in working with the County to come up with a reasonable plan for continued maintenance and replacement of vehicles.

In the Capital Budget there are five cars slated over three different appropriations for Probation. This would really help ensuring that Probation Officers are able to get out in the community to ensure that the probationers are doing the right thing and to continue to maintain community safety. I am asking for your help again in making sure that Probation receives the five cars in the Capital Budget and that early in 2014 these cars arrive into our fleet. Thank you again for your continued support.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you, Christine. Don't go anywhere, Legislator Kennedy has a question.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good morning. Hi, thanks for being here. I'm sorry, I was out of the room, I didn't hear the first part of your comments. The -- how many vehicles do you have assigned to Probation now? Well, you know what? Don't even give me a particular number, let's go with a broader question; are there enough vehicles right now for your officers to go ahead and do the field visits and the other things they need to do?

**MS. LARKIN:**

If we had all the vehicles out of the shop, we'd be okay, I wouldn't say we'd be great. I mean, of course we would love more vehicles so that we could have more probationers on the street every day. But the problem that we're running into is the vehicles that go in the shop and sit there for months don't come back and then we have next to nothing for them to go out into the field.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So at some point we're probably going to speak to Commissioner Anderson. But that's -- that's been your experience? No matter what it is, vehicle doesn't work, off it goes, two, three, four, five months can elapse?

**MS. LARKIN:**

Yes, that's correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you, Christine.

**MS. LARKIN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And next speaker, Paul Llobell.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Good morning. How are you? I represent the Suffolk County SPCA, I'm a Detective with them. With the motion that's -- the -- the petition that's out there to set up the -- the registry and take it away from the SPCA and give it to some other organization. What I did is I put together a file full of notes for reading, because I think -- are you tabling that today, did I understand?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, it has to be.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Okay. Well, if I could just say a couple of things and, you know, maybe we could --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That's okay. And actually, on Tuesday there's a public hearing on it, so.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Oh, there is; huh?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

What time's our meeting? It's in the morning, right? But, no, you can go ahead and speak on it, but you can come back on Tuesday at the public hearing.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Well, the Suffolk County SPCA has been -- been in business in Suffolk County for 29 years. We have about 60 volunteers. We do all the animal cruelty items in the County of Suffolk; neglect, abuse, stuff like that. We respond to calls not only from the public but from the Police Department, the Sheriff's Department, Animal Control Officers around the County, DEC, elected officials, State Police, Village and Town Police units, Adult Child Protective Service units, the County Executive, and even we get calls from your offices in the Legislature.

We're responsible for training the police. The -- annually we train the -- each precinct has a pet detective in it, we train them every year. We also train the new recruits at the academy. We operate the pet-friendly shelter under an MOU with the County, we've been doing that for quite a few years, you know, Hurricane Sandy, etcetera, etcetera.

We take dangerous animals off the street. You know, we've confiscated or we found 19 alligators just in this past year in Suffolk County, in different ponds and lakes and stuff like that.

We do all this at no cost to the County whatsoever. Now, when I say no cost to the County, you know, there are some -- there are some -- we get a lot back from the County as well; not monetarily but in support, which we appreciate greatly. We take dangerous animals out of homes. We take them out of ponds. We take them off the street. We take them from dogfights, cockfights, etcetera, etcetera.

We just recently hosted another dangerous reptile clinic, that was last Friday and Saturday, we had the DEC, the State Police, Suffolk County Police, a couple of other agencies there and we had a -- an expert, at our expense, come down from Massachusetts and two days of training how to handle venomous snakes, lizards, turtles, other wild and dangerous animals, cobras, etcetera.

When the West Nile outbreak became an issue here in Suffolk County, we were the only agency that was responsible for going out and picking up the dead birds and the dead crows and bringing them back to the Health Department to be checked. Again, we did that -- you know, we do that for the County of Suffolk.

We've been through the wildfires, the gas leak in Shirley; Kate, as you know very well, right across the street from your office. We provide emergency vet care to the police and fire K-9 units, no cost to the County. We spent quite a few -- quite a few months at Ground Zero after 9/11 taking care of animals from all over the country, actually. Yeah, I lost my button.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

You don't have to hold it.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Okay. We investigate about 2500 cases a year. Last year we seized in excess of 500 animals; this is all in this little pamphlet I gave you. We arrested dogfighters, cockfighters, animal abusers. You know, there's some pretty famous cases out there that made worldwide -- worldwide coverage, you

November 14, 2013 - Public Safety Committee

know, the woman with the 40 dogs in Selden, {Pernara}, the guy who burned his dog to death in Central Islip, I believe it was. The crush videos, you know, stuff like that.

The Animal Abuser Registry was originally created for the Suffolk County SPCA to handle that. We went through the expense, we set up the website, we've been ready to go since this registry has been taken -- has been created. For some reason, I'm not sure why, one of the Legislators here has it in his mind that he wants to take that and assign it to some other organization. I understand it's an organization that recently just -- just incorporated, just got their 501(c)3, works out of a residential home someplace. They're really not qualified. They're really not as -- as experienced as we are. And we don't think that it should be taken away from the Suffolk SPCA.

Sixteen years we've been doing the bite registry for the County of Suffolk; I don't know if you're all familiar with that. A dog bites somebody, PD, Sheriffs, whatever -- whatever agency it is, they have to fill out a bite report. That bite report comes to us, we keep that registry. We have -- we have an accurate record of how many dog bites there have been in Suffolk County every year.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Paul, your -- if you could wind up.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Okay, I'll wind it down.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You're at three minutes.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

All right.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You know, obviously we'd like you to come back again during the public hearing.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

We'd like you to reconsider it. We're even -- the \$50 fee, we're willing to waive that. I mean, you know, let the County keep the fee if they want. We're all set to go. No, there's no other terms and conditions. I know at the beginning the attorneys couldn't get together. Everything's fine. So I think that could be changed and corrected and, you know, we could keep it in the Suffolk County SPCA's hands, which I think would be a smart move.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And actually I'd -- I'd like to say thank you, because just about a week ago -- in fact, I think it was last Wednesday -- the SPCA was called to come to my district for an issue, the police were called and they called you to come and respond to -- it was an animal abuse case.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Well, I hope we handled it well for you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I know -- I know you get called often, but -- Legislator Spencer, you have a question for Paul?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Hi, Paul. Thank you. And kudos to you for what you do, protecting our pets, and there was definitely a big issue in the 18th Legislative District with, you know, Legislator Cooper.

I wanted to -- I remember you just said that you had undergone some expense in terms of setting up to perform these functions. Do you have kind of an idea of like how much it cost? And did you receive -- cause I think, and I'm just trying to remember correctly, Legislator Cooper had also allocated some funding for -- for that. So how much of it did you get that was -- funds from the County and then how much personal, or, I guess, the agency's fund?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

I can't tell you the total amount we spent. The website is quite -- quite involved to do it properly. We -- we've actually -- our website has become a model for other states and other counties across the country, they've been calling us about this -- this pet offender registry.

To answer your question, I don't know what the exact cost was. I know Legislator Cooper did fund a PC for us to house this information and to use for accumulating the information. Other than that, I couldn't tell you what the exact cost was, but for next week I'll let you know for sure. All right?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

It just helps us to be able to make, I guess, informed exact decisions. But, again, thank you for what you do. I appreciate it.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

My pleasure. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

DuWayne?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Hi. How are you? I -- I vaguely recall when the issue with indemnification came up that -- that you guys said that you weren't going to do the Animal Abuse Registry because we wouldn't indemnify you. So has that issue been resolved? Are you still taking the same position?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

No, I believe that issue has been resolved. Really what type of indemnification do you need to put information into a system? You know, if you're getting -- if you get good information, you know, it's like a computer, good information in, good information out. Bad information in, bad information out.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

That was my question.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Yeah.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

That's why I thought it was a little curious that you guys had requested that.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

The only -- the only -- the only issue we have is we just want to make sure that it comes from one source, which would probably be the District Attorney's Office, and goes to one point of contact in our organization. And it's -- the trail would be either an e-mail or -- or a letter which would become part of the permanent file. And God forbid, you know, I'd hate to -- I'd hate to list it *DuWayne Gregory*, and it's really a *DuWayne R. Gregory* and -- and have a problem with somebody saying, *Hey, you listed my name improperly*. But I think we're past that. You know, the County does a good job at what they do, the Police Department does a great job, the DA's Office does a great job and I don't really expect that we're going to have any issues along that line. So, the indemnification

is not an issue as far as we're concerned.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. And in this specific bill, not to debate it, but just to ask the question, or just, I guess, verify my understanding of it. It doesn't designate a certain organization to run it, it just says that any, I guess, qualified organization can run the -- the Animal Abuse Registry?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Well, the original bill, which I believe there's a copy in that file, in that folder I just gave you guys, it does specify the Suffolk County SPCA.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right, but this doesn't necessarily state that you will not be able to, it just opens it up for any potential.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Hey, you know what? Anything could be, you know, changed and adjusted. But as far as I recall, and as far as I am made to understand, it specifically stated that this County was empowered to auth -- to hire the SPCA or -- or contract with the SPCA to handle this situation.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right. And was that through some type of competitive process, or how did that --

**MR. NOLAN:**

That's just -- that was in the original law, Legislator Gregory, it designated the SPCA. And you're correct, this bill would change that to open it up to any qualified organization, leaves it up to the Commissioner of the department to -- to pick who is going to run the registry.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Now, is that -- wouldn't that come under some type of competitive, or could it be under a competitive situation? Well, I guess they're not getting money for it.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right, so I -- I don't think so.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

There's no income. As a matter of fact --

**LEG. GREGORY:**

But there is a fee.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

-- I just spoke to the Chief and the \$50 fee that we're supposed to get to enter -- enter the information, the County can keep that, we're going to waive that. I mean, you know, it's not that -- it's not that important to us.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, thank you.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

So, in essence, we're saying we're doing it for nothing, you know.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, I guess no more questions. Thank you, Paul. And like I said, you could come back on

Tuesday, 2:30 Public Hearings start.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Great. Thank you very much.

*(\*The following testimony was taken & transcribed by  
Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter\*)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. Okay, we will start with our presentation. We have Joe Hawkins, he's Senior VP for Operations for ShotSpotter. And, you know, I know ShotSpotter exists in my district and a number of locations and, you know, we -- we've been hearing a lot about intelligence-led policing. And I know that ShotSpotter is not a hundred percent foolproof, but I think there is some disappointment that there has been a disconnect somewhere with the reports that we've been receiving. But I do believe that ShotSpotter is -- can and could be better. And when we talk about intelligence-led policing, technology is a wonderful thing, and I think it can certainly be utilized to help our Police Officers. I have always said that having ShotSpotter, now that -- when a Police Officer responds to a call where shots are going off, he has a better idea of what he's going into, and that way they know whether -- what type of gunfire it is, you know, how many shots.

So, you know, again, I think it's definitely a tool, an effective tool that our Police Officers can use and our Police Department can use.

So with that, Mr. Hawkins if you would like to begin.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

First of all, thank you very much for having me here. It's a pleasure to be of service to the Police Department of Suffolk County and the people of Suffolk County. Thank you for the introduction as well,

Ms. Browning. You're absolutely right, ShotSpotter is not a perfect technology and we're only one part of the information and intelligence available to the Police Department, and so it's in the spirit of being a part of a larger system that we come today.

I don't know if there's a time limit you've got on me, but I have about an hour's worth of material. I can cut that down. The first half is really about a background and overview of the technology and the system and how it works, if that's of interest. I can skip by that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, generally we try to stay at least within 20 minutes.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I'm pretty sure there's going to be quite a few questions, so it might take some time anyway.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure. Then what I'll do is I'm going to skip past a whole bunch of stuff, and if there are questions about the technology I'll go backwards to that. I'll go right to the -- what's going on with ShotSpotter in Suffolk County, and I'll try to go quickly. So please bear with. You're getting the speed version of everything right now so you can sort of see how it works.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Can you give a little bit of the theory?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure. I'll tell you what, I will -- let me get to the -- let me get to the front page of where I want to start and then I will. So in brief -- and I guess I could have done this over a picture.

The way ShotSpotter works is we are a gunshot detection system. And what that -- with that there are really four components to the service, and the ultimate -- the ultimate objective is to provide real-time gunshot intelligence, data about gunshots that have happened, exactly when and exactly where to Police and first responders so that they can, number one, respond safely to the scene of a shooting; and secondly, to provide historical data to the Police Department and others, perhaps as far as the District Attorney's Office in terms of prosecutions, so that you can look at the patterns of gunfire over time within an area that is being covered.

The major four components of the whole system are a network of acoustic sensors that exist. They are installed throughout the coverage area, so in the case of Suffolk County, we've got two square miles in Huntington Station, two square miles in Brentwood and one square mile each in the Towns of Amityville, Wyandanch and Bellport, North Bellport. So those sensors, think of them as nerve endings; all they do is they sit passively and listen for gunshots, loud, impulsive noises with an explosive sort of a sound. Those communicate with a second part of our system, which we think -- like to think of as the brain called our location server. It's a cloud-based computing service hosted in California and its job is to take these impulsive events from all the various sensors that may hear things, and when there's data or events that suggest that something has happened, more than three or more sensors have heard an instance, that location server will perform the mathematical calculations to determine, number one, where it happened and if we can place it on a map with accuracy, classify it as either a gunshot or a different kind of a noise, perhaps construction, fireworks, backfires, helicopters, so on and so forth.

And the third part of the network then are software clients -- user interfaces, if you will -- that exist within the Suffolk County Police Department, the 911 Communication Center and so forth where they can receive alerts of gunfire in real-time and they can look at historical reports and to do analytics on gunfire over -- over time.

The fourth piece in all that is really the Internet for connectivity between the client software and location server or the database in California, and cellular network, AT&T or Verizon, to carry traffic between the sensors and the brain. Sorry, I should have done that over a picture, but that's generally how it works.

So what we've got in Suffolk County -- and again, I'm going to apologize a little bit for the eye charts -- is a little bit of background on, again, where the arrays are, you can see those on the right, and a little bit about how we build these sensor rays and the state they're in. The key to making all this work is getting acoustic sensors with the appropriate density and spacing in areas where they're clear to hear the shots, hear sounds, with as little impedance from obstacles, buildings, signs, dense trees that may not directly prevent the sound from getting to the sensors. But the fewer places or things that can cause sound to bounce, to reflect, to change direction, the clearer the direct -- it's not really a line of sight, but the direct path between the sound, the muzzle blast and a sensor, the better the signal we get to operate on. Every time a sound bounces off of a surface, whether it be a building or something else, it loses some of the energy which means it's not going to travel as far and we'll have to deal with things like echoes and so on and so forth, which the software does quite well. So we like to be installed in high places, we're typically on buildings, up on rooftops, occasionally we will be on utility poles. We like to be away from high sources of ambient noise like air-conditioners on buildings, we always stay away from those, and we try to stay away from heavy road traffic where we can.

And the last piece is we need to be installed in a place where we get permission from whoever owns those buildings or those assets or those poles to put those sensors there. So we're always appreciative of the cooperation we get from business owners, residents and so forth, to allow us to put sensors out there.

As a matter of practice, we over-design and over-build these sensor networks for resiliency and redundancy. These are electronic devices that do very, very well out in the wild, but they are electronic devices, and when Hurricane Sandy comes through, they take quite a beating. So we have designed these networks such that if some number of sensors are off-line or not available to us for some period of time, the system is not blind like they would be if it was a camera system. If you lose one camera, you cannot see where that is; if you lose a sensor, you do not become deaf where that sensor is. In fact, sensors that are further away, several hundred yards to up to a mile, will actually hear better and participate better in gunshot detection than a sensor that's a hundred feet away.

When we install these networks initially, we go through a number of exercises and tests to calibrate them and to ensure they're working properly. We look at and test for network latency, the ability to get information from the sensors to our location server very, very quickly; that's critically important when you're dealing with precise time calculations. And we also look at ambient noise, we look at other mechanisms that we can adjust and mechanisms that self-adjust, in fact. The term *floating trigger* refers to the sensitivity of a sensor, so if there's generally a very quiet place that suddenly becomes very loud, maybe there's some construction going on, the sensors actually raise or lower their threshold to detect impulsive sounds above the base ambient noise. And then we do a live-fire test. In 2011, December of 2011, live-fire testing was done with live rounds in various points throughout Suffolk County, throughout the arrays, and we detected at that point 89.9% detected and located within 25 meters, those gunshots. Our standard performance is 80% of outdoor gunfire will be detected and located within 25 meters; in practice, we always exceed that by quite a great deal. From our first go-around, 89% was good and the sensors and the whole system continues to calibrate over time through the indigenous community gunfire that's going to occur naturally.

We measure our effectiveness generally with one key measure and that is the percentage of gunshots that we are aware of that go off in the area and those detect -- and those gunshots that we detect. And so it's a simple mathematical calculation. We know all the gunshots we detect, the data's there on the database, and we divide that over those detections plus the undetected gunshots that we weren't aware of, either when the Police Department tells us. We also monitor news sources, so we'll learn of some that way, and the reports of gunshots that did occur that we detected but did not locate accurately, and sometimes that will happen, particularly when you get to the edges of the sensor array or the coverage area, and you'll see that a little bit.

The accuracy and reliability of the data falls off dramatically when you get outside the coverage area. We still do and can detect some gunshot incidents outside, but they don't meet our standards so we don't guarantee them; in fact, they're not there -- when we deliver them, they're really freebies, if you will, because they're not part of the covered service.

The other thing that we look at in terms of health of the array is the number of sensors that actually participate in the detection of any given incident and we call that sensor participation, and I'll show you some figures there as to how Suffolk County's been performing.

One of the things that I didn't cover quite so much is it does require a minimum of three to four sensors, typically, to detect gunfire. In the case of a single gunshot, it requires four sensors; in the case of multiple gunshots, it requires three sensors, unless we have a good Azimuth or {covis heading} on the sensors, which they do. If we get two sensors that have a good Azimuth reading on the gunshot, and if you're interested I could explain that further, then it will require two sensors for a multiple gunshot and three sensors for a single gunshot.

So just looking real quickly at some of the service reliability. As a general rule -- as I mentioned, some sensors can be off-line and the system will still perform -- we look at 85% as a nominal baseline to consider -- to have the overall network performing very, very well. We can meet our gunshot detection service level agreement with 85% or better. Over the past several months you can see we're averaging 93.1% uptime of our sensor network and we've got it broken down by the city that we're covering as well. Huntington Station, actually up until a couple of days ago, had about four sensors that were off-line due to cellular modem problems, those have been resolved so they're actually up at -- there's one sensor off-line in Huntington Station now.

But overall, the sensor network is very, very healthy. This is actually a good improvement because, as we talked about last time I was here, after Hurricane Sandy, a number of sensors had been down for much longer than we were happy with. Part shortages all around the Atlantic seaboard, the East Coast, as everybody out here got hit very, very hard, but for the past several months, the sensor network has been extremely healthy.

On the back end, the hosted services that are required to actually perform the calculations, do the gunshot detection and make themselves available for the PD to look at data have been averaging 99.91% availability for the three-month period -- four-month period, July through end of October. So overall, services are performing very, very well in terms of availability.

Looking at the other metric I mentioned really briefly, sensor participation. As I said, two to three sensors are required to detect gunshot at a minimum, plus a single confirming sensor making it three to four overall. Looking historically over the almost two years that Suffolk County has had ShotSpotter in place up until the -- to July, it's been very, very consistent, averaging just under seven sensors per gunshot detection. Now, that's the 50th percentile. So on a typical gunshot you're getting seven sensors participating, more than -- just about double what you really need. The chart on the bottom and the ones on the right, which I won't go through in detail, simply show we can look at every single gunshot and you can see where -- how many sensors are participating typically. They're -- most of them, the heaviest are in the three, four, five, six sensor range, but you can see a number of them going out to as many as 16 or more sensors.

Another look at the same graph, and this is partially to show how you compare -- in Suffolk County, how we compare in Suffolk County to our other flex customers, it's very, very comparable. One thing that's worth noting that I did not mention yet, Suffolk County's coverage areas are very, very small compared to our other customers; typically we're in three square miles to as many as ten square miles of continuous coverage. The larger the coverage area, the more sensors you've got; therefore, the more sensors that are available to hear gunshots, they tend to perform better. That said, the pattern of gun -- of sensor participation mirrors what we see with all of our other flex customers combined very, very well. A little bit more skewed to more gunshots with fewer sensors and fewer gunshots with more sensors, but generally this shows to be quite healthy. More than 50% of your gunfire are being detected by six or more sensors, and two-thirds by five or more.

Again, another bit of an eye chart, and this is just to provide context for each one of your -- the coverage areas that have ShotSpotter in action. The top row shows the number of gunshot alerts we detected and sent to the Suffolk County PD since the beginning of the year. The second row is gunshot incidents from July through the end of October. And just for context, because I know a large part of the concern is how reliable the gunshot alerts are; are they really gunshots, how good a job are we doing in terms of filtering out the noise that are not gunshots. And that bottom row shows the actual number of impulsive noise events that actually cause an alert to come to our review center, which operates 24/7, that we listen to and make a decision. The software always classifies every incident and does its best to say *that has got all the signature characteristics of gunfire, that is a helicopter, that is a truck jake break*, and so on and so forth. But we've got human reviewers who are trained over thousands and thousands of hours -- not -- well, actually they're trained over 160 hours before they become independent reviewers; they're trained over thousands

and thousands of gunshot incidents. And as you can see, we're looking at a very large number, about 95% of the incidents we listen to and review are dismissed as non-gunfire. You're getting about four-and-a-half to 5% of the noises in Suffolk County are actually being sent as gunfire alerts.

So looking a little bit more at that incident review, from July through the end of October we reviewed over 3700 total incidents, and just over 3500 of those were dismissed as non-gunfire. Amongst those 3569 incidents were dismissed, we did learn that two of them actually were gunfire incidents that we misclassified. We take these very seriously, we call those a false negative. The bad news is we did not give the Police Department the opportunity to respond to the gunfire in real-time. The good news is it's still there in the database. When we learned it was a gunshot incident, we were able to reclassify it so that it's there for historical reporting purposes. We're able to do detailed forensics on that in case the data is required to help with an investigation or prosecution and so forth.

Of the 209 gunshot incidents we published in this timeframe, and I note the number 167 through the end of September because that's the timeframe that I've been able to see the reports that the Suffolk County Police Department produces on their evaluation of those gunshot alerts. Of those 209 gunshot alerts we've published, we learned of two other gunshot incidents that we did not detect at all. What this means, if you take for granted for a moment that the 209 gunfire incidents were real gunfire, you can see we're clearly doing much, much better than our 80% detection guarantee. For argument's sake, if we were to assume that half of those gunshot alerts were not gunshots, we're still doing extremely well with regard to our guarantee. But I do understand that nobody is really challenging the effectiveness of the software or -- of the system, it's working very, very well. It's really a question of can the Police Department rely on the data that we're giving them? Is there enough real gunfire to merit its continued use? I appreciate and understand the question.

So let's talk about the gunshot alerts that we do send and have been sending. We know that through the Police Department's analysis, and it's clear, they're doing a lot of work. They're putting in a lot of time carefully analyzing every gunshot alert we send over. It's extremely commendable. We don't see many of our customers putting this much effort into analyzing every single alert and actually telling us how they think that we're doing, so we appreciate that greatly.

Many of those gunshot alerts we've sent we have been told are being treated as either false alerts, meaning there is physical evidence or a reliable eyewitness saying *I saw the thing that made the noise*, it was not gunfire, it was something else; or were found to be unsubstantiated meaning the Police responded and, despite their best efforts, were unable to find anything that suggested gunfire or otherwise. In other words, they're not finding shell casings, victims, cooperative witnesses and so on and so forth.

Of note, in those reports, and I'm -- we've already started working closely with Suffolk County PD to collaborate on making sure that we're using the same terminology and language and data so far. Few or half the gunshot alerts that we've actually sent the Suffolk County PD are in those internal reports. I'm not sure why yet, but we're going to be getting there and that's one of the reasons that I'm here as well.

At the same timeframe, there were ten gunshot alerts that did have positive outcomes. Now, I'm not going to say that ShotSpotter is to credit for that. It's great police work. At the end of the day, all we do is provide data. It's a very, very small part of the work that has to go on to turn that into positive outcomes, and we recognize that.

But what's notable to me is over a similar study period, actually a much longer study period, from I think August of last year through March, I believe there were only a dozen confirmed gunshots or gun -- ShotSpotter incidents where they were able to find physical evidence. So ten over the past

## November 14, 2013 - Public Safety Committee

three months is a pretty significant improvement in terms of being able to get good results where ShotSpotter gunshot alerts were there. So I think that's notable and commendable.

We've also noticed looking at the year-over-year gunshot data, I looked at all the gunshot alerts from June 1st through the 10th of November of 2012, the same time period for this year, and there's been a dramatic reduction in gunfire that we've seen, particularly in Huntington Station and North Bellport, 50% down in both of those areas. Again, we would not take credit for that. I hope that ShotSpotter's been part of the reason that gunfire is down. Obviously the police work is really paying off there as well. Amityville, Wyandanch and Brentwood are actually all up about 10%, but overall across the entire Suffolk County coverage area, you're down almost 20% year-over-year for that time period.

There's clearly room for improvement, and I think all the way around and we've certainly got a commitment to work with Suffolk County PD on those improvements and we're already starting to see it, which is fantastic. We're collaborating now on improving the way reporting is done, the metrics and measurements of success that we're applying, the integrity of the data. As you mentioned, Ms. Browning, and we completely acknowledge, ShotSpotter is not a perfect technology. There's no way we're going to detect every gunshot. And as good as we are, and I believe we are very good at classifying gunfire incidents accurately, we're also not perfect. Mistakes are going to be made. We've got software which cannot be perfect and we've got humans who are humans. They are very, very good, they actually listened to probably more gunfire in six months than most Police Officers will in their entire lives, unless you're the range master. But we're very, very good.

So working on aligning our efforts on reporting, understanding the data and taking action when we find there's data that suggest improvements need to be made. I've noted just briefly, many of the gunfire alerts that we've sent to Suffolk County actually are originating outside the coverage areas. Now, as a matter of practice, we always send those alerts. If we detect it, we're going to send it to the Police Department so they've got the ability to decide whether they want to dispatch a role on that or not. But again, to be clear, those incidents, because they are outside the coverage area, are not contractually committed; we have no obligation to deliver those and we know that they're not nearly as reliable. We can, if the Police Department would prefer not to be bothered with those things knowing they're going to be less reliable, eliminate those alerts entirely. I do believe one of the positive outcomes and arrest came from a gunfire incident outside the coverage area. But again, I know a number of the ones that we've been told were either unsubstantiated or false came from outside; so if that's an annoyance, we can eliminate those entirely.

And the commitment that we've seen from the Police Department, to training and deployment of best practices, has really been great, the past several months in particular. I'm going to come back to the training thing in just a moment, but I wanted to bring up a couple of examples just to demonstrate both the difficulty, in some cases, of classifying gunfire and comparing that to the ground truth that we get, but also I think to demonstrate that in some cases it's why we have to have the discussion. It's why it's not always black and white, and sometimes we're wrong in ways that I think hopefully you will find to be understandable, and in some cases we think that we're right and the Police aren't always right, but we work through those things.

So with some apologies, I'm not able to play the audio unless I actually escape out of this thing and do it the old fashioned way. So this is actually -- I'll just give you a little bit of background, let me do that for a second and show you the whole picture again. This is a gunfire alert that we sent over back in August 23rd; it was something we recorded as two gunshots. We learned from the Police Department that this was the case of a burning car where we were told it was two of the tires exploding, which we absolutely -- we don't hear that an awful lot. But what's interesting is the sound that it made and, as you can see the wave forms on the left, you can see the actual audio wave forms from four of the sensors that detected that, the closest one was 209 feet away, the furthest sensor was point nine miles away. Typically, this is one of the data we look at when

qualifying gun fires, because when loud things make noises, very few things travel as far as a gunshot. Backfires do not travel a mile, typically, and the fact that the car tires did is certainly interesting. But I'm going to play the sound here so you can hear what it is we listened to and this is why we called it a gunshot.

*(Played Audio)*

So there's a case of one where we were incorrect. I think that was on, right? Did everybody hear that?

"Yes" said in unison

Yeah, so I won't do that one again. Yeah, I've got that mic'd up over there. So those were two exploding tires, we thought were gunshots. Sounded like gunshots, looked like gunshots, we would have sent those. And we get the same thing, you know, ten times out of ten we're going to send those over as gunfire; they sounded too close to not be. However, we very much appreciated learning that they were not, because we take that information, we reclassify that incident so it will show up as non-gunfire for reporting purposes. And importantly, when we learn of incidents that we do not classify correctly and we change the classification, the system actually learns over time. Now, it's not going to change its behavior on one bit of data, but as patterns emerge the software actually does learn, there are artificial intelligence and machine-learning algorithms amongst the straight math that get applied. So if we do see areas, and every geographic area is unique, where something's going on repeatedly and the system will learn that that pattern may not be what it originally thought it was over time. So it's unlikely we'll see a strong pattern of car tires exploding, but we always want to know that as well.

Here's a second incident that happened September 28th, and this was also sent over as a multiple gunshot incident. This is one where we feel that we did get it right, although the report from Suffolk County Police Department said it was unfounded and, therefore, not a gunshot, and I'm going to play that one for you as well.

*(Played Audio)*

Were you all able to hear that? I'll play that one again. This one we're quite certain was gunfire.

*(Replayed Previous Audio)*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

That sounded like six tires.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Is that clear enough? Unless that was six tires. Yeah, that has all the hallmarks of gunfire; there's absolutely no doubt, even on further review. It's unfortunate that the responding officers weren't able to find the evidence of that. As you can see right here, this is where the gunfire actually happened in the backyard. It's also interesting that there were a couple of other incidents at other times, pretty much in the same general area, so it seems to be a spot where there's been some shooting going on.

The last example I'm going to show you is one where it's just really hard to tell. And this one is interesting because you're going to hear some other sounds in play and these are some of the things we take under consideration as well when we send these over. This has many of the hallmarks of gunfire. The wave form pattern that you see here is not classic, but it is consistent. What we look for is a very, very fast rise time, and then something that looks for close-up sensors, sort of like a Christmas tree lying on its side; usually those are echoes. But the other thing that I've noted there

is it's carrying more than a mile away which, again, is very, very unusual.

The other thing here is you're going to hear the sound of a car, and we do know drive-by shootings occur from time to time, so this is one we classified as a multiple gunshot as part of a drive-by shooting. It's not ob -- we don't know that happened and, in fact, what we heard from responding officers, or at least the report says it was a sound of a loud muffler; whether it was a loud muffler or backfires, certainly possible. It would be very, very unusual for a muffler or a car backfire, again, to travel over a mile, but I'm going to play the sound for you as well just so you can get a sense of what it was that we listened to and classified.

*(Played Audio)*

Did you all get that? I'm going to do that again.

*(Replayed Previous Audio)*

So, hard to tell, borderline. We called that a multiple gunshot because in our mind we felt the Police needed to hear that, needed to have that available so they could respond. Again, we're not always perfect, we make some judgement calls as well. But given the opportunity to say, *Ah, we think that's probably a backfire* when you've got a screaming car speeding away and you hear those noises, we're going to send that over as gunshots. For whatever it's worth, it's interesting, it's likely that these first two pulses here were gunfire and the second two were actually echoes, because you don't see those traveling nearly quite so far. When you get the further out sensors, you can see the amplitude dropping significantly, so it's probably two shots and then two echoes.

So those are just the examples I brought along. Again, the bottom line is, again, we're not always going to be right, but we feel we most often are. Certainly when there's ground truth, live eyewitnesses, physical evidence that suggests we were wrong, that we know that's going to happen, we always ask that we get those reports quickly so that we can reclassify, we can retrain our system, we can train our people where there are patterns. But in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we know that the best Police Departments aren't going to find physical evidence every time they go out. In fact, if you're able to do it half the time, I don't think most of our customers in law enforcement agencies do much better than that. It's very, very difficult work, we recognize that.

I want to go back again to some of the great things that have been going on in Suffolk County PD recently with regard to training and best practices. We had an officer from Suffolk County come out to California to take part in an intensive four-day train-the-trainer course where they learn all aspects of our business, they get to see behind the curtain, if you will, they see our review center in operation, they meet our support staff, our engineers, our incident reviewers, and they come back trained on all aspects of how to operationalize the data to best effect, both in dispatch and response, in investigations, in crime analysis, in prosecution. And we're very, very pleased to have done that. Most typically our customers pay for that; in this case, knowing the point where we were with the Suffolk County Police Department and knowing that there was a need, we comped that training for Suffolk County PD. So now they've got a trained professional trainer, one of only about two dozen in the United States within law enforcement that can train their own people on how to operationalize ShotSpotter data with the best effect.

And, as I've noted, we've seen great strides already. I know that we now have -- I should say Suffolk County PD now has several cars that have got the mobile application of ShotSpotter, so responding officers can see and listen to the gunfire as they're approaching the scene of a shooting, they can get right to the dot. I'm told that they are now being much more diligent about getting out of the car, walking to the spot, conducting thorough searches; these are all critical aspects. For other Police Departments that are still employing, you know, your typical response protocols, when

you get a 911 call, driving large areas, you know, watching out the window, looking for things without stopping, that the ability to get out of the car and conduct a search, engage -- knock on doors, engage citizens, look for witnesses makes a huge, huge difference, because, again, all we do is provide the data. We don't do any of the police work. So again, seeing great strides there, and I understand that Suffolk County is using their most experienced, best cops in those cars that are responding to ShotSpotter alerts, which we could not be more pleased with.

I just wanted to note as well, I thought that the timing was great. There were two press releases that came out just this last Monday on arrests that had been made in connection with shootings where there were gunshot victims; thankfully both whom I understand are living and with arrests made. Both of those incidents were detected by ShotSpotter, the first one was a shooting that happened on October 28th, I believe, and it says approximately 1:40 PM; in fact, we know it happened at exactly -- I can't even read my own thing -- we got it within seconds. The person was shot three times. We sent it over as a single gunshot. Now, this is only a short audio clip. We know there are other gunshots in here, but again, this is great to see. The Suffolk County Police Department has already requested a detailed forensic report; this is some additional analysis we can do and that reports in progress where we can actually do a breakdown shot-by-shot, the exact timing, the location of each individual shot, they can be extremely helpful in investigations. If it goes to court, they're extremely powerful in presenting testimony to the efficacy of the shot and to be able to describe in great detail exactly what happened with the shooting. Particularly powerful when there's more than one shooter involved, we can often distinguish who shot first, which shots belonged to which shooter, whether they're shooting in the same direction or shooting at each other and so forth. So we're working on that forensic report for that particular incident right now.

The second incident was another shooting that occurred in Wyandanch, approximately 10:25 AM; and in fact, it was 10:24 and 28 seconds, so the time was very, very good. This one is interesting because I understand the victim was shot one time, we've got three gunshots, very, very clear. And if -- again, we're hopeful. We'd like to do a forensic report for the Police Department on that one as well, if that can help them with their investigation. I do know that their press release says they are looking for information from possible witnesses or the citizens, so we can certainly help with the forensic breakdown of the gunshot incident.

In summary, in terms of my presentation, we know that the technology, the service is working well, it's doing exactly what it is supposed to do, it's doing extremely well. Sound is traveling very, very well throughout the County. Lots of acoustic adventure being picked up, over 95% of them were dismissing as non-gunshots, they are there in the database so they can be searched later on, but -- and very, very few reports of undetected gunshots. We do know that there's a lot of work to do to better align our efforts between SST and the Suffolk County Police Department to get better outcomes. We all would like to see better, positive policing outcomes come as a result of the data. So some of the things that we're doing already underway is working together on developing a common language, a set of measurements and metrics and really looking at data to understand the true performance of the service and of how best practices are being applied.

We do value reports of undetected gunshots, they're extremely instructive. I did not get into one thing, but in earlier -- when I was out here a couple of months ago, we looked at all the patterns of all reported, undetected gunshots going back to last year and found that the vast majority of them were all happening in one-quarter square mile area in the southwestern area of Amityville. We looked at our sensor array down there, found a spot where we think we can improve that gunshot detection by adding a sensor in Amityville, so we're actually working on that right now.

Most recently there was a reported missed gunshot in Brentwood where I think it was somebody shot up a house, five shots, very loud, people heard it. We looked at that as well, there's clearly a hole in the sensor array from the original design way back when, we're going to add a sensor in Brentwood as well. The rest of the array looks very good. But that's an example of how when we

learn about missed gunshots, we always look at a wholistic larger pattern of where they are, and if we see patterns or misses, things change. If your community's building out, you're constructing things, buildings are being torn down, acoustic propagation can change over time, we know that. So we're in this for the long haul. We look at the continued usefulness and efficacy of the system over time, not just when we first installed. So we want to keep the reports of undetected gunshots coming.

We also know that false positives are -- an annoyance would be an understatement. We don't want to send false positives to the Police Department, sending them out when they're not real gunfire alerts. We do our very, very best, we think we do a very good job. I think we do a much better job than some of the reports I've seen would seem to indicate, but we'll get to that. And we want to understand the false positives so we can train our people, train our system. We also want to understand were there real gunshots that don't lead to positive outcomes? Maybe there's some things we can do to help, although typically what we do is say *Here's what we know other agencies are doing to good effect.*

Some areas of possible improvement, as I mentioned before, we can eliminate all the alerts that come from outside the coverage area. It would mean fewer alerts in general, it would mean fewer less accurate alerts, it might mean fewer positive outcomes; this is really -- we'll take the decision of the Police Department, whatever they'd prefer there.

We'd like to get to more real-time feedback on undetected shootings, that's been very, very good. It is -- it gives us the opportunity to actually recover some audio. If we learn of a gunshot within 72-hours we don't detect, we can actually go remotely into the sensors that were nearby that might have heard something and we can play back raw audio looking for the sound of gunfire. And if there's anything there, we can actually take a snapshot of that gunfire incident and we'll send that over, even if only one sensor detected it. We won't be able to put a dot on the map, but we can say *Hey, there were four shots.* So if your witness is saying there was only one, you know you've got something to work with there.

I'm going to answer the question before it gets asked; we do have audio for 72-hours on every sensor. We know that some people are concerned about privacy, whether or not we're listening to conversations, whether or not we're going to take the sound of human voices and send that on. It's a fair question, but the answer is we do not. We are a gunshot detection service. The only audio that we ever get is when gunshots are detected and that location server says *sensor No. 3, you gave me an impulsive incident at exactly this time, please give me the four second -- the two seconds of audio preceding the gunshot and the four seconds trailing the gunshot and everything in-between.* Everything else is lost, it's overwritten constantly. When we go back to sensors and look at raw data to see if we can hear gunshots, we bring back the same thing; the gunshot audio, the two preceding seconds, the four trailing seconds, the rest is lost, deleted forever. So we do not have or keep anything except gunshot audio.

Lastly, we do want real-time feedback on false positives. Today we're getting the monthly reports; however, if we are able to get it more quickly, we can do the classification on the system that allows that retraining to happen. If the reclassification is done a month, two months after the fact, it, in fact, is not effective at retraining the system. And the importance of getting the false positives correct and not overstating those is if, in fact, if reclassify incidents that were gunfire and call it not gunfire because we didn't find evidence or whatever, we can actually do damage to the system because the system will start learning that gunshots aren't gunshots, so we don't want that to happen.

By the way, it's not localized in just Suffolk County. It affects all of our customers equally. So just as we wouldn't want them to take incorrect false positive reports here and apply it to the system because it will do something bad elsewhere. You wouldn't want Kansas City or Chicago telling us the

same thing and having it affect Suffolk County's gunshot detection. So real-time feedback on false positives does help us train our system, it reinforces our training because, again, we know that things can be different locally everywhere we go. And as I said earlier, some improvements are already evident. Over the past couple of months we've really appreciated the partnership and the openness with Suffolk County Police Department to work with us and to allow us to work with them, to listen to us and talk about things that have worked elsewhere and things that might be relevant here.

I would say please do take advantage of the detailed forensic reports whenever we can be of help in aiding with an investigation, hopefully a prosecution. And that we continue to be extremely pleased to serve Suffolk County and hope to continue doing so. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, thank you. And I think we do have a couple of questions.

But, you mentioned about not picking up voices or conversation. When we went to Nassau County, they did have some conversation, and I know that they have it a little different, but if you do pick up conversation or people's voices and it might be related to the gunshot or the actual shooters, can you -- can you save that to make sure that -- I mean, it might be good evidence to give to the Police Department.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure. So the only human voices that we will have and be able to give are going to be the voices that come from a sensor that had the gunshot audio on at the time of the shooting. So if somebody says *hey* and shoots within a second, that's going to be there. If there is any other human voice on a sensor or any other noise on a sensor that is outside of that two second before or four second after, the answer is always going to be no, we don't have it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

We've modified our system in the past year to make it impossible for our people to keep that information. We do that, number one, because we are a gunshot detection service; and number two, if we chose to do that -- and technically, you know, we could change our system so that we could pull back and keep all those other things, we wouldn't do it anyway because, you know, if there were a large community backlash over privacy, over the notion that eavesdropping, whether it was legally possible or not, the public backlash would be almost impossible to overcome and we'd certainly go out of business.

The other thing is, as I mentioned earlier, when we put our sensors on buildings in particular, we have to get people to give us permission to do that. It's usually out of a sense of goodwill or wanting to help do good things for the Police Department. We always promise that, number one, they're going to be completely anonymous, people will never know where there -- where these sensors are, what they look like if they're on their property, and if we do get questions about *are you going to be hearing my conversations*, we always tell them *absolutely not*. If we breached that promise to them, if we gave up other audio that had nothing to do with gunfire whenever anybody asked for it, no matter how heinous the crime, that's going to get back to the community and we're going to be told take your sensors out of here, we don't want you. So as a matter of staying in business and being able to serve Police Departments, law enforcement everywhere, that answer is always going to be no.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And one more, or we have a couple of questions. But when you talk about picking up some of the gunshot outside the coverage area, have you seen any numbers that you picked up outside

coverage area and some of the areas where you say maybe we need to move the sensors so that you can pick up that -- maybe there's a scenario where it's more frequent. Have you been moving any sensors to --

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure. In terms of -- we have not relocated a sensor to change the coverage area. Again, the boundaries that define where we're detecting gunfire and delivering data are of a matter on our contractual agreement between Suffolk County and SST, so those were established a couple of years ago. To this point, those boundaries haven't changed. Certainly, if that's something that if Suffolk County wanted to either expand or move the coverage areas, we'd certainly have the ability to do that, that's just a matter of, you know, business deals doing that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And --

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Most certainly we've seen -- oh, go ahead.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No, I'm just thinking, you know, working with the Police Department, if you have an area where it seems nothing's going on and you have an area where there's coverage, that you could move that circle, if you know what I mean.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure, sure. Well, in fact, I will tell you, one thing that -- it's been very, very obvious to me and some of my colleagues, is we looked at the data recently, and I mentioned this to one of the Legislators or one of the people here when I first came in. In the west side of Wyandanch there's a school out on Jamaica Road, and the coverage area extends probably, oh, maybe about 10 or 12 blocks short of the school, I think. But clearly between the school and the western boundary coverage area, there's a lot of gunfire going on out there. We do get a lot of those. There seems to be a particular block around 28th or 29th Street, I think, and Jamaica Road where there's obviously something going on out there. Why that's not in the coverage area, I don't know. If you wanted to expand out there, we'd love to be able to do that for you. You know, like I say, that's a matter of just negotiating a deal around that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And one last question from me is the ShotSpotter employees, because obviously we do it a little different than Nassau. So you have employees who are listening to the gunfire, making the reports.

Can you give me a little background on your employees.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Yeah, certainly. And you're exactly right, Nassau County, being an older customer, has what -- we used to sell as a turnkey hardware/software solution, and the almost 4,000 incidents that you saw that we've been reviewing, dismissing 95% of, they get a hundred percent of those things and they have to do all that weeding through the haystack to get to the gunshot data. We no longer even offer that as a service. We sell strictly the managed service where we do the review, the expert review of all incidents and the delivery of the gunshot data. We find -- in fact, that's what the public safety and law enforcement market is demanding of us, so we changed our business a couple of years ago.

The people that do our incident review, I've got a staff of about ten incident reviewers, they work 24/7 in three shifts all year long, especially holidays because, not surprisingly, New Year's Eve and Fourth of July are by far the most active time for noises of all kinds; naturally fireworks being the

most obvious, but people go out there and shoot their guns. Celebratory gunfire is a problem; I don't know if it is here in Suffolk County, but it certainly is in lots of other places in the country. And so we're staffed 24/7. We listen to several hundred gunfire incidents a day, typically. We've got people from all walks of life but with a strong preponderance towards former police officers, military, 911 dispatch, people in the public safety business, people that actually spent a lot of time before their ShotSpotter careers working with and around guns. As a general rule, they have to be -- the qualifications we look for are extremely detail-oriented, extremely focused, able to do a repetitive job, because unlike a 911 dispatcher, the only thing they do is listen to gunfire alerts or things that might be gunfire alerts. They also do some other things for us, like they monitor our sensor network so that if a sensor goes down or there's a problem with that, because they're 24/7, they help provide some alerting to us as well. But their only real job is listening to and qualifying gunfire.

They also are available by on-line chat with responding officers or dispatchers at any time, so that if somebody has a question, they're arriving on-scene, they'd like more information, they can chat through the application on their mobile terminals or on their desktops through their alerts console with the reviewers and actually get, you know, real-time updates, have a conversation with them. But, so attention to detail, focus, very good hearing, obviously, and general sparks, but experience with gunfire. I hope I answered the question.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, I just -- you know, that's the thing is for me to go do it, no, I wouldn't be able to do it. But, you know, obviously you have retired police officers or military that are familiar with gunfire, that are listening to the system.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Legislator Spencer, you have a question?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I actually have several questions.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Also through the Chair, I don't -- some of my questions would relate to our Police Department. Is it okay if I have a representative from the Commissioner's Office?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah. Actually, I was going to see if, Commissioner, if you'd like to come up and whoever else you think you might need.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Good morning, Commissioner. Thank you. Thanks, Joe, for that presentation. Just a few general questions to you, Joe, with regards to ShotSpotter. Are you the only company in the country that's doing this? Do you have any competitors?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

There are a couple of outfits of note that do similar things, but in material ways that are different. There's an outfit -- I forget the name of the company, but the product's called Boomerang -- that is more of a military application for anti-sniper, whereas ShotSpotter triggers exclusively off the muzzle blast, the origination of the gunfire, and how that sound radiates at the speed of sound and

all directions simultaneously. The Boomerang System, which is an anti-sniper thing, actually uses the supersonic sound of the bullet itself slicing through the air, and that depends on -- so it's typically you set these up to protect specific locations; maybe it's a high value target, an embassy, you know, a military outpost, that sort of a thing, and the bullet needs to pass within 50 feet of the actual sensor to be picked up. And that tells you not the sound -- you know, it doesn't use triangulation as we use with multiple sensors. It says based on the path of that bullet and the supersonic crack of the bullet slicing through the air, the sound came from that cave over there, go ahead and unload your artillery on that thing.

There's at least one other company that I'm aware of in the U.S. that offers some sort of a gunshot detection system, I'm not very familiar with it but I do know that -- I believe it is not accurate on location. It says a sound went off, they don't have anything in terms of reviewed alert, expert qualification, that sort of forensics, that sort of thing. And to my knowledge, they don't have any successful deployments anywhere.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

How long has ShotSpotter been in business?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

ShotSpotter's been around from the early days for about 18 years. It was invented by an astrophysicist and a couple of other highly educated people, MIT, computer scientists who took their knowledge of acoustics and engineering to apply it to help out law enforcement, starting in East Palo Alto, California. So it started up in the garage days about 18 years ago, we went with a managed service about two-and-a-half, three years ago.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And how long have you been with them?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Since July of last year, one year and four or five months.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

What's your position within the company?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

I'm the Senior Vice-President of Operations, so I'm responsible for the teams that design the sensor arrays, deploy and install them, operationalize new customers, also customer service and the Incident Review Center.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And you're in Nassau County; how long have you -- has ShotSpotter been in Nassau?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

I should know the answer to that question, I'm afraid I don't. I know longer than Suffolk County. I think it's been four or five or six years; Commissioner Crumpter (*sic*) would be the better person to ask there. And I do believe they are strongly considering and very close to deciding to convert to the managed service, as most of our longer term customers have.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

A couple of detailed questions just with regarding the sensors. I know that you had indicated that there's a two square mile radius coverage area, and typically we see larger coverage areas. Is that -- in your opinion, does that decrease the effectiveness of the system?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

The size of the coverage area definitely matters. We found coverage areas as small as a mile are more of a challenge because there are just fewer sensors. So once you -- as I mentioned earlier, once you get to the outside of the array, when you're not -- when the gunfire is not surrounded by sensors, the math that has to be performed is more difficult to get an accurate location on. The closer you are to -- well, not the closer you are to the sensors, but the more you are surrounded by sensors and the more of them, the more intersecting lines you're basically going to be at. I could actually -- I'd like to pull up a quick slide, if I can, and I'll show you what that looks like.

But the short story is that if you've got a larger coverage area and you have a gunshot that goes off in the middle of it, think about just more and more layers of sensors in all directions, the more that are going to hear that. And a gunshot that was detected by 15 sensors is going to be far, you know, more likely to be accurate than a gunshot that was detected by four. The margin of error simply goes down.

So yes, most of our -- today when we sell a new system, we start with a minimum of three miles. Can it still be effective at one to two? Absolutely.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Was that -- well, I guess you were not involved in the negotiations with Suffolk County. But as we were looking at some of our coverage areas, did we recommend the three mile coverage area for Suffolk, as far as you know, and those communities where we have ShotSpotter?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

I'm afraid I don't know the answer to that question, sir. That predates my experience.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

If we go from a two square mile radius to a three square mile radius, do you -- is the sensor number increased proportionately? Like if we have one square mile, do you go from 10 sensors to two square miles to 20 sensors, or is it less sensors as the coverage area increases, or how does that work?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

A great question. It goes up proportionately. So our rule of thumb is 15 to 16 sensors per square mile, and it varies depending on a lot of factors having to do with the geography, the terrain. In heavily built-out urban areas, you get in some downtown areas with very large buildings, lots of hills. I'll give you San Francisco as an example; it's the challenge of both lots of hills and lots of buildings. We'll go as dense as 20, 22 sensors per square mile. Suffolk County, you're at 15 to 16, so if you went from two square miles, you've got 30 now, you'll go up to 45.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Does the -- I know the sensor cost would increase because you're paying for more sensors. Does the monitoring cost change?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

No, it doesn't. Suffolk County, because you're under a managed service, it's a flat fee per square mile, so you would pay the additional cost for the additional square mile, or a proportion thereof. But all the capital cost is strictly ours to bear.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

But I -- so the monitoring costs do go up if you go from one square mile to two square miles, then. It's per square mile.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Yes. The overall cost of the service per square mile -- the data, the monitoring, everything that goes with that -- goes up for additional coverage area, yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I wanted to talk a little bit about some of the science, when we look in terms of, I guess, a concept of sensitivity versus specificity. So you can have a system that is very sensitive that picks up everything but it's not necessarily so specific, if you make it less sensitive and more specific you lose some of your sensitivity. So obviously the role here is not to miss gunfire under any circumstance. But as far as when you look at a situation where you're getting these reports, how often do you adjust that sensitivity if you're getting a lot of false negatives?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

False positives, actually. False positives.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

So one thing I'll clarify, there's not really a trade-off between sensitivity, meaning how many and what kind of noises we hear, and -- was it accuracy that you mentioned?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Specificity. So we can adjust sensitivity, and this is really not so much being accurate or being specific to where an incident occurred or what it was, but really a matter of economics. If we made the sensors much more sensitive. As an example, our gunshot guarantee, when you look at the fine print, says *calibers greater than 22*, and this is strictly a matter of acoustic physics. A 22, the explosive charge behind a 22 is much, much lower than any other commercially available ammunition. It just does not make much of a noise. And so if we were to -- so we don't detect 20 -- we don't guarantee to detect 22s because they're just too difficult to pick up. To adjust our system to be so sensitive that it would pick up a 22, you'd be picking up baseballs popping in mitts, car doors closing, all kinds of things, and it would be overwhelming. I would have to probably -- you know, we'd triple or quadruple the number of staff we had, it would drive the cost of the service up to the point where it would be prohibitive, most customers wouldn't want to buy it or we couldn't afford to run it. So as a matter of economics, many years ago we decided that the 80% detection standard was one where we could meet, where we could deliver gunshots reliably and actually offer a business that was viable, and that's why we chose the sensitivity, if you will, that we -- that we have.

Several years ago there were scientific tests done, control tests funded by the Department of Justice and then let's the -- that tested the efficacy of the system under different sensitivity settings and parameters, and at that time it detected -- I've got a slide here of something that addresses that as well. An extremely high number of --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

While you're pulling that slide, I guess my question specifically would relate to fireworks. And when you look at fireworks, which are gun powder, explosive projectiles, very similar to a gunshot, that would seem to be -- it's really a major challenge, especially, you know, a lot of communities that, you know, that fireworks are very frequent. So how -- you know, I'm not worried about the car doors and the baseball mitts and those things being that sensitive, but it seems that when you talk about distinguishing a firework from a gunshot, I would be curious to know that -- that really must

be a major challenge to do that.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure. And actually, I heard, I think, Mr. Harris mention that as well. So first, we can distinguish between gunfire and fireworks. It can be a challenge in the case where you've got a single gunshot and a very loud explosive, an M-80, a cherry bomb, that sort of a thing. Those are probably the most challenging to distinguish. But otherwise, multiple gunshots and fireworks are very easy to distinguish. The firecrackers that have, you know, the crackle/fizzle/pop sound, if you can hear a rocket propeller, those are sounds we're very, very good at picking up. In fact, there's a Latin American country -- actually, it's Panama City, they've got these notorious triple rockets, they're motor-driven rockets, they fire off three rounds. And in the early days, those were difficult to distinguish from gunfire, but we trained on those and we'll do this frequently. When we run into patterns that are localized to different areas where they've got something unusual going on, we trained to the sound of those triple rockets quite extensively and now they're easy to distinguish.

Here in Suffolk County, you've got somebody firing off a 40-cal or -- and then, you know, throwing an M-80, those are the harder ones to distinguish. And again, those are probably the ones where if we're prone to making a mistake in judgment or -- in the call there, it'll be something like that. But we generally do a pretty good job, we feel, and can distinguish those sounds.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

As far as your company with regards to upgrades in the software, when was the last software upgrade? Are there major software upgrades that really have a major impact in terms of -- in just improving the technology and, you know, can you tell me when the last upgrade was?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Sure. We actually had a software upgrade on our back-end service yesterday morning, which we do occasionally. We have basically three sorts of software upgrades, if you will. One is we occasionally upgrade the firmware on the sensors, this is the software that's actually on the board, on the sensors. That has not been upgraded in about a year, early on it was about twice a year that we would do that. Typically improvements to digital signal processing, that sort of thing, but that software is generally very, very stable. And in fact, what we are deploying now is a new generation of sensor that's only been out -- this is probably a couple of years work to improve a number of things in the sensor firmware, the sensor package, what it looks like, the whole thing, and that's been out for just short of a year. That has not had -- that's not had a firmware upgrade since it's been released.

The second kind would be the kind that you would typically -- that our customers would see, feature enhancements, functional enhancements, either on the back-end or on the client's software. We had one of those I think about a month ago here in Suffolk County. Actually it's one thing I didn't mention as well; here in Suffolk County it was done coincident with moving the back-end service off an older server to a more modern state-of-the-art server facility in California. Suffolk County is one of the first, if not the first, ShotSpotter flex customer under the managed service, and consequently it was on an older server that we upgraded. We had promised to do that back in June and that was completed a month ago, October 7th, I believe. So at that time, we also made an upgrade on some features. The last one is just the occasional updates we'll make on the back-end servers that are strictly about expanded capacity, expanding resiliency, so on and so forth.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'm going to, Madam Chair, apologize for taking so long, but I -- this is very important to my constituents and we've had some major concerns. I do have a little bit more and then a couple of things for the Commissioner.

As far as when you -- you indicated that there is an officer trained in Suffolk County and that officer goes back and he trains everyone else. Do you offer advice, or that's not -- as far as when you offer the service to a municipality, that municipality then has to put in engagement procedures in place. Do you offer that type of support in your training to advise municipalities how they should respond, what their procedure should be, or is that separate or do you send them to other municipalities where they can get that information?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Yes, we have a training department that, again, are made up mostly of former law enforcement officers. The gentleman that works with Suffolk County most directly, Ed {Falossi}, is a 27-year veteran of the San Jose Police Department. And among training, about just the general simple things about how to use the data, how to use the software, how to, you know, log in, so on and so forth. They do -- we do offer advice and consultation on best practices as we've seen developed by other law enforcement agencies. We've got over 60 customers now and some are extremely forward thinking and aggressive about their integration of the data with other data sources.

So we do offer that, that advice, those recommendations. Certainly things like get out of the car, respond to the dot, not the street address which comes from the County parcel maps, because the dot's what's going to be accurate. We do offer that advice, but certainly it is up to the local law enforcement agency to determine what's best for them.

*(\*The following testimony was taken by Alison Mahoney & was transcribed by Lucia Braaten - Court Reporters\*)*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And my final question for you, and I'll shift over to the Commissioner, when we look at the ShotSpotter technology and combining that with other technologies, license plates readers, camera systems, is it difficult? Do you -- does the software communicate well? Like, for instance, in Huntington Station, we have a Business Improvement District cameras. There's dozens of cameras that are there. I have legislation that we've done a pilot program where -- I guess my concern is that if there's a gunshot, obviously, having a response in a few minutes versus being able to turn a camera to the area within a few seconds. Does your software specifically have its own cameras, or do you allow other camera systems to be tied in, or is it just two separate platforms?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

So ShotSpotter does not have a camera component ourselves, but we do have an API, or an Application Programming Interface, which is designed to work with external systems. Camera systems are the most wide-of-often deployed. A number of our customers do have camera systems that take ShotSpotter data. The requirements are it must use a video management system that can take input from another system, and the ability to actually tilt, pan or zoom their cameras. But we do have a number of customers who do take the ShotSpotter incident in real-time. So it will say here's a gunshot, here's the latitude and longitude, and the exact time, and a video management system will take the nearby cameras and point it at the location of the gunshot. In some cases, in the most sophisticated cases that I know of, one camera will tilt to the origination of the gunshot, another camera might slew to the nearest intersection that somebody might be making -- using as an escape route.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you. I appreciate your technology, and I appreciate you answering my questions. And, Commissioner, thank you for coming up, and I appreciate you taking some of my questions.

First of all, I wanted to express my appreciation to the Second Precinct, which is my Legislative District. Inspector Brady really has done a lot of community outreach and a lot of work with my office. And, really, I'm impressed with some of the gains that we've been able to make and -- but

I'm always looking to improve. But that is really a testament to your leadership and really the fine work that you've done.

But specifically with ShotSpotter, with regards to this officer that went out and trained, can you tell me approximately right now how many officers in Suffolk County have been trained in ShotSpotter technology and response to activations?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Good morning, everyone here. To my right is Chief Mark White, Chief of Support Services, should he have to answer any questions.

To respond to -- there's only 17 sector cars that fit within the five areas that we have the ShotSpotter technology; virtually every one of those have gone. But, in addition to those individuals, there's about five hundred and some-odd officers. But they would be less likely to utilize it, because they're not working in the areas where the ShotSpotter is giving us the information.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

As we look at -- there's a couple of, I guess, policy issues when we look at ShotSpotter. One, the sensor location, and the coverage area, which I can understand it's not something that you would want to advertise. And then, also, as we look at information data that comes in, and I do appreciate the reports that I've been getting. Can you talk to me just a little bit about the policy with regards to releasing reports? I know there's a safety issue, but that information is able to be FOIA'd, and, you know, I do have interested bodies or persons in my Legislative District that are constantly looking for that information and have to go through kind of a process. Is there a policy in place with regards to the reports that you are able to share? And what would be the concerns in terms of divulging more information to the public?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

The reports that we have been issuing have really been internal. And for those Legislators who requested it, we feel that it's -- at this point, that's the best way until we get a chance to really evaluate the system. We're using December 31st as six months to have some true basis, since we've really had -- as Mr. Hawkins mentioned, we have been very -- had many meetings with the ShotSpotter individuals and incorporated people, and we have sent additional people to training. So we want to give a fair run for the ShotSpotter system before we make an analysis, or before we go to any public with what we have. We're just giving you individual months as we see them, and the summation for months from June on would -- to October 31st. Now, we would prefer to wait until after we do an analysis, a detailed analysis before we go public.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

But the information currently, if a member of the public, or I have like -- Mr. Harris is in my Legislative District, who's a community leader who has actually had to FOIA that information. So I guess it is public information, or is it internal work product? How -- where is our standard?

George, do you have -- can you give, I guess, a legal take on that? That if I have a constituent who comes to me and says, *"You're my Legislator, you have information on ShotSpotter, I want that information,"* what -- should we be sharing? What are we legally obligated to share? And is this an internal policy that is a legal -- that holds legal --

**MR. NOLAN:**

Well, you know, every County department has their own FOIL officer who makes the determinations. I believe the Police Department has taken the position that there is an exemption to the Freedom of Information Law in terms of releasing records, if they would reveal a public safety, law enforcement technique, investigative technique, or might endanger the public safety to release the records. You know, I think most likely, at this point, these reports would fit under that exemption and would not

necessarily be released to the public.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And with regards to just the cameras I had mentioned earlier, I know that last year -- I appreciate the Police working with me where we have a pilot program looking at the potential of being able to turn cameras wherever possible. Have we been able to do any of those things? Have the cameras assisted us in any way so far?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yes. We've implemented your suggestion, and to date, there's been no information gleaned from the use of the camera system.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

It seems that it would be a good idea because of just the immediate response. Is there an issue of having someone manning the cameras? What would be -- why isn't it working, or what would be just -- I don't know. You may not have any, but do you have a sense of what the challenge would be?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

I can only tell you, Legislator Spencer, that when we have officers actually monitoring, when the alarm goes off, and we have not learned anything at all that would be -- help us at all in any of the shots areas.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you so much. I do -- again, I'd like to have some more conversations just privately and with some constituents that -- to just kind of help them feel more comfortable. But I do appreciate what you've been able to do in Huntington Station. And I thank you for answering my questions, Commissioner. Thank you. I'm good.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Rob.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you. And thank you to both of you for being here today. I've got a couple of quick questions, and I won't prolong them, although I think I'm going to be looking to set up some sort of follow-up with the Police Department on the issue. I think I've been pretty clear about my support of ShotSpotter, and that I think this is a tool that we need to utilize.

Over the last couple of months, I actually organized a trip to Nassau County to -- with a number of my colleagues to take a look at how they implement the system, and it was quite eye-opening to see how they utilize this. And it's certainly just one tool of many that they utilize in their Bureau to deal with not just gunshots, but with a number of different crime problems that they've had in some of their neighborhoods.

So my first question is for Mr Hawkins, specifically to that calibration of the system in terms of what level of weapon you can actually detect. And I know that you have said that the system that we have here in Suffolk County is only guaranteed to detect gunshots from weapons that are over a 22 caliber bullet. But correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe Nassau County actually specifically requires you to get down to that 22 caliber weapon, that they wanted that specific information, and, as a result, it may have required a few extra sensors to go in, but they felt it was a needed tool, given the types of gunshots that they were experiencing in the neighborhoods, and that the 22 caliber weapons were not something that were -- you know, the bad guys shy away from. And so they wanted that information, and if it means that, you know, they pick up the starter pistol over at the high school, that when the track meet is being held, then so be it, they want to have that

information; is that correct? I mean is that something that you're capable of doing, you just decided that it's a little bit more intensive and extensive in terms of the number of sensors you need to do that accurately?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

At the risk of potentially walking into a trap, I don't think that I am. The answer would be no, that's not something that we do, certainly not in the year-and-a-half that I've been with ShotSpotter. We don't have a play, if you will, that says, *"Well, if you just add more sensors, we'll be able to commit to a 22 detection with the same accuracy that we do with"* --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, they certainly reflect -- they certainly made it clear to us that they have -- their system is guaranteed for a 22.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

I'm not aware of that.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Well, I'd ask that you take a look at that and --

**MR. HAWKINS:**

I will.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Now, of course, they've got the older system that's not the one that relies on the system that we have here in Suffolk, that, you know, they bought their sensors from you and they maintain the system themselves at this point in time.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

Well, one thing I should clarify, then, as well, the only difference between Nassau's system and Suffolk County's system is the service that we wrap around that. It is exactly the same technology, the same software, the same firmware, the same hardware, the same detection algorithms. There is no difference in the technology or what it can detect at all, strictly the service we provide in terms of the reviewed alerts and other things that go with the flex program.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Sure. So I'd just ask that you take a look at that, because it sounded to me from them that they made that. Not only, you know, is it something they have, they made it very pointed that they wanted that, that they insisted that that be part of what they got.

Commissioner, I've just got a couple of quick questions, and it's to the point of, you know, talking to our neighbors and seeing how they use the system. Certainly, they were part of the impetus that made us want to bring the system to Suffolk County, because they felt it was so successful for them. Have we sent anybody to meet with the Commissioner or Sergeant Ryder over there who runs the system for them; and if so who?

**CHIEF WHITE:**

Good morning, Legislator. The Suffolk County Police Criminal Intelligence Section is the mirror of what Sergeant Ryder and that group in National Intelligence Section do, and they meet on a regular basis, visit back and forth with each other and speak frequently.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So they have actually toured the system and seen how Sergeant Ryder implements it? And I'm speaking not just -- you know, it was quite eye-opening, honestly, when we were there. I often

hear about how police work is not what you see on TV and CSI, but in some ways what they were doing in that room, and I'm sure they don't want us to divulge everything of how they do what they do, it seems like it was CSI to me. You know, it was really quite an extensive system that relied on quite a few things. And, certainly, ShotSpotter was not the only thing that they used in determining, you know, how they just used it as a number -- as a tool. Are we looking at doing that? I know we've talked about going towards intelligence-led policing. Are we looking at trying to copy their model?

**CHIEF WHITE:**

The analysis center that they have is nice, it's state-of-the-art, it's really great, but we have an equivalent type of operation, not the same, done in a different manner, but with our criminal intelligence-led policing center. So we do have the same type of environment. And they get all the data, the ShotSpotter data from us and analyze that on a full-time basis; they have analysts.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Do they do that in real-time?

**CHIEF WHITE:**

We do the analysis of the ShotSpotter data now since June in real-time. As soon as an alert comes in --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Good.

**CHIEF WHITE:**

-- we get it and --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'd appreciate the opportunity, and we'll reach out and I'll have my office set it up, but the opportunity to come and see how that the system works.

**CHIEF WHITE:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

As a follow-up to that, and it actually hits on a point that Mr. Hawkins brought up during his presentation, do we review the data afterwards, and I obviously get the reports that we send, to see if there are patterns showing up? Obviously, if we have three unsubstantiated incidents at a specific location, as pointed out earlier, does that maybe raise some flags to say, *"Hey, wait a minute, maybe this is something more than just an unsubstantiated situation"*?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yes, we definitely do. That's a part of the intelligence-led policing, and we did it before we had the ShotSpotter. We track and have always tracked high incidences of crime and patterns that they have in order to make and be more efficient policing.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Sure. And I guess this is an added tool, because now it's not just a -- you know, incidences that were reported by 911, you're actually getting a very specific location. And to have three unsubstantiateds at a very specific location to me would indicate that there's a probability that there's something that's not -- that is real going on there, right?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

If that were to occur, I would agree with you, but I don't believe that's the case.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

He just showed us one. He just had it in his slide presentation. There was a house where there were three incidences within the same backyard.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

I don't think he believed and said it was unsubstantiated.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No, that's exactly what he said. He said they were unsubstantiated; that we indicated that were unsubstantiated situations, and that he felt were most certainly gunshots, but we had them classified as unsubstantiated. I mean, I just saw it. I mean --

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

I think he was talking about the --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Am I missing something here?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

No. The one incident with the large "M" there was one that was this five-gunshot incident that came back as unfounded. The other two incidents in the backyard, I don't know that those were unfounded. There may have been gunshots that, in fact, did produce shell casings or something like that.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So I would like us to check that, then, because that's certainly to me an indication that there's an issue at that location, because you've got three little dots within two houses.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

No. All our Criminal Intelligence does is provide the officers with detailed maps on a regular basis. We're fully aware of where these shots are coming in when they're actual shots. And even if they're considered -- we call it unsubstantiated only because we said we can't prove it.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No. Absolutely, and I can appreciate that. There's not always going to be the ability to pick up a shell casing, or, you know, sometimes these guys are smart enough to pick up their own shell casings, I understand that.

Okay. That's all I have. And I have a lot more questions, but I don't think they're necessarily appropriate for this venue.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

DuWayne, you have a question?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Sure. And I guess I would like to go back to Legislator Calarco's last comment. A lot of the -- well, I'll say several of the slides are in my district, so, obviously, I'm concerned. I'll just leave it at that.

So, with the backyard issue that Legislator Calarco referred to, was it -- there's an unsubstantiated category or designation, then there's an unfounded, or are they both the same, or am I making that?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

We don't have an unfounded. We have a false --

**LEG. GREGORY:**

False.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

-- and unsubstantiated or confirmed.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

We have three categories.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So, as I understand it, the sensors reported several shots in the backyard. Obviously, if they reported it as a shot, they feel that it's a shot, a gunfire, but they were unsubstantiated when the local officers came to the scene, or responded, or at some point --

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Unfortunately, I really can't tell you which incident you're speaking about, so I can't address this. If I had the specific incident, we could research it and I could get back to you on it.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think it's -- it's this one right here. I mean, if you would like to play it again. And I believe there is a date on it, right? That's in September or --

**MR. HAWKINS:**

This was September 28th, 3:13 AM, on Williams Avenue in Amityville.

**CHIEF WHITE:**

Yeah, unsubstantiated.

**MR. HAWKINS:**

The comment, by the way, that I've circled, and you can see is -- the word "unfounded" was not from the report, this is what was the dispatcher typed into the alerts console with whatever feedback they got from the patrol officer. What the patrol officer said, we have no idea, of course, but the dispatcher, whose log-in ID we can see there, typed in the word "unfounded".

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So when your -- you guys, ShotSpotter, picked up this sound, you reported it to the Suffolk PD, and they reported back to you that it was -- they didn't find anything; correct, yes, no?

**MR. HAWKINS:**

That's correct, yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And then how -- so then it comes back, and that -- is that one that the Police Department, when we get that report, did that come back as a false, unsubstantiated -- I mean, I don't want to put you on the spot, because you don't have it.

**CHIEF WHITE:**

No, no. That would be --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You have that one?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

It's unsubstantiated.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It's unsubstantiated, okay. But when we listened to that today, it certainly sounds like gunfire.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

We treat them all as gunfire. What we're suggesting is that we don't know for a fact it was.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So the police officer went, and we don't know if he went in the backyard to look to see if there was a body, or shells, or anything.

I would hope he did.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

All these shots are taken very seriously by our officers that are in these sector cars. They're our best -- among our best police officers we have on the street. We're not broadcasting the entire Suffolk County --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

-- we had mentioned at a recent meeting. These areas that we have, the five areas are among our best officers. They take every gunshot for real. They do detail work on it. They do the neighbor check -- neighborhood check, foot chase for casings, and bodies, and wounded individuals. This is our best -- these are our best officers.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, sorry we jumped in.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

No, no problem. My line of questioning was really going towards what I was going to ask next is through the statistics; is there a higher level of unsubstantiated incidents in one particular area than another, and could that lead to -- because when we -- I went on the trip to Nassau as well, and to Legislator Calarco's point, that I forget the gentleman's name, the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner who sat with us --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Inspector.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Inspector, excuse me, right. They had talked about their system is refined so that they could pick up a 22, and the reason that they were able to do that was, for example, we have, say, 32 sensors per square mile, they went to the extra effort of having, say, 64 or 50. It's significantly more sensors to be able to pick up those finer calibers. That's my recollection. I could be wrong, but that's what I remembered. But are there -- are we seeing in the data more incidents of unsubstantiated reports that any other area -- like is there more in, say, Amityville, or Bellport, or Huntington Station, or is it kind of spread out throughout the system?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

It's really pretty spread out throughout. We have 211 notifications since June to October 31st, of which we have confirmed 21. That's the only ones. We had 85 false out of those numbers. The rest are unsubstantiated, which means we can neither prove nor disprove, but we treat it as a gunshot when we get the call.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right, okay. All right. And has there been any communication between your office and ShotSpotter about maybe rearranging sensors, if necessary, or adjusting the technology, if necessary?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

As we mentioned earlier, these reports that we've been giving is just to increase communications, and that would be something that would be best answered by our experts as to whether or not these sensors should be moved or additional sensors be needed; that would be yet to be determined.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. That's all I have at this point. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Oh, sorry. John, I forgot you asked.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No problem. Commissioner, my questions are very, very simple, I think, hopefully. One, first of all, the training. How did the training go for the officer that went out there to the California site for ShotSpotter?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

It went well.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It did? And so he's been able to bring it back and kind of implement it? Has it been able to enhance the use of the product, from the Department's perspective?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

At this point, the officers who have the existing systems have all been trained. We're looking for our new officers who are in the Academy now, and for future enhancements as the company presents them. He'll be able to then bring it out to the officers who are currently trained and update it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And thank you to ShotSpotter for going ahead and following through with that. I recall that's something that we discussed when we met in August, I guess it was, right?

My other question is just a real broad, simple one. From your perspective, our officers have a whole bunch of tools, I guess. They have a weapon, they have a radio, they have a vest, they have a car. Is this tool, ShotSpotter, something that helps them do the job; is it worthwhile having?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

The cost benefit analysis will be yet to be determined, but, yes, it is a tool. It's another tool in the toolbox to help us.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So you're still -- you acknowledge there's some value to it, but you're still doing your due diligence to see whether or not the expense associated with it is something that's justifiable based on, I guess, the value that it brings to help in catching bad guys?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yes, you're correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. How soon do you think we'll know? When do we expect to see that CBA?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

As we suggested at earlier meetings, we wanted to go through December 31st and then do an evaluation.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. But as of right now, my recollection is we did fund into the 2014 budget whatever the monetary amount was, 200, 250. John. How about from BRO? What is it, John, how much in 2014?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Three-fifty?

**MR. ORTIZ:**

I believe it's 334,500.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All of that out-of-County funding? Have we exhausted whatever those donations or grants were that were originally secured by Legislator Eddington?

**MR. ORTIZ:**

We get 47,500 in revenue.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We still have that left from the donation component? And is that part of the 334, or is it in addition to?

**MR. ORTIZ:**

The 334 is actually net.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's net County money, okay. All right. So I'll be eager to see what the CBA is, then, when we get into the beginning of next year. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I don't think there's any more questions. And so I guess I want to say thank you, Mr. Hawkins, for the presentation. And, you know, hopefully, our relationship will continue to improve. I don't want to say it's not good, but continue to improve, that -- because I do believe, you know, ShotSpotter is not 100%, and like the Commissioner said, it's a two. And I like the fact that when a police officer knows that shots have been fired, that he knows what he's going into, unlike what it was in the past.

And I can tell you, in the North Bellport community, I have heard the comments, it's been a deterrent, and there has been less gunfire in the North Bellport community. There hasn't been zero gunfire, but it's still happening. But the fact of the matter is, is that it's -- it has helped to arrest someone. It has helped the police officers to get to a location where someone was shot. So, you know, what could be better than that, to make sure that it's possibly saving a life, and, again, possibly saving the life of a police officer who might be responding to something that he doesn't really know what he's going into. And it certainly gives them an opportunity to say how many police

cars we need to send. And I'm assuming that, well, when there's a phone call for a gunfire, you're not going to send one cop, you're going to send a few of them, so -- but I always believe it is good.

When the question came up about the 22 calibers, just out of curiosity, and maybe you can answer this, is the types of gun crimes that are going on, how many can you relate to 22 caliber weapons?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Generally higher caliber automatic weapons today.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

They're higher than a 22?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. You know, just Rob and I were saying, I said, "*Well, I think a 22 is probably easier to buy than anything.*" You know, I think you can go to Walmart and buy a 22 caliber, you know. But, you know, I just was curious what type of guns are most common when it comes to gun crime.

Okay. So thank you, Mr. Hawkins. And I know we'll be continuing with the conversation.

*(\*The following testimony was taken by Alison Mahoney & Was transcribed by Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide\*)*

And, Commissioner, I don't know if there were any more questions with regards to some of the stuff on the agenda. I did receive the e-mail. I know we have a bill here for the body armor, which I'm glad to see, and I did receive the e-mail with regards to the body armor. And I believe the -- there will be a need for 550 vests by the end of the year for replacement, and there's a \$350,000 resolution right now for the purchase of new vests. How many vests does that purchase?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

About 335, 340.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So that's about 340? Okay. So we'll be able to buy, with 350,000, buy 340 vests. And -- but at the end of the year -- so we're still short 220 vests; correct, for the end of the year?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yeah, it's about 500 -- I have 540 vests, actually, we could purchase, and next year we're going to need the remainder, which we'll probably come to you again in '14 for additional funding.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Okay. So you're -- what I'm reading here is that we need -- 550 vests will need to be replaced by the end of the year. This resolution for 350,000 will buy 340. So at the end -- at the beginning of next year you're going to be coming back for how many more?

**CHIEF WHITE:**

I'm sorry, Legislator Browning. We have some vests in stock.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Oh, okay.

**CHIEF WHITE:**

This resolution for 350,000 is going to be for 535, not 335 vests. And we'll need funding next year, we'll come back for the balance of vests that are going to expire next year for 350, or about 350 vests.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Now, does that get everybody -- that -- that has all of our police officers are now equipped with the necessary vests and --

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yes, we'll be current if we get the additional vests.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And I'm trying to remember, was it seven years? I'm sorry, I know --

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Seven years.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Seven years is the lifespan, okay. Okay. Does anybody else have any questions about anything else, while we got them? I guess not.

Okay. Kara, you had a question about cars. And I believe -- and you did, too.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Go ahead.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So I don't know if Gil is still here. Is he still here? Yeah.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Mr. Anderson; he is out there, I see him.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, I had heard that we've been waiting -- well, this is about maintenance and cars that have been sitting in lots for months, if not years on end, and we just haven't been able -- you know, we have folks -- sector car operators doubling up because they don't have their car. So I just wanted to know if that was going on, and obviously we, in the budget, are trying to help this situation. I don't know that that'll be enough to rectify it, but I want to just have an understanding of how we're handling this and what's happening.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Gil, if you can give us an update. I know we put in the budget for three new mechanics for next year in our budget. So hopefully that'll help you to get the work done a lot quicker. But also, you know, if you can -- I did send you an e-mail and I don't know if you had enough time to respond to that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. Yeah, no, I haven't been able to. But, obviously, the three additional staff would help. Again, you know, we just, as I stated I think at the last meeting, we just hired three additional auto mechanics, so that will hopefully clear up -- help us clear up the backlog. I mean, we have --

honestly, we have 492 vehicles that are under repair right now, 235 of them are police, 157 are DPW's own; we have 13 in Probation and another 87, so that brings us to a total 492. The fleet staff, you know, we have 41 filled vacancies, 26 of which are mechanics, and nine vacancies; we have a few guys out on disability, they're getting older. There's no doubt that we need staff. We have gotten money in our budget to make repairs and I will -- I am planning on sending out some of the repairs that the Director of Probation mentioned, the 13 cars, get them, you know, to help them out as well. You know, as everybody knows, the budget is the budget, I mean, we're asking towns to help pay for overtime for dredging. I mean, you know, we're doing the best we can.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, right. So you -- I'm looking at an e-mail I got in September from John Ortiz, and it's -- it says DPW auto mechanics, it has 28 is what you currently have; back in 2003 you had 48. So is that about right, 28 auto mechanics?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Sounds right, yeah. That sounds about right.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So now you've got three SCIN forms signed this year?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We actually filled -- we actually filled two of the positions. I'm not sure about the third.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, okay. And with a bit of luck we can get three more signed next year. And I know one -- you know, you said now you've been sending some of your cars out to shops to try and get it done a little quicker. So that was one of my questions was, you know, how many vehicles are out at, you know, at the outside shops, how many are sitting in -- at DPW waiting to be repaired, and also a breakdown of Police Department --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- Probation Officers, which you've given me that. And --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, the only thing I don't know is how many we have out to shops; I didn't get that for you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And your DPW vehicles, and I know this is probably -- it's somewhat of a public safety issue anyway, is your DPW vehicles. Because, you know, we had our first little bit of snow, and God forbid we have snow like we did last year, we want to make sure that -- because, you know, I talked to a couple of guys and they said that they broke down while they were plowing. So, you know, we need to make sure that you have your equipment is up to speed.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We are -- we are -- our two priorities in repairs right now are either police public safety vehicles or our snow equipment to make sure we're up and running. You know, those -- any type, any situation in a snowstorm, it's -- the equipment gets beat up pretty heavily. And you know, like I said, we are right now and we will be, I'm confident, ready for any snow that comes in.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. We just want to know that the roads are clear for --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- fire departments, ambulance companies and police departments so that they can make sure they use the roads. You have another question?

**LEG. HAHN:**

You know, I just wanted to understand how serious it was. And what I had heard was happening, you know, is a serious result of this that, you know, you need to come to us and let know, not that we -- if that is, in fact, happening. I don't know that we're doubling up because we don't have a car. I mean, that sounds crazy, but if that's happening, that's when you kinda of come here and you say, *red flag*, you know, *we need this situation taken care of*. So I kind of wanted to understand is that actually happening; are we doubling up sector officers in a car because they don't have a sector car?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

To my understanding, it has happened actually at one occasion, but it may have happened more, it hasn't gotten up to my office.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Question on cars?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah. Likewise, I kind of want to echo what Legislator Hahn is saying. And Gil, the thing that I'll ask you, and I do not expect you to be able to answer this today, but let me see if I can go through it again just kind of quickly. Four hundred and fifty seven vehicles out for repairs, 235 of which are PD and you have 28 people swinging wrenches, two more that you got, two that are out on long-term disability; is that about it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Pretty close. It's 492 is the total.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Oh, even better. Excellent. Okay. The devil is always in the details. You know, if a car's in because it's got an electrical system malfunction that may require -- well, they don't use bus fuses anymore; I don't know what the hell they are, but there's something with the electrical system, you know, that's a minor fix, that's great. If you get a vehicle in because it's thrown a piston or it's got a transmission that's let go or something like that, that's not one day or a half-a-day, that's one week, two weeks, one month, two months.

So 492 is not a homogenous type of number, in that you have minor issues and you have major issues.

So what I'd like to know is is amongst that almost 500 vehicles, how many of them are you looking at, you know, from just what the chilton or whatever says is a simple two-hour repair to something that's a two-week repair. And then we can kind of ascertain, is 28 mechanics, you know, kind of like, you know, spitting in the ocean, or is it something that there's some daylight at the end of some period of time?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I mean, I can get you that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I can tell you that most of our staff is trying to do roll-in/roll-out repairs, the simple things.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Uh-huh.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

When it gets to a more complex thing, we have to send to a vendor, we have to send back to the place we buy it, depending on the age, if it's covered under warranty.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes. I know if it's under warranty, I think, what do we do, in three years -- do we have a three-year or a four-year warranty? What is it with the -- with Ford?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, I know it's 100,000 miles. I don't know what the time is.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Either which; so it's either mileage or years?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, right. And our fleet's getting older, so a lot of the stuff we continually are looking at to see whether it's, you know, is it -- does it make any sense to make the repairs? After a while, you've got a car with 180,000, you've got to replace the whole tranny.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, to the point that then with the next resolution that we see before us where we're being asked to purchase vehicles, it's almost counterproductive. I mean, if we were all to take a five minute walk from here, we'll see about 30 brand new Ford Tauruses sitting in that lot waiting to get whatever I guess our units get, which is the striping, the markings, the additional electrical system, all the things that take a regular Taurus and turn it into a police vehicle.

Now, I think we probably took delivery on them in like late August or early September. And, you know, they're well-kept and safe up there, but they're still sitting there, you know, while there's wrecks or whatever that are going on out in all the precincts, we, you know, we got 500 of them. Are they included in the 500 repairs with new vehicles being introduced into operation, or is that an additional task that our mechanics have to undertake?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe we've actually been trying to send those out for, you know, the installations. I can check, though. I don't know, I'm not sure. I know that we took -- we took possession of them within the past few months, I'm not sure when.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, it was some time I think late summer, you know, mid-August, July, something like that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The resolution, you know, to spend a million dollars on public safety vehicles will provide us with brand new equipment. It will enable us to get rid of or decom aged and very worn units. And again, it also minimizes our need to do maintenance, other than the basic maintenance, because we'll have warranties with them again. So we have a million coming in now, we have five million coming next year and we'll be able to ramp up the fleet again.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I understand that. And trust me, I mean, I realize that, you know, our vehicles, we played with this number back and forth, we've talked about it, there's been years where we had eight million, there's years when we've been down to two million. And we've looked at, you know, 140,000 for decom, 100,000 for decom, wherever. You know, your guys who, you know, are trained in this ultimately have the best idea where to go ahead and cut that, not me. But if I'm being asked to go ahead and vote on yet another expenditure, I try to look at the things like, okay, if we spend the money today and I witness or have experienced what I've seen here with about a 90 to a 120-day lag before a brand vehicle; is it even at the point where they can go ahead and put an officer in it? I'm wondering, are we gonna have that same type of experience. It's almost like why buy it now? I mean, we don't have the ones that we just purchased out yet, ready and into the precincts; that's the part that I'm just trying to, you know, get my -- get my head around.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Understood. And I can find out why they've been sitting, but I think it's more of -- you know, before I say anything, let me find out. Obviously, we need the vehicles. There's no question our fleet is --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We are in complete agreement there.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

But to not get it because we're unable to push out the vehicles to get them out to PD, I think, would be biting our nose to spite our face. We are working on trying to get these vehicles out, without any question.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, but, here's the -- I mean, the other thing that I'm going to say to you is is, you know, without trying to be an obstructionist or something like that, we just talked about the warranty. The warranty period starts the day that we take delivery, and whether it's the calendar or the mileage, we hit a particular thing. If we're looking at 36 months on a warranty and the first four months they're sitting on asphalt, that makes no sense. I'm struggling with it, anyhow. If you can get me some of those answers, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

John, I believe -- Commissioner, you have some comments you want to make?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Yeah, I just want to let you know, Legislator Kennedy, that part of the problem here we discussed during the budgetary process that these new cars are much smaller.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Uh-huh.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

And we had to order smaller monitors and a smaller console in between and rearrange the way we do our computer and radio system. Unfortunately, those parts have not come in, they're coming in as we speak. As soon as they're in, we will be putting them in right away and the cars will be on the street. There's an unusual holdup on these particular cars only because of the new configuration of the cars.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Which -- and I appreciate that, Commissioner. That's -- thank you for sharing that with me. But will we have that -- so, did you order the parts and the material to fit these 30 that are sitting up there plus the other 20 we're going to be asked to acquire for a total of 50, or did you order just for these?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

It's my understanding that not only the 40 we have, but the 24 that are on order that we should get hopefully in the next month or so, they'll be fully fitted. And as Gil mentioned, the -- the way we're pricing them out now, when we're ordering the new cars we're putting in a price of the new computer system that we need to put in, radio system.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You mean in the resolution that we'll see before us? In other words, that last set we just got the vehicle absent the equipment, now this time we're going to be looking at vehicle and equipment?

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Usually we transfer the equipment from one vehicle to another.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But that's not happening now.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

In this particular case --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

-- it's too big.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Sure.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

The officers hit their elbows on the console, on the --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, yes.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

So with that we had the whole new system, so that was the holdup on these here. We tried to -- on the first part of the new Tauruses we got last year, we put in the --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

-- older equipment and we found it was a problem.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I know, I know.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

So we had to change it; unfortunately, delivery is beyond our control.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right. I'll go back to the -- the original basic question that I had for the Commissioner, though, about those 500 vehicles that are sitting waiting for repairs. You know, don't characterize every one of them, but, I mean, you know if a hundred are minor and 400 are major, or something

like that, that would be a help.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'll get you the information before Tuesday.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And, you know, the -- what is the average mileage on a vehicle where you say, *okay, it's time to decommission this vehicle?* Isn't it something like 130,000?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It could go up to -- honestly, it could go up to 180. I mean, we just -- we drive them until it just doesn't make any sense anymore.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. But, you know, like a sector car that's being driven 24/7, I mean, it's taking a beating. So when you get to 120,000, it's really -- while it may clock at 120, it's probably a car that's got maybe 200,000 miles on it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There's no question. I mean, a standard fleet car does not take anywhere -- get the wear and tear that a police vehicle will.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. And, you know, I've got a question, because, you know, an issue's been brought about Detectives and the shortage of cars for Detectives. Do we have sector car's having to drive Detectives to scenes when -- when they're being needed? I don't know if I'm saying this appropriately, but --

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Again, that has not come to my office, but I have been advised that there are occasions when we have to delay our response to a scene, the Detective Division, because of the lack of vehicles.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Can we get a breakdown by precinct of how many -- I know they're not all at the precincts, but, you know, how many Detective cars we do have, or cars available for Detectives by precinct and maybe at Police Headquarters also. And how many Detectives do we have, because I would assume that you should at least have one each, you know.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

No, because they -- there's at least three to a squad, you know, so one's off, one's on 4012 and the other one is --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, okay.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

-- off that day.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So by squad, then; there should be at least one car per squad. Okay. Okay, so, I -- oh, sorry, Kara; I forgot you had a question.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I'm sorry, I forgot that we were going to have you here for this and I would have -- I don't feel like I have all my notes with me; they're on my computer at the office.

But the contracts with mechanic -- the outside mechanics. I mean, I've heard that there's a lot of wait on some of -- and I hope I'm articulating this properly, that there is a lot of weight on those contracts because of how the contracts are -- are written and/or there are problems there. Can you speak to waiting long times? Like, I've heard some of these cars are waiting over 180 days longer, you know, and that sometimes it's because the actual vendor, you know, just isn't adequate. And is there something we can do differently when these contracts expire and should we be doing differently?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We -- we take advantage of both contracts that we have let as well as working through the State contracts. In cases where vendors haven't been responsive -- initially everybody was responsive. Things have slowed down, whether it's the workload we're giving to these guys is too much. We try to -- we try to, within the contract, distribute the work as best we can based on the response we get to the work that we need done.

If -- certainly if it's a contract issue and it's a persistent issue, we could look to somehow terminate the contract and rebid. But then again, any type of bidding process like this the -- the process to let, award and execute could be months; it could be, you know, three to six months. So, again, given the stable of contractors that we have, folks who have responded to our bids as well as those who are on the State contracts, we try to get the work out as best we can and we do monitor it and make sure that, you know, that they're responding properly.

Certainly if there's issues that they're waiting for equipment, things like that, you know, those are out of our control. But, for the most part, we do make sure that it's not just sitting in somebody's yard for reasons that we don't understand or accept.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. No more questions? Okay. I think we're good to go. Thank you, Gil. And I know we have a committee meeting not next week, I think, the following week, so if there's a possibility to get answers to those questions --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Will do.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- for the next meeting, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

I don't think there's anymore. Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Chief.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**

Thank you. I hope you do favorably support that million dollar bond issue for the purchase of the vehicles.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You've got the equipment that's coming up.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. We do have -- Chief Sharkey is here. Is there anything that you need to report on or any issues?

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

*(Shook head no.)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Nope. Our Director of Probation; Patrice, anything? Nothing?

**MS. DLHOPOLSKY:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And, Mr. Holley, I see you're here. Curiosity, how's things going -- how's things going with your negotiations? Let's -- maybe we can make it short and sweet.

**DIRECTOR HOLLEY:**

Yes, ma'am, this will be very short and sweet. Commissioner Williams met with the legal department last Friday, as he said he was going to do, and then got hold of me and the County is in the process of drawing up a draft contract. So that's where we stand.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, I know you'll stay in touch and let me know how things are going. I appreciate it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Madam Chair, just one more question.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sure.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Bob, towards that, I'm glad to hear about that. It's my understanding that you're already beginning to get some response from departments about committing to particular dates for some of the trainings?

**DIRECTOR HOLLEY:**

That's correct, we're scheduling the entire season right now for next year. We had the lottery yesterday where we picked the departments out one at a time so they get first preference, and departments have committed to holding classes out in their regions.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Uh-huh.

**DIRECTOR HOLLEY:**

And we will be assigning the -- the field schedule. It'll be completed by the 1st of December.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And that schedule that you're putting together is going to be a schedule for all of the field trainings and any other instructional stuff; in other words, running the full 2014 calendar.

**DIRECTOR HOLLEY:**

That's correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good. Excellent, glad to hear it. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So, I guess with that, we'll go to the agenda.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

***IR 1508-13 - Adopting Local Law No -2013, A Local Law to require use of safety helmets by all bicyclists in Suffolk County. (Barraga)*** Do I have a motion?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Motion to table, Legislator Gregory. I'll second. And, I don't know, this is -- just to make it quick, this is -- I understand putting a law in place for our children, and I know we do have a law requiring children to wear safety helmets, but I'm inclined to not support something that tells adults what they should or should not do. So that's why I'm supporting the tabling on this. So with that, we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled. (VOTE: 5-1-0-1 - Opposed: Leg. Kennedy - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1592-13 - Terminating the County's ShotSpotter Program (Cilmi).***

I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1690-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to amend Section A13-10 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code to authorize donation of property held by the Police Property Bureau. (Co. Exec.)*** It does -- oh, okay. I'll make a motion to table for a public hearing. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1698-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to enhance and improve Suffolk County's E-911 Service. (Schneiderman)*** I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Madam Chair?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yep.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

After you call the vote.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's tabled. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can I go back to 1508? I'm sorry, I didn't realize that we actually were doing the vote there.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yep.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The motion was to table?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yep.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Can I change my vote to opposed to table?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We're all right with that?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No problem.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, I made my comment; I don't believe we should be telling adults what they can or cannot do.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's fine. I just needed to make sure I --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We are known to be the nanny state.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okey-doke.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I'm not prepared to be supporting that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

A lot of knuckleheads out there, you know?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

You can't fit in the helmet, that's why.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Not my head, that's for sure (*laughter*).

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS**

***IR 1829-13 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal funds awarded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements. (Co. Exec.)*** I'll make a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved and Placed on Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1845-13 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal funds additionally awarded by the U.S. Marshals Service to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements. (Co. Exec.)*** Same motion, same second, same vote. ***Approved and Placed on the Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1846-13 - Accepting and appropriating grant funds from the NYS Division of Criminal Justice to the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner for the Toxicology Laboratory. (Co. Exec.)***

**LEG. HAHN:**

On the motion?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I'll make a motion to approve. That's -- can we put that on the consent calendar?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, so we'll do same motion, same second, same vote. ***Approved and Placed on Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore).***

1871 --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can I just ask a question about 1846?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sure.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Do we have a Medical Examiner?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I don't know if there's anybody here. We don't have a Medical Examiner, but we do have a representative from the County Executive's Office.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We have the budget lady from ME here, too.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, we do have Linda Russo from the Medical Examiner's Office.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Where is she?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And I have, as I promised, I've been watching YouTube videos to -- if, in a pinch, I need to step in and perform an autopsy, I am ready to go. And Doc Spencer said that he would teach me anything I need to know.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

But in all seriousness, we have continued the interview process for finding our next Medical Examiner candidate. And to the best of my knowledge, we have interviewed at least two other candidates, I believe, since the -- since our last meeting.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Do we have a timeline on this? I mean --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We do not at this moment in time.

**LEG. HAHN:**

What happens when we don't have one?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We do have people over there, as we went through at the last General Meeting, who are performing the duties of the Medical Examiner currently.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you.

Okay, *IR 1871-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of replacement Public Safety Vehicles (CP 3512). (Co. Exec.)* I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

On the motion.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So, John, now we just had that conversation before with the Commissioner, both Commissioners. So I'd like you to tell me very specifically, this resolution is for how many cars and how much equipment for each car?

**MR. ORTIZ:**

I don't have that information at my fingertips, but I believe this is for an additional 30 cars, which would include all their equipment.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That is -- in other words, with whatever --

**MR. ORTIZ:**

It's got to be more than 30 if it's a million dollars.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, it can't be 30.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

If you give me a minute, I can find out.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's fine. I just -- you know, based on what the Commissioner just explained -- what do you want to do?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Give us those numbers again; how many cars?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thirty.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Is that how much they are?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Not for a million bucks.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thirty times 30,000.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Thirty million, \$30,000 a car with all the equipment.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No, no.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But that would include the equipment.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

In the contract the vehicle is 30, but then the equipment is --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Gil, can you respond to that? Okay, Gil is here.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'll find out.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's 30 grand.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, you'll find out?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I mean, a computer --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Yeah, but you -- that's including the equipment, right?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Computer, lights, everything else, gives you the other hundred grand.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

It was 30 cars, six for the DA. I believe the police interceptor that we're buying now is less than 30,000 fully equipped.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Say that again, John? In other words, the vehicle off-contract is somewhere in the neighborhood of 25, 26 grand. Then if we're throwing in a whole nother electrical system into that, it's got to be more than \$4,000. Now, a laptop alone oftentimes is one of those Panasonic Toughbooks, which that itself has got about a \$3500 contract price.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

Correct. But I'm not sure these all 30 -- like I said, six are for the DA; not all 30 may be police cars. The remainder --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You know what, John? Can we just --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, go ahead, go ahead.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- get an answer on Tuesday? Is there an opportunity to --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Go ahead, go ahead.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Can we get an answer on this on Tuesday?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Go ahead, go ahead.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Because I know the next committee meeting's going to start in 20 minutes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, good. Yeah. All right. No, I'm fine. Call the vote.

**LEG. HAHN:**

My question is why only 30?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, that's what we're going to have someone come back on Tuesday and give us an answer.

**LEG. HAHN:**

All right.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Agreed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay? Thank you.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

More than happy to.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Great. Okay. So some people are saying they're hungry here, and I'm -- we're between their hunger.

Okay. 1871, we had a motion and, I believe, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Okay, ***it's approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1872-13 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$52,582 in Federal funding from the United States Department of Justice for the Suffolk County Forensic Analysis Quality and Timeliness Improvement Program with 100% support. (Co. Exec.)***

I'll make a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. Second, Legislator Gregory.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved and Place on the Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***1874-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Custom Fitted Ballistic Soft Body Armor Vests (CP3153). (Co. Exec.)***

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Motion to approve, Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)*

*IR 1877-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to strengthen the Animal Abuse Offenders Registry. (D'Amaro)* I'll make a motion to table for public hearing.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved (sic). *Tabled for Public Hearing (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)*

*IR 1879-13 - Requesting Legislative approval of a contract award for Canine Veterinarian Services for the Suffolk County Police Department. (Co. Exec.)* I'll make a -- is it -- well, can anybody answer? I guess I'll make a motion to approve; and second, Legislator Calarco. Is that a new contract or is that just renewing a contract; do you know?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Browning, the information that I have was that this was an RFP that was sent out and that we only had a sole provider --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

-- and that -- that this is the reason that it's in front of the Legislature at this point in time. My information does not indicate whether it is a renewal or a new contract altogether; however, if you adopt it, I promise I'll get you that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Tuesday.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Tuesday.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. So we had a motion to approve and a second; did we? Did we have a second?

**MS. HOWARD:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)*

*IR 1935-13 - Approving an increase in fleet for the Suffolk County Police Department's Criminal Intelligence Bureau at no cost to the County through the use of Asset Forfeiture Funds. (Co. Exec.)* We have a motion to approve. Second?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1936-13 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$17,203 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the County Police Department's participation in the Long Island Cyber Crime Task Force (LICCTF) with 77.01% support. (Co. Exec.)***

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Motion to approve, Legislator Spencer. Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

***IR 1937-13 - Accepting and appropriating a Supplemental Award of Federal funding in the amount of \$1,200 from the United States Department of Justice, U.S. Marshals Service, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Regional Fugitive Task Force with 77.02% support. (Co. Exec.)*** Same motion, same second, same vote; how's that?  
***Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

And ***IR 1974-13 - Accepting and appropriating a grant from the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in the amount of \$25,000 for FY2013 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) to be administered by the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office, a member of the East End Marine Task Force and to execute grant related agreements in Suffolk County with 100% support. (Co. Exec.)*** I'll make a motion to approve and place on consent calendar.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

*(Nodded head yes).*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. ***Approved and Place on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Muratore)***

And with that, we have nothing more on the agenda, so motion to adjourn. Second, Legislator Calarco, and we're adjourned.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 PM\*)***

***{ } - DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY***