

**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, May 2, 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, District No. 14  
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature  
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature  
John Ortiz, Budget Review Office  
Josh Slaughter, Aide to Legislator Browning  
Bobby Knight, Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay  
Paul Perillie, Aide to Legislator Gregory  
Lora Gellerstein, Aide to Legislator Spencer  
Kellianne Sacchitello, Aide to Legislator Muratore  
Ali Nazir, Aide to Legislator Kennedy  
Gerard Hardy, Deputy Inspector, Suffolk County Police Department  
Mark Fisher, Captain, Suffolk County Police Department  
Kevin Burkel, Lieutenant, Suffolk County Police Department  
Michael Shanahan, Suffolk County Police Department  
Tracy Pollak, Suffolk County Police Department  
Patrice Dlhopsky, Director, Suffolk County Probation Department  
John Jordan, Deputy Commissioner, FRES  
Thomas O'Hara, FRES  
Robert Sheron, FRES  
Jay Egan, Chairman, FRES Commission  
Suzanne McBride, SCAME Police Emergency Unit  
John Desidario, Suffolk County Resident  
Laura Ahearn, Executive Director, Parents for Megan's Law  
Peter Reimann, AME/FRES Unit Vice President  
Kevin McEvaddy, AME, Legislative Liaison  
Mike Sharkey, Chief of Staff, Suffolk County Sheriffs Office  
Joe DeStefano, Suffolk County Sheriffs Office  
Lou Tutone, 2nd VP, PBA

Public Safety 5-2-13

Russ McCormick, Sergeant at Arms/Suffolk Detective's Association

**Minutes Taken By:**

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

**Minutes Transcribed By:**

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

*(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:44 a.m. \*)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Can we have all Legislators to the horseshoe for the Public Safety Committee. Good morning. We'll start the Public Safety meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Legislator Kennedy.

*(\*Salutation\*)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And a moment of silence. Actually, April 28th was Workers Memorial Day, so a moment of silence for all workers who have lost their lives on the job and also for our military men and women and our officers who serve our country every day.

*(\*Moment of Silence\*)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. Okay. And Joe DeStefano, I see you're here. Congratulations on your appointment to Secretary Treasurer for the New York State Fire Department Association. Congratulations. And we have one speaker, John Desidario. I hope I'm correct.

**MR. DESIDERIO:**

Yes, that's correct.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You have three minutes.

**MR. DESIDERIO:**

Thank you. I was here on January 31st and I brought up some issues and concerns in public safety. I live in Northport behind the marina, and I brought up the issue at that point because I've been into Legislator Spencer's Office discussing this after not getting any results from Northport Village. And it was -- to deal with boats that have fuel stored in them over the storage season on dry storage. And these boats are stored right behind our homes along the fence line. And as a result of the fire that occurred in Freeport Marina last February, I got very concerned because it really pertained to just what the situation is behind my home and other homes in Northport. And when I came to the committee after not being able to get any resolve through the Northport Village or Legislator Spencer's efforts, I came here to address the full, you know, Public Safety Committee. And as a result of that a letter went to Mr. Nolan from Mr. Spencer laying out, you know, the concerns I addressed.

Unfortunately there was -- something was miscommunicated because I was asking about, you know, dealing with the issue of safety regarding boats not having fuel in them at all if they're stored, you know, over a long summer season where fumes form and people are working on their boats with electrical equipment, smoking. You know, it's a real danger as evidenced by what happened in Freeport where two workers were working on boats in storage that had gasoline in them and they were working with electrical equipment and they ignited the fumes in the boat. There was an explosion and the two people that were working almost got killed, a million dollars in damage on boats. Fortunately, this wasn't near any homes, you know, whereas in Northport we're right on the fence line with all the homes. Now, you know, I didn't address this when I --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Mr. -- okay, go ahead, finish up, because I was going to have Counsel respond to your letter.

**MR. DESIDERIO:**

On January 31st I came, and I wasn't only addressing it for my concern in Northport. What I really

wanted to put out there is that this should be a much broader concern because it pertains to boat areas everywhere with there's storage, County, State, Federal. And I'm in conversation now and communication with Senator Marcellino's Office to see if they can do something on the State level. But I was very frustrated with the response that I got in regard to addressing this committee because I don't want boats not stored at all behind my house. The issue I wanted to address is that boats with fuel in them should not be stored very close to the fence line or homes. Either remove the fuel and have legislation saying such, or if there's fuel in the boats have a certain distance away from property lines, fence lines, and don't allow any use of electrical equipment or smoking on or around boats that have fuel in them. Just like we go into gas stations, I mean, you can't smoke. You have to shut your engines off. So why shouldn't that be the case in, you know, boatyards where these boats are sitting over a long, hot summer, fumes are forming in these tanks and it's a very dangerous situation, as what happened in Freeport.

So I was asking for that to be addressed on a County level because I can't get anything done at the Village. They seem not to want to do anything, you know, regarding the marina situation in any respect, so that's why I went to Legislator Spencer's Office, but we haven't had any success. And Legislator Spencer even sent a letter to the Mayor of the Village, I'm wrapping up, asking him to address us and get back to him. That was in March. Unfortunately Legislator Spencer is not here. I wanted to ask him if he got any response on that. So I really, again, ask Mr. Nolan to, you know, relook at this because it's much broader than just saying, "Mr. Desidario, you have to deal with the Village on this". It's broader. It means a lot to a lot of people.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. George, would you like to comment? I mean, off the top of my head I'm thinking I don't know if there's an issue if a boat's sitting there with empty tanks that it would have a problem with the tanks. And again, like, you know, if the boatyard is not -- it's not gas pumps, like a gas station, and, you know, so I think there are some things I'd like to look into myself to see what the safety issues are. But I know George, George can respond to your question.

**MR. DESIDARIO:**

If you look at the Freeport fire incident, which I gave a copy of the letter to the Legislators.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Very briefly, Legislator Spencer did bring this issue -- these issues to my attention, asked me for my opinion. Mr. Desidario had two or three or four ideas. It's a number of months ago and I can't remember all the details, but essentially what I advised Legislator Spencer is some of the stuff we couldn't do. Some of the ideas that Mr. Desidario had were, you know, zoning type of issues which we have no control over. And then the other piece was some of it I just advised Legislator Spencer the County wasn't built to enforce. These were not the type of laws that, you know, you could pass something but we have no ability to do anything with them. I think Mr. Desidario went to the right place to begin with, the Village and/or the town and didn't, you know, get the response he wanted there, but I think that's the level of government that should be dealing with the issue he's raising.

**MR. DESIDARIO:**

Can I respond briefly?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sure, go ahead.

**MR. DESIDARIO:**

As I said, Mr. Nolan, it's not a Village issue only. It's, you know, there are boatyards all over our community, all over Long Island.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, but I think what he's saying is the enforcement part of it, that we would be very -- we wouldn't be able to, even if we put something in place, he's saying that we wouldn't be able to enforce it.

**MR. DESIDARIO:**

Well, just by virtue of putting severe penalties on the books saying if you are caught doing this, and then a large percentage of the people are going to not break the law. Of course you'll have people that will break the law and do it, but they're risking getting caught with severe penalties. So, yes, enforcement may be a difficulty but, you know, if you put penalties in place, you know, people are going to really take notice and probably not break the law.

And as far as the zoning, I'm not talking about Village zoning. I'm talking about County legislation, State legislation. This is something that should be addressed on those levels because there are a lot more people affected than just me in Northport.

And again, I just want to address Legislator Spencer. Did you ever get a response from the Mayor of Northport on the March 19th letter asking him to please address this issue.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**MR. DESIDARIO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. Next speaker, Suzanne McBride.

**MS. McBRIDE:**

Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Suzanne McBride. I represent the Suffolk County Association of Municipal Employees Police Emergency Unit, the workers up at the 911. I'm here today basically to thank you all for your support in getting us the additional SCINs that we received the last Public Safety meeting, but I did just want to put it on record that yes, it is a wonderful thing we have those new 14 SCINs that we got, but just so everybody knows the reality of it, those 14 bodies will not be working, functioning 911 Operators and Dispatchers probably until December of this year. We'll be lucky if they get their ID cards by Labor Day. It is a very lengthy process that they have to go through. Even if they expedite the process it's still a lengthy process.

We will still be short-staffed during the summer. It's going to be a very difficult summer on my members. I would hope that maybe the County could spend some time on maybe some public service announcements to educate the public on how to use 911. Dr. Spencer had done a wonderful piece on his social media sites about using 911. If we could get that out to more of our residents I think it would be a wonderful thing. I think it not only would help our members, but cut down on a lot of frustration by County residents when they call 911 and they're not getting the response that they hoped for.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you, Suzanne. And I guess Doc Spencer, we'll be talking to him to see what he's been doing so we can maybe borrow some of your work.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, thank you very much.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And again, when you're saying that you're not going to have anybody up and running really until December, obviously we have -- we'll be hitting the hurricane season before that. And I was wondering, Mr. Vaughn, do you know if there's been any plans for the upcoming season, because I know we have talked about how the 911 Operators and I think there's - I forget what the name is, but I know that we had some of these people through -- that were working down in dispatch at FEMA, I'm sorry, at FRES. They're -- I'm drawing a blank on the name. Does anybody remember?

**MS. McBRIDE:**

CERT team?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Say again?

**MS. McBRIDE:**

I wonder if it's a CERT team?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Not the CERT team. These were people that were on loan from the Feds that come and help in an emergency situation. I think they were working at FRES.

**AUDIENCE MEMBER:**

TERT.

**MS. McBRIDE:**

TERT?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I know there's a few FRES people here that may be able to kind of give us an FYI on it. Great, we have somebody. John, you had some people that came and worked at FRES during the hurricane season with dispatch, correct?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

Correct. They're TERT teams they're called. What that stands for I don't remember.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yup.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

The T, maybe Telecommunication Emergency Response Team. They were mutual aided from Upstate. We had them for well over a month. We had staffing and we used them in the radio room. They didn't actually dispatch, our Dispatchers continued to dispatch, but they did call logging, things like that. We had them in the Emergency Operations Center assisting in the call taker room as well.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Suzanne, would that help you? Because I know that when initially we talked about it --

**MS. McBRIDE:**

It might help to a small degree. I think something that might help even more is if the County were to establish an information line. Right now we have 852-COPS, which is supposed to be targeted for non-emergency police response. However, unfortunately that line has become the do all for the County and it's put out there every time we have a storm for any information to call that number. Our operators just get completely overloaded with calls for information that we're not equipped to handle. If the County could establish an information line and have, you know, switchboard

operators, someone else answer that line would be a tremendous help.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. That probably would help is if we were able to put some staff members on the 852-COPS in the event of an emergency.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Sure. When we have talked -- pardon me, Madam Chairwoman. Tom Vaughn from the County Exec's Office. But, yes, when we have talked and we have discussed technological solutions to or technological reliefs to the situation over in the 911 Call Center, that is one of the options that's being explored at this point in time and we're hoping that something along those lines would provide some relief there.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And John, did you have something to say?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

During emergencies when the Emergency Operation Center is active we have -- we use the 852-4900 number, the general business for the Emergency Management. What we do is that number is forwarded to a call taker room and we have the Community Emergency Response Team, which are volunteers for the County. They work very hard. There's about 300, 400 of them, and what we do is we bring them in to staff that room, so the room is staffed by volunteers to handle the non-emergency calls.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I believe many of those CERT members are actually County employees anyway, right?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

There are. They come from all walks of life. They're, you know, all professionals, you know, volunteers, Red Cross volunteers, firefighters, as well as just ordinary citizens that choose that as their avenue for volunteering and they're very dedicated and they spend hundreds -- during Hurricane Irene they spent over 1400 volunteer hours in the Emergency Operations Center alone. I don't have the number for Sandy, but it's well above that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So I guess being that we will have that hurricane season coming up starting around August, September, is there a possibility maybe in a couple of months you could come back and is there an opportunity to try and set up a plan of some kind in the event that there could be another emergency?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Sure. And as the Administration has said, this is a priority. We have been working on it. We have been -- I think we've been quite dedicated to providing a solution to this situation. Yes, hurricane season is coming up. Yes, we continue to work on the situation, and I don't think that what you're asking to come back and talk about some type of plan maybe during that -- looking -- thinking about the calendar, maybe during that July Public Safety meeting maybe we can have a conversation about that at that point in time, if that's what you're thinking.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sure, that would be great. Kara, you had a question?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Okay. But we have the shortage now.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And we have hired people.

**LEG. HAHN:**

How do these 852-COPS calls affect the daily operations now, non-emergency scenario.

**MS. McBRIDE:**

They keep us pretty busy. We get a lot of calls through 852-COPS. One of the aspects that slows us down with 852-COPS calls is we don't get all the information that we would normally get through a 911 system as far as where the caller is coming from. We do have a high volume. I don't have the numbers, I don't have access to those, but the 852-COPS keeps us busy during storms. It's just nonstop, it's crazy. We have people calling for, you know, "I heard I can get a free generator", "Where can I get gas?" And things that, you know, my operators just don't have that information. We don't have access to it. We're there for, you know, life and death situations.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Remind me, Sandy was October 29th?

**MS. McBRIDE:**

October 29th.

**LEG. HAHN:**

It is now May 2nd. It's been a very long time.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And we have put in a lot of effort to this program, Legislator Hahn. We have put in a tremendous amount of effort. We've hired over 20 people, we've put a tremendous amount of effort.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I just think we should by July we should have a plan actually implemented. I don't think by July we should be discussing the plan.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I don't think --

**LEG. HAHN:**

I think we should have a different timeline.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Pardon me, Legislator, but Legislator Browning asked that we come back and report on something that there was no discussion as to whether or not it would be implemented or not implemented at that point in time. I didn't say that we weren't going to have something in place by then. I said that we would come back and do a presentation on that.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Okay. I think we should up that timeline. I don't think that's acceptable, and that's my two cents.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think that, you know, obviously I think the Administration has done a good job in making sure that the SCIN forms are being signed. And again, not thinking about the fact that it takes about six months for somebody to be up and trained, I'm willing to give them, you know, it's May. So you're talking like maybe eight weeks to have them come back. Obviously what we're looking for is that come hurricane season you're going to be able to tell us that you have County employees or you have CERT volunteers, somebody who's going to be manning the 852-COPS number so that they

don't. And what other, the TERT team, whatever they're called, you know, is there a possibility to have someone from there to come and help out in some way? Just for -- because obviously I'm hoping by next year we're going to be up and running and in better shape next year for the next season.

**MS. McBRIDE:**

I'm hoping.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And, Legislator Browning, one of the things I would just like to add is I -- my understanding about one of the limitations of 852-COPS is the fact that that number goes directly to 911; am I correct?

**MS. McBRIDE:**

Yes.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So I think that -- when we talk about technological solutions we're -- I don't know how easy it is to make that break. So while I think an ideal situation certainly would be there's 852-COPS, for example, I had Tim Motz, who was the former Director of the PIO operations over in the Police Department had said, "Look, what if some of my -- what if the people who I used to oversee were doing some of the 852-COPS work." And that makes a lot of sense, a tremendous amount of sense. The concern that we have, or not concern, but the technological issue that you run into is, is it that easy to just break that off and that's one of those things that we're looking at, because you're talking about -- if those calls are being routed to 911, then you're talking about something that I probably don't understand, but you are talking about diverting that to another place and it is certainly something that we are exploring.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, I know, and actually that was something that I had, you know, mentioned at one point was somebody calls 852-COPS, why should 911 be responding to that? I know sometimes you get the 852-COPS calls that were really 911 calls, so how do we -- if we were to say somebody at Police Headquarters, the PIO was to now take those calls, then can't they be switched over to 911?

**MS. McBRIDE:**

If I can. The 852-COPS, if I understand correctly, was originally established for calls that need a police response, but that are non-emergencies, they're not life and death. That would still be a function of the 911 Operators because those calls would still have to be put into the CAD system, an officer would still have to respond. What's happened is that that 852-COPS number has become diluted because it has become the general purpose information number for the County. What we need to do, unfortunately, is try and retrain the residents of the County 852-COPS is not for information. It's if you want to physically see a Police Officer. If those were the calls that were strictly routed to 852-COPS, the appropriate place for it to go is to the 911 Operator. We need an informational line for Suffolk County.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Tom?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I think that Suzanne always makes a very good point, and that is, you know, I've said it once, I've said it 100 times. We understand the frustration behind this issue, but carving this out and figuring out what the best solution is is part of this process. So she's absolutely right, we should have --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Could we do it with like a 555-3000 number, whatever it was.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We should have some type of general information line and make sure that press and all department -- and all County departments are making it clear as to where 852-COPS is supposed to be going to. But as I said, that is one of those issues that we are working our way through.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

There's a seat next to Tom, if you'd just give your name on the record.

**MR. FISHER:**

Hello. I'm Captain Mark Fisher. I'm the Commanding Officer of the Suffolk County Police Department's Communication Section. As I'm hearing this conversation, I'd just like to put in some clarification on 852-COPS, and I think we can simplify this and maybe make this work a little better. 852-COPS has become blurred as to its intent. 852-COPS is a line that's designed when you need a Police Officer or a police response that is a non-emergency situation. Its design was to take those police requests away from the 911 system to take the strain off of the true emergency.

Now, what has happened here before a storm, information would come out and say if you need information on where the shelters are, use 852-COPS. That was not its design. So having said that, when we're giving out information and it goes into 911, 852-COPS goes into 911, our operators become inundated because people are doing the right thing in the County, they're following instructions, they're calling on 911 lines for information, but they're taking down our 911 lines in essence on the 852-COPS line. So my suggestion would be that we segregate that line. When we put out press releases we give a special number called Hurricane Irene or whatever we wanted to designate it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, like the City, like the 311.

**MR. FISHER:**

Like a 311 system, but --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I don't know. She said she thought we were getting that.

**MR. FISHER:**

The 311 system is truly an information line that really doesn't deal with the Police Department. It deals with informational services within government, within New York City Government. Police Department can be included, but it's not for when you want a cop for response. So hopefully I can clarify that a little bit.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No. I know that that's what was happening because during the storm people were calling -- there was press releases going out for information for this, for information for that, it was 852-COPS and then the operators didn't even know about the press release.

**MR. FISHER:**

Right, the Commanding Officer didn't know.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So that really muddies stuff up when they're getting phone calls and they have no idea what the people are talking about. It's an embarrassment.

**MR. FISHER:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Legislator Calarco has a question.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I just am looking for a little bit of information on this, and I'm sure nobody has this off the top of your head, so when you have the opportunity to send it to me. Could you just give me a breakdown of all the phone calls we received over the last year, 911, 852-COPS, whenever the 911 Operators had to re-route calls or do the long distance thing that they have to do. I know sometimes when people need to make long distance calls they're required to do that. Just give me the numbers of what they've had to do over the last year so we can get a real handle of what they've been required to do and how much of that work really falls outside of the 911 system.

**MR. FISHER:**

We could do that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That would be great. Would you be able to have it for the next committee meeting?

**MR. FISHER:**

Yeah, I think I can do that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Excellent. John, you have a question?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I do. Captain, thank you for coming up. Similar to Legislator Calarco, I would be interested in seeing that universe of the calls that come in. And I don't know whether you can speak to this. Ms. McBride has been outstanding in bringing the concerns and the staffing issues associated with the 911 Section there. I still don't understand why with the actions the County Executive took in signing the SCIN forms to fill the various positions, we are at May 2nd today and she's saying that in all likelihood we will not have new employees at consoles until December. I don't understand it. What's involved?

**MR. FISHER:**

Well, I don't know that December -- I'm hoping a little sooner than that, but once again it all really will depend on the level of the employee. Training is a, you know -- I really -- you have to get the operators by themselves when they are ready. There are certain levels in training. Some people pick up quicker than others. It's a complicated job. We will do anywhere -- we'll do two to three weeks of classroom training.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. FISHER:**

Then we will follow that up with anywhere from 12 to 16 weeks of on the job training.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. FISHER:**

Understand, and I think there's a concept out there that anybody can sit on a 911 line, answer the phone and take the information.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Hold on, Captain. No, please, I'm not trying to infer that at all.

**MR. FISHER:**

No, and I'm not saying you are.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

My sense is that we do have highly skilled employees there and what I've seen in the films is they are working or engaged in a fairly complex set of screens and equipment, and despite being in -- you know, around the County for 20 plus years, I was never aware that they do the audio monitoring when an officer's dispatched for some type of a 911 call. Completely unaware of that on my part. So in no way, shape or form am I trying to minimize their function. I believe it's very important and I believe they should have training. I'm just trying to go a little bit more to the specifics. So the County Executive signed the SCINs. Do we actually have lists and have you been able to start interviewing people.

**MR. FISHER:**

Yes, we have lists. The background checks are being conducted and we are working diligently. As far as background goes there's, you know, and again, I don't want to say to anybody here that you don't understand, but there are some notions out there, and not necessarily from this committee, that it's just a matter of hiring people and they sit down at a console and they take calls. We have to do screening to see what their criminal record is. They're in a sensitive area where they are going to be getting sensitive information. Their psychological backgrounds and all this stuff has to be done and this takes time. So we've got approximately a six week lag time before an employee is actually cleared.

We give them an interview, and we're fairly quick, just to see if they're suited for the job and make sure that they know what the job entails as far as working holidays, etcetera, and hammer that home. It does us no good to train an employee for 12 weeks and turn around and have them walk in and say I can't do this because I really want weekends off.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No doubt, no doubt. So without me trying go too much further on this, because you folks do know what you're doing, is there any -- these positions, from what Ms. McBride has been telling us and what we hear from you, is that unfortunately it seems that we have a high burnout rate there, or conversely it seems that we're frequently calling for new folks to come off of the ESO is that it? What's the -- I apologize that I keep mangling these terms.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

The ECO?

**MR. FISHER:**

ECO.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's it, the ECO. So if those people test and they need to have this print background, the print check, psychological check and some of the other stuff and we know we're going to be going to that list fairly frequently, wouldn't it behoove us to kind of bring some of those people in as soon as they pass, say like that first category, you know, 100 to 95 or 100 to 90 and give them that first pass so we can weed out? You know, if we have people that, "Nah, I don't want to work a weekend, I'm never going to work a weekend." Thank you very much. You know, maybe we should have even put that out there when we took their 50 bucks the first time around.

My point to you is, is it is such a -- I don't want to say a difficult process, but an involved process with getting people on board. The more that we could do I think to front load to get to people who really want to come to work for us, have the qualifications and the skills, meet all of the background types of items and can jump in for the training, we'd get them in sooner.

**MR. FISHER:**

Yeah. One of the things with front loading, and I agree with that, but when we've done some analysis on it, and I don't know if the conclusions are all in, but I will tell you this. When we front load and we don't have SCINs or we don't hire for a period of time and we get in our minds a group, for example, let's say of six candidates and they really look good and they're ready to go. But if we don't hire soon after they find other jobs. Investigation costs money for this type of investigation. It costs the County to pay for the psych, the Investigators to go out, it's a lot of money. So we look at it and we say, "Well, we don't want to go too far ahead because we lose these people to other jobs, and we've expended all this money only to start all over again." So it's a balancing act with that and how we do it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll leave it at this. I don't want to monopolize the committee anymore. But is it part of the Civil Service requirements? You know, 38 years ago when I started working in the State hospital I had to get my fingerprints done. It was a requirement right then and there, the old card where you rolled your prints. Is that a requirement for our -- when these Civil Service tests are administered, that everybody's printed out of the shoot?

**MR. FISHER:**

I don't work for Civil Service, you know, so I don't know on that end, but I believe they are printed and I know psychological is part of the process and background checks are part of the process.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I see Suzanne --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think Suzanne has a --

**MS. McBRIDE:**

If I may. My daughter just took the test for Dispatch and ECO last Saturday I believe it was. They are not printed when they take the test.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

They're not.

**MS. McBRIDE:**

The only thing they have to do is show a photo ID and their Social Security number and they take the test.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right. So maybe that's a conversation I have to have with Mr. Schneider then, because I think we need to look at items, administrative items in the chain here to help get you folks, you know, that are ready to go. Thank you. I'll yield.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Kara, did you have a question? No?

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. One last thing, because I know that a long time ago when I called the 852-6000 number, and that goes to you guys, also.

**MS. McBRIDE:**

At times it does, yes.

**MR. FISHER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That's something that I don't know why it goes to 911. Is there a way that that 852-6000 number can be re-routed to maybe the PIO. I mean, that's the front desk when you walk in. Why wouldn't they be answering that number?

**MR. FISHER:**

Well, again, I think it came back to manpower. We used to have a switchboard. We had two Switchboard Operators that would handle those type of administrative calls, and I guess due to budgetary constraints that we're all crippled by, they were not rehired. It was decided that somebody had to answer these calls and the 911 Operators were there and could be trained for that. So that's where we stand with that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So then that's another challenge for you, is to find a way to re-route this 852-6000 because, you know, there's times I had to call Police Headquarters and sometimes I don't always have the number of the, you know, section that I need to call. And that's the central number and I don't think they should be answering that phone call.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And I can confirm that is one of the things that Tom Melito has been looking at.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Great. Okay. I don't think there's any more questions. Anybody else? Nope? Okay. Thank you. Suzanne, any last comments?

**MS. McBRIDE:**

The one other thing that I was hoping to mention is there was -- while we have gotten a tremendous amount of SCINs that exceeded my expectations, there is one job title in our unit that is critical that has not received any help. I understand the department's plan is to eventually cross train Dispatchers to cover our Teletype Operators, which is a Police Operations Aide. Right now we have six Police Operation Aides that work in Teletype. If you recall, my original presentation I explained that they're responsible for entering into the system warrants and missing people and also for confirming those things not only in our jurisdiction, but with out of state jurisdictions.

We have six. We used to have, I believe, 12 or 13. I know two of those people are planning on retiring probably within the next year or so. One of them has been with the County for 30 something years. And while I do understand that the department plans on cross training eventually the Dispatchers to cover that position, they need help right now, and their position can be trained much quicker than a Dispatcher. Where it's going to take maybe, you know, six months to get a dispatcher fully trained and running, hopefully a POA can be trained within two months, three months, to be fully functioning and to run on our own.

I have a midnight POA Operator who is the only midnight POA Operator. She works five days a week. When she's not scheduled to work it has to be filled with overtime. When she is scheduled to

work, unless we have a Dispatcher who happens to be cross trained, and there's only four of us that are, she doesn't get meals, she can only get a quick run to the ladies room if she needs it. They really need help. If we could get one or two POA Operator SCINs somehow, some way. They're a lower grade than our ECO Operators, lower grade than our Dispatchers, but they need help. They are going to have a very long and very stressful, painful summer. And I'll leave on that note. Again, I thank you for all that's been done so far, and I hope we can do more.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you, Suzanne. So I guess maybe we can look at that. I mean, does it have to be a 911 Operator to do that function at all? Could we have them just a totally separate entity and just doing that alone?

**MR. FISHER:**

It does not have to be a 911 Operator to do that function.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. FISHER:**

Once again, 911 is being used to backfill a function because that's where we have the manpower.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Is the Teletype Operators, is that a POA Civil Service test or?

**MR. FISHER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So they are in the POA but -- okay. I'm trying to figure out how that would work.

**MR. FISHER:**

If they're a POA, you know, they have a specialized training for that area, but that's the title.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But they wouldn't necessarily need to be a POA. You could have actually a separate job title that could be created as a new position, a new job title. Do you know what I'm saying?

**MR. FISHER:**

Yeah, I know what you're saying. And, again, that I think falls back to Civil Service, which I'm not the expert on, but I don't see why not from an amateur standpoint.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Tom, we can talk about it later.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I would be happy to, because quite frankly I'm a little confused as to what you're asking, so I would love to have a conversation off line with us.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And I think we can talk to the Performance Management Team to see if that's something that can be done. Okay? Anybody else have any questions about anything? No? Okay. We have -- I know Patrice Dlhopsky, see I got it, practicing.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

I think there was a bill that you were going to explain to us actually and I would like to get an explanation on it. I believe it was 1353.

**MS. DLHOPOLSKY:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good morning.

**MS. DLHOPOLSKY:**

Yes. 1353 relates to the Community Service Program. As you know, Red Cross was operating community service until last June, if I remember the dates correctly. EAC took over in November. During the time that Red Cross operated community service as part of their budget, various equipment was purchased. It belonged to the County, it was used by Red Cross. Upon their termination of their contract, that property reverted to the County -- well, it's accepting the transfer of the inventory that they had that was purchased with County funds.

This particular resolution concerns with dealing with the dispensing of that property. The vast majority, a lot of it and the reason we wanted to get this through, is that there's a very large amount of equipment that has to do with things rakes and hoes and things like that so that they can have work crews use that, and since the season is upon us, we would like to get that taken care of. It would be retained in County ownership, but it would be used by EAC and available to them. At the same time there are vehicles, and this discusses the disposition of the specific vehicles that are involved.

So again, basically everything would be within the ownership of the County. Some of those vehicles would remain with the Probation Department, some would go to the Sheriff. Heavy duty mower and -- well, two heavy duty mowers would go to the Sheriff so that they could use it for their Corrections Work Program. And basically that's all that this is requesting.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Any questions? No questions about anything else? Okay. And actually I'd like to know how EAC is doing. I mean, not necessarily we'll do it today, but, you know, at some point maybe get back because I know there were some --

**MS. DLHOPOLSKY:**

Generally -- yes, things are I think they're going pretty well, you know.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Sounds good.

**MS. DLHOPOLSKY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you, Patrice. Okay. We have -- okay. Anything from FRES to report on? No? Yes?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Madam Chair? Kate.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Oh, sorry.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Weren't we going to have a presentation from the Sheriffs for the jail?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We were, but weren't able to get that done this time around. We will have one, right, Mike? We were going to have a presentation. We're working on getting a presentation on the jail.

**MR. SHARKEY:**

I can take questions if you want.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. John, do you want to -- you're next then.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

We just have the resolution 1342-13 for the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan, accepting the money.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We'll take money any time.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

I don't think there's any questions on that one. Nope. Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Actually, Madam Chair, I do have a question.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. You have another question, okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That committee has started the actual process for renewing the plan, John?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. There's one particular category in that disaster mitigation plan that's of -- all of it's important, but I'm particularly concerned about that groundwater, the elevated groundwater sections that run through the Hauppauge/Smithtown area that are identified in the plan. Do you anticipate that they're going to wind up remaining in the renewal?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JORDON:**

I am going to pass that question to -- I brought our two experts which I know that you know well.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And worked well with them. As a matter of fact, it's a simple yes or no. Yes, it's still in?

**AUDIENCE MEMBER:**

(He did a thumbs up).

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's fine. That's all I need. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Great. So I guess no more questions. Okay. Mike from the Sheriff's Department, Mike Sharkey. I guess there may be some questions. I would have preferred that, you know, we could -- I know there have been back and forth with the Sheriff about a couple of issues with the Youth Program and obviously the jail issue come up and there is that bill coming up on Tuesday. Maybe we could have them come in on Tuesday for the full Legislature to talk about the bond resolution.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

That would be fine.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But if you have questions anyway you might as well ask him now.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I recall at the last meeting when we were debating this topic I think the Presiding Officer had indicated that this project has had such a long scope with the different phases that, especially with some of the newer Legislators such as myself, to kind of have a -- just someone start from the beginning and kind of take us through the different phases. I don't know if it was meant to be in this venue. There's no specific questions except I know it's a lot of money, and I would like to get kind of an historical perspective and to understand why we are at this point and what I would be voting on.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

All right. And I think that not all of the newer Legislators are on this committee and --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

True.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And, you know, I think that might be best to maybe have it at a General Meeting.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I agree with that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And have everybody get the presentation and get an update, because certainly I know the Sheriff has worked hard to -- the initial plan was definitely much larger than what we currently have. And I know he reduced -- increased the number of beds, but reduced some other like basically office space and that to reduce the cost, so he was actually able to add more beds than -- in Phase I than what was planned initially. But, Mike, you want to go ahead? We're talking and you can probably answer questions better than the rest of us.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

May I, Madam Chair, just one quickly. If you'd like to place that on the Legislature on Tuesday's agenda we're game for that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You think you would be able to come on Tuesday, or the Sheriff, to do a presentation on the Phase II?

**MR. SHARKEY:**

I discussed that with the Sheriff and as you know, I was at the last General to take any questions from the Legislature. I think there might have been a misunderstanding that I was going to make a full on presentation. I discussed it with the Sheriff after the meeting and, I mean, the crux of it

remains is the reason to move forward is that it's being mandated by the State. The Sheriff feels that if you want to know the State's motivations, it really would be more of an invitation to the Commission to come down and speak to the Legislature and make their presentation. It's not -- it wouldn't be the first time they've done that. You have had the Commission down before.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Why not?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, I guess why not, as John said, because obviously they're the ones that are looking at us to spend the money and they're not prepared to give us anything. So maybe we should make a request to have them come down, although I don't know if they'll come on Tuesday. I don't know if there's a possibility of getting them coming that soon, but we could certainly put in a request and see if they could come. But again, that would be something we'd want to do in front of -- at a full General Meeting. So do you want to make the request or should we?

**MR. SHARKEY:**

Well, I think that your body is the entity that wants to hear from them.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We'll do that.

**MR. SHARKEY:**

I will be -- you know, I was here last General, I'm here today and I will be there on Tuesday. Again, I'm available, I can answer any kind of questions about the facility, any future plans about variances.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

We could do that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can I --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Hold on.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Through the Chair for just a second. Chief, just so that you -- I don't want to speak for everybody else, but I'll go from somebody who is not a new Legislator and who followed the whole process with the construction of the new jail going back to -- actually it predates my time when I first came in in 2004, from some of the planning and the aggregation for the capital expenditures and the, you know, special meetings in December of '05 where we had, you know, 90 million that was encumbered without even a set of plans that was in place.

I for one in particular am extremely interested in hearing from the Commissioner of Corrections about their, I guess, global perspective regarding what our responsibilities are, not so much the Sheriff. The Sheriff does an excellent job. You all do a very good job. But what their broad set of parameters are that they're directing Suffolk County has to fulfill. And then perhaps where we're at now concerning what's physically been constructed, what can be added in increments, and then what -- how you folks will be fulfilling that housing requirement.

In my mind it's almost I'm thinking about three entities. I want to hear from the Commission on Corrections and then ultimately I'd like to be hearing from the Sheriff and from the Commissioner of Public Works regarding the incarceration function. From your perspective, what you have to do with

the individuals, and from Public Works, what it's going to take to actually get the additional number of units to fulfill what you guys have to do with the bad guys. That's what I'm looking for, Madam Chair.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Wayne, you had a question?

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

I just wanted to -- if it's the request of this committee certainly the Presiding Officer's Office could see what the schedule is. Mike, do you have all the addresses and telephone, all the contacts who we should be addressing it to?

**MR. SHARKEY:**

Necessarily not with me, but if you wanted to contact my office I could get you the information you need.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very Good. We'll be glad to facilitate that, inviting him down for one of the General Meetings. This is what the Chair would like to have done, invite the Commissioner down to one of the General Meetings for a presentation to the full Legislature.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yes, that's what we'd like to do.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

Michael, could you get -- don't need a phone call, just get us the information if that would be possible.

**MR. SHARKEY:**

Who do you want me to forward that to?

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

The Presiding Officer's Office and with a copy to the Chair.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. And we'll schedule it when he's available. He? She? I'm not sure who the Commissioner is.

**CHAIRMAN BROWNING:**

He.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

He.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Any other questions? No. Any comments, Mike?

**MR. SHARKEY:**

No. As I said, I'm here and I'm available. I will just very quickly on another issue, 1185, I apologize, I've been asked to table.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I forgot I was going to ask you about that.

**MR. SHARKEY:**

I've been asking to table two cycles now. I did speak to the County Executive's Budget Office yesterday and that should be laid on the table for Tuesday, so I only have to ask you hopefully one more time today to table that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Tom, it's going to be laid on the table? You're not familiar with this?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'm sure I'm familiar with it. If the Budget Office says it's being laid on the table, then it's being laid on the table.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Yeah, because I thought it was supposed to be laid on the table on this past General Meeting, so I just want to make sure it's coming this time. Okay. I guess no more questions, no more comments. Anybody in the room have anything they'd like to comment on before we go to the agenda?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Madam Chair, I have one last question. Just a general question for the PD. And it's just that I've seen -- Captain, can you just bring the question. I don't expect you to have an answer on this, but I have seen that there is another grant offering for COPS funds. I believe that this month is -- the end of this month, mid-May is a deadline for the application. You have to be familiar with the COPS funding.

**MR. HARDY:**

Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the committee. My name is Captain Gerard Hardy. I work in the Chief of Department's Office. Legislator Kennedy, I am actually not familiar with that grant that you're speaking about.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MS. POLLAK:**

The COPS MORE grant -- I'm Tracy Pollak from the Office of Support Services. The COPS MORE grant is due on the 22nd of May.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So thank you for that. Now maybe can you tell me then next, will we be applying for funds to bring on personnel.

**MS. POLLAK:**

The Police Department needs authorization in order to submit any grants applications.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So then the next thing I guess I have to do -- so should I call the County Executive to ask him if he'll authorize the Department to apply for grant funds? I'm not trying to be sarcastic here, folks. I'm really asking. What do I do? Because the way I read it, and my understanding in previous administrations is that we can receive up to \$125,000 per individual hired for a three year time period, and my understanding is that we are below 1600 field officers. So even I could do that math.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

What fund is this? I'm sorry. Can you explain what this grant is?

**MS. POLLAK:**

This is a COPS grant, which is the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. It's a Federal program. It's generally offered on a yearly basis. And you can -- you can hire new Police Officers who come in. The grant will pay the salaries of the new Police Officers and we have to -- we have to use those Police Officers in community orientated policing functions.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So that's different than the veterans one, because I know there was one for hiring veterans. Have we taken advantage of that one?

**MS. POLLAK:**

This particular grant will give us extra credit if we hire veterans.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. But doesn't that -- don't we get some grant money for that one, too?

**MS. POLLAK:**

I am unaware of any specific grant to hire Police Officers that was specifically targeted at veterans.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I thought that was a Federal grant that came a couple of years ago through the President, I think that he announced it. So okay, I'll see if I can find out more about it. But the other one, are we taking advantage of the grant that you're talking about?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Through the Chair. Then, Tom, I guess I need to know, does the County Executive intend to give the department the approval to apply for a grant that's due in three weeks?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

As soon as this meeting ends I'll be happy to go back across the street and find out what we're doing with it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, and you'll let me know?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Excellent. Obviously one way or the other you'll be letting the Department know as well.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

The one thing I remember seeing about the veterans one was that they pay the salary of the Police Officer I think for the first three years if he's a veteran, if he's hired off the test list and he's a veteran, or she I should say.

**MS. POLLAK:**

This particular grant will give us extra credit if we do hire veterans. As you know, our Civil Service system, we do give preference to veterans, they get extra --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**MS. POLLAK:**

And so on and so forth.

**CHAIRWOMAN BROWNING:**

Right, but I believe there was a Federal grant for Police Officers hired who are veterans and it was a three year -- it was a three year grant that they would pay the salaries for three years. I will check into it, because I know I've read about it somewhere, and I believe New York City took advantage of it. So I'm just curious if we haven't taken advantage, why not?

**MS. POLLAK:**

We can only take advantage of grants when they are actually available before the due date, so.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. Okay. Any other questions, anyone? No? Kara, did you say no?

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So thank you. So we will go to the agenda. Okay. Tabled resolutions.

**Tabled Resolutions**

***2014-12 - Directing the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council to study the effectiveness of the County's Alternative to Incarceration Programs (Hahn).***

**LEG. HAHN:**

Okay. I think we were tabling this one until we got the new Director, so I'm hoping I can meet with Patrice about this. And I might have to reintroduce it, but --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think we were also -- we had the conversation with Risco Lewis to look at an alternative way to do it.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Maybe we'll set up a meeting with Risco and Patrice.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Sure and everybody.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So motion to table?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes, please.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. *(Vote: 7-0-0-0)*

*2088-12 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to set minimum safety standards for recreational boats in Suffolk County (Spencer).*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Motion to table, Legislator Spencer. Second? I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. *(Vote: 7-0-0-0)*

*1185-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of heavy duty equipment for Sheriff's Office (CP 3047)(Co. Exec.).* I'll make a motion to table. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. *(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. Second, Legislator Calarco?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yup.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Abstain, Legislator Spencer. *(Vote: 6-0-1-0 Abstention: Legislator Spencer)*

*1248-13 - Clarifying rules for distribution of public safety revenue sharing monies to towns and villages (Schneiderman).* Same motion, same second, same vote?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Mr. Vaughn.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So I hope Mr. Nolan would correct me if I'm wrong, but this was a bill put forward by Legislator Schneiderman to clarify some of the rules for the towns as to how they would submit an application for public safety money. If I understood the sponsor's concern, what he wanted was to be -- for the towns and villages affected by this money to be able to use the money that was budgeted but not yet -- but they wouldn't have to actually receive a check. They could just use the information based on our budget, and I really hope that I'm explaining this correctly. The Legislator has made some amendments to the bill about some other things that we had some concerns about, and so long as the bill is exactly what I kind of just explained, the County Executive's Office is fine with it.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Well, it was amended. Just so we're on the same page, and there's no misunderstanding, I think what Legislator Schneiderman is trying to do is basically say that starting next year, if there's money in the 2014 budget, what they're going to do, a town or a village is going to tell us how they spent the money in 2013, the money we gave them. Okay? And if they do that they have until March 31st each year to do that, to say we spent the money this way last year. Then they're entitled or eligible, I should say, to receive the funding that's included in the 2014 budget some time during 2014 or any time after they file the certification of how they spent the money the year before. And that's what he's trying to do. I think it's just to try to get the money to these towns and villages in the same budget year that the money is included in the budget for. Was that clear?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I don't know.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

You want to try that again? John.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Do the villages have to file any kind of certification now?

**MR. NOLAN:**

They do. But the system that's being used now is they -- when they file a certification in this year, let's say for 20 -- they'll file something with us by March 31st in 2013. That will allow them to get the money that was budgeted for them last year, so there's a long delay in this money getting to the towns and the villages. And I think that's the problem that Legislator Schneiderman's trying to get at. There was a, you know, an issue raised about the cash flow problems of the County, so that's why he made the law effective next year.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

He's been doing that all week.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Right?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Doing the best he can.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Hold on. Doc?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, I -- these two resolutions, the one that was tabled before, when you look at the villages, I think I would like to have some discussion as to what the concern is when -- I have four of these villages in my Legislative District. They pay their full share of taxes for public safety on their tax bill, and I don't understand if it's just a matter of that there are more Legislators that don't have villages, but I would love someone to kind of help me clarify or understand why shouldn't there be some equity if they are -- if they're paying and they're contributing and they have to -- they don't get the benefits of all of the services because they have their own village services. There should be some --

**MR. NOLAN:**

You know, just so we're clear. I mean, the resolution we just tabled now actually goes to the amount of money that the towns and villages are entitled to. The resolution we're dealing with now just deals with if we put money in the budget for the towns and villages, how they get the money and when they get the money.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No, I understand that. But I think it goes to, you know, it's kind of back and forth. Every time these motions come up I abstain or disapprove because I have an inordinate, heavy number of villages and their Mayors are in contact with me and they're asking the question, "Why? What's the problem? Why shouldn't there be equitable distribution? Why shouldn't we be able to get our monies in a timely fashion?" And I would love to, you know, I'm representing my constituents, to kind of get their side of that argument.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You know, I don't know if I'll ever understand this, because I know that we have the Police Departments, I know they pay in the Police District, but I know that there's services that we provide from the District Attorney's Office, you know, from the various departments within the five western towns in our Police Departments. So I don't know that we can really -- I don't know what the numbers are, but are they getting their fair share? Because if we were to start looking at the other services that do get provided to them throughout the year, you know, from the Police Department, if we were to put a number to that, are they getting their fair share?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Right, right. I think that's the question. I know that they do receive services and, you know, we're talking about the sales tax. I know that they're not paying into the Police Fund but the sales tax revenue, and some of these villages have, again, just when you look at the sales tax that comes out of the villages, that is a hefty portion. But I understand, you know, the tabling, the first motion, but I would like to make a motion to approve the second one. The County Executive's Office has weighed in, we've had clarification, and I think in fairness.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

John.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So on the motion to table --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I apologize. Just procedurally I put a motion and I was just looking for a second.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay, thanks.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. My rationale for bringing a motion to table forward is not so much that I do not have a village in the 12th Legislative District, we have a couple of villages in up in the 13th Legislative District, but my understanding with this is as to equity, Doctor. The village forces generally are involved in essentially basic patrol, but that even in some of the routine district functions out of the precinct, you'll see those services provided like here in the 4th Precinct. If there is a burglary up in the Head of the Harbor or we have an arson that might go on in Nissequogue, those services, which are general district services, are provided to the villages and so, in fact, the villages are getting the

benefit of some of the funding that's committed to the special district.

So while from the Mayors' perspectives they may be looking for what they deem equity as far as offset of their patrol function, in fact, those Mayors are -- and their residents, are getting the benefit of the special district levy by virtue of the fact that they get the benefit of those additional services. So, quite frankly, that's why I'm looking to table. My perspective is, is they are benefiting. They're benefiting from the levy that we all pay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

DuWayne.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I think we're clouding the issues a little bit. This is, and correct me if I'm wrong, Counsel. This is not about equity. The previous bill that we just tabled was more about equity and changing the percentage of the sales tax. This is about the monies that they already get ensuring that they can get them in a more timely fashion and stating what actually those monies are going to be used for in the equitable or inequitable system, depending on your point of view, as it is now. So this is not about services that they receive, or disproportionate services. This is about clarifying the process that is already in existence.

**MR. NOLAN:**

It doesn't -- this resolution doesn't guarantee anything in terms of the towns and villages what they'll get, whether they'll get any money. It simply states if money is included in an Operating Budget for public safety revenue sharing monies going to a town or village, it just lays out a new process for how they can get that money with the goal of, you know, speeding it up and simplifying. Because right now, like in 2013 the towns and villages have to certify how they spent the money in 2012. They haven't gotten the money in 2012, they haven't gotten the money for 2012. This is kind of clarifying, basically saying going forward in 2013 tell us how you spent the money in 2012, and once you do that, then you are eligible to receive the money that's included in this year's budget. Personally, I think it's a needed clarification, because what we have on the books right now just doesn't make sense.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Doc, you want to say something?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, that was my point in terms of this particular legislation, that it should be approved for that reason. But I also, if I could through the Chair, just responding to Legislator Kennedy's remarks before, was that in addition to paying, when they do receive these services, they're billed back for these services additionally, too. So I think I would like to get really some clarification. They pay additional fees when they utilize these services.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I didn't think so. Can we have BRO?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can we, through the Chair, go to BRO.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, I was going to say because I didn't think they got billed on that.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay. Well, maybe I could be wrong. But then it still comes down to a matter of what they're putting in for the services. We've never had a debate in this body, at least since I've been here, as

to even if they are getting some services, do those services come close to what they are paying in for.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I would still, Madam Chair, I guess ask if BRO --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

BRO.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

The Police Department does not bill the towns and villages for their services in the Police District. Certain things like individuals pay for, you know, towing and whatnot, but they don't bill the towns and villages.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I apologize. Is there, as far as -- is there any analysis to your knowledge as to with the amount of monies that come from the villages towards public safety and what they receive in services? Is there any sense or is there any way to figure out if there's equity there?

**MR. ORTIZ:**

There's been a lot of discussion about this over the years, but there's been nothing formally, you know, determined whether the towns and villages are paying too, much not getting enough back, or whether they're getting too much back, you know, because they get General Fund services like homicide investigations and everything from the Police Department, MedEvac. They're not billed for any of that. So are we giving them too much back, are they getting not enough back? It would be a lengthy kind of audit report that would have to be conducted.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think it'll be hard to try and figure it out. Obviously the services are there, but they're not necessarily using it. I mean, a major crime happens, you're going to use it. If there's a MedEvac needed, you're going to use it, but you may not need it every year. So I guess it would be kind of hard to really do the math on it. I guess it's kind of like paying insurance, that's the way I see it. But -- okay. So I guess I can support the motion to approve. You made the motion to approve, Doc Spencer. Was there a second?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Yes, Legislator Gregory.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Gregory. And there was a motion to table.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Did we have a second to table?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

I don't want to table it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

There was no second on the motion? Tom, did you want to say something?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Nope.

**CHAIRMAN BROWNING:**

Okay. So there was no motion, no second on the table. So there's a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

One opposition, Legislator Kennedy. And it is approved. *(Vote: 6-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Kennedy)*

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

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yup.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Legislator Kennedy made a motion to table for public hearing.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes. The public hearing is still open. Hopefully we have accurate publication this time around.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled for public hearing. *(Vote: 7-0-0-0)*

**Introductory Resolutions**

*1318-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Replacement of Existing Fireworks Burn Pits (CP 3016)(Co. Exec).* I'll make the motion to approve.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

If there's someone from the department here who could answer the question. We had quite a bit of discussion last year about the burn pits. We bought a trailer for the disposal of fireworks and ammunition and some other things. And so we were having the question about whether or not we needed to move forward with the burn pits. It's an awful costly program or project here and we were looking at whether or not it was something we can not do now that we have the trailer or maybe postpone. Do you have any information on that, Captain?

**MR. HARDY:**

I have with me today Deputy Inspector Michael Shanahan from Special Patrol Bureau and Lieutenant Kevin Burke, Commanding Officer of Emergency Services, would be more than happy to answer some of your questions.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good morning.

**MR. SHANAHAN:**

Good morning. I'm Michael Shanahan, Deputy Inspector.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Hold the mic.

**MR. SHANAHAN:**

Commanding Officer of the Special Patrol Bureau. This is Lieutenant Kevin Burke. He's the Commanding Officer of the Emergency Service Section. To answer your question, the trailer won't suffice to dispose of the amount of fireworks we normally receive.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Is it just there's too much volume, or is there items that are just too big for the trailer?

**MR. SHANAHAN:**

Both. The volume is a big issue, but also your larger commercial grade fireworks would exceed the capacity of the trailer.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Legislator Gregory?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Hi, how are you? I have testimony that Inspector Cameron had stated before I guess this committee, I don't have a date on it. Paul, do you know when this was? But anyway, it states that in reference to the burn pits, it mentions that the Inspector would look at possible alternatives. Has there been any look at alternatives, what those alternatives were? Did we research them and find out that they're not feasible? What's the status?

**MR. SHANAHAN:**

Currently the pits appear to be our best option. We are looking at alternatives. One thing we're looking at is possibly one pit and an alternative above ground structure, but as of right now the pits seem to be our best option.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good? Yeah. And I thought that the -- because of the trailer, that you would be using the pit a little less than the trailer. Now that you have the trailer.

**MR. SHANAHAN:**

The trailer really would only be useful for a small amount. And also, the trailer has proven so useful for the disposal of ammunition that we'd like to save it for that. You know, it has a useful life and like I said, it's really worked out very well for the disposal of ammunition so we wanted to keep it to that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Anymore questions?

**MR. BURKE:**

If I could just add. The trailer has come in tremendously with the disposal of all the ammunition

that we recovered from the Hurricane Sandy that was damaged and we've been using that nonstop, and that's really if we start using that for the consumer grade fireworks, it's going to shorten the lifespan of it, and if we have another large influx of ammunition we're going to be in a bind. The commercial fireworks that we dispose of, you have to have the pit. There's no other way to do it. These are items that detonate. They're explosives. It's the mortars that go up in the air and send out the big aerial display. If those go off at grade level and we have people nearby, they're going to be killed from it. Two years ago there was a huge accident in Hawaii where a disposal company was disposing of mortars and they had an unexpected detonation and you had five people killed as a result.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. One more question.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Is there any program where if we have these commercial grade fireworks, that they could be either given or donated to a professional fireworks company? Is that illegal or is there any way that these items that are illegal, if they are placed in the hands of someone that's licensed to do fireworks shows? Is there anything -- what would be some of the concerns with that?

**MR. BURKE:**

We've explored that with some of the commercial entities that do deal with fireworks, and they're not interested. These have no quality control. They don't know where they came from, they don't know what condition they're in. Once they become wet or damp and they dry out they appear okay but their substance has changed and they're not going to function as designed. So no commercial entity is going to take them.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I think that's it. Okay. So we had 13 -- oh, John. Sorry.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

I'd just like to add that I spoke with Commissioner Webber and Chief White earlier this week about this project, and one of the technologies that they're looking to that Mr. Burke had alluded to about an above ground structure, that would be covered with what's called a blast blanket and this would actually be a much cheaper alternative than building the pit. So I would recommend that we go forward with this project and the cost of the project may actually be less than what we're budgeting.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That's good. Thank you. So I believe we had a motion and a second, right Renee?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, it's approved. **(Vote: 7-0-0-0)**

**1319-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Replacement of Police Headquarters 911 Backup Generator (CP 3216)(Co. Exec.).** I'll make a motion to approve. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: 7-0-0-0)**

**1342-13 - Accepting and appropriating 75% Federal pass-through grant funds from the**

***NYS Office of Emergency Management to the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services for a Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Planning Grant to update the existing Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan and to execute related agreements (Co. Exec.).*** I'll make a motion to approve. Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. ***(Vote: 7-0-0-0)***

***1353-13 - Accepting the asset transfer of inventory of furniture, fixtures, equipment, materials, supplies and vehicles purchased under Probation Contracts for the American Red Cross Community Service Program and appropriating such inventory to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements (Co. Exec.).*** I'll make a motion to approve. Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. ***(Vote: 7-0-0-0)***

With that, we have no more on the agenda. I'll make a motion to adjourn. Second, Legislator Calarco. We're adjourned.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:04 p.m. \*)***