

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, December 12, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson

Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair

Legislator DuWayne Gregory

Legislator Kara Hahn

Legislator John M. Kennedy

Legislator Tom Muratore

Legislator William Spencer

Also in Attendance:

Presiding Officer Wayne Horsley - District #14

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature

Sarah Simpson - Office of Counsel to the Legislature

Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature

Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning

Kellianne Sacchitello - Aide to Legislator Muratore

Lora Gellerstein - Aide to Legislator Spencer

Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy

Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory

Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay

Debbie Tinnirello - Aide to Legislator Hahn

Bobby Knight - Aide to Presiding Officer

Sean Rogan - Aide to Legislator-Elect McCaffrey

John Ortiz - Senior Budget Analyst/Legislative Budget Review Office

Tom Vaughn - County Executive's Office

Marie Berkoski - County Executive's Office

John Marafino - County Executive's Office

Ed Webber - Commissioner/Suffolk County Police Department

Mark White - Chief of Support Services/Suffolk County Police Department

Robert Waring - Captain/Chief of Department's Office/SCPD

Anthony Schwartz - Sergeant/Chief of Department's Office/SCPD

Bill Madigan - Chief of Detectives/Suffolk County Police Department

Adina Beedenbender - Assistant to the Police Commissioner/SCPD

Michael Sharkey - Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office

Jay Egan - Suffolk County FRES Commission

Patrice Dishopolsky, Director, Suffolk County Probation Department

Christine Larkin - Vice-President/Probation Officers Association

Lou Tutone - 1st Vice-President/Suffolk County Police Benevolent Assoc

Russ McCormick - Sgt-at-Arms/Suffolk County Detective's Association

Public Safety Committee - 12/12/13

Jim Bruenfelder - Superior Officers Association
Jimmy Roddin - Superior Officers Association
Jose Nunez - Secretary/Deputy Sheriffs Police Benevolent Association
Arthur Sanchez - Treasurer/Deputy Sheriffs Police Benevolent Assoc.
Suzanne McBride - AME/President/Police Emergency Unit
Bob McConville - Selden Fire Department
Michael Gunther - Parents for Megan's Law
All Other Interested Parties.

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter

*(*The meeting was called to order at 9:42 A.M. *)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, good morning. We are going to begin our Public Safety Committee meeting. If everyone would rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

Salutation

And if we could give a moment of silence for those who defend our country home and abroad, and also for Jack (**get last name from Josh**) who is being buried today, retired from the Suffolk County Police Department.

Moment of Silence Observed

Thank you. Okay. I don't see any cards; no cards? Wow. Okay. Is there anyone in the room who would like to speak? Okay.

Okay, so we will begin with the presentation.

We have our County Attorney, Dennis Brown, Commissioner Webber. Is the County Attorney here?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

I don't see him, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay. Thomas, is he coming?

MR. VAUGHN:

I was told that he is, so we're just confirming where he is right now.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Would you prefer that we wait for him or --

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- you're good to go?

MR. VAUGHN:

No, I think we'd like to wait for the County Attorney.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Well, then we'll go through the agenda until he gets here. Unless -- I know that I did ask -- I guess while we're waiting, I did put in a request that there was an issue about the sex offenders, and I guess if we want to get to that one?

Newsday reported about sex offenders who have gone among the missing, and there is a report that there was twelve in Suffolk County. So I did put in a request to find out if our Police Department could give us some answers on the twelve people, who they are, not necessarily by name, but if we do know where they are. And with that, Mr. Madigan, if you could give us a report on that, I would appreciate it.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Good morning, Legislator Browning. Good morning. Thank you very much for inviting us here --

MS. MAHONEY:

Excuse me? I'm sorry.

MS. ORTIZ:

Just tap the button once.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Good enough? Can everybody hear?

MS. MAHONEY:

Yes. Thank you.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Thank you very much for inviting us here, or me here to talk to you today about the twelve sex offenders that have warrant status here in the County of Suffolk. Can I start off by saying they're not all missing, okay, so let's just put that to rest right off the bat.

I'd like to talk a little bit about what goes into it, maybe explain the process a little bit, and then talk specifically about the twelve that are, in fact, in warrant status and have absconded from Suffolk County jurisdiction.

Just by way of explanation, Level III sex offenders are due to report and do an address verification every 90-days; they have to come into a police precinct, meet with Detectives in the General Service Squad. Level I's and Levels II's are responsible to do that once per year, and then there are certain other requirements, but that's specifically what we're talking about, warrants that have been issued for ones that have absconded or left their known residence here in Suffolk.

Basically when an offender -- they're all flagged in our system. I think we have one of the most stringent supervisory policies probably in the State of New York, maybe in the country, of supervising these sex offenders. We set up a flag system on the 91st day. If a Level III sex offender does not appear, basically a flag goes off in our Special Victims Section and an investigation is begun.

(*Legislator Spencer entered the meeting at 10:47 A.M. *)

We begin to look into where that sex offender is, what contacts we have with him, what contacts we have for him, what address he lives at or lived at, what phone number we have for him, and any other -- what job he has, we'll check his job to see, maybe there's an honest mistake. Maybe the person had a heart attack or is sick or is in the hospital and there's some reason for this absence from us or failure to register. What's that's determined that that's not the case, we then have a

Public Safety Committee - 12/12/13

meeting with the District Attorney's Office. We sit down with the Special Victims Unit from the District Attorney's Office to determine if a warrant will, in fact, be issued. Prior to 2007 those warrants were a misdemeanor; since 2007, it's been upgraded and it is now a felony for the person not to report within their allotted time, or to verify their address.

At that point, if an agreement between the two agencies, the Police Department and the District Attorney's Office, a warrant would be issued for the person and then entered into the system. What that warrant does for us, it gives us the ability to put it into NCIC and anywhere in the country, if that person, that offender has contact with a police agency, the warrant can be executed and we can bring them back. Okay? Once the warrant is issued, we then begin the process of actually looking for them on a more broad basis. We incorporate our partners, we deal with United States Marshal Service all the time, they are great partners to us here in the Suffolk County Police Department; Immigration & Custom Enforcement, better known as ICE, we deal with them depending on the status of the individual that is now absconded. We also deal with Probation and Parole, obviously, for obvious reasons; the person may have been on probation, may have been on parole, they may have further contact information that we can use.

Since this Administration began in 2012, and more recently in 2013, we've actually incorporated a Warrant Squad, which are a Sergeant and six to eight Police Officers that all their main job is to do is go and find people in warrant status and arrest them and bring them into justice. Okay? That's what we do. It's force multiplier, we work with our fellow -- you know, fellow partners in law enforcement in our attempts to capture these suspects.

Let's talk about the twelve a little bit. It's not twelve anymore. I can tell you honestly, probably as the date of that, one of them was arrested this week. Okay? He was not arrested here in Suffolk County, he was arrested in Nassau County. Another one of the subjects was arrested in Texas and is currently incarcerated in Texas. Our warrant is lodged with the Texas authorities, so that when he is released from a jail in Texas, he will be extradited back to New York, to Suffolk County to face the charges here. The person was not arrested for a sex offense in Texas, he was actually arrested for unauthorized use of a vehicle and fleeing the police down in Texas. He's due to get out in one week and our warrant has been lodged with them. A third person, through our contacts with ICE, has been deported; he's back in -- excuse me, Columbia, I believe; yes, Columbia.

Our investigation into what would be the remaining nine have indicated that one of them is in El Salvador; this is confirmed through our partners in ICE. We got the information originally from his mother, so Mom actually did tell us the truth because we were able to confirm that through ICE. We have two other -- oh, we have one other that's also in El Salvador. We have one that is in the Dominican Republic. We can't show him leaving here; what we can show is he filed to get a U.S. Passport in the Dominican Republic in order to return here and it was denied. So I'd say with a certain level of certainty that he's in the Dominican Republic and has not been able to come back to our country.

All these people remain in warrant status. There are other warrants that we have where the person is deceased and they're out of the country, we can't get a death certificate. We can't clear the warrant if the person is, in fact, deceased.

So I guess -- to back up a second, the way I'd like to address it is there's three of them, I know where they are; one's in jail here in Suffolk County. He's currently -- he was in jail as of this morning, he was arrested Tuesday; one is in jail in Texas; and the third person I know for a fact was deported back to Columbia. So that's three off the board.

The next five that I'll talk about -- and that includes the one where his mother told us he's in El Salvador and also ICE records indicate he's in El Salvador. Those five, I'm not going to say assertively that I know a hundred percent that that's where they are, but I believe strongly, and I

Public Safety Committee - 12/12/13

think the evidence would indicate, that is where, they are at. The one in there, the one that was in El Salvador, we have another one that's in El Salvador and that's confirmed through records with ICE. We have the third person that's in the Dominican Republic and there were attempts to come back to our country from the Dominican Republic and is denied. So, you know, I can't say a hundred percent he's in the Dominican Republic, but I can feel fairly certain that that's where he's at.

We have a fourth person that was, in fact, arrested in Maryland in March of this year for an unrelated crime that was not a sexual offense. It was a relatively minor crime, he was arrested utilizing a false name and an alibi which turns out now would be an alibi for him. And the person, before the fingerprints came back, got out of custody on bail status. So we are following up with the Maryland authorities as to whatever leads they may have there. Any time something like that happens, it's very good for us because it develops new information. We get a cell phone number, we get an address that he used in Maryland and we're able to take that, follow-up on it and hopefully we're able to locate him now with the help of the Maryland authorities and the United States Marshals, so that's four.

We have one other one that is in Virginia, and we have been in close contact with the Virginia authorities in an attempt to locate him in Virginia. So that takes care of approximately, I believe, eight of the missing, for lack of a better word. There are four others. One of them is -- and I hope by the end of today will be in custody. We have some very strong leads on him through a family member that he had a baby with a girl in the city and we're still trying to track that down.

So again, my point is we don't let these people -- it doesn't rest. We don't stop, it doesn't go away. If you called me today and asked me how many warrants we have, I would tell you eleven, because, you know, I can't execute the one in Texas. There are three other people, our last known address is -- one of them's in the Bronx, we sent officers into the Bronx to look for them in the Bronx to try to apprehend them in there; we have another one that has an address in Sunnyside, Queens. We've been in there on numerous occasions to look for him there and we're not getting -- not that we're not getting cooperation, the people that are there are saying that name, that face, doesn't recognize, we don't have anybody here that recognizes them. So it's not for a lack of them trying to help us, we just -- it's just not there.

By putting them into warrant status, what that gives us is the ability to basically, if they come into contact with any law enforcement agency in the country, they will contact us hopefully before they get out of custody, a la the Maryland case. But generally speaking, we would be looking to get them while they're in custody and then we lodge a warrant with them and then we extradite them and bring them back.

We are now currently in the process -- back up a second. There are thousands, give or take, numbers in Suffolk County of sex offenders. They're in our system, the Suffolk County Police system. When they come into contact with any law enforcement agency in Suffolk County, the next day our Special Victim Section gets a notification. That could be a traffic ticket, that could be an ambulance call if they get taken to the hospital, that could be a domestic related incident where they then have a domestic with somebody and basically a report is generated. Any type of report; they could be reporting a crime to their own vehicle and then that report goes into the system and it generates a report to our Special Victim Section for follow up.

What we're currently -- and the plans, this is the first we really talked about it -- for 2014, we had a meeting with the County Executive's Office the other day to get the approval and it was approved. We're going to put the 35,000 sex offenders, registered sex offenders in the State of New York into our computer system. He said *why?* Well, if an absconder from Buffalo comes to Suffolk County and has Police contact, it obviously would have to be a law enforcement, our plan is it will generate that same kickback report to our Special Victim Section the next day. It may be nothing, it may be

nothing at all, but if that person is not supposed to be outside of Buffalo, we can contact the Buffalo authorities and maybe that person will be in warrant status.

Also, on top of that, we'll know where the sex offenders are if they come into contact with law enforcement in Suffolk. It's a prudent idea. I believe, I can't say with a hundred percent certainty it's the first of its kind in the State of New York, but it will give us access to the 35,000, the thousand we already have, and access to at least know who the 35,000 are that are listed on the DCJS website, and that we hope to bring forward and get done early in 2014. I think it's a good idea, I don't think anybody would argue with that, and that's what we plan to move forward with moving into 2014.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, I appreciate it. So I guess Suffolk County residents should be very comfortable to know that pretty much those so called missing twelve, they're not in Suffolk, most of them, which is a great thing.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

I would love to come in here and tell you that all of them are in custody and they're all sitting in the Suffolk County jail, but -- and I hope at some point they all will be and we are vigilantly working on that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, you know, I did receive, you know, some correspondence from constituents, you know, *What's going on, we saw people that are missing*. But then again, people have to understand, it's not just sex offenders that go missing like this, you know, it could be anybody, any criminal. There's a lot of warrants out for a lot of other people who have committed different offenses.

Now, Megan's Law and with the Community Protection Act. Are you in communication with Megan's Law, with the Community Protection Act to make sure that their records are up-to-speed? Because they could be on their system as being a registered sex offender here in Suffolk County, but they're not, what their status are. Are we --

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

I'm not sure I understand your question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We have a Community Protection Act --

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- and we've been working with Megan's Law.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay? They have their website where they list all the sex offenders. And, you know, are we making sure that they're aware of the status of these twelve individuals or any of them?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

We are in daily contact with the people from Parents for Megan's Law, with their investigators, with Laura Ahearn. My officers in Special Victims daily are in contact with them. So yes, I would say

safely the answer to that is yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's just that I know -- you know, I have it on my computer at work and at home and, you know, we get the notifications when somebody moves in and when somebody moves out. So I just want to make sure that, you know, she's getting all the information so she can keep the website updated.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Kara?

LEG. HAHN:

So you're saying out of the thousand sex offenders that there are in Suffolk County, there were eleven, twelve in warrant status; is that like a good average, a daily average year-round, you think?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

It fluctuates up or down. But, yeah, I would say, you know, 1% of the thousand.

LEG. HAHN:

So it's not unusual to have that many in warrant status.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

I actually think, Legislator Hahn, that it's because we do such a good job, we don't let it go. You know, on the 91st day or on the --

LEG. HAHN:

You better not (*laughter*).

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

-- 366th day, we're looking at it. So, I mean, I'd like to think that and I do believe that.

LEG. HAHN:

No, I believe that that's important. And so that's the ones that if the level III's who don't report within 90-days, and also including level II's and I's who don't report within a year.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So --

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

To give you the breakdown of the twelve --

LEG. HAHN:

Sure.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

-- only two of them are level III's, five of them are level II's and five of them are level I's.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. And also part of the law is that they have to -- there's a difference between reporting and registering their address and their work, and so the Community Protection Act was established just to help keep up with everyone and their work address, registrations and their home address registrations, and there probably was less at this point. Do we have -- do we have a report yet on what they found through the Community Protection Act? Like how many -- you know, I'm sure the group has found times when sex offenders weren't registered and didn't, you know, reregister their work or they don't live in their address anymore and that's the whole goal. Like, we were, you know, excited to have those things checked. And are they sent to you, then, from Parents for Megan's Law, the agency that we contracted with. Do you get the leads from them on when someone hasn't registered or they find a work address that's old; those things get sent over to you?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes. Not to me personally, but to our Special Victims Section, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes, the Special Victims Unit. And to answer your question, and I don't want to speak for Laura Ahearn or for the Parents of Megan's Law people, but I can give you raw numbers from our perspective and explaining it from the Police perspective.

Every one of those leads that they send to us generates a case for us, okay. They have sent us -- and I'll give you approximate numbers -- approximately 300 leads that were considered criminal in nature during the course of this year, since the contract was in effect. Also they have sent us -- and again, approximately 1700, which if you do the math is about, right, 1700 address verifications. What we do and the benefit of having that and the benefit of this partnership is that this address verifications indicate that employees of Parents for Megan's Law went to those residences, they saw that John Doe was where he was supposed to be on today's date, you know, December 12th he's there, he or she is there. They send that to us on the address verification, that gives us the lead -- you know, should John Doe become an absconder somewhere in the future, that's the first place we're going to go back to, because I can tell you affirmatively today John Doe is there. So, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. I'm sure we're going to have a report from them, too, at some point soon.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yeah, and I don't want to speak -- I certainly don't want to speak for them.

LEG. HAHN:

So I'm sure you'll be coming back and we'll be talking about how that -- you know that's working, because I think that's very important.

So when you get 300 leads from an agency of that nature, you know, you're taking those just as seriously, I'm sure, as the non-reporters and that, you know, it's a slippery slope from not reporting your current address which could be in a place that shouldn't be or your work which could be somewhere where you don't need it to be, it shouldn't be. You know, there's slippery slopes there. So what can you say about follow-up on the leads that you've been given?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Well, and just to break it down for you. The way that Special Victims is broken down in their case assignments, obviously current cases of an abuse of some sort, whether it be sexual or physical to a targeted group, would be the primary cases that they work on right away, obviously, for obvious

reasons. Then there would be these criminal leads, you know, that are sent to us by the Parents for Megan's Law people and then the address verification. So by way of breaking it down for you, that's basically hierarchy, I guess, for lack of a better word of how it's handled in Special Victims.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So we'll talk more when they come in about -- and we'll hope that you'll be able to tell us where you're at with those 300 criminal leads at that point, you know, where we're at with them.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We have two more speakers.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Okay. Yeah, for now, I think I had another question but I can't remember what it was. Thank you. Thank you so much for all you're doing to protect us.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Presiding Officer Horsley?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Thank you. Thank you for your support.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes, hi. Good morning.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Good morning.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I just had a quick question. First of all, I just wanted to say overall that I feel a lot safer today than years before involving sex offenders. And I appreciate your diligence and your -- and the fact that you're on top of this. And you can see that you are -- that you're expending your energies on this issue to the end, and I appreciate that.

I have a quick question involving the new program where you're going to be downloading all 35,000 across the state on our computers. Now, does that cross over to Megan's Law? Will they also have these 35,000? Will they be tracking them with you or is that -- are you partners in that new program? How is that going to work?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Well, I think at least for the beginning part it will be coming to the Police Department. For obvious reasons there are certain offenders -- first of all, this is from the DCJS website.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

So we may get a little more information than another agency might get. But it's being designed for the purposes of if one of those offenders were to have a law enforcement contact here in Suffolk, get a traffic ticket on the LIE.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

That we'll get that notification, or our Special Victims Section will then get that notification. So it will be coming to us. We may, again, get a little more information through the website; I have to verify that, I'm not, as I sit here, positive of that. However, it's the same information that can be accessed on the website, except that for us it will be the names, maybe dates of birth and a little more information, maybe their New York State identification numbers.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And are you prohibited by law not to be able to give them to Megan's Law?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

There are certain parts that I think that we are.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

But that's all to be worked out.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

This is coming, it's not here yet.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I understand, and it's a new program and I think it makes perfect sense. Sex offenders know no bounds as far as County lines, so --

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

As we've seen, right.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, as we've seen. So I applaud you on that. You know, I just wondered, you know, how does that work with -- or I guess it's almost your sister agency now as far as sex offenders, the Megan's Law folks, so.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

I guess the best way to answer the question is certainly any information that they are legally entitled to get they'll get.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You'll be able to give it to them. Okay. And I --

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Fair enough.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And I appreciate the comment. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Chief, thank you for being here.

Chief, I just wanted to ask or get some guidance from you. It's something that occurred in my district just in the last week, and it is in the realm of sex offender, not necessarily absconded but a notification that came out of a school district regarding two sex offenders in residences. And, in fact, the residences turned out to be Suffolk County Department of Social Service Centers.

Now, the average individual isn't going to know that. When I see a sex offender notification forwarded to me from the school district and it shows 200 Wireless Boulevard, you know, that and then 3805 Veterans Highway in Bohemia; both of them are actually Department of Social Service Centers. I spoke to a couple of folks and they say that's an aberration of DCJS, but I'm not sure that I quite understand that. Who actually is charged with or where does the requirement for the sex offender to actually furnish a physical address come from?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

It could be Probation, it could be Parole, depending on what conditions they're released under when they provide the address. And again, I think there's a multi-part question, it sounds --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Probably.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yeah. It depends, are they homeless? Obviously if it's not that --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, that would be the assumption, that, I guess, if it's a Social Services Center that's being provided, then they must be being released from, you know, either Upstate or here out in Riverhead with no set address to begin with. But that to me would seem to almost undermine the whole notification requirement and process, because it's an impossibility to have a Department of Social Services Center as a residence.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Absolutely. I think what happened was when some of the offenders were initially released -- and I know to what you're talking, I thought it had been straightened out. I thought there was a glitch initially.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Uh-huh.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

That they were using those addresses because they hadn't -- the residence that they were going to live at had not been vetted yet.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Vetted by us, the Police Department, to make sure it wasn't violative of any of the laws, County law or State law.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

So that address was used temporarily and I thought that had been cleaned up. I'll have to check on that and get back to you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I want to ask you if you would -- and I would ask you to go ahead and just help me with the other notification requirement. If an individual is being released from whatever facility and there's no permanent address yet, so they fall into the broad category of homeless, and then they subsequently have some kind of permanent address, but it's an address for a short duration, less than 30-days, less than 60-days or whatever. What's the responsibility about notification for the subsequent address?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

They are responsible to notify us, the Police Department, the monitoring agency of them.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

It's on them.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, so let me see if I can ask you one other way so I could kind of follow it. I get released from Riverhead, I don't know, I did six months for cutting checks or something like that. I have no home. The department has the responsibility to go ahead and put me up someplace. They say, *Okay, Kennedy, you go to 123 Elm Street. You're going to be there for about ten days, and then I'm going to move you to 567 Oak Street; who's got to notify you guys that I go from Elm to Oak, me or the department?*

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

If the department -- well, first of all, for the check cutting it wouldn't pertain, it would be the sex offender --

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right, all right.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yeah. No, no, it would be the sex offender. You know, obviously --

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm all for hypotheticals, but I'm not going with that one.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

I got ya, I got ya. No, I know what you mean. If they're being housed there, DSS would -- they work in conjunction with us. In other words, if DSS is housing at 123 Elm and then they move them to Oak, both of those addresses are vetted by us, the Suffolk Police Department, for a homeless sex offender.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So in other words, there's that constant back and forth of information, and so you always should have current information as far as where the physical address is for the offender, even if, you know, they're the department's responsibility in the first instance. As long as there's that kind of department engagement for the category of homelessness, then there'll always be that link to you guys as far as physical location.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, good. All right, thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Well, thank you. And again, I know that my office calls on sex offender notices when we get them to check on them and I've always said that you guys do a phenomenal job and it's much appreciated. Because I know that with the calls that come from my office, you know, when the local residents and they hear about the one moving in, you know, they always tell us *How can he live here?* And I know you guys jump all over it. And if they're not supposed to be where they are, I know you're making sure that they're in compliance with the laws. So I certainly appreciate that.

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Thank you, Legislator Browning. I wish I could say it was me, it's the people in the unit that do it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, it always comes from the top down. So I appreciate that.

And I guess with no more questions, we will now go to our Police Commissioner. And I believe -- yes, Mr. Brown is here?

DETECTIVE MADIGAN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And this is to discuss -- thank you. To discuss the agreement between the Department of Justice and the Police Department.

Okay, good morning. And I guess you can start whenever you're ready.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, good morning. Before I start I would like to put on the record the great job that the men and women of the Police Department, Suffolk County Police Department, both sworn civilian, are doing. Crime's down again 10% this year, over a reduction of 9% last year, and I just wanted to make reference and recognize them for all their hard work, diligence and professionalism that we do.

The agreement that we have in front of you is -- and you will be voting on is really a culmination of a four-year collaboration between the Department of Justice, United States Department of Justice and the Suffolk County Police Department with the -- trying to identify the best available methods of strengthening community trust and access to police services. Before we get to any -- that's an overview.

Before we get to any questions, I would just like to mention a couple of things, one of which since 2009 the Department of Justice has done an intensive and thorough investigation of the Suffolk County Police Department focusing on allegations of discriminatory policing. I think it's important to

note there was no finding of discriminatory policing. And I'll repeat that; there was no finding of discriminatory policing on the part of the Suffolk County Police Department. That's very important, not only to the residents of Suffolk County but to the police force and the members of the Suffolk County Police Department.

The second thing I would like to recognize and they mention throughout is many of the recommendations that we agreed to we've already voluntarily initiated, and we have been doing them for some time now. As a matter of fact, Laretta Lynch, the United States Attorney for the Eastern District stated, "*I commend the Suffolk County Police Department for its cooperation with the United States investigation and its willingness to ensure fairness and equal treatment to all.*"

Some of the questions that I received on the statement was -- revolve around on the agreement, proposed agreement, is the COPE Unit, that's something that most of the Legislature is interested in. We currently perform a hybrid function which includes the traditional community policing such as non-emergency, response to non-emergency complaints of junk vehicles, abandoned houses, abandoned residences, graffiti, illegal dumping, attending community meetings and attending school functions. But the primary function of the current TASK -- COPE Units we have it now -- is responding to traffic-related issues, special events, directed patrol and community hot spots.

As a result of this agreement, what we'll do is we'll go -- we'll move from the singular hybrid system to two separate units. There will be an exclusive community policing, that's COPE Unit, and we'll have a separate selective enforcement unit. We're going to use the same person that we have and it will be completely transparent to anyone outside the department. The functions will change slightly and it will be directly attributed to individuals.

The other item is the cost. There's been questions of what this is going to cost us. We have estimated that for 2'14 it will be about \$650,000. This cost is primarily generated by the backfill necessary for the training required, the various trainings that they -- we have agreed to initiate. Some of which we're already doing, but they've asked for an expansion in certain areas such as the limited English proficiency site.

I think it's important to note, I know it's tough economic times, but I think not signing this or approving this agreement, we lose -- the possibility of losing the trust and confidence of the communities we serve, especially the members of the Latino community, and that's something I think we simply can't afford. And now I'll open it up to questions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Is there anyone that has any questions? (*No response*). Really?

*(*Laughter*)*

Okay. The language barrier. Because I know that, you know, prior to this agreement you have been working on addressing the language barrier. Can you give me a little update or background on a Police Officer who responds to a call. You know, the complainant or people involved maybe don't speak English very well; what does that sector car do when he responds to that 911 call?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

In the areas where we have the highest populations of non-English speaking, we do have cell phones assigned to each one of those sector cars which are a direct line to language line services which provide interpretation, and they will differentiate between whatever language it may be and they will be talking back and forth so we can understand. If we don't have a sector car -- and by the way, we're going to expand that by at least 50% in the very near future. And again, the primary areas we're talking about are the 2nd Precinct, 3rd Precinct and 5th Precinct. If they -- that's as far as the cell phone.

If they don't understand, we do -- can contact Communications and they will determine the language and we would send down an interpreter, a Police Officer authorized interpreter.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And, you know, as far as sensitivity with the minority communities, with the Hispanic community or whatever other nationality it could be, what are you doing at the Police Academy? Are you doing any kind of trainings with Police Officers, the new officers in the academy? And, you know, again, community outreach. There are a lot -- my local library has a family literacy program where there's a lot of people, you know, from other nationalities who come to learn to speak English and to take citizenship. So what kind of community outreach are you doing to get to them? Because some of them who may not be documented, you know, would have concerns about calling 911. What are we doing to make sure that they understand that they have the same rights as everyone else?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Well, we -- as far as the language goes, we're actually instituting 40 hours of basic Spanish, the basic phrases to everyone that goes through the academy now. We do have cultural sensitivity training where we invite members of the communities, no matter what the community may be, into -- we do 40 hours of that and we -- we train the laws of Title 6 and all these other laws, U.S. Constitution as well as local and State laws as to the sensitivities and the rights that the individuals have.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And what was the other question? I'm drawing a blank on the other question.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Kate?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And as far as -- you know, I do agree. I know that a lot of what I've read in this, you know, agreement, it seems like it's -- you're already doing it, and you have been doing it for quite some time. So, you know, I -- now, after four years, what happens after the four-year period?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

It doesn't have to -- it's a three-year agreement.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, three years, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

But after twelve consecutive months that the Justice feels we are in compliance, we can request that -- and I'll pass it over to Law, the Law Department, but if they feel we're in compliance in twelve consecutive months, the agreement will be satisfied and put aside.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Okay, I've got -- I do have one question again. If you can go back to COPE, because I know the COPE officers do the community policing. Say you have a day that's really busy and, you know, you have a sector car, or a few sector cars responding to 911 calls and now there's no sector car available to respond. Generally a COPE officer could respond to those 911 calls; correct?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

As I mentioned, we're going to really differentiate between the COPE Unit and the selective enforcement, but he's a Police Officer, and yes, if there's an emergency, he can respond to any emergency.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. But does he have to stay within the area where he works, or can he --

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

It would be precinct-wide --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

-- the individual COPE Officer, so there's not really a particular area.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right, right. But he'll stay within his precinct.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

He won't move outside his precinct, you know, if need be.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Not unless it was a major catastrophe.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Okay. Presiding Officer Horsley, you had a question?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes, I do. Thank you, Legislator.

First of all, let me just start by congratulating the team, and I understand it is a team that negotiated this with the Federal officials and you did a good job. The concepts seem reasonable and certainly something that we've -- we have to go along with and it is the right thing to do. So I think that's congratulations to all on that.

But I just want -- before -- you know, knowing that you're going to sign this, or at least that's something that you've already requested, is that there are some costs involved in this. I know you're a dollar and cents person, Commissioner, whether it's training or the like. Do you anticipate what that dollar amount is and will it -- where will the monies come from? What would you expect from this Legislature as far as financing those additional items that you have to take care of? What is your feelings about the dollars and cents of this? We'll find the money no matter what, so *(laughter)*.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

I've mentioned we've estimated for next year, '14, to be about \$650,000, and the line item it will come from will be our overtime because that's the only line we have. We have about 30 million all funds and appropriations in overtime next year in our budget. We always try to control the use of overtime and we hope to be able to spend it through our overtime account.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So at this point in time, by signing this you feel that you have the adequate funds to move forward into next year so that you'll still remain on budget.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

We'll attempt to, yes.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

That was a good answer, we'll attempt to (*laughter*). It sounds like a yes, but just in case. But I, again, applaud you. And you'll keep this committee updated as to, you know, whether or not that is on target as far as dollars and cents, and so that we can maintain our budget County-wide.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, we will.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Great. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Mr. Brown, we did wait for you to come, so I'm not going to have you just sit there and not say anything. But if you would like to give us a summary of the agreement, I'd appreciate that.

MR. BROWN:

Well, I will give you a summary, but actually what I'm going to do is defer it over to Gail Lolis. And the reason why I'm going to do that is because Presiding Officer Horsley did mention that it was a team effort, and certainly it was a team from the Police Department as well as the Law Department. But I have to say, you know, at least from the Law Department's perspective, Deputy County Attorney Gail Lolis, she handled the day-to-day negotiations going back to 2011 with the Police Department. So, you know, all accolades really belong with her as far as the Law Department is concerned.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MS. LOLIS:

Well, I think the Commissioner pretty much gave you a good overview of the agreement. There were primarily three aspects of the agreement: One had to do primarily really was with the improved training in various areas; the second had to do with better data collection processes to enable the department to analyze if there are any trends or potential trends in terms of discriminatory policing; and the third had to do with the community policing and the improved community outreach. They're going to have a liaison officer in each of the precincts with specific function in addition to -- in addition to the COPE Unit.

One of the concerns was that there was a hybrid COPE Unit and they -- the Department of Justice preferred that there just be a unit that's a pure COPE Unit, and so that was why it was restructured to take out the hybrid officers. And the COPE officers that will be in this unit will perform the pure COPE functions, again, unless there is an emergency and they need to be deployed due to emergency situations.

The only additional requirement really on the Police Department is for the term of the agreement, is just the reporting requirements to the Department of Justice, just to show them what we're doing. And we do that depending upon what it is, either at six-month intervals or 1-year intervals, and that will terminate once the agreement ends. But as far as the policies and the procedures that are part of this agreement, the department plans on proceeding with those. It's not going -- those aren't going to end just because the agreement ends. I don't know if anybody wanted any more specifics, but --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No? Okay. John?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. Commissioner, thank you for taking the time to talk with me; as a matter of fact, both yourself and Mr. Brown, we've had conversations with. I think the agreement will move forward, hopefully it will serve its purpose and at the end of the day will get us closer to where we need to be and address some of the issues and needs.

Just two other simple questions, I guess. I would assume that there's been some consultation with the PBA with this to a certain extent?

The only reason --

MS. LOLIS:

(Shook head no).

LEG. KENNEDY:

I see Gail shaking her head. No, okay. So this is an agreement that's being implemented at this point, it's between the department and the Department of Justice, and the PBA's position is really immaterial to whatever the agreement is?

MS. LOLIS:

Yes, there are provisions in the agreement that any policies or procedures still must confirm with the collective bargaining agreement.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Let me go to a specific, Gail, and tell you the reason that I raise that. Because when I was reading it I saw some representations in there or indications about consequences that would occur, I guess, if an officer violated a particular provision or categories that barred or precluded officers from being included in particular segments or sections. So having seen both those, I just -- you know, I've wondered whether or not this was something there was consultation there. If that's immaterial, I get it, I understand it, it's a simple question asked and answered.

The other thing, though, that I personally found a little interesting was reading about the Internal Affairs Bureau, the IAB, and the fact that I guess officers will be specifically recruited or added that are bilingual in there as well. Is that new for us or --

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Actually it says that if there is a person held out to be bilingual, that that individual will be tested on some form, some methodology which is yet to be determined. But yes, we always have several Spanish-speaking individuals, that's their highest demand language, 90% of our requests for language line, or in excess of 90% of our excessive language is Spanish. So we do have Spanish officers in IAB and we've had them for some time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just out of curiosity, Commissioner, I mean, obviously this is -- comes out on incident that came out of the Spanish community, Latino community. But as you are well aware, we have other pockets of concentration, Asian-American, Russian, Polish-American. I assume if there's some particular incident, what do you do if you need to have communication in native tongue there and you don't have it in the department?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Well, we do have interpreters for -- I don't have the number of languages as we speak, but the language line that I spoke about earlier is 154 languages.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So it's covered end-to-end.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Every recognized language, I believe, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right, that's fine. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You know, the one thing as far as now reporting to the Department of Justice. Do you have somebody now who's going to be dedicated to do the reports? I'm just curious. I mean, now it's an additional task. Is it -- you know, is that going to be something that's not going to be too difficult to do? Is it going to entail a lot more work? I mean, can you give me what that's going to do for you?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The agreement states that there will be a coordinator and we have -- (*brief pause*).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm sorry, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Sure. The agreement states that there will be a coordinator, that individual has been identified. And yes, I think there's 13 reports, some of which are reoccurring, some are not. But yes, it will be -- and as Gail mentioned earlier, some are six months, some are annual, some are only initially, surveys have to be conducted. So it will be -- this individual will be spearheading that area.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, and that would be a member of the Police Department?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And where is the Law Department now in this; are you still going to be involved in this, or is it now -- now that the agreement is done, where is your involvement?

MS. LOLIS:

We're here as needed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay. So -- and, you know, again, I want to -- I know that you said this, that was my question, is that they have found that there was -- there was no findings of wrongdoing on the part of the department. And, you know, I was asked about, you know, these requirements and these changes or whatever you want to call them that have been requested. And I've always said that, you know, 20 years ago, what the Police Department did 20 years ago is different today. And I think that a Police Department is very fluid, that, you know, there's constant changes and upgrades and amendments to everything you do.

You know, so -- I see that, you know, again, this is something you're already doing. There may be a couple of additions, but I think whether the Department of Justice is involved or not, I do see that you're going to make changes as needed on an as-needed basis for the Police Department anyway. But Doc Spencer, you have a question?

LEG. SPENCER:

Good morning, Commissioner, and thank you for being here. I do understand the agreement. I appreciate you reaching out to ask if I had any questions regarding it. I think when I look at our Police Department, I can say that I have complete confidence in all the men and women that serve.

I don't know if when I look at an agreement like this and you see the Department of Justice coming in, and I sit as a member of Public Safety, if there is a perception issue. I mean, this is a -- it seems that a lot of the things in this agreement are already being done. And I understand that there's a hierarchy that then goes up to the Commissioner and the the Administration, but I'm just wondering just some personal thoughts with regards to any sort of law enforcement department that is this large, that has this much responsibility, you can always find individual cases where we may look for areas where we could improve. But when I see an agreement of this nature that we're entering into that causes for expenditures of funds, I wonder about my role sitting in Public Safety as far as oversight is concerned from the fact that we're the funding body, and I think that that's going to be the story that -- you know, I think we all have received letters recently from a story that's being worked on concerning oversight in general, moving on. Because the fact that the Department of Justice has to make an agreement in the first place, does that indicate that there is a lack of, again, transparency or does it -- you know, are we not communicating effectively to the public?

And I know I've spoken a long time, but I am looking for some personal thoughts, Commissioner, moving forward. Because it's one thing to have an agreement, but we still long-term need to decide why are we in this particular situation? Is it justified, is it unjustified, is it unique? So I'm curious to hear your thoughts.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Any department can always improve. And while we -- we're doing well, I believe, in 2'08 when the incident occurred, we can always improve and we're improving on the best practices as perceived by other major organizations, Chiefs of Police, International Chiefs of Police and all other areas, other departments. So what we're doing is really making ourselves, we're trying to increase the outreach that we have to do, the training we have to do. We've building the trust and confidence of the community that we serve, and I think that will eliminate any misconceptions which I believe that Justice found that there were -- or allegations of discriminatory policing, but when they did their investigation they didn't find any. But they offered some improvements of what we do, and we're always looking for improvements. We can always improve what we do.

LEG. SPENCER:

I know the -- I thank you for that, and I totally agree with that. And I don't know within this committee, if we look at our relationship that we have, I don't know if oversight is the correct word. I know that right now there's Internal Affairs that really addresses these issues and it's handled and I think you do a fantastic job by doing that. And I don't know if there is a bigger role that we need to have as elected officials sitting on this committee and I think that that may be something that we'll discuss in the new year. But thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You have a question?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes. So I think part of that is when the reports go back to the Department of Justice, you know, asking and your willingness to come here and tell us about where we're at and status and summary of what we've done in meeting these -- you know, what we've agreed to. So, you know, I look forward to you coming here when the reports are required and letting us know where we're at and the status, and I hope you're willing to do that.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Sure. Hi.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So I guess no more questions.

I appreciate you coming in and, you know, maybe at some point -- you know, I'm trying to think when our next committee meeting would be next year. But, you know, if you think within a month or two months of this agreement that you would like to come back in and again and brief us and let us know how things are going, we'd appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

I would suggest that we wait until we generate some reports, as Legislator Hahn mentioned.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

In order that we have some substantive matter to discuss.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

I would like to mention that this really dovetails into the philosophy that we adopted in 2012 when Chief Burke and myself came on, where we have the intelligence-led policing, we have the enhanced community service and accountability. That's really what this all revolves around and they could have almost taken our -- those theories and applied it to this agreement, because that's what they're talking about.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The accountability, the training and the outreach to the communities we serve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, I appreciate it. And again, like I said, things change every day. And, you know, five years from now this Police Department will operate a little different than what it does today. So I thank you.

I did want to ask you, I'm not going to put you on the spot to give me the information today, but I did ask John Ortiz to provide us with what your overtime stats are for the past year, you know, by precinct and speciality units. So if we could get that information, I would appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you. Any more questions?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Do you have that? You don't have that information.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

No, I don't have that information.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

I know what the budget is, I know what our current estimate is, but I couldn't give it to you by precinct or -- it's not something we track.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, you know what it is, is next year there's the plan to hire new Police Officers. And I know that there's a lot of discussion about Parks Police Officers being merged in next year, whether that's a reality or not. But again, I'm hearing how the overtime is going and that we're actually going over your budgeted, I believe, what is budgeted for overtime. So again, we're looking to hire new Police Officers next year at a lower salary scale, you know, so how is that going to benefit us? So I think next year, before next year, it would be nice to know, you know, what the savings could be if we hire new Police Officers next year at that lower salary scale, how that's going to affect our overtime budget for next year.

So I thank you. And, you know, John, if you can work with Mark and the Commissioner to get us those numbers, I'd appreciate it. Okay?

Thank you.

Any other questions about any other issues? You've got the Commissioner now, don't --

*(*Laughter*)*

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you. I wish you all happy holidays.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I appreciate it. Thank you. And have a Merry Christmas.

Okay. So with that, I see Chief Sharkey is here. Chief, do you have anything?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

(Shook head no.)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No. And FRES; our FRES Commissioner is not able to be here today. And I know Mr. Holly reached out to me, something came up; he was going to be here today, but something came up for him, so he is not here. And I don't think I have any other issues. But we will 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). I'm making a motion to table.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll make a motion to approve, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And second, Legislator Muratore. So there was a motion to table --

MR. NOLAN:

Tabling goes first.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Tabling goes first. So there was a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. MURATORE:

Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Opposed to tabling.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Two opposed to tabling.

LEG. SPENCER:

I'm opposed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Three? Where was the three?

MR. NOLAN:

Spencer.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

Are you voting, Wayne?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Presiding officer, are you voting on this?

P.O. HORSLEY:

I'll vote to table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we were one, two, three to table.

MR. NOLAN:

And three opposed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Three opposed to tabling, so the motion to table carries. How many?

MS. ORTIZ:

Five with the Presiding Officer.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So it is **tabled (VOTE: 5-3-0-0 - Opposed: Legislators Kennedy & Muratore).**

IR 1592-13 - Terminating the County's ShotSpotter Program (Cilmi). I'll make a motion to table. Second, Legislator Calarco?

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Opposed.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Opposed; two opposed to tabling. The ***motion is tabled (VOTE: 5-2-0-0 - Opposed: Legislators Kennedy & Muratore).***

MR. ORTIZ:

Presiding Officer, are you still voting?

P.O. HORSLEY:

No, I'm not voting.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

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 (County Executive). I believe -- was that --

MR. NOLAN:

It's still open.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's still open. Okay, motion to close.

MR. NOLAN:

Table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sorry, table for public hearing.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

Introductory Resolutions

IR 2076-13 - Authorizing the transfer of funds from the Sheriff's Office Prisoners' Commissary Account to the General Fund (County Executive). I'll make a motion to approve. Second, Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

IR 2091-13 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal pass-through grant funds from the NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services in the amount of \$118,750 for the 2013 Technical Rescue/Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) Grant Program administered by the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services and to execute grant related agreements (County Executive). I'll make a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is approved and placed on the consent calendar (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

IR 2104-13 - Authorizing execution of an Agreement with the United States Concerning an investigation of the Suffolk County Police Department (County Executive). I'll make a motion to approve. Second?

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

So with that, I don't think we have anything more on the agenda, so I'll make a motion to adjourn. Second, Legislator Hahn. We are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 AM*)