

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

Capital Budget Meeting

A special 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 16, 2013 at 2:00 P.M. to discuss the matter of the 2014-2016 Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair
Legislator DuWayne Gregory
Legislator Kara Hahn
Legislator William Spencer

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Kate Browning, Chairperson
Legislator John Kennedy
Legislator Tom Muratore

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay - District #8
Deputy Presiding Officer Wayne Horsley - District #14
Robert Lipp - Acting Director/Budget Review Office
Rosalind Gazes - Assistant Director/Budget Review Office
John Ortiz - Budget Analyst/Legislative Budget Review Office
Jill Moss - Budget Review Office
Diane Dono - Budget Review Office
Tim Rothang - Aide to Legislator Browning
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn
Bobby Knight - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Tom Vaughn - County Executive Assistant
Ed Webber - Commissioner/Suffolk County Police Department
Robert Scharf - Lieutenant-Staff Services/SCPD-Headquarters
Mark Fisher - Captain Communications/SCPD
John Hanley - Deputy Inspector-Communications & Records Bureau/SCPD
Michael Postel - Communications Director/SCPD
Mark White - Chief of Support Services/SCPD
Marianne Scheschowitz - Budget Analyst/SCPD
Dr. Yvonne Milewski - Suffolk County Medical Examiner
Patrice Dishopolsky - Suffolk County Probation Department
Mike Sharkey - Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Mike Franchi - Deputy Warden/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Lou Tutone - 2nd Vice President/SCPBA
Joe Williams - Commissioner/FRES
Richard Stockinger - Chief/Suffolk County Fire Academy

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

Bob Holley - Deputy Director/Suffolk County Fire Academy
Arty Sanchez - Treasurer/Deputy Sheriffs Police Benevolent Association
Rick Brand - Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter

Verbatim Transcript Prepared By:

Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide

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

*(*The meeting was called to order at 2:10 P.M. *)*

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. We're going to get started. If everybody could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Hahn.

Salutation

We'll stay with tradition, if everybody could just rise for a moment of silence for all of our men and women serving overseas and at home who to protect our way of life.

Moment of silence observed

Thank you. Our Chair, Legislator Browning, can't be with us today. She is in Colorado visiting with her newest addition to her family; she has a new grandson, so she couldn't be with us here today.

We're going to get right -- started. I don't have any cards? Is there anybody from the public who'd like to address the Committee this morning? Seeing none, I see a lot of people from our various departments. Perhaps, Commissioner Webber, I see you over there, would you like to come up and address the Committee and let us know what your needs are and what you think of the proposed budget.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Good afternoon. Thank you very much. To my right is Mark White, the Chief of Support Services, my prior position.

I'd like to just thank the Budget Review Office for their thorough and detailed review of the Police Department's request for capital projects and we agree with their recommendations. Due to the financial insecurity, we've only requested one new capital project that we require 2014 funds and that was the emergency generator for Special Patrol, and both the County Executive and BRO has suggested that we attempt to get FEMA funding for that and we agree with that possible solution, so we're not asking for that.

In addition, we're only asking for three cyclic programs that would require 2014 funds, and that would be the heavy duty vehicle purchase, the purchase of marine diesel engines and the firearms -- shooting range safety improvements. Other than that, they're all subsequent years.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Is that it? Okay. I just -- on those cyclical programs you mentioned there, I know specifically with the -- the Marine Bureau engines and the -- the flatbed tow trucks there that you

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

needed, if -- did we purchase those items this year? We already authorized for purchasing of those items this year as well? I guess we'll start with the marine engines; let's go one at a time. I believe we just authorized that, if I'm not mistaken.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, you did on the '13 -- the heavy duty, we did a flatbed for '13, you just appropriated '13 funds.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Next year is for an ES truck.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Next year will be an ES truck. And how much is the ES truck going to cost? I think the County Executive put it in for a hundred for next year? BRO was recommending something different.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The ES truck -- the flatbeds, rather, are pretty much on target for what we -- we all asked the same, the Recommended and the requested and BRO is all the same, about 120,000 for the flatbed. The ES truck, yes, they did increase, BRO did suggest and we concur that we need some more funding for next year's ES truck.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. And the flatbed truck, though, is 120, is what you said?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, that's the estimate.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And you wouldn't need a new one of those until 2015?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The next flatbed will be 2015. We have a heavy duty ES truck due in 2014. The 2013 you just appropriated the funds for.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And that was a flatbed truck.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, it was.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. And with the Marine Bureau engines, I think if you saw BRO's report, their recommending just purchasing one engine in next year, in 2014, then putting off any further purchases for a few years. I know the budget typically was saying a new engine every year, but they're saying that -- that all of our engines at that point would be new and under warranty. Would we be able to put that off by a couple of years before we have to necessarily purchase a new engine?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes. That actually occurred because the -- on twelve of eleven --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Put it off for a while.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

On twelve of eleven you appropriated funding. It took until the beginning of this year to get some of those engines. We got a -- had no money for '12. We got a Port Security Grant so we're having those engines also. So if we buy '13 and '14, yes, we wouldn't need them because they come with a five-year warranty, so they would still be in warranty for a couple of years.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So you're comfortable with BRO's recommendation on that?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, I am.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, great. Okay. Does anybody else have any questions for the Commissioner?
Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Hi, Commissioner. The purchase of these vehicles, has that always been in the Capital Program? Because I know some vehicles we used to purchase, you know, in Operating, so I'm wondering why these are in the Capital Program, or is it always, I guess, the more expensive heavy duty type vehicles have always been in the Capital Program?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, these programs have always been very high dollar value and they always have to be spec'd out so it's long-term in getting -- we don't go down to the local Ford dealer and ask for a flatbed or an emergency service truck. It takes quite a bit of time to spec them out for Police needs. So the dollar amount is a big thing, 120 for the flatbed, up to 200,000 for the Emergency Service vehicles, so they are very expensive. There is quite a long life for them and, therefore, it requires capital.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Any other questions? Great. Commissioner, thank you very much for being here today. We appreciate your time.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, we'll move on. I see Chief Sharkey in the back from the Sheriff's Office. Chief, if you'd like to come up, I think we probably have multiple questions for you.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Good afternoon. Deputy Warden Franchi is appearing here today with me and I'd like to thank him for his work in preparing our Capital Budget, and as well thank the Budget Review Office for their work and their review.

I will say at the outset that we do agree with the majority of the Budget Review Office's recommendations. We'd like to do a presentation on each of our projects. We'd normally go in project number order, but I am going to take project 3008 last; that's the one you're likely to have the most questions on, so I'll do that one last.

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

We have one new project this year, which is improvements to various Sheriff's Office facilities. Currently there are two umbrella Capital Programs under the Sheriff's Office whose purpose is to fund all renovations, major systems, equipment repair, large scale maintenance and issues, repurposing existing space to accommodate the Sheriff's Office mission at Yaphank and Riverhead Correctional Facilities. These are 3009 and 3014. However, the Sheriff's Office has many assets that are not part of these two major components. First District Court Detention Facilities and Domestic Violence Unit in Islip, Headquarters and County Court Detention Facilities in the Criminal Courts Building in Riverhead, Civil Enforcement and Personnel Investigation Sections in Yaphank, and the Sheriff's Academy Facilities in Brentwood and Westhampton are some of these areas. Unfortunately, none of these can be serviced by the funds appropriated under 3009 and 3014. Because of this, when these areas have renovations, repairs, maintenance issues, which are significant in cost, a new Capital Project has to be requested to address them. Even if the Capital request is approved, it means at least 18 months will elapse before any work can start. Invariably, this means degraded operational efficiencies for many units.

As problems go unaddressed and repairs and maintenance work gets deferred, in addition, problems related to deferred maintenance and repairs lead to issues of safety, both for employees and the public and a potential for liability claims.

This Capital Project would establish an Umbrella Program under which the funds could be appropriated for the purpose of addressing issues of major repairs, renovations, repurposing and large scale maintenance at these unattached assets in a more timely, systematic and less reactionary way as is currently done for the same issues for the facilities under 3009 and 14.

Capital Project 3009 is for renovations at the existing Yaphank Correctional Facility. This is an ongoing Capital Project which addresses the renovations and repairs to the old 1959, 1983 and 1988 portions of the Yaphank Correctional Facility. The renovations of the eight dormitories in the old portion of Yaphank is the construction -- is in the construction drawing stage. This contract was awarded to Ehasz Giacalone Architects, or referred to as EGA, with the actual construction RFP scheduled to begin in mid-summer and construction to commence in the fall of this year. The original plan the Commission received from Suffolk County had these eight dormitories being converted to direct supervision housing areas with expanded footprints to accommodate indoor recreation. The Commission has since stated that they would only require the County to convert these dorms to direct supervision without the addition of space for attached inmate recreation area. This will save significantly on construction costs and not force any reductions on current housing capacity. The Commission expects that all eight dorms will be renovated in a timely manner. The funding for this project was approved.

In 2012, an evaluation was done of all Suffolk County correctional facilities by EGA. The resulting comprehensive analysis report will serve for the next ten to 15 years as a basis for all system maintenance repair and renovation work.

(*P.O. Lindsay entered the meeting at 2:21 P.M. *)

In conjunction with DPW, plans to undertake to maintain the older portions of the Yaphank complex. This report will also serve as the basis for funding we ask for for Capital Project 3009, beginning in 2015 and continuing through subsequent years, which will allow us to establish a reliable source of funds to maintain this asset. We'd like to avoid issues caused by operational efficient -- excuse me. We'd like to avoid issues caused by our operational efficiencies by deteriorating -- the deterioration of the physical plant that came with deferred repairs and maintenance work. While half of the Yaphank complex will be brand new, the other half is not and correctional facilities age at a much higher rate than other public buildings because of hard and continuous use.

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

Additionally, with the opening of the new portion of the Yaphank facility, a large portion of the old part will become available to the Sheriff's Office for space repurposing. The comprehensive analysis identifies many areas of Yaphank as possible, new work space for units that are currently occupying areas that are not adequate for the current mission.

The bottom line is that ongoing maintenance, upgrading and repurposing of the space in the correctional facilities is required. Even with the construction of new facilities, it must be remembered that a plan for this system has always been -- included the older portions. We cannot risk losing them, as has happened in the past, because we have failed to maintain them. The cost of maintaining the 588 beds of old Yaphank is dwarfed by the cost of having to recreate them via new construction should we lose them because of preventable problems, as happened with 120 permanent beds lost in 2004 with the closure of North Four and South Four.

Capital Project 3014 covers improvements to the correctional facility in Riverhead. This is an ongoing Capital Project for the maintenance, repair and upgrade of an overcrowded correctional facility that is 43 years-old. The maximum security portion of the facility has been severely overcrowded since 1980. Even without overcrowding, jails are severe-use facilities because they are used 24-hours a day, seven days a week. In the past we've used a master list of maintenance and repair projects that was jointly compiled by the Sheriff's Office and DPW to guide the work that we perform under this Capital Project. In the last quarter of 2011, EGA was selected to develop a master plan to include a complete evaluation of all of Suffolk County's correctional system. This analysis document has been completed and, henceforth, will serve as the basis for identifying and prioritizing various renovation and maintenance projects with regard to the Riverhead facility. It is a more systematic look at our needs and will allow us to more efficiently allocate resources to the identified and prioritized capital needs of the Riverhead Correctional Facility specifically and the entire correctional system in general. It will be used as a justification document for all future funding requests for Capital 3014.

Our objective is to generate significant cost savings by accelerating projects now, thereby avoiding construction cost inflation and cost increases due to deterioration caused by deferred maintenance. Ultimately, this will result in less maintenance expense because timely attention to repairs lessens damage and/or loss of efficiency caused by delay.

As an illustration, to put the value of maintaining Riverhead Correctional Facility into perspective, the capacity of the new Yaphank Correctional Facility is 440 beds and cost 181 million to plan, construct and furnish. If we do the math and equate these construction costs to recreating the 921 beds that Riverhead, with the inclusion of the double-celling variance, can legally house, we arrive at a conservative cost estimate to replace Riverhead of approximately \$378 million. This estimate is conservative because it's based on a contract awarded in 2006, and the Yaphank cost did not include construction of a food preparation service area which the recreation of Riverhead would necessitate. Consequently, protecting and maintaining this investment must be a high priority in the County's Capital Program to assure continued service of this complex' systems as well as long term cost avoidance and improving operating efficiencies.

The levels of funding in '14,'15 and '16 and subsequent years reflect our needs based on the Comprehensive Analysis Report with a nod to fiscal realities. This request would establish a funding stream for the protection of the functionality of this very valuable asset. It will allow the Sheriff's Office, in conjunction with DPW, to implement the maintenance and repair programs as identified in the analysis in a systematic way.

Also, with current fiscal realities in mind, the Sheriff's Office has delayed requesting funding for the largest single item identified by the Comprehensive Analysis as being a need, a new kitchen and food service area. However, in lieu of requesting the 12 million, this project is currently estimated to require, we are instead requesting a steady stream of furniture and equipment funding as a

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

band-aid approach to keep the current kitchen facilities functional and in compliance with all applicable standards. In conclusion, we urge that funding for 3014 be adopted as we scheduled it.

Capital Project 3060 is the purchase of communications equipment. This is simply a continuation of an existing program. There's no changes in the funding request from what was adopted in '13 to '15.

Now I'm going to return to project 3008, which is the new replacement facility in Yaphank. At the outset I'd like -- we'd like to say that both the Sheriff's Office and the County have been dependent upon the cooperative relationship between ourselves and the Commission to accomplish our goals in this facility and to open the new facility. They have worked with us as far as maintaining variances and allowing us to utilize existing staff to open the facility when the County made the case to the Commission that we were not in a position to hire the number of officers that the Commission originally needed.

Phase I of this Capital Project is complete and fully open as of May 1st with the exception of medical housing. This is approximately ten months behind our original schedule. This portion of the project provides an additional 440 beds in our legal capacity. The New York State Commission of Correction is mandating that Phase II commence immediately. Phase II is to provide an additional six housing pods, each of the same design as those in Phase I. Each pod will have a capacity of 60 housing units which will provide another 360 beds to our capacity. The purpose of Phase II of this project is to provide the necessary -- the funding necessary to plan and build a correctional system that will address Suffolk County's future incarceration needs without the need for variances. In a letter from the Commission dated February 23rd of '12, it specifically states; *"It was the Commission's understanding that funding for Phase II expansion portion of this project, construction of six additional housing pods, has been appropriated by the County. Submission of those plans was to take place in 2010 but did not occur."*

The letter from the Commission goes on to state; *"The Commission is requesting an up-to-date timeframe for the Phase II construction plans submission and subsequent construction and completion of this phase. The timeframe will help the Commission with determining the need, if any, for continued variance relief during this phase of the project."*

At this time, the last correspondence from the Sheriff's Office and DPW has given the Commission a schedule for Phase II of Capital Project 3008 that shows planning starting in 2013 and construction starting in late 2014. By 2014, the '16 Capital Program requested that funding for Phase II be moved from subsequent years as shown in the '13 to '15 Adopted Budget to '14. Instead the funding recommended by the County Executive was moved forward to '15 with the construction monies being requested split between '15 and '16. This will, in effect, not allow any potential construction to commence on Phase II until sometime in late '16, since an RFP cannot be issued until all the required funding is in place. Therefore, we are requesting that the funding be scheduled as originally requested, or at the very least, that the required construction monies be requested in '15 and not split between '15 and '16.

At this time, I'd be happy to take any questions you might have.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you, Chief. Does anybody have any questions for Chief Sharkey? Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. You had finished before I was able to pull it up. The other day I just -- for my own reference point, because I wasn't here when discussions were made over Phase II or even Phase I of -- the beginning discussions, I should say, over the Yaphank facility. So I went back, I started looking at BRO's review and I think I went back to 2004, and from those discussions, from

what I read in the review, it was clear that Phase II wouldn't have to happen. So at what point did that change? I mean, at least from the review, I'll read it again, but that was my understanding. So I'm just trying to clarify what point, if that -- even if that were true, at what point did that change and why?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I don't have the benefit of going back and having just looked at those reports, so I can't comment directly on those reports. But I can say that the Commission of Corrections really is the motivating force behind moving forward in Phase II and their analysis of our capacity and our potential future census. I know that, as I said, the Sheriff had shared his thoughts with all of you in regard to examining alternatives to incarceration, but we're talking about striking a balance between planning for the future and the mandates of the State versus ongoing discussions with the Commission as we examine those alternatives.

LEG. GREGORY:

I'm going to try to find that language, just even for my own edification, and I'll -- when I find it, I'll let you know.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mike, I think you know our problem. We're trying to strike a balancing act between the Capital and Operating. We don't want to lay anymore people off and we don't know where we're going to get the money to make payroll, which is being very blunt about it. And we're just trying to figure out this whole thing where we could steal a couple of bucks here and there or stretch out something to get us to the next year or to the next benchmark until something loosens up. And I know you're aware of it because you've been with me every step of the way here with this battle that has went on for my whole tenure. I went through a couple of Governors and a couple of CEO people and COE people and I just -- you know, I just -- we're at the point where we don't know where to go anymore. And so forgive us if we seem to be asking the same questions year after year after year. I mean, we invited -- the Safety Committee has invited the head of Corrections down to chat with us directly on it, which I know they've been so gracious to do in the past. I don't know whether they're at the end of their wits or not and might refuse to come down, that's certainly up to them, I mean, they're busy people. But we're just looking for some help somewhere, you know, so.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I --

P.O. LINDSAY:

If that's any kind of explanation.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I understand your position and the County's fiscal position.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you. Chief, I guess part of what we're looking to get a handle on is even if we're ultimately going to be forced by the -- by the State to build this additional facility, I know there's a resolution pending now for the planning money for that; correct? And how much is that for, do you know off the top of your head?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I believe it's 3.7 million.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Three point seven million, okay. What is the realistic timeframe in order to put that plan together, given current time we're in now in the year, by the time that money gets appropriated we'll be halfway through 2013, even if we do it at the next meeting. How long would it actually take for them to do that engineering work? How likely is it that we'd be ready to go with anything in 2014?

And also, I guess the other follow-up to that is how quickly do we need to spend the money? You know, it's \$113 million you're looking for for the entire project. Is it something that can be spread out over a number of years to -- to phase it in, so to speak, so that we're not encumbering all of that in one particular year in our Capital Budget? If I'm not mistaken, I think that's how we did the original, but I could be wrong.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I'm not sure if there's someone here from DPW, but some of this does bridge over from our operational concerns that are engineering and design concerns. I'll try to answer that as best as I can.

In the near term, I think it's prudent to appropriate the planning funds because this is a modular design, if you will. So if, in fact, there was discussions had with the State over the course of the next year and the State position was modified to say, *"You know what, we know you're going to need two pods immediately,"* the planning is not going to go to waste. But really the driving force between whether or not it's going to be allowed to be -- you know, Phase II is going to be allowed to be broken into smaller parts is really going to be something that's going to have to be approved by the Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. So the first part of the question, then, is you're not sure how long the engineering work would take, even if we were to -- to appropriate the money at the next meeting.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

In our discussions with DPW, and when we made the response to the Commission, we did make the response that we'd be able to do design work in '13 and at some time in '14 at least start construction. It may be the very end of '14 because of the nature of, you know, appropriating funds and sending out RFP's, etcetera. So even if you -- even if you were to put the money into '14, I would think that -- again, I would almost rather defer to DPW, but I would think that it would be hard pressed to start any construction before the end of '14.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. And in terms of spreading out that construction cost over a couple of years, how long did it take us to build the current -- the new jail that we just finished? How many years did it take us? We didn't do that all in one year.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Including planning?

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Well, not including planning, just construction.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Six.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The construction started in '06.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

In '06, okay. And the bulk of that money was probably spent in '06, '07, '08?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I think it was spread, you know, over the project. You know, the money was appropriated, but it wasn't borrowed on --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Until it was needed, right?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

-- as needed, yeah.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So theoretically, we could probably, even if the State forces us to do this entire project, maybe spread out the 100 million over a couple of years, maybe 50 in each year or 33 in each year or something along those lines so that we can avoid having to encumber all of that in one part of our -- in one year of our budget.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The issue that comes up is when we saw that the Executive had recommended splitting between two years, is that you can't -- you can't -- you have to appropriate the money to be able to go out to an RFP. The money's not spent -- the money can be spent out over a number of years, but in order to be able to actually put out the request for a proposal, the money has to be there for the entire project.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

What would be the feasibility of, say, putting it out then doing one pod at a time, and what would be the breakdown of a cost for one pod at a time?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

You're getting into things that DPW will have to answer.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

I need to get Gil here. Okay. Okay, that's all the questions I have. Legislator Horsley?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hello, Chief. How are you?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Good. How are you?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Good, good. Just a quick couple of questions. You're -- is the jail, are we fully phased-in now, the inmates to the new jail?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yeah, fully -- fully occupied with the exception of medical housing.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. And at this point in time, your projection -- are we still in a situation where we are required to have variances even with the jail full?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

We are using the variances that are left. The variances were reduced from, I believe it was 511, they reduced us down to either 371 or 376 once the facility was opened.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Uh-huh. So what we're looking at now is we have to make up that difference and that's the reason why the Corrections -- so this is --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Well, I mean --

LEG. HAHN:

This is not something that we have any time on is what you're -- is basically what you're saying because we have to deal with the variances.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

It gets -- the whole -- the whole process becomes a little bit confusing because of these variances.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

And to look at it through the Commission's eyes, the Commission views variances as they're temporary and we're not supposed to have any. So, ultimately the Commission wants us to have a capacity that's going to allow us to operate with zero variances and that's where Phase II comes in.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. So we're in and around three -- even with our -- to full capacity, which we are in now, it would be both -- for both jails, I would assume, and that'd be correct cause we -- otherwise we wouldn't be required to use the variances.

What -- your future projections for the numbers in which we are going to hit as a County. Do you have any -- you know, how do -- how do you do that? I know that this has been discussed many times over and I'm sorry I don't know that off the top of my head. What are those projections and how do you get to those projections?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

We've done it based on a 20-year trend.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Uh-huh.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

And the 20-year trend shows an average 2% a year increase in our population. Now, we've had an anomaly over the last year or so, which has dropped us.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

So we've readjusted our projections based off that low. And if you just give me a second, I'll give you the -- the numbers we're looking at now. I don't know how far you want to go out. I'm out to 2016 on my chart, so.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, that's fine. I just wanted to get a feel for, you know, the trend line at this point in time. We're still looking at 2% a year even though the population is now flat.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

In 2015, based on our current trend, we could expect a high of 1,956.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And that's what we have to prepare for, is what you're --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Basically, yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Now, if we --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

That's -- that's if the current trends -- you know, I feel like I'm talking on, you know, a Christmas Carol here; that's if the current -- the shadows of the current future are not changed. I mean, that the Sheriff's plan here is to -- is to try to find ways to impact --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

-- inmate population, which would buck these trends, but based on what exists now, that's what the future holds.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Uh-huh. Yeah, as it is right now, and I can understand that would -- what you'd have to project off of. If we -- if the Sheriff moves in that direction and he has successes, do you feel that it would impact it as much as -- how much -- what is he looking at? You know, and it's a hard guess and I realize that.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I mean, it is a hard guess. I mean, you know, obviously he's looking to mitigate construction costs as all of you are.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I mean he worked very hard --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And we appreciate that.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

He worked very hard on Phase I to eliminate any excesses that may have been in the planning, you know, do a value engineering, if you will, to get down to, you know, a project that -- that was realistic for that phase, and he'd like to do the same going into same Phase II.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So even if he's wildly successful, we really don't know what wildly successful would be at this point.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I think that the bottom line is the size of or necessity of Phase II is going to be based on ongoing discussions between the County, the Sheriff and the commission.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Uh-huh. Okay. And lastly, the old portions of the old -- of the Yaphank Jail, is there any -- any consideration of where we're going to be doing with that? I know we're doing renovations to it, my understanding.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

That's all handled under Project 3009 --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right, right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

-- which we will be renovating all eight dormitories in that section.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Now, what does that do to our numbers as far as future beds?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

That keeps us static, I believe. Do we lose any?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

That just keeps us static, even with the repairs? Oh.

MR. CAVANAGH:

Yeah.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I mean, in reality --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I'm thinking that there is some catch-up there.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

-- I'm going to give you another example. I'll give you another example of the Commission working cooperatively with -- with the County. Their original plan and through discussions with the Sheriff, they moved on this position. Their original plan called for including attached recreation space, which would of actually cut our capacity. We would have lost beds in each one of the eight dormitories and through negotiations they agreed that all of them could be renovated without the attached recreation area, which preserved our capacity in those dormitories.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I think I -- I get it. Thanks. Appreciate it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Sorry, I know we've asked this three times and you're going back to the same numbers, but I just thought I heard something wrong. Five hundred eleven variances was the height of our variances, right?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

That was our variances up until we opened the new section, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So 511 variances, a new facility with 440 beds.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So you subtract 440 from 511; correct?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

To get what?

LEG. HAHN:

What the number of variances we need to continue with at this moment?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

We actually, we need -- the Commission only took away, what was it, a hundred and --

MR. FRANCHI:

One hundred ninety.

LEG. HAHN:

But my point is variances were like --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

There's other reasons for variances aside from just our basic capacity. We're still doing renovations, so we have four dorms closed right now. So, as I said, the variances serve more than a purpose of saying all of our beds aren't open at one time. Right now we have a major closure, we have four dorms closed to do renovations. That -- so those have to be covered by variance beds.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So that's where my confusion is.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So, you have four dorms. How many beds are we talking about? This means that right now you have four dorms that are closed, we can't use those beds cause they're being renovated already. How many beds is that?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

There are currently 144 beds, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Are being renovated at the moment?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Those beds are closed in Yaphank. Now, there's always something going on somewhere in the facility, whether there may be -- let's say in Riverhead there might be a tier that has to be closed for a week to be painted or something like that. There's always something going on in maintaining

facilities of these ages, there's always something, every bed is not always open.

LEG. HAHN:

And so that means -- when you get a variance, it means that you're housing an inmate in a double bunk, in a -- what does it mean?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

In an area that the Commission has deemed to be temporary housing. It could be a day area, in a linear cell in Riverhead, it could be a gymnasium, it could be --

LEG. HAHN:

The sprung thing.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

It could be the double-celling in the pods in Riverhead.

LEG. HAHN:

So we're down to 300 variances?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Three seventy-one.

LEG. HAHN:

But ultimately, when everything's renovated, it should be more in the lines of 71?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Variances? Ultimately, the Commission wants us to have none.

LEG. HAHN:

No, I know they want us at zero, but I want to understand in terms of our capacity right now what we have built. And Gil's just walking in. What we have built right now. Obviously some of it needs to be renovated, but our current capacity we are only over by 71 of our current capacity?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Give me one second. All right, our current capacity in our current state, which was with the new section open and the dorms closed, our legal capacity is 1977, but our functional capacity is 1,779. Now, that's sort of an amorphous number that's arrived at because you can't necessarily fill every bed because -- and I always give the example, if you have 15 females on a tier, I can't put five males to fill out the tier. So that's the difference between legal capacity and functional capacity, so you also can't fill every bed because of different classifications.

LEG. HAHN:

(Nodded head yes). Sorry, I thought you were still reading to give me more. Okay. Yes, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, thank you. Commissioner Anderson, I saw you walk in, we've been talking about the jail. There was a couple of quick questions that maybe you will be able to answer that the -- the Chief really thought you might be in a better position to to speak to.

Hi, Gil. So we were talking about when we need to actually start construction of the new -- the second phase of the jail, if we actually need to start construction. If we decide to appropriate the planning funding at our next meeting, which would be in early June, which puts us about six months into the year, what's -- what's the realistic timeframe for that -- that work to get completed before

we'd be ready to actually put a shovel in the ground?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, it -- a lot really depends on the negotiations with COC. We're waiting for -- you know, we're right now talking with Commission of Corrections to see what could be done to possibly change, you know, reduce the amount that we're going to bring in there, thus reduce the amount of housing that we have to provide.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Let's just say we do --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Let's do 360.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- what they're right now telling us we must do.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay, say we're going to do 360. We get the approval next -- the end of the year before we get a consultant on board, probably another year at least before we get the construction done, so 2015 --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Engineering work done; you mean.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, so 2015 would be the earliest we'd able to --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe so.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

If all things go right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. What if -- what if we wanted to try to break the project up, would we be able to do this engineering work, say, and do it as -- as one pod at a time or two pods at a time as opposed to the full proposed second phase?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, depending -- assuming that we hold to the current design. That was the intent of doing a pod, was that it could be developed, you know, if you only wanted to do five, four, three, two, one. You know, certainly the less pods the more cost, but all the -- per pod, not overall. Could you break it up? I suppose you could. I think the -- if you're referring to the -- the County Exec's proposal of splitting it in years, I believe it was done for the same reason we did it under Phase I, we -- because of the expense, because it was so, you know, expensive we broke that into -- into multiple years rather than doing everything as one big hit to the Capital Program that year.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Well, that's certainly part of our concern here is that putting all this money into one year is a very difficult thing to do, it's almost half as large or, you know, 50% the size of -- of what we typically approve in a given year. So it's a pretty substantial number and we'd prefer to find a way to break it up over a couple of years. Would it be for the possible for us to do that, to say spread the cost out over a couple few years and still let the project and move it forward.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, it could. I mean, it's similar to what we're doing with the outfall; you know, because of the expense of that, we've appropriated the funds over multiple years so that, you know, rather than having a \$150 million hit or a \$200 million hit, you're doing 50 -- \$50 million per year.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And would we be able to maybe say have the engineering work done in such a fashion that say we do build two or three pods in that -- in that first year of construction and we find out that prison populations are decreasing because of the efforts by the Sheriff to reduce recidivism and the State's getting off our case a little bit about how big we've got to build and we could maybe cut our losses at the two or three extra new pods as opposed to a full project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, only because what you're going to wind up doing is you're going to build your foundations first, you're going to excavate and build your foundations. So, I mean, hopefully prior to going to bid you would -- you know, you would have a determination from COC what you're -- you know, what you're going to house.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So what you'd want to do is do all the excavating at once as opposed to build one pod then move it on, build the next pod and move on --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- build the next pod. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, yeah.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, thank you. Does anybody else have any questions for Commissioner Anderson while he's here? Commissioner, thank you for coming by. Chief, thank you very much. We appreciate the time.

I guess, Commissioner Anderson, you might want to stick around, because as we get to some of the other departments, you might be needed again.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you. All right. Well, let's move on. We have Commissioner Williams here from FRES. Joe, if you'd like come forward. I don't know if Mr. Stockinger would like to come up with you at the same time from the Fire Academy. And Bob Holley. It looked -- it looked like Bob was trying to stay behind the scenes there (*laughter*).

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Good afternoon. You mentioned I got Chief Stockinger and Chief Holley from the Fire Academy with me. I also have Mike Postel who is a major player in my own CAD system who recently was transferred to the Police Department. I still value Mike's expertise in our CAD system, so I asked Mike to stay around after the PD had given their talk.

Again, like the other Commissioners had mentioned and the Chief had mentioned, I want to thank your own Budget Review Office -- excuse me -- for the questions they asked, pointed questions, working with us.

Looking at our budget, again, the Recommended Budget from the County Executive is almost identical to the recommended recommendations from your own office. One good news is that -- well, I'll start off with 3418, that's our Emergency Operations Center. One of the things that really came out loud and clear during Sandy is that the current building that was built in 1968 no longer serves the services of us in an efficient way. We make it work. We put people in, it worked very well for us during Sandy. We originally had requested a capital project for a rebuilding or renovation of that.

What we're -- the line we're taking right now, we've had meetings with FEMA. We've had some positive feedback. There is nothing guaranteed from them, but we feel the funding, all the funding for that's going to be coming through FEMA or through the Mitigation Act Money. We don't have a positive answer on that, that's the reason why it has been put back. We hope to know that within this current year. A lot of the FEMA -- we had the advantage of having a lot of the FEMA people in our office during Sandy and the months afterwards and they acknowledged the fact that we could operate, but we -- it would be more efficient when we rebuild the new center.

The other project I'd like to talk about, and I'll leave the Fire Academy to Chief Stockinger and Chief Holly, is the -- our CAD system. I'm going to turn it over to Mike Postel to just explain what our project does. And again, I appreciate Mike taking the time from his job at PD to come over and give us a hand.

MR. POSTEL:

Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. Going forward with project 3416, the Fire Rescue CAD system. This phase is for the increased -- I'm sorry, the replacement of the UHF -- replacement of the activation system for the fire departments and ambulance companies to an Ultra High Frequency Radio System. The current system that's in place right now is in low band, a very difficult system to get parts for any longer. The bay stations, which are in place currently right now, are better than probably 25 years-old. And these systems are no longer off the shelf, they have to be custom built and that takes several months in order to get that taken care of should one fail.

So the project put forward was to basically start appropriation of the funding in this year for the 2013 budget for \$40,000 to basically start planning and then building out the system going forward for construction and further implementation in the program through 2016. Again, I worked with Commissioner Williams on this. This is definitely something that Fire Rescue needs to do to support the Fire and EMS service throughout the County of Suffolk and we definitely need the continued support of the County Executive's Office and the Legislature.

If anybody has any questions on that, I'll be happy to answer them.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Just a little follow-up on that is what's happened in the County, as the years have gone by, all the fire departments at one time used to be on a low band frequency. We divided it up by divisions. What was happening, as our activity over the years are going up, even the EMS end and Fire end -- a lot of the departments on their own applied for their own frequencies. Right now we have

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

106 fire departments in Suffolk County and 27 ambulance companies, standalone ambulance companies, and there is probably about over 90 private frequencies in the County. It doesn't stop the County from talking to them. It doesn't talk at a major event. We still have a Countywide frequency, We still have division-wide frequencies. But this would bring us to a new level where, again, right now, when those departments are operating on their tactical channels and an operating fire, it doesn't hurt them operationally. What it -- it doesn't allow us to monitor those type of calls, in which we need to really do to get everybody back on that same page.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Legislator Spencer has a question.

LEG. SPENCER:

Could you help explain to me in terms of the requirements, in terms of antennas, do you have these -- that the equipment on towers with cell phone carriers, for instance? Is it -- does it take up a lot of space? I guess my question is relating to currently when we look at some of the towers, which I understand some of the fire departments are on, that they're close to capacity, but there's a new service standard in terms of upgrading the strength of the towers to be able to meet the new Federal standards, but we're at like 105%. Could you speak to that a little bit?

MR. POSTEL:

Certainly. Yes, some of the towers that the County does own are reaching capacity and we do have to ensure that by putting more equipment on these sites, that we're not going to exceed that capacity and put the County in -- at potential risk. There are pros and cons to some of this and that's what part of that planning money and construction money that is in the budget to help insure that we're either not going to exceed capacity or help us to mitigate problems where we would potentially exceed capacity and maybe just strengthen the tower. We do co-locate with some of the cell companies on some of the towers that the County has engaged in contracts with for cell companies to build on County property, and we do utilize that and we constantly work with the Department of Information Technology to leverage that in the event we need additional tower sites that hopefully can be built for the County for no cost, and public safety typically gets the prime space, which is at the top, and that enables us to do future projects like this. But we are constantly on top of the towers. That is actually something that I continue to do now with the Police Department, is monitoring the towers and finding out what we need to do to continue to maintain them over the course of the their useful life.

LEG. SPENCER:

I think that one of the concerns that -- they're currently, the towers are currently in compliance in terms of their capacity, the load capacity. But if you add extra equipment, you have to go up to the new -- and again, I'm speaking out of my -- my element here. They call the G-standard, perhaps, and the new standard requires more strengthening, in particularly I'm concerned about the Mount Misery tower where I think AT&T wants to upgrade to the newer standard. But the County, which I think is very wise, has asked, well, you -- if you're upgrading to the new standard, you're still going to be at 100% because of the higher requirements. We want you to upgrade to even further to where you still have -- where you're only at 90%, which would leave us 10% for equipment.

So I don't know if you know anything specifically about this situation, but my concern here is I think the County's wise in asking them to do that, but I think that this is kind of drawing on for a year. And when I see the -- the budget request for this type of equipment, it seems to me that it would be wise to maybe negotiate with them to let them upgrade to the new standard.

MR. POSTEL:

Yes, you are correct. The standard is the G-standard, TIA-222-G is the latest standard and that has increased wind load, increased ice load, as opposed to what I believe Mount Misery is at now --

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

MR. POSTEL:

-- which is TIA-222-F. So I do have some insight onto the AT&T issue there that they are looking to do some additional work and the County's in negotiations with them. And Mount Misery is a tower that would be targeted by Fire Rescue to have some work done.

The slight benefit is is that there is, I believe, one piece of equipment on there currently that would most likely be able to be taken down with this project. With that being said, sometimes trading a like for a like, you don't have to do any maintenance to the tower. And that's all part of the planning money as far as figuring out if we do that, if trading a like antennae for a like antennae in different band actually creates any detriment to the tower and typically it doesn't.

But to your point of doing negotiations with these companies, I know it's something that's always on the table so that we can leverage the benefits to the County as well as partnerships with the cellular carriers.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you so much. I appreciate your answer.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, great. Chief Stockinger, would you like to go into your --

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

Yes, thank you very much. Our one project that we have, the 40 -- 3405, you know, has several phases on that, and we agree with what BRO has recommended as far as continuing with the sustainable project, which is Phase 11 and that's the continual upgrades to the older buildings that we have on the facility. And a lot of that work is currently being -- while we're talking is currently being done.

On Phase 12, the new buildings, we fully understand the position of the County, as far as, you know, the budget issues and things like that. And one of the things that maybe we should be looking at, you know, this has always been a dual project where we've always talked about two -- two new facilities, and maybe it's time that we've looked at that as possibly breaking that down and doing two separate projects on that and doing one facility now and then several years down the road look at the second facility.

I'm not sure if you remember last year we talked about one of the -- the oldest building on the property, you know, was getting -- was getting to the point of its life. We have made a decision only several weeks ago that the, what we call our old class A facility or the private dwelling that we currently use for -- as a catch-all building, we have stopped all live burning in that building now. It's just to the point where it's unsafe to conduct any burning in that. We are using it as a smokehouse, you know, and just burning some hay in it, but the building is not capable of sustaining live burns anymore. So it's starting to limit the availability that we have right now to be able to meet all of the training that we have to do. We have been using that building for some of our newer programs that we've redeveloped, the new technology in the fire service, and we're finding it difficult to replace that because we do need live fire for some of these -- the new technology that we're teaching.

I'm not sure, I think, if we broke that down possibly, if we could at least start some of the planning and development in 2016, you know, work with DPW and get a more accurate number for what we need, but I think, you know, we really seriously have to look at something. You know, the volunteer firefighters must have the training.

Public Safety Capital Budget - 5/16/13

What we have found recently is that a lot of the -- not a lot. Fire departments are looking for other venues now. You know, they are going to the neighboring County because they do have facilities that we are -- that we're looking to build. Those facilities are available and they're going there for training, and some of the other local fire departments are starting to build their own training facilities. And that's fine, we understand that people have to do that.

One of the fears we have, though, is that we're getting away from the standardized training. You know, we've taught these departments for many years. You know, Suffolk County is unique in the way they fight fires, just like every other County is, and by not having standardized training, could we possibly be jeopardizing the safety of the firefighters?

So I would encourage you to look at these projects and maybe we can work together for a better way of presenting this whole thing.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Legislator Hahn? Commissioner, you had something you want to add?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I just wanted to add, I want to also let you know is in numerous conversations with Chief Stockinger, Steve Holley -- Holley, in the -- their {V-Board} is that as much as they -- they're in a contract agency to our County, they're very much part of my department. And they are -- they have been -- we've had numerous discussions on how even to help with funding some of those things. There's been a lot of things coming up that we talked about, a private -- if we get a corporation that would come in and build these buildings and we put their name on it, things like that.

So I just want to you know that they -- they have not just sat back and said, "*We need these buildings,*" they're working very diligently to help the County, help my department and to try to make this happy -- happen for the volunteer firefighters in Suffolk County.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. That's an excellent idea. Sell the naming rights.

Two things. Class A is the residential?

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

Yes, that's correct.

LEG. HAHN:

So we don't -- we're not training -- any new firefighter that we want to train right now can't have a live experience in a residential home-like setting in our training facility?

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

No, that's -- we had the new -- well, new, it's -- it was built in 2005. The replacement building that we -- that's the private dwelling, if you remember on the southwest end of our property, that's the current building that we use, that's the private dwelling.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay.

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

That replaced this old building. And because of the demand for that type of fire, we had still utilized the old building.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So we do have one residential type for a live burn facility?

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

Yes. Yes, that's correct.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Was there any -- I know we had talked, and I'm sorry that I don't recall the latest update you had given me, Mr. Holley. Has there been any movement with the Federal government on grants for any of this?

MR. HOLLEY:

No. After we met with Congressman Bishop, I have not had a follow-up from his office.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Okay, because we should pursue that as well. I think there certainly could be some opportunity there, we need to just keep on them, obviously. We have to keep up with this 109 volunteer departments we have in Suffolk County. We train thousands of volunteers. I mean, you all know how I feel about this and they've got to -- we've got to make sure we have the facilities they need so when they are going in -- I mean, they -- they give up so much of their time and they risk their lives for us and we have to make sure they're trained the best we can and that they're -- they know how to proceed with as little risk as possible. And so thank you for all that you do to protect them. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, thank you. Chief, if we were to split the project up as you suggest, what would -- what would be the cost for each facility?

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

Our estimates, and I'd have to get back -- sit with DPW, but the two projects were a warehouse, a one-story warehouse, which I would estimate at about, with design and planning, about \$3 million, and then the garden apartment/nursing home/hotel about \$6 million.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And which of the two do you think would be needed most, or which would you think would need to go first?

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

I would say the garden apartment complex, cause I think just this year alone there's been three fires in garden apartments in Suffolk County and we're only in May. So I think that may be probably the priority.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And I know one of the things that we've come across, and I experience this representing Patchogue Village and us having a few more buildings that are little bit taller than the average building on Long Island, and more going up that are the five and six and taller being proposed. Is that something that you're able to handle, or is that what part of this garden -- garden apartment-type structure would help handle? Because I know a lot of times towns are hesitant to provide or allow for construction of buildings more than two or three stories because of the hesitancy by the fire departments, because they're not necessarily capable of handling those taller structures either

because they don't have the equipment or they don't have the training.

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

Yeah, we currently have that training. We have that four-story tower building that we use, which was -- that was converted back in 1998. That was -- the older portion of that building was the original building that was built in 1958 on the property when the Fire Academy first opened and we added onto that. We added a three-story addition onto that that simulates high-rise fires where we have standpipes and -- and we can simulate -- that particular building has movable walls and so we can simulate any -- whether it's an office building with cubicles or if it's an apartment complex, we can simulate that for the department. So we can provide high-rise firefighting for any department.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, great. Thank you very much, Chief.

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Does anybody else have any -- Legislator Hahn?

LEG. HAHN:

And it's more than just those particular departments. Like Stony Brook and Setauket dealing with the university, they have -- but often you have mutual aid scenarios where you need to bring in the surrounding department. So it's not -- it's not just the department that live -- that house the tall buildings, it's the surrounding departments as well that have to be trained cause they're -- you know, should something significant happen in those buildings, it won't be the singular department responding, there'll be many, many multiple there and providing resources, et cetera, so.

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

And we do encourage that, you know, we spend a lot of time talking to these departments that do have those mutual aid possibilities. And this goes back, and we've had this conversation in the past, you know, as the budgets have dwindled and our training dollars, we've tried to get the fire departments to consolidate their training and do that. You know, not only come out on your own, but come out with your neighbors so you can train at the same time, and especially on the high-rise because that's always going to be a mutual aid fire.

LEG. HAHN:

Right. And also with brush fire scenarios, like out East in the Pine Barrens, you know, it's not just those East End departments that wind up there as, you know, we see how many had to come to the aid from all over, both in '95 and -- and recent -- and the more recent scenarios that we faced just last year and previous time before that.

CHIEF STOCKINGER:

And in my years in the fire service, I never thought that I would actually go to a fire in New York City, but, obviously, you know, since 911, you know, that's happened. And I know Commissioner Williams can testify to that, even during Sandy, the requests that came from neighboring -- from New York City and from Nassau County to send our assets in there. You know, so those days of not going outside your borders are gone.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Great. Thank you, Chief. Thank you, Commissioner. If you don't have anything else to see add; Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

No. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you very much. We appreciate your time.

We're going to -- I see Dr. Milewski in the back, I know she's been waiting very patiently all day. If she'd like to come forward and speak to anything for her department that are --

DR. MILEWSKI:

Good afternoon, Legislators. I would like to be -- I'd like to express some thanks towards the County Exec Budget Office and the BRO for the serious consideration of our requests and needs. We, of course, appreciate the difficult times for the County, but we have very unusual and difficult problems to confront and BRO has done, I believe, a very accurate and concise job of describing what our main problems are.

Our main problems that Capital addresses for us right now is a situation where much of our scientific instrumentation has been pushed well beyond its industrial recommended life. So the requests that we made and are trying to fund still, even though our request was significantly reduced, has to do with looking out for very old instrumentation that, should it break down in the next two years, will halt services and will not be repaired easily because some of the instrumentation is so old that replacement parts aren't even manufactured for it.

So, in response to the Recommended, we're doing a very robust effort to investigate grant opportunities to still try and fund the purchase of some of the replacement equipment. We postponed items that are not critical to operations and will not shut down should we not purchase or replace them in the next few years. And with the additional money that was infused to us by BRO, it does sort of give us a buffer to cover some of the expense of replacing the vital equipment. The alternative to not providing that infusion is that should something break down in the next year, again, we don't know if it will or won't, we take very good care of our equipment. The fact that some of it is as old as 12, 15 years and outgrowing software updates and part manufacturers in the next couple of years, we take very good care of it. But, you know, if it did break down and if that material -- if those instrumentations were not covered in Capital, it would require an emergency purchase and that cost would be outside of what could be covered with the recommended at that moment.

So we are very appreciate. We do continue to try to work with what we're given to us and we await to get the final decision. But in the meantime, we are putting off and looking at external sources of funding to provide what's critical.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Great, Doctor. Thank you very much. You have a question?

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, great. Thank you very much. We appreciate your time.

DR. MILEWSKI:

You got it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And we'll consider everything you had to say.

I see Director Dlhopsky; I think I got the name right, I hope.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

You did.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Come on up, from Probation. Good afternoon.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Good afternoon. I'm here speaking on Probation's request No. 3063. And again, I would like to join the chorus in thanking the Budget Review Office for the work they did. I think they very accurately set forth what our needs are here.

What the Probation Department is looking for is the replacement of two existing public bathrooms in the lobby of the Yaphank main office of the Probation Department, the replacement of two existing staff bathrooms, and the construction of a Drug Testing Center in a secure area of the building that's used for office reports.

As FRES noted in their presentation, the building is 45 years-old and the plumbing in that building shows every day of its 45-year use. We had a breakdown a couple of months ago that resulted in sewage being dumped underneath in the lower portion of that building because the pipes are simply rotting, I would think, would probably be the best explanation, and that required an emergency repair.

What we're looking for with the Drug Testing Center is a secure area where we can do it behind the security area so that probationers are -- who are waiting are not viewing our randomization of testing, and it would eliminate the necessity of probation officers coming out and using public bathrooms for drug testing, which is never really the best scenario.

The Budget Review Office has recommended, in essence, that we be given the funding. They made a few little changes, but recommend that we be given the funding in 2014 and 2015 as we had requested, which is not very different from the Executive Recommended which simply did put it off to 2015 and 2016. We are anxious to get it done as quickly as possible. However, with regard to the County's fiscal situation, we feel limited in our ability to push that too much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, thank you. Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Hi, Director. I just wanted to see if I understand the requests correctly. You're renovating the public facilities as well as the staff facilities and you're also adding, I guess it would be restrooms, but a secure testing facility for the probationers.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Right. It would be making a secure facility in the closed off secure area of the Department where it would be a drug testing center that would house the equipment, the things that we need, the drug testing materials that we need, in addition to the refrigerator, and then also have the bathroom there that could be used for collection of urine specimens.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. And you're saying right now there doesn't exist a secure -- they're using the public bathroom for that.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

They're using the public bathrooms, yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Now, what about the refrigerator in the other part of the --

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

We have the refrigerator.

LEG. GREGORY:

You have that, you just don't have a bathroom.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Right. We have -- we are using what is, in essence, an office report room to house testing supplies and the refrigerator. But we are sending people out to the lobby for the urines -- to the bathroom in the lobby to collect the urines.

LEG. GREGORY:

Oh, right. Okay, okay.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay, all right. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

(Inaudible).

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

You have anything?

LEG. HAHN:

(Shook head no.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Director, thank you very much. We appreciate your time.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

I don't see anybody else out there. Commissioner, it looks like we didn't need you again. Thank you for your time, we appreciate it. If nobody else would like to address the Committee, we stand adjourned.

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 PM*)*

{ } - DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY