

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

Verbatim 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, April 18, 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 John M. Kennedy - Member
Legislator Tom Muratore - Member
Legislator William Spencer - Member

Also in Attendance:

D.P.O. Wayne Horsley - Legislative District No. 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
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Bobby Knight - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Lora Gellerstein - Aide to Legislator Spencer
Pierre Albert - Intern/Legislator Hahn's Office
John Ortiz, Budget Review Office
Tom Vaughn - County Executive Assistant
Maria Berkoski - County Executive Assistant
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Craig Pavlik - AFU Deputy Bureau Chief/SC District Attorney's Office
Gerard Frielingsdorf - Sergeant, Chief of Department's Office-SCPD
Gerard Hardy - Captain/Chief of Department's Office-SCPD
Chris Hatton - Deputy Inspector/Marine Bureau-SCPD
Tracy Pollak - SC Police Department/Principal Research Analyst
Suzanne McBride - SCAME/Police Emergency Unit President
Patrice Dishopolsky, Nominee for Director/SC Department of Probation
Daniel del Valle, Delegate/Suffolk County Probation Officer's Assoc.
Mike Sharkey, Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Russ McCormick - Sergeant-at-Arms/Suffolk County Detective's Assoc.
Lou Tutone, 2nd Vice-President/Suffolk County PBA
Arty Sanchez, Treasurer/Deputy Sheriffs Police Benevolent Association
Jay Egan - Vice-Chairman/Suffolk County FRES Commission
Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken & Transcribed By:

Alison Mahoney, Court Stenographer

*(*The meeting was called to order at 9:48 A.M. *)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good morning. Sorry we're starting a few minutes late, but we will begin the Public Safety meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

Salutation

And we'll stand for a moment of silence for our men and women who defend our country, but also for the families and the victims of the tragedy in Boston.

Moment of Silence Observed

Thank you.

Okay, before we start the public portion, I guess, Mr. Vaughn, you wanted to come up and give us some updates on 911?

MR. VAUGHN:

Good morning, Legislator Browning. Good morning to members of the committee. Legislator Browning?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sorry. Go ahead.

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator Browning, with your indulgence, I'd also like Ms. McBride to come up here with me, if that's okay with you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure, absolutely. I like that. Or I'm hoping I'm going to like it (*laughter*).

MR. VAUGHN:

So good morning again. First of all, I would like to, once again, thank Ms. McBride for being here this morning. As I told Legislator Hahn yesterday, if I were ever in a fox hole, and the chances of that are pretty highly unlikely, to have a -- I could do a lot worse than having a dedicated individual such as Ms. McBride right next to me.

So I just wanted to thank her again and say how critical I think that her efforts on this issue have been over the last couple of months.

So just a quick recap. On the first day that Ms. McBride was here, which was back on November 29th, we had eleven SCIN forms signed that day. Two of those individuals were brought on immediately, and four people have now been hired and that training process has begun. Training is typically three months and it's expected that some of those individuals who were hired will complete that training quicker than the three months. We do expect that some of those new individuals will begin to come on-line as of July.

Also, the promotions for the other six individuals, bringing us up to the full complement of eleven that we spoke about, will be going into effect soon. Those promotions were slightly delayed because we didn't want to put additional burdens on to the ECO's and PSD's.

Also, as promised, as promised in December, Performance Management has been conducting an extensive analyzation of this center. The team is not only looking into staffing issues, but they have been looking in to see what else can be done to relieve some of the excess burden. As we talked about at the last meeting, this includes looking at the routing of calls, such as front desk calls being routed to 911, 852-COPS, if there's any advantages that can be possibly made in technology.

Another aspect of the project that Deputy County Executive Tom Melito has been working on is to develop a call model and he will be using that model, once it's fully developed, to work with Chief White to create a staffing plan for the unit going forward. Unfortunately their work is not yet completed and this -- this is not a situation that lends itself to a quick fix. But, however, the research and the analyzation has led to one very important result, and that is why, based on the analysis and in conjunction with Chief White and our Budget Office, I'm able to announce today that as of last night the Administration has signed off on additional 14 SCIN forms for the center. The breakdown is as follows; six ECO's and eight PSD's.

I would like to conclude with one final thought. This is a pretty unique situation. All across the County, in every single office, people have been asked to do more with less. Any of us who have worked for the County over the last ten years can probably tell you that if you look to your left and you look to your right, there are a lot less people there than used to be there. That being said, public safety is priority one. So we also have to make sure that we get this right, and I believe that we are.

We are not in a position to simply bring on new staff wherever there is a shortage, because the truth of the matter is that there are shortages throughout this County. But we recognize the importance and we recognize the work that these individuals are doing, which is why we've decided to go ahead with these hires at this time, and it is also what the analysis has borne out. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. I have to say, I'm impressed and I'm very happy to see that you've addressed their concerns. I know we met with the Commissioner and I know he also felt that, you know, there was definitely a need. Susan, do you have something to say? I know you signed a card, so if you want to go ahead and say something.

MS. McBRIDE:

I just would like to thank the County Executive's Office and this body for your assistance in getting this done. It is a vitally important function of the County and it's wonderful to see that they recognize how important it is. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I think in light of what this week is, it's 911 operators.

MS. McBRIDE:

This week is National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week, and I would like to thank not only the dispatchers and call takers and teletype operators in my unit, but across the County and across the country who provide a function that most people never see them, but without their calming voice when they call in for help, they would be lost.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And it's certainly appropriate the signs you're getting SCINed (sic), especially this week. Kara, you have a question?

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. I appreciate, Tom, the extra effort, you know, you made to be ready for today. And I guess the one question I have, is there any way -- if there's the training already going on, you

know, the SCINS that were just signed, is there any way to get any of them in on that training, or has it already started and too late?

MR. VAUGHN:

My understanding is that that's not possible. I understand we would like it to be possible. And also, Legislator Hahn, I do want to speak to you also about at the last meeting you had asked about potential retirees, and as soon as the meeting concluded -- and Ms. McBride can certainly correct me if I'm wrong -- but we did not think, after speaking with Ms. McBride, that that would really be an option, which is also why we've gone with what I would say is a more permanent solution of bringing these individuals on.

The fact of the matter is we went through in somewhat excruciating detail at the last meeting, bringing on these individuals is a very -- it's a very specific and it's a very detail-oriented process. We have to make sure that we're hiring the right individuals, we also have to make sure that those individuals are passing their background checks. I believe that there's also a psychological component to that background check. So that in and of itself is extensive.

I -- and I'm certain that Ms. McBride does not think this; this is not -- -- there are no immediate fixes. I said it at the last meeting, I'll say it again here, there are no immediate fixes. There is -- there is a concerted effort to make the situation better and we realize that we want to improve the situation, but there is no immediate fix.

LEG. HAHN:

So repeat again the number of SCINS that were signed? They were signed.

MR. VAUGHN:

They were signed.

LEG. HAHN:

Not that they're going to be but they were; good.

MR. VAUGHN:

I witnessed them signed myself last night. They were signed, there are 14 of them, they include six ECO's and eight PSD's.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

John, go ahead.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Tom, thank you for giving us that update. And I want to go to a little bit of -- I know you say that the analysis is not complete yet, but what Mr. Melito's group is doing. Because as strange as it might sound, I think I'm going to agree with the County Executive's position for once, which is that we do not have unbounded or limited resources. And quite frankly, as we address functions, we need to do so differently than we've done in the past. And this is something that, you know, I've been saying for quite some time. County government still has that same exoskeleton that we had back in the 90's. But when you look at the individual units anymore, more often than not you see empty desks.

Towards that end, there are 911 operators in FRES and there are 911 operators in PD. So while I guess the analysis has looked at the function as it's associated with the PD, there's that whole other aspect of when a call bounces to FRES and where it goes and what function the 911 operator in

FRES does. And then finally, can we justify two discrete units performing the same functions anymore? I'm hoping that Mr. Melito's group is looking at that. Can you share any of that with us?

MR. VAUGHN:

There are a number of aspects that Mr. Melito's group is working on and the reason why I have not presented more of them at this point in time is they're simply too early to talk about at this moment. They have been -- they have been looking at it. Their analysis is what yielded the signing of the 14 SCINS, but there are long-term, long-range plans that are being looked at there and I just think that all of it's too premature to kind of discuss it at any length or detail at this point in time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Fair enough. I, then, as I suspect most people on the committee, are going to be interested to see what the outcome is there. But then I'm going to ask you specifically, if it's not part of his range of study yet, I do want the -- I want FRES and their 911 function somehow looked at and I want merger evaluated.

In addition, I want the structure that's in there now for these three titles. And I couldn't articulate them to you if my life depended on it right now. Quite frankly, I think of 911 as picking up the phone. And I do know that there are supervisors who then turf more of the complex calls, if you will. At the end of the day, my constituents, any of our constituents know they have some kind of a distress, some kind of a life emerging type of function, they dial those three numbers and they're expecting that the appropriate emergency medical service is going to hit their door as quickly as possible. They could care less about Civil Service titles or how the various work allocation is now. If it's going to be a true business analysis, it's got to look at not only merger of function, but actually legitimacy of the titles that we have in there now and the possibility of looking at maybe expanding duties and ramping up, a concomitant ramp up for function.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Actually, I have to tell you, I was at -- I go to the FRES Commission meetings and I paid them a visit at the last meeting and there's definitely issues for them with the staffing, which, you know, we certainly appreciate what you're doing. But again, they're getting the calls, they're sending them to FRES and they're also issuing some -- experiencing some problems. But go ahead, Tom.

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator Kennedy, I just want to make sure that I understand exactly the information that you'd like me to bring back to Deputy County Executive Melito. So if you don't mind, if I could reiterate back to you what I --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Absolutely.

MR. VAUGHN:

-- believe that I thought I thought I heard.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Sure.

MR. VAUGHN:

So you are asking the Deputy County Executive to possibly look at the merger of functions across all boards, that would include FRES, perhaps the Sheriff's Office and anybody else who's doing 911 operations? I mean, I just want to make sure that I completely understand what you're asking.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Absolutely.

MR. VAUGHN:

The scope of the work.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Absolutely. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, the very first platform that they should be looking at is, is something that justifies if there's the same function under different offices; and if so, why? Because invariably there's going to be an economy of scale that you achieve if you have that one function.

Again, as I've said, my constituents could care less about whether it's a PD operator, a FRES operator, a Sheriff operator or any operator that picks up the 911 call. They call because of the life emergency, the heart attack, the drug overdose, the child drowning, a house on fire. They know three numbers and they expect the service back. It's incumbent on us, us meaning County government, to be able to provide that in the most efficient matter. So you have to begin with look at the function, justify if there is a reason between the different entities; and it can't just be that they're separately electeds either, that one doesn't cut it. And then you drill into the level of title within those various units. These titles probably came about, what would you say, Suzanne, 30, 40 years ago?

MS. McBRIDE:

Probably.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Probably.

MS. McBRIDE:

We originally only had civilian call-takers. The dispatch function was left to the Police Officers back some 20 years ago, so that's where the title of Emergency Complaint Operator came from, to my understanding. A little over 20 years ago they civilianized the dispatch function and that's where we got the PSD's.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So towards my point, then, Tom, if you look at it, then, it's kind of like a twofold slice; function off the top and then individuals that you've tasked at those particular specific Civil Service titles, ultimately with the ability to deliver service and then to go ahead and achieve economies of scale as we can.

MR. VAUGHN:

Right. So with the ultimate goal of a possible consolidation; that's what you're looking at?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I rely upon him, that's the Performance Management Team, purportedly they have the expertise. But again, I've said all along, we can't keep representing to the public that we're delivering the function with this large, external structure that's got nobody in it. So, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you, John. Rob?

LEG. CALARCO:

Just one quick question for you, Tom. Out of 14 SCINS signed, how many of those were promotional?

MR. VAUGHN:

I believe that Ms. McBride could answer that probably even better than I could, since she's more familiar with the titles. But it's my understanding, and please correct me if I am wrong, that ECO's and PSD's are all entry-level spots; correct?

MS. McBRIDE:

It's possible. I don't know if we have anybody on the current list that an ESO could be promoted to a PSD. Other than that, they would all be entry-level.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. So we're not getting into a situation where we had earlier in the year where we had eleven SCINs signed and it turned out we only really gained one person.

MR. VAUGHN:

Well, I would say that we gained six, but -- because we brought on two new and then hired four additional, and those are the four that have begun training now. So, six.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

MR. VAUGHN:

And five promotions.

LEG. CALARCO:

So I'll wait. I'm sure that if it turns out that many of these people end up promoted from within ranks, we'll hear about it.

MR. VAUGHN:

Well, I'm sure you would. But second of all, I do believe also that the reason that we had to -- that there weren't more promotions is because that one list is just about expired, which is why we ultimately ended up with hiring four new people. Because I do remember the conversation earlier that a lot of the ones from the November signing were a lot of promotions, those are the five promotions that we were just talking about. But that the reason that we brought on a total of six new individuals, or four new and two returning, were due to the fact that we couldn't get -- that we couldn't promote. So that's where we're at.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You're good? Anybody else? No, okay. So I think no more questions. Suzanne, you did sign a card, you're more than welcome to take advantage while you're here. No?

MS. McBRIDE:

No thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You're good to go?

MS. McBRIDE:

Other than to say thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

(Laughter). Well, I have to say, you know, you've made some good presentations. And I have to

say, you've done a phenomenal job representing the 911 operators, and I'm sure they're very pleased to have you.

MS. McBRIDE:

Thank you.

LEG. HAHN:

And thank you to the County Executive's team --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

-- for truly looking at it and recognizing the need.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I guess, Tom, whenever the Performance Management Team is ready, they'll reach out to me and let me know what their findings are.

MR. VAUGHN:

Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

Okay. Craig Pavlik we have from the District Attorney's Office; you have something you'd like to speak on?

MR. PAVLIK:

Green light must be on.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, the light has to be green.

MR. PAVLIK:

There we go, all right. Good morning, Legislator Browning and Members of the Legislature. I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you here this morning very briefly.

I'm here today on behalf of District Attorney Tom Spota in connection with a Certificate of Necessity request that we are submitting to the County Executive for next week's General Meeting. The purpose of the CN is to adopt a resolution to accept and appropriate approximately \$1.6 million in our Crimes Against Revenue Program. That is an ongoing program that we use to fight tax crimes and labor crimes in Suffolk County.

The reason for our request is that it's imperative that we get the funding in place as soon as possible. Unfortunately, due to delays outside of the County, and primarily to New York State, the award has not been finalized until just recently. Although the grant does start or did start on January 1st, we were not notified of our award until sometime mid-January, till the end of January. We were not given a budget to create until February. And then finally, at the end of March, we are now just finalized -- the State finalized our budget and granted us what we were looking to get. Thus, we're already three months, four months now into this program without having the money in place completely. While the salaries have been budgeted in the 2013 budget and will be recouped from the grant funds, other portions of the grant funding, including equipment and other monies used for undercover operational expenses, are not yet appropriated into our budget.

And so we are requesting that the Legislature, at today's Public Safety meeting and then again at the General Meeting, please give serious consideration to this CN request so that we can get the money into the budget as soon as possible and continue our tax crime fighting. Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. No questions? No?

MR. PAVLIK:

Great. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think we'll be happy to accept that money for you.

MR. PAVLIK:

Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Laughter).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

Where to begin. I know there's a few questions on some issues, but we do have Patrice Dlhopsky (sic). You know, Patrice, I'm never going to be able to say your name correctly. If you'd like to come up. I would like to -- what I would like to do is take 1247 out of order, and that's confirming the appointment of County Director of Probation. Patrice, you could tell me your name so I cannot crucify your name again.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

It's Patrice Dlhopsky.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm never going to be able to say that *(laughter)*. We have a second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is taken out of order.

1247-13 - Confirming appointment of County Director of Probation (Patrice Dlhopsky) (County Executive).

I guess I'll make the motion to approve ***1247(13), Confirming appointment of County Director of Probation (Patrice Dlhopsky) (County Executive).*** Second, Legislator Calarco. And Patrice, it's nice to see you here today and, you know, if you just want to introduce yourself to anyone and give us a little bit about yourself.

I do want to say, also, I do have a letter here. I'm not going to read the entire letter, I could give copies to all of the members of Public Safety. I will read one paragraph saying, *"Having served as a permanent Principal Probation Officer for approximately nine years, Ms. Dlhopsky --"* see?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Dlhopsky.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I am never going to be able to say it. I'll have to practice. *" -- meets these promotional qualifications. From your prior communication, I understand that she will be appearing before the*

Suffolk County Legislature on April 22nd, 2013, for your confirmation." This is a letter of recommendation saying that you have all of the qualifications to hold the position and it is signed by Robert MacCarone, Deputy Commissioner and Director of CJC -- sorry. I'm just blowing it today (*laughter*). But anyway, if you want to go ahead and introduce yourself to everyone.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you, Madam Chairman, Members of the Committee. I am honored to appear before you today as the nominee of County Executive Bellone for the position of Director of Probation. I have appeared before this committee on several previous occasions as a representative of the department, but I would like to take this opportunity to provide you with some background information of my years and experience in the department.

I thought first I might help you with the pronunciation of my name, which has presented a problem over the years. In the Probation Department, when there's a phone call and they hesitate after "*Duh*", it's usually routed to me. It helps if you think of it as two separate words, "Dela" and "Polsky" and then just put them together, Dlhopsky. Yes, it's been something to deal with over the years.

*(*Laughter*)*

I have been a Suffolk County Probation Officer for close to 40 years. In that time, I have served in every rank and in every capacity in the department. As a Probation Officer Trainee and then as a Probation Officer, I worked with at-risk children and families in our Family Court Intake Unit. I moved on to Pre-sentence Investigations for both juveniles and adults. I served in Criminal Court where I supervised a caseload of 80 to 100 women. I was involved in the development of our first Electronic Monitoring Unit in the early 90's which used voice recognition technology to verify that probationers were at home at the times ordered by the court. This was an interesting contrast to my involvement years later as an administrator setting up our current GPS program.

As an administrator in the department, I have been responsible at varying times for Criminal Court Pre-sentence Investigations, Family Court supervision and specialized Criminal Court supervision. Because of my computer background, I supervised the changeover to our current Case Management System. Between November of 2010 and November of 2012, I served as the de facto, although not in terms of having been appointed, Deputy Director of the department. Finally, I have been the Acting Director of the department since December 1st, 2012.

In my many years of service, I have been honored to be a member of this department. I have served with many fine professionals, all of whom shared a dedication to the dual mission of our department, which is both enhancing public safety and providing client assistance and rehabilitation. The consistent aim of our department is to reduce crime and prevent victimization by lowering recidivism. Statistics from New York State confirm that our department has had success in lowering the recidivism rate among probationers for the past eight years. Of course, it is our goal to continue that trend and to accelerate the rate of reduction.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to both praise and thank the department's current staff. Peace officers and civilian staff in the Probation Department evidence a daily dedication to the performance of their duties that goes beyond providing mandated services. We expect all employees to put in a fair day's work for a day's pay, but our employees consistently show concern for the population we serve and for the general community. Our staff was quick to volunteer during Superstorm Sandy, staffing shelters, answering phones and providing ancillary services. Many members of our department share their time and energy with their communities on a regular basis as fire fighters, emergency service workers and in many other capacities.

For myself, after my years with this department, I remain committed to our goals and convinced that the Probation Department is a cost effective method of providing community supervision for offenders. It would be an honor to be confirmed to serve in this position. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Patrice. And does anyone have any questions? Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. Welcome, and thank you for the opportunity to speak before -- I think we'll be well served with your decades of experience.

I guess I would just like to, basically on the record, talk a little bit about your general sense of the staffing of the Probation Officers that you have in the unit at this point, what the overall responsibility is, and then your willingness to be frank with us if you believe that that's being compromised.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Certainly. We have 252 filled peace officer positions with our department and 96 civilian staff. You know, obviously I would not -- I would certainly say we could be served by having extra people in our department. I'm sure that would be true for every department. I think Mr. Vaughn already noted that, you know, all of us have seen the need to do more with less over the current years.

I would say at this point, while I would love to have more people, we are managing to provide all the mandated services and we're doing so without jeopardizing the community safety. We will have to look at where things go in the future in terms of whether there's some ancillary services that we provide that we may need to cut back on. What we will remain firm in our commitment to is anything that is involved with the public safety and protection of the community, and at this point we are certainly managing to do that. It takes creative use of staffing on our part, and obviously it's helped out by the fact that our Probation Officers are very dedicated and they do their very best.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No doubt. As a matter of fact, we've had many of them before us and they are consistently recognized for their service and they play an important role.

Just one other piece, and we talked about it privately, I would just like you to kind of reaffirm. Probably four or five days ago, the Sheriff sent all of us a letter indicating that he felt that there were additional things that we, meaning the County, could be doing associated with alternatives to incarceration, and that he felt that there was a need for some more earnest or robust dialogue amongst the many entities, including the courts and the PD, but he referenced Probation as well. Would you be willing to kind of sit with that?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Absolutely. First of all, any form of communication is certainly helpful. We -- our aim is to keep people from being in the jail.

When we're successful, our probationers do not go to jail. We're not always successful, but that is our aim; we are looking to reduce the population of the jail consistently.

I know that I have met with Sheriff DeMarco and he stated -- we talked specifically about the fact that we need an active and well-staffed and well-functioning Probation Department in order to keep the jail from having to deal with overcrowding. Meeting together and seeing what we can do combined in terms of our programs would certainly be helpful.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good. I appreciate that and I'll be reaching out to the Sheriff and to the Commissioner and everybody else and let's see with my colleagues if we can put some type of, you know, think session together and try to work to enhance the ATI's. Thank you and welcome aboard.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Sorry, I had to get my microphone ready. Thank you for your willingness to serve all your many, many years of service. I want to ask a couple of general questions and then get on to some questions about narcotics, oversight.

What do you think you will do differently? You've been in the department for 40 years. You're really part of the department. But now that you want to lead it, what will you do differently? What do you see as, you know, the chief weakness, the greatest need in the department and how will you make it better.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Well, I believe for those of you who have been around for the last few years, you know that our department has had sort of a period of instability in terms of leadership because we had a succession of Probation Officers -- Probation Directors. One of the major needs, I think, is stability, to have a leader who will be present for a period of time and approach things consistently.

What we need to do, as always -- first of all, we need to adapt to the changes that we see around us. We can't keep doing things always the same way we've done them, we have to know where -- we have to evaluate and go by where we think we should perhaps let go of certain things and enhance others. I mean, I've been around long enough to see changes in what the drug issues were, in all kinds of things, and we have to stay current with that. What I want to do is to make sure that our programs match our needs. I'm not ready at this point to say that we're going to drop this or add to this, but I -- I mean, we have to -- we have to evaluate that consistently, and that is something that I will be doing.

LEG. HAHN:

We -- you know, I think you're right. I think when we have a strong Probation Department, we can keep individuals from heading either back to jail or to jail. However, I'm very concerned that as caseloads rise --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Uh-huh.

LEG. HAHN:

That, you know, the monitoring, we just don't have the capability to monitor in the right way and they won't be going back to jail just because we're not catching it, and that is an unacceptable way to keep people from heading there. So we really have to make sure -- and especially, I want to bring up, because of my work on the drug epidemic that really is gripping not only this County but this nation, I want to talk a little bit about what was the Narcotics Unit and the Probation Alcohol

Treatment or the PAT Unit. I had heard that we were down officers; certainly given this time, that should be a focus, and I want to know a little bit about your ideas on that.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Well, the true -- what happened was the two units were combined into one unit. However, within that unit, there were those who were devoted mostly to the Probation -- to the alcohol problem and those who were devoted more to the drug situation. Those are for the most intensive cases. The people who go into that unit, I mean probationers who go into that unit are those who have evidenced years of use of these substances and where we have attempted -- maybe not our department, but there have been attempts over the years to deal with those issues unsuccessfully, so we give those people the very closest supervision.

That is not to say that people in our other caseloads, on the other caseloads are not supervised for alcohol and narcotics use, they are. Many of them have specialized conditions regarding alcohol and narcotics use. Even for those who don't, we added a general condition of probation, I would say it was more than a year ago now, which allows us to test anyone who's on probation for narcotics use as we feel it necessary. So we always identify this. Certainly it would be foolish not to note that substance abuse is a highly contributing factor to many of the crimes when it's not the crime itself.

LEG. HAHN:

But I'm concerned that we combined the alcohol treatment group with the Narcotics Unit and we decreased the number of individuals in that one unit as compared to the two, when we're facing one of the worst epidemics in the drug -- you know, in our history now, and the numbers are down and we're not focusing on the real hard-core --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

We are.

LEG. HAHN:

-- problem individuals.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

We are focusing on that.

LEG. HAHN:

So how many do we have in that unit?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

We have four officers who are considered specifically intensive narcotics and six officers who are the DWI. But as I say, that is not to say that everybody else is not also supervised for drug and alcohol use because they are. The -- we have divided the County into four quadrants in terms of intensive narcotics, but we also have other units that deal with people with intensive problems and some of those people wind up, who have those narcotics problems, are also in other intensive units. We have the Day Recording Center, we have the Intensive Supervision Program, and so there are other areas in which they're getting more intensive supervision. In addition --

LEG. HAHN:

Right. So we have four quadrants and four officers, so each quadrant of the County --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

-- has one officer in the Narcotics Unit.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Well, obviously it's divided by -- it isn't divided simply by geography, it's based on geography but it's divided by population of the drug offenders.

LEG. HAHN:

Do you know how many of those four narcotics officers, what their caseloads are each?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

I believe those caseloads are approximately 40. I could give you that information exactly, but I believe that they are, at any given time, in the neighborhood of 40, whereas a regular caseload would be 80 or 90.

LEG. HAHN:

But is that the recommended level for intensive narcotics oversight, is a 40-person in their caseload?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

The intensive units in general are approximately 40. Some units we keep smaller at 30, dependent on the problem involved, but basically 40 is the intensive level that we use. Juveniles we tend to keep smaller because those, you know, have extremely intensive problems and you're dealing with always the entire family.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah. I just want to make sure that this is something on your radar screen.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Absolutely.

LEG. HAHN:

That we -- you know, especially the narcotics and the alcohol units, that we're making sure they're intensively monitored, they're not setting up appointments for home visits as a way to save time. They're not, you know -- the drug testing is done properly. You know, when staffing goes down or caseloads go up, there are ways to cut corners to make sure you look like you're meeting all you need to do. I need to know you're going to assure us that you're making sure we're watching these individuals most closely.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

This is certainly a concern. This is absolutely on the radar screen. I have been looking into methodology to make the drug testing -- to strengthen that, shall we say. At this point, I can't speak to exactly where that's going to go, but we are certainly taking measures to look at that. Drug testing is an important function and we will give it appropriate attention.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. I hope that maybe we can talk --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Absolutely.

LEG. HAHN:

-- you know, individually and I can hear more about your plans for this. It's so important that our Probation -- as mentioned before, that we're adequately staffed and then we can save money by keeping individuals out of jail. And I'm especially concerned about the narcotics and alcohol group and look forward to hearing more from you on how you can assure us that they're being properly

monitored.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
Certainly.

LEG. HAHN:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thank you, Kara. Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:
Good morning, Ms. Dela-polsky (sic).

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
(*Laughter*) Thank you.

LEG. GREGORY:
I apologize, I know you called me and I didn't get an opportunity to call you back.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
That's okay.

LEG. GREGORY:
But thank you for giving me a call. My colleagues have generally asked the questions that I wanted to ask, but -- so I will just say that I look forward to working with you and addressing recidivism, staffing levels, because that's been a concern the past several years.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
I understand.

LEG. GREGORY:
You know, reduce the caseloads for the Probation Officers. I had the opportunity several years ago to go on a ride-along --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
Right.

LEG. GREGORY:
-- with two of the Probation Officers and it was a great experience, and I think you don't really get the full appreciation until you do that.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
It's not an easy job.

LEG. GREGORY:
Right, exactly. So we need to ensure that our probationers are being monitored at the level that they should be and that our Probation Officers have the equipment and things that they need to protect themselves and to do their job the way it should be done, and I look forward to working with you to ensure that happens. Thank you.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:
Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Rob?

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. I just have one real quick question for you, and I heard a couple of my colleagues talk about staffing levels. Could you just tell me what is our current staffing level in the department?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Two hundred and fifty-two sworn officers and 96 civilian staff.

LEG. CALARCO:

And how -- if you happen to know, how does that compare to our staffing numbers, say, like five years ago?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

It's down.

LEG. CALARCO:

(Laughter).

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

It is, it is down.

LEG. CALARCO:

How many people are you charged with overseeing?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

At any given time in Suffolk County, there are an excess of 10,000 people being supervised by the Probation Department, and we complete 5,000 pre-sentence investigations every year.

LEG. CALARCO:

Does that include our ignition interlock?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes. Those cases come under those that are supervised.

LEG. CALARCO:

How many do we have there, that's been added? That's a new responsibility for your department, right, in the last couple of years?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes. You know what? I would not want to be quoted exactly. I believe that any given time we have probably about 800 people of the 10,000 who have ignition interlock conditions, but I would have to get back to you to tell you exactly.

LEG. CALARCO:

And how many personnel does it take to administer that? Because those people aren't actually on Probation; the department's charged with administering the program.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Well, there's two separate things here. For people who are on probation, many of them are subject to ignition interlock, so we supervise the ignition interlock as part of their probation. Of the people who are -- and I didn't include that in the 10,000 number. Of the people who are sentenced to a conditional discharge, they're not on probation, they're sentenced to a conditional discharge and the Probation Department is charged with monitoring the ignition interlock; there are in excess of 300 of

those. We have three people assigned to that function.

LEG. CALARCO:

So would it be safe to say you could use some more bodies to get the job done effectively?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

If someone would like to give us more bodies, we would never turn them down (*laughter*).

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Patrice. And I know that we had an issue come up recently and I spoke with yourself and Errol Toulon about the policies and procedures on car stops.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So, you know, once now that you're confirmed, I think it would be good to have you come back at some time, and maybe Mr. Toulon would like to come with you, to talk about what you are planning to do, unless you already have something in the works.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Actually, I'm waiting for the -- for Mr. Toulon to give me a decision on where the County Executive's Office and the County Attorney feels that it stands in terms of Probation Officers powers and abilities. And once he has made that decision, we are ready to go forward, if it's agreed to, to implement a training program and to set out a policy.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And also one last thing, I believe Mr. Muratore has a question, but I have one other issue, is that over the years, when I first came into office, we had Probation Officers in our schools. And I know that the school district that I live in, they loved having the Probation Officers --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- because not only were they dealing with the kids that they were, you know, challenged to oversee, but also they were able to help the school to basically mitigate some problems --

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- that were going on and because of their experience and their expertise. So I think that's something that I would like us to -- we don't -- I don't want to go into it today, but obviously we have lost Probation Officers out of our schools and I think that that's something that we should be reconsidering at least. And again, you know, you look at 252 Probation Officers and the amount of work that you do and it just seems like your caseloads keep going up but your numbers are not. We talk about, you know, building this new jail, it's cheaper for a Probation Officer than a jail cell. So

that is something that certainly needs to be addressed. But I think later we should talk more about Probation Officers in our schools.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And Legislator Muratore, you said you have a question?

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. Ms. Dlhopsky, just two real quick ones.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Sure.

LEG. MURATORE:

You're being appointed to this position by the County Executive and approved by us.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Now, is this going to have any impact on the way you do your job? I mean, who's going to run the department? Because I remember a couple of years ago we had a Commissioner appointed by the County Executive, but the County Executive ran the department, the Commissioner was just, you know, "You do this, you do this," "Okay, okay." So I'm looking for someone who's going to stand up and say, "Well, you know what? I know my people, I know what they need," and you're going to vehemently fight for them.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Well, let me say this. I have been here for 40 years. I have never been known for having -- for being quiet about what my feeling is about needs. I also have found that to date the Administration has been extremely responsive. Mr. Toulon has worked very closely and has shown a real willingness to understand what our needs are, and I believe he will be very helpful to us in terms of making plans for the future.

Certainly, I understand the meaning of taking orders; when somebody tells me this is the decision that's been made, I understand that. However, you can be sure that I will be very forthright with my opinions in terms of what is needed.

I would also say I've been here a long time. I -- you know, this will be -- probably these years will be my final years with the County, and I want to go out knowing that I did the best I could for the County, for the department and for our Probation Officers, and I will do so.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, you're before a great committee. I mean, if you just sat here now and listened to all the artillery I gave you to, you know, solidify and strengthen Probation. I mean, coming out of law enforcement, I know the value of Probation Officers.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you.

LEG. MURATORE:

I mean, they're good to work with as far as, you know, from the police aspect. So I just hope that you, you know, work with the contract, work with the union and work with the members of your organization and make it strong like it used to be. Thank you.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes. That's my intent.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And I think we're done, Patrice.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There was a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *Approved*
(VOTE: 7-0-0-0). Okay, Patrice.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you very much. I look forward to working with all of you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Congratulations and good luck to you, and always make sure that you stay in touch.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

I will. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Patrice, what I'll do is -- you know, a lot of times we don't generally have people come back on Tuesday at Tuesday's meeting. I'll reach out to the rest of the Legislators and see if they have any desire to have you come on Tuesday.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

So you will let me know.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I will let you know. Thank you.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We did have another card that came in, a Michael Tosto? T-O-S-T-O.

MR. TOSTO:

Good morning, everyone.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Go ahead, you have three minutes.

MR. TOSTO:

Okay. I'm here to talk about something that's been on national TV, it is affecting the County taxpayers, everyone that's living here; it's the Safe Act. Luckily yesterday the Senate voted down these new proposals. The County -- what we're worried about here is enforcement, the cost and also endangering the safety of our residents. Does anybody know in 2011 how many people died by

rifle in all of New York State with 19.2 million people in it? Five.

Now, unfortunately Cuomo decided that spending \$32 million is good for this when people are dying from many other means and we're not spending this much. I do want to show -- now, I know this County is stopped by certain regulations from passing motions, but this is our State.

(Held up map of New York State)

All the green is every County that's passed a resolution calling for the repeal of the Safe Act. They've done this because now it's come to my attention -- and I talked to my County Legislator, William Spencer, about two weeks ago and I talked to his office -- that there's something called an opt-out form. Now, this opt-out form is basically saying, *"I don't want my registered weapon publicly available."*

Now, if you remember the Daily News, they posted all Westchester County's pistol owners names and it caused a big problem. In fact, a lot of law enforcement, as far as inside of the jails, were getting threats because their names were actually publicly available on that list for being gun owners, so they were actually calls to their house, they were getting threatened by people inside of the jail. It caused a big problem.

These opt-out forms cost man hours to County workers. So far Monroe County has seen about 11,000, Westchester has seen about nine. I don't know how much Suffolk's going to see. I don't know the cost in hours per form; William Spencer's Aides are looking into that, from my understanding. I will have better knowledge in the future as I come back. But I basically wanted to come here to put this down to show everybody that this is not the problem that the media is actually talking about. And it's unfortunate because, you know, may they rest in piece with the Boston bombings; you don't see people talking about banning pressure cookers. Okay? You don't see people, when Timothy McVey killed 19 children, you don't see them talking about banning fertilizer, racing fuel and box trucks. Now, I understand guns are a little different. They are dangerous, you do need to take safety courses. Mentally unstable people, unfortunately, are committing crimes and I think it's at a record level.

I'm 30-years old. I've seen all the asylums in this County close down, pretty much. These people now, instead of being in an asylum, are on the streets with us and unfortunately, yes, they can get their hands on whatever they want.

Now, what I do want to read to you, just as an example, because I think the problem is not being addressed the way it should be. We're addressing inanimate objects. Now, I know we can't go after Cuomo, but --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Your three minutes is up, so you are going to have to wrap up.

MR. TOSTO:

Okay. Basically to say the truth is that these pharmaceutical companies and their drugs, if you read the side effects, that's what's causing the problem. It's not an inanimate object.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mr. Tosto.

MR. TOSTO:

Yep.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I believe we have a couple of bills on the agenda that some people had some questions about, and Mr. Anderson from DPW is here to speak. There were some questions about the Sheriff facilities at the Aviation Unit. If you'd like come up, we'll do it now so we can -- I apologize you're still sitting here, but we'll let you get out of here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

1243. Basically, you know, just to let you get out of here, I know there's been some questions and I know last year I did go with you to see the Sheriff facilities, which I absolutely agree are horrendous. No one -- it's definitely -- it's not healthy and it's not safe. And, you know, of course the issue of why would it cost \$50,000, because that still boggles my mind, because I could probably build about a half of dozen bathrooms with that amount of money. So if you could explain why it's costing so much.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The work that's required at the ES Unit is we have to actually take down the entire shower units that exist now, they've eroded, there's corrosion. We actually have to break into the foundation to repair the piping and that's what's brought the cost up to where it is right now.

It is currently a three or four shower unit. We're looking at building -- well, it was currently three, I believe, and we were going to try and retrofit it for two, but we can't retrofit it. We actually have to take the entire walls down, all the piping has to be replaced because, as I said, we have to go into the foundation, that's the reason for, you know, the high cost.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Does anyone have any questions besides that? No? Wow, that was easy, because I know there were a lot of questions before you got here. But again, I did see it and I believe there is an OSHA requirement for the facility to be there for the officers, so it's not a choice. We have to get it done. How soon -- obviously, when we pass this, how soon is it going to be now until they actually get a new shower facility?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It will move relatively quickly. Another month or so, we're ready to cut the work order. We will be using one of our annual contractors to do the work. A couple of months and we should have it, I'm hoping, by summer.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I know they'll be very happy because, like I said, I've been there twice and looking at the condition of it, it certainly needs to get done.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. I appreciate you coming in. And I know there was a couple of other issues. Do we want to just wait until we get to the bills?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah? What I can do is we'll take out of order -- do we want to take it out of order?

MR. NOLAN:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No? Okay, we won't. Thank you, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome. Have a good day, everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we'll go to the *Tabled Resolutions:*

2014-13 - Directing the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council to study the effectiveness of the County's Alternative to Incarceration Programs (Hahn).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to table, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

2088-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to set minimum safety standards for recreational boats in Suffolk County (Spencer). Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to table, please.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

1183-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to amend "Suffolk's Safer Waterways Act" (Schneiderman). Is that still in public hearing?

MR. NOLAN:

It's closed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's closed.

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm trying to think; what is this one about? Because I know we've got a couple of these.

MR. NOLAN:

This one -- there's a number of entities that are authorized to issue the certificates boaters are required to have, the boating safety certificates. This would authorize town and village harbor masters and bay constables to issue boating safety certificates to persons who live within their jurisdiction.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Yes, I forgot about that. So we did have a motion to --

LEG. HAHN:

Was this amended recently, like on Monday?

MR. NOLAN:

It had a very small change, added one word, "other".

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

MR. NOLAN:

That apparently was a request by a number of Legislators.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So that change was made.

MR. NOLAN:

It was.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So there was a motion to approve. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

1185-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of heavy duty equipment for Sheriff's Office (CP 3047)(County Executive). Mike, you wanted it tabled. Do you want to come up?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I just want to let you know, I did submit a resolution for an alternate solution to this need. I don't know if it's going to make it in for next cycle, but I would need this to be tabled today

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay. No problem. So I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

I apologize, Mike, because I should have asked you if there was anything you wanted to report on. But you're good to go?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

1194-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to expand exemptions to boating safety instruction requirements (Krupski). I believe this is the one that exempts --

MR. NOLAN:

The retired members of the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard Auxiliary and the Navy, from the boating safety instruction requirements.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. That's good. So I'll make a motion 1194.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

1197-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues (Schneiderman). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. SPENCER:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Opposition, Legislator Spencer, but *it is tabled (VOTE: 6-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Spencer).*

1198-13 - Establishing a program to develop all hazard protocols for staff at County facilities (Hahn). Legislator Hahn, it's your bill.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes. Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve. Do you want to kind of give us a little bit of an update on this? Because I know you tabled it for something.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes. It actually -- I think the title has been changed (*laughter*). Because now we're going to do a pilot project starting with the H. Lee Dennison Building, the Rogers Building, a DSS building and the Riverhead County Center, and we're going to work on new protocols for not only active shooter scenarios, but make sure everything's up-to-date on our fire evacuation protocols and other hazard scenarios. And we're going to start with those buildings and PD is going to work on -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, go ahead.

LEG. HAHN:

On training of staff in these buildings and then we're going to work to expand it out to all County buildings.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. John, you had a question?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Sure. To the sponsor, I guess, or to even Counsel. I'm trying to remember who responds in the Dennison Building. I guess it's the Sheriffs. I believe the Sheriffs respond in any of our County buildings if we have an emergency, I believe. Isn't that -- can the Chief --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mike?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Chief, can you talk to us? Who responds if we have some type of an incident in a County building; is it your personnel or do we get the 4th Precinct?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I believe --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Who? Who do I call if somebody comes in my door waving something?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think it would depend on the situation. I mean, if it's a bomb scare, the Suffolk County PD is going to show up. But Mike -- I would say it's based on the issue, it depends on what the condition is.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I mean, a bomb scare is Suffolk County PD.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, let's do it this way. You've worked with the various departments and they're going to be

developing the protocol.

LEG. HAHN:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Fine. All right, thank you.

LEG. HAHN:

And it will include Sheriff.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I would assume that the Sheriff's Department would be included in this; am I correct?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You never know, I didn't get my Kevlar yet.

*(*Laughter*)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You're not getting one *(laughter)*.

And I have to say, I recently got a robocall from my school district that they're actually doing drills in our schools. So I'm very happy to see that they're definitely working hard on that, hopefully for no reason that it will ever be needed. But anyway, there was a motion to approve, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

Introductory Resolutions

1240-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of heavy duty vehicles for the Police Department (CP 3135)(County Executive). We have someone here who could respond to that. I believe it's tow trucks and, you know, I did speak with the Commissioner, if there were some members who had questioned if this is an expansion of the fleet. Is this that you're moth-balling vehicles and these are replacement vehicles?

CAPTAIN HARDY:

Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the committee. I'm Captain Gerard Hardy and I'm assigned to the Chief of Department's Office and I'd be happy to answer that question for you.

My understanding is that it is for a two-vehicle tow truck. We operate a fleet of four of these vehicles, and my understanding of it is these vehicles are on a cyclical replacement program. So

rather than everything coming up at one time and creating a large expense, they replace these vehicles every other year. So currently the vehicle with the largest amount of miles is over 311,000 miles, so that would probably be the vehicle getting replaced. These vehicles operate 24/7. Last year, in 2012, they towed in excess of 3,400 vehicles for a variety of reasons.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Question, John, I can't imagine.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It's a simple one and, again, you know, I don't know whether it's relevant or not. What determines the difference, Captain, between when one of our flat beds are deployed to retrieve a vehicle and when a private tow company, like Birchwood or whomever, goes out to pick them up? What's the deciding factor?

CAPTAIN HARDY:

That's a good question. It's an easy one to answer, too. Basically with the tow trucks, it would depend on why the vehicle is being towed, and there's a variety of reasons that we would use Police Department vehicles, including evidentiary reasons that would include fatal motor vehicle crashes, vehicles used in the commission of crimes that would want to be impounded for either the Police Department or District Attorney's Office. Also, Legislative initiatives such as unlicensed or suspended licenses, DWI and unlicensed contractors.

Also, the Police Department vehicles get utilized for decommissioned or disabled Police vehicles. Non-evidentiary, a crash without criminality, a simple tow, stuff like that, that would be contracted out to private vendors, which we maintain a list for that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So to assist in the prosecution, then, if there's a criminal crime or something, that it's been something that's within our custody and not out of the private.

CAPTAIN HARDY:

Yeah. Just the main thing, like the chain of evidence, so to speak.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. No more questions? Okay. So basically this is the vehicle at 300 plus thousand miles is being replaced. Okay. And I guess you might as well stay there for the next one.

1240; did we have a motion?

MS. ORTIZ:

No. I didn't have one.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I guess motion, Legislator Calarco. Second, Legislator Gregory. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

1241-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Marine Bureau Diesel Engines (CP 3198)(County Executive). If you can give us -- oh, sorry.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR HATTON:

Good morning. Deputy Inspector Chris Hatton, Commanding Officer of the Marine Bureau.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So if you can just give us a little bit of information on why we're buying these engines.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR HATTON:

Sure. I have a little prepared statement regarding the history and then I can give you the current status of the project.

This project provides for the continuing cyclical funding of the replacement of diesel engines for one of the departments four 38-foot Thomas boats. Just to explain, these boats are the big, white vessels that you see on the news or on-line, they're pretty much the symbol of the Marine Bureau. We call them Thomas boats because they were made by Thomas Marine in Patchogue. The boats range in age between 29 and 31 years, and obviously they're not operated like any other type of pleasure craft. They're operated all year long on the north and south shore. Currently there are one vessel on the north shore in Huntington and three on the south shore that operate out of Timber Point. They're all certified ambulances in New York State, and last year we transported approximately 265 persons for medical conditions.

They used to tow all types of impounds regarding fatalities, DWI's, disabled vessels, or also used on dive operations. Recently, one was called upon in 2010 to transport our dive team to New York City regarding the plane that crashed in the Hudson. They were all used at Flight 800 in 1996, and personally I was on one last summer when we were recovering a victim in a fatal boating accident under the Robert Moses Bridge.

In the past, we have replaced these engines every five years as the warranties expire at that time. Two of these boats, the current boats, were repowered in 2003 and two in 2004 which means they're all out of warranty. In 2009 -- 2010, correction, we replaced the transmission in one of them. The transmission on these vehicles is included with a new motor, but we ended up spending \$6,000 on a new transmission for one of these vessels in 2010. One of these vessels has not been in the water in two years due to the fact that motors were taken out of it, they were no longer useful, the boat's been on stands.

Currently, the current status is the one boat that's been out of the water for two years is being repowered at this point. I have received two diesels for that in February, I believe that was approved in 2011, we finally received the motors in February and they're going in right now. I have three more that are coming from in 2012 Port Security Grant, two of them will be used to repower one of the other vessels, and one will basically be kept on the shelf as a spare.

Even though all these motors are covered under warranty, if they suffer catastrophic failure, it's nice that the manufacturer will repair it, but we still got to get the boat back in the water, so that's why we leave the one engine for repair. Other than that, I'm open for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, obviously we have the summer coming. And since we have just passed some new laws, we certainly need those boats in the water.

Does anyone have any questions? None? No. Okay. Okay, well I guess no questions.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR HATTON:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Thank you for giving us the information.

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We have a motion to approve, Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

Next one, *1243-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the replacement of existing shower facilities in the Police Emergency Services Section Building (CP 3232) (County Executive).* I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

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

1245-13 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal funds awarded by the U.S. Marshals Service to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements (County Executive). 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? *It's approved (& placed on the Consent Calendar) (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

1246-13 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal funds awarded as pass-thru funding by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. *Approved & placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

We already did 1247.

1248-13 - Clarifying rules for distribution of public safety revenue sharing monies to towns and villages (Schneiderman).

LEG. CALARCO:

Explanation.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Explanation, please.

MR. NOLAN:

This resolution -- as everyone knows, a portion of our sales tax is used for public safety purposes. A

portion of those revenues goes to the various towns and villages that have their own Police Departments. This resolution seeks to clarify the way the money is actually distributed to those towns and villages.

We passed resolutions back in 1995 and 2000 and they've been interpreted in such a way that if money is included in a year's budget to go out to towns and villages, let's say in the 2012 budget, they won't see that money till 2013. And they have to -- the odd thing about the bills and the way those old resolutions have been interpreted is that the towns and villages have to explain to us, they have to file a document explaining how that public safety revenue sharing money was spent the year before, but they really haven't gotten the money yet from the County. So this resolution would repeal the old resolutions and say that beginning in 2014, towns and villages that are budgeted to receive revenue sharing monies from the County, they have to file their accounting by March 31st of that year. And basically they have to verify that the amount of money that they spent totally on their public safety expenses exceeds what they received from the County in terms of revenue sharing.

And then second, that beginning in 2014, once they file that accounting of the previous year's public safety revenue sharing monies, they are eligible to get the money at any point thereafter. So it is possible that if we put money in the 2014 budget for the towns and villages to receive these monies, they'll actually get the money in that same fiscal year. So we will get the money, possibly, out to the towns and villages quicker than they receive it now.

LEG. CALARCO:

Does that actually require the disbursement to be made, or it just gives -- makes it possible?

MR. NOLAN:

Makes it possible.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Vaughn, you have some comments?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes. We've actually wanted to speak with the sponsor, and I actually did speak with him yesterday. We want to talk to him some more about this bill with our Budget Office and him and he's agreed to table it for a cycle, if the committee will indulge.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I guess motion to table, Legislator Calarco. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

1250-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to enhance and improve Suffolk County's E-911 Service (Kennedy).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Table for a public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to table for a public hearing by Legislator Kennedy. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

And with that, I believe we have no more business. I'll make a motion to adjourn. Second, Legislator Calarco. So we are adjourned.

Public Safety - 4/18/13

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 AM*)*