

PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION COMMITTEE
Of the
Suffolk County Legislature

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Public Safety & Public Information 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 **March 22, 2005**.

Members Present:

Legislator Angie Carpenter • Chairperson

Legislator Pete O'Leary • Vice•Chair

Legislator Michael Caracciolo

Legislator Daniel Losquadro

Legislator David Bishop

Legislator William Lindsay

Legislator Lynne Nowick

Members Not Present:

Legislator Elie Mystal • Excused

Also In Attendance:

Mea Knapp • Counsel to the Legislature

Alexandra Sullivan • Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

Linda Bay • Aide to Presiding Officer Caracappa

Doug Sutherland • Aide to Legislator Carpenter

Maria Ammiratti • Aide to Legislator O'Leary

Paul Perillie • Aide to Minority Caucus

Kevin LaValle • Aide to Legislator Losquadro

Ed Hogan • Aide to Legislator Nowick

Carl Yellon • Aide to Legislator Kennedy

Terry Pearsall • Aide to Legislator Lindsay

Lisa Keys • Aide to Legislator Caracciolo
Colleen Ansanelli • Intern to Legislator Bishop
Jim Maggio • Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn • Assistant County Executive
Jimmy Dahroug • County Executive Assistant
Christine Baumgartner • County Executive Assistant
Allen Kovesdy • County Executive's Budget Office
Jacqueline Caputi • County Attorney's Office
Robert Kearon • Bureau Chief/District Attorney's Office
Alan Otto • Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Donald Sullivan • Undersheriff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Richard Dormer • Commissioner/Suffolk County Police Department
Ed Webber • Chief of Patrol/Suffolk County Police Department
Aristedes Mojica • Inspector/Chief of Department's Office/SCPD
John McElhone • Chief of Support/Suffolk County Police Department
Kerri Smithers • Detective•Special Victim Section/SCPD
Harold Jantzen • Deputy Inspector•Marine Bureau/SCPD
Donald Maxwell • Sergeant•Crime Scene Section/SCPD
Bill Gardner • Supervisor•Technical Services/SCPD
Joe Williams • Commissioner/Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services
Carolyn Fahey • Economic Development & Workforce Housing
Anthony Ceglio • Economic Development & Workforce Housing
Hope Collazo • Director/Community Service Program•American Red Cross
Debbie Eppel • Public Information Office
Bill Ellis • Correction Officer's Association
Michael Sharkey • Vice•President/SC Deputy Sheriff's Benevolent Assoc.
Cheryl Felice • President/Association of Municipal Employees
Ann Abel • Treasurer/Association of Municipal Employees
Maria Perez•Lent • STOP DWI Coordinator
Mary McLaughlin • Suffolk County League of Women Voters
Andrea Golinsky • Resident of Huntington Station
Bob Franz • Resident of Huntington Station
Emi Endo • Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney • Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 11:48 A.M.*)

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I would ask everyone to please rise and join us in the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Caracciolo.

Salutation

I would ask if you would please remain standing, I would like to have a moment of silence. I know we did earlier this morning, but a very dear lady who served as the Clerk of the Legislature for many, many years has passed away, Betty Taibbi. She was a consummate professional and sat across from us for many, many years, and even after she retired from public service continued to give back and was a member of the Suffolk County Advisory Board for Senior Citizens and it is a great loss. So, if we could.

Moment of silence observed

Thank you. Good morning. I apologize for the delay. We have two cards, I think we'll go to the cards first. And the speakers have three minutes, first being Mary McLaughlin. Mary, do you want to come forward please? You have three minutes.

MS. McLAUGHLIN:

Good morning. My name is Mary McLaughlin and I am here on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Suffolk County. Today's agenda includes two resolutions to amend the 2005 budget with regard to adding personnel to the Suffolk County Department of Criminal Justice. They are IR 1266 and IR 1267 which would amend the 2005 budget to add 20 new Deputy Sheriffs and 40 new Corrections Officers respectively.

While we do not question the need for these additional officers, we do want to know if there are any plans for additional Probation and Parole Officers. In order to effectively utilize available resources and implement alternatives to incarceration, there is an obvious need for more Parole

and Probation Officers to further this objective.

Thank you for your attention.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you very much, Mary. Next speaker, Jared Feuer.

MR. FEUER:

Good afternoon. Members of the Public Safety Committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to offer comments today. My name is Jared Feuer and I am the Director of the Suffolk Office of the New York Civil Liberties Union. We have 4,000 members in Suffolk County and we work on behalf of civil rights in the local community.

I am speaking today in favor of Resolution 1324 and in opposition to Resolution 1281. These two bills take a very different approach to security; 1281 utilizing surveillance and 1324 building ties between the community and the police. There are four basic reasons for our position. Number one, surveillance cameras do not work. Cameras are commonplace in Britain, yet exhaustive studies by the British home office, Scottish office and South Bank University found no related reduction in crime. In a report to the Scottish Office on the impact of cameras, the Director of the Scottish Center of Criminology argued that many claims of crime reduction are little more than wishful thinking, saying "All evaluations and statistics we have seen so far are wholly unreliable." The British Journal of Criminology went even further describing the statistics as "Post•hoc shoestring efforts by the untrained and self•interested practitioner."

Even with other studies that might have been more measured in their conclusions, the reality is that there is no conclusive understanding on the success of cameras. Suffolk County will not be able to do the exhaustive study of other areas nor the comprehensive use of cameras that would allow for a true study. Thus, the trial will be inconclusive and should be not seen as an experiment but as making a larger decision about whether we are going to be using surveillance cameras on innocent people.

What we know to be successful is community policing, creating trust and relationships so that individuals and the police feel secure and welcome in obtaining the assistance of each other. This trend towards community policing has helped reduce crime in Suffolk County and we should not replace the face of our neighborhood police officer with a silent surveillance camera.

Surveillance cameras are also un-American. Yes, they are everywhere in Britain, but Britain does not have the same freedoms and protections as in America. A question is why our founders chose freedom. We argue that it is not just because it is more pleasant to live in a free society, but that a free society is a strong society. When we can associate freely and openly with each other, we are more likely to feel enfranchised, more willing to play our part, more willing to share in collective responsibility and disciplined policing, focusing on particular investigations rather than being drowned under a torrent of information leads to good police work.

(*Legislator Bishop entered the meeting at 11:55 A.M.*)

We live in one of the safest places in the world and isolated incidents should not cause such a loss of faith that we consent to be on camera when we leave the house.

Finally, surveillance cameras are tailor made for abuse. Is that 15 seconds or is that it?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

No, it's three minutes.

MR. FEUER:

Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you very much.

Okay. Before I go any further, I just would like to put on the record Legislator Mystal has an excused absence, he was not able to be with us today.

I note that the Police Commissioner is here. Commissioner Dormer, thank you so much for joining us again. I know we had to end abruptly, although it was after quite a bit of time the other day, but I know there are a few resolutions on the agenda that you might want to address, so please come forward.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

You're welcome to have a seat at the table, you might be more comfortable.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you. I was hoping it was going to be a short session, but you're having me sit down, so.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, if you remember, when we left off at the last meeting, we allowed you the ability to give an overview of where you've been and I think that alone took about an hour, so it wasn't all our doing. But we're glad you're back.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Do you want to go straight to the resolutions on the agenda or do you want to pick up with questions, because I know that I had one in particular. I had asked about •• in your overview of things that had been accomplished under your tenure, you had said that many of the foot patrols were restored and I had asked you exactly where they were and you were going to check on that and let us know.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I don't have that information with me. I know it was increased 118 tours in the downtown areas in the summer of 2004.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Right.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I don't have the list in front of me.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

All right, if you can get back to me with that, then I'll share it with the rest of the committee.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, I'll have Chief Webber make a note on that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Good.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

And we can e-mail you with that information.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

And I should mention, by the way, that we plan doing this again this summer in the downtown areas. We have plans afoot, no pun intended, to put foot posts and increase our presence in the downtown areas.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Oh, do you want to go to the resolutions or did any of the other members of the committee have a question?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, if somebody has a question, and then I'd like to just ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

You'd prefer to do that?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

•• maybe mention something on your bill. We've had some discussion about that in the Police Department and also with the District Attorney's Office and philosophically we agree that aggravated unlicensed, which is people that have suspended licenses, should be stopped from

driving on the roadways of Suffolk County. And even though it's going to be a major hit on us to impound these vehicles, maybe that's the only way we can make the roads safer. So philosophically we agree with that.

As the bill is written, though, the way I read it and from what other people tell me is that it would include impounding vehicles from everybody that's unlicensed. So if you have somebody that failed to license •• renew their license and they get stopped by a police officer for some reason or at an accident scene, their vehicle would be impounded. If we find somebody driving out of class, somebody, a high school that's driving out of class, the way I read it we would have to impound their vehicle, it would be mandatory, and I don't know if that's what you intended.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Actually, I just leaned over and asked Counsel about that, whether it •• and maybe I'll let you respond to that specifically

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Maybe I'm reading it incorrectly.

MS. KNAPP:

Now, we may be talking about two different things. Certainly the forfeiture is absolutely discretionary for the County Attorney, the County Attorney does not have to proceed with hearings and can immediately return the car. Is what you're asking are the police mandated to make the seizure?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, that's my •• that's the issue with the Police Department. It said "shall", shall impound the vehicle if they're driving unlicensed. Now, that covers everybody, the person that failed to renew their license because they forgot or some youngster that's driving out of class, and I don't know if you intended that impact or did you want the aggravated unlicensed?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I will respond directly; I did not intend that impact. I appreciate you bringing that forward, I'll ask Counsel to make the necessary language change. Because what I wanted to do was to give you the tools so that hopefully when we read in the paper that John Doe, you know, killed

someone and had had a license that had been suspended 18 times or, you know, revoked or whatever, that we could avoid some of those instances in the future. So we'll make those changes and I thank you for that.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, that would help. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

And Counsel, if I may. Yeah, I guess the County Attorney's Office would have the discretion, but that's after the fact.

MS. KNAPP:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You know, after we've already impounded the vehicle and stored it and there's a lot of work entailed with that, a lot of police resources.

MS. KNAPP:

The Legislator has just indicated that she's willing to make the seizure discretionary on the police.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

See, we're easy.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

The Easter spirit.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Do you want to comment on any of the other resolutions that pertain to your department specifically? Go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, Legislator Binder has a resolution which, again, has an impact on the police operations

where it requires, it says, "Police Commissioner shall direct patrols in the downtown area of Huntington and specific patrols," in that it would be COPE, foot posts and bicycle patrol.

Now, we have a lot of downtown areas in the County and our commanders, our Precinct Commanders respond to the needs in these downtown areas, including Huntington. We know that during the summer especially and busy weekends they do need special attention, and we'll make sure that they get that. I think mandating it is an issue for the Police Department and for the administrators. There are a lot of considerations with mandating, whether they're foot posts, gang units, drug units and so on; I think that should be left up to the discretion of the Police Department and the administrators. I think that's what they get paid for and they know the conditions in the downtown and the business areas and they deal with the elected officials and the community groups in these areas and working together, they can respond to the issues.

We are responding to the issues in Huntington Village, the Precinct Commander is making sure that there's adequate response on weekends in Huntington, I can tell you that, they have extra patrols down there. So they know where the hot spots are. I think requiring it by mandate, again, ties the hands of the Police administration and I would caution everybody to stay away from that because it's problematic, because we may have to move people around depending on what's going on in a town on a particular evening. You know, moving from even another precinct, and we do that regularly where we move COPE from one precinct to another to address problems in that precinct. So we don't want to get them locked in so we're not flexible with that, so I'd appreciate you be aware of that when you look at this bill.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Legislator O'Leary, I think you had a question on this particular bill.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes. I'm assuming that you're referring to 1324, Binder's resolution on the •• that's specifically what you're talking about?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yes, that's 1324, yes, sir.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah. I'm seeing this for the first time and I have to agree with you. I'm a little bit troubled with trying to legislate the deployment of personnel rather than leaving it up to the discretion of the Commanding Officer. I haven't had an opportunity to speak to the sponsor of this particular resolution, so I would probably be in favor of tabling until such time as I had an opportunity to speak to him. Because on its face, I have to agree with you, it's legislating police presence and that should be left to the discretion of the department personnel.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Could I chime in on that issue?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Absolutely. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Just an observation on this discussion; it's legislating a police presence when it isn't even his district.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, okay.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Any other questions or comments on this particular resolution while we're on it? Then I'd ask you, Commissioner, if you could comment on 1281, the cameras, security cameras.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, we're still reviewing this. You know, I'm talking to people in the police business, we're reaching out to other communities that have this kind of system and •• you know, so I haven't really •• I haven't really made up my mind on it yet, I have to talk to some people in the department. You know, I heard the person from the American Civil Liberties Union give a presentation and, you know, we're very mindful of the issues involved with privacy, but from the reading of the bill, it only occurs in public places and we do have a lot of cameras in public

places anyway throughout the country, throughout the world.

The one problem or one issue that I would have is that, again, it directs the Police Department to purchase these cameras, put them in, and do we monitor them? I mean, does •• we can't just say in a bill that the Police Commissioner shall and then not have the resources to do it; I mean, I have questions about that. But if it would help to reduce crime I'm all for it, it would help to make the community safer, I'm all for it. But there are a lot of issues with this thing and I think we should hold off on it.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, I appreciate what you're saying because I, too, have some concerns about it. And really from a fiscal perspective, if we go forward with something like this for this particular hamlet or village, then we sort of let ourselves open to any other hamlet or village within the County that feels that they would want this same service provided. And I think that it probably is more appropriate being funded through a Chamber of Commerce in a business district, or perhaps a business improvement district, that's why these things are put in place in the various towns and hamlets.

I know that whether it's security or beautification efforts, the business improvement district collects money from the businesses that will be gaining from an initiative like this. And then once the cameras are in place, they then can have that information to turn over to the Police Department if there is an incident, but it's not putting the onus on the department, just the same at the mall. And I know specifically the Westfield Mall in Bay Shore, that they have, too, put security cameras within the mall and outside, around the perimeter of the mall, and they have very often provided those films to the precinct if there is, you know, an instance that warrants it. But again, it's the private person that's paying for it and monitoring it, as they should because they're right there all the time, and certainly we don't have the resources to have, you know, the police presence 24/7 on each, you know, block in the County. Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just a comment on this resolution and how it pertains to the effectiveness of the security of the people in public streets. I know there's some resistance to the big brother aspect of this proposal, however, I do note that there's certainly the expectation of privacy is minimized substantially in public places and this clearly is in a public place, it's not in a private location where the expectation of privacy would be maximized. But Legislator Carpenter brings up a

good point with respect to the cost factor associated with this in this pilot program. On its face, I'm supportive of this particular initiative, but the questions raised today, perhaps we should look into the financing of this particular initiative as to whether or not the town or some local chamber should share the burden of cost.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Commissioner, I would just •• are there any other questions or comments on this particular resolution? Then I would ask that we move on to the issue of the alarm systems and where the department is with that particular initiative, because I see now that there's another bill on for alarms.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. Well, at your suggestion, we reached out to the alarm company and we had a preliminary meeting and we have another one scheduled because they didn't have enough people at the first meeting, they wanted to get some more people in. We want to get input from them, as you recommended. We're certainly flexible, again, because there was a concern with this committee over the fine structure and we're flexible on that. So we want to work with the alarm companies, the people in the business who, by the way, agreed that we should have an alarm law and •• but we wanted to make it so that it's workable for everybody, we can all work together to make the false alarms at least be reduced substantially, if not go away, and make Suffolk County safer by doing that. And also, you know, reduce the impact on our police resources. So I think if we •• and we have scheduled another meeting, the Chief told me that the meeting is scheduled •• do we have a date yet, Chief?

CHIEF WEBBER:

Not yet.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We don't have a date yet, but we're working on that, so.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, I really do mean this, I do appreciate the fact that you are meeting with me. Because I think if we're going to come up with something that is really practical and doable, that's the

best avenue to take is to work with those that are doing it 24/7, you know, monitoring the alarms and so forth.

I see that Legislator Cooper, who is not a member of the committee, has come up with another bill and I'm concerned there because it has the same provision that the original bill had as far as providing a venue for a public hearing in the Office of Consumer Affairs. And the Commissioner •• and we can bring him down to a subsequent meeting •• had concern about that, because not only did he feel that especially when the fines were high that people would want that hearing and he didn't know if he had the resources to follow through on it, but also it would require the police officer then to be present at the hearing. And that kind of defeats the whole purpose of, you know, coming up with the alarm law so that we're not, you know, negatively impacting our police resources, and then if we come up with a bill that's going to take the police officer off the street, it kind of defeats the whole purpose.

So I'm glad that you're moving in the direction of working with them. And if you could let me know when that meeting is, I, if I'm available, would like to attend.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Okay. I should mention, by the way, since this initiative was started being publicized, we've had a substantial decrease in false alarms. People are going out and getting these things repaired, which is really what we want them to do. And you know, they know that something is going to happen, they've got to get them repaired; it's almost like having to inspect your car every year, you know, you've got to do it. So we think this is a plus by just even discussing this alarm law. It still is not substantial enough, we really want to get them reduced by thousands and •• you know, so it's not, you know, impacting heavily on our police resources, both from a monetary aspect and also safety. Because the cops are lulled into a sense of "There's the false alarm again," and God forbid that something happens, you know, and then we'll be saying we should have done something about this. So I'm glad that we're working together on this, I think it's going to be a plus. Other municipalities have struggled with this for years and never really came to a working conclusion. We think that we can do it, working with the alarm companies and working with the Public Safety Committee, I think we can do it.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. And the one comment that kind of sticks with me, with all the speakers that we had on the alarm, and I would just ask that we keep this in mind, even though we may characterize

it as a false alarm, if a potential burglar goes up to a building and starts jiggling the door or the window and the alarm goes off and he runs away, is it really a false alarm? We don't know that that may have happened. So I thought that was really a very interesting point.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, I know, I understand that. And I'm well aware that that is •• that could happen. I should mention that over the last 10, 15 years, commercial burglaries in Suffolk County are down around 35%; I'm not saying they've gone away, they haven't. And I should also say that the alarms have had something to do with that, you know, businesses have alarms, so they do work. But again, we know that a lot of them are false. They're really •• if an officer gets called to the same business 15 times in a row, you know it's a false alarm, you know it's not a burglar; that's the issue.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Commissioner, is your policy still in effect of not responding to an alarm if that particular location has had X amount of previous false alarms?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We haven't implemented that yet. We're still reviewing •• you know, the last letter went out after the review, that's how we knew that they want down almost 20%. So we gave people another chance to get on board.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And it's been effective.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, you know, they've been down, the numbers are down.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Well, that's good.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But I have a problem with you directing officers not to respond to an alarm because there's been five or six previous false alarms at that location; is that still going to be the policy of the department?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, you know, I haven't changed my mind on that, I've got to be very honest with you. And I will tell you that the reason, the main reason that a lot of the false alarms are down is that people know we're serious about this. You know, there are sanctions; that's the only sanction that I have as the Police Commissioner. And as long as there's adequate notification that if you don't •• you're going to be on the non•response list, get your alarm repaired, when you get it repaired, bring it to the precinct and they'll put you right back on the response list. People have been repairing their systems. I've talked to the alarm companies who are getting a lot of calls now because they said, "They're going to put us on a non•response list, I want this thing fixed."

LEG. O'LEARY:

Well, then ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

And it didn't happen over the years. So, I mean, that was the only option we had to get people's attention on this thing and I think it's working.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Well, if that was your intent then it is working. But I'm still troubled by a direction •• a directive from your office to police officers not to respond to any given alarm during the course of their duties; I have a problem with that.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, I understand, and we did look at that very carefully.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But if your intent was to get the chronic false alarmers, if you will, to address mechanical problems, then obviously it's working, if that was your intent.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, maybe we won't have to do the no•response, but I've got to still have that out there, it's one of my options.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I don't want to see the day come where there's no •• someone's on a no•response list and there's an alarm that goes off that's a legit alarm and, you know, you wonder what would happen, what the repercussions would be after that; that's my concern.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I understand. I understand.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Right.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yes, if you have questions. Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you. Hi, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

How you doing?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. First let me say that your presentation at the previous committee meeting I thought was exemplary.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you very much.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Two weeks ago. While I might take issue with some of your fact finding versus my own experiences and others, you're the boss as far as I'm concerned and I have to respect that and I know you respect the positions we sit in here; we are the policy makers.

I want to, though, address a related issue and that is the services that the County Police Department provides to the villages and towns in Western Suffolk and Eastern Suffolk. It's my understanding that as part of Public Safety police staffing task force or committee, that the department is putting together some information along those lines. I sent you an e-mail a couple of weeks ago, where are we in terms of that data?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We're gathering that information for you. In fact, I made inquiry of the Chief I think yesterday or the day before, where were we with the stats. The divisions are responding, because the three divisions support the 01 Fund which is the Countywide fund and we're trying to gather information from •• it's not just Emergency Services responding out to the east end.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

It has to do with candidate investigation, the academy also supports the 01, so they're gathering the information. We want to do it one time and get it correct and we're going to get it to you, so we're working on that.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Going forward, can the department maintain this information in the data base so that when there's inquiry like this it's readily available rather than ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, we can •• yeah, that's a good point, yeah. We should be able to do that so we can get it pretty quickly rather than have to gather it from paperwork or talk to people, so that makes sense.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. It's been rumored that a figure of 60,000 man hours in one year was provided in terms of services; do you know where that number came from?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, that's the first ••

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

It didn't come from ••

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, that's the first I heard that number. I don't even know what the numbers are.

LEG. O'LEARY:

If I may? Actually, I just discussed this with Legislator Carpenter. Both of us sit on the committee you're referring to. My recollection is that at some point in time during those proceedings we requested that information and initially it was 96,000 hours, but then upon further questioning that was calculated at a time and a half rate, so they were basically doing what they were paying in over •• you know, time and a half rate for •• it included time and a half rate. So then we requested hour for hour and there was an estimate given, I think it was by Chief Moore, I may be wrong, of 70 to 75,000 hours, and I don't know where they got those numbers from.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But that was, in fact, given to the Task Force Committee.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. We will try and get the accurate figures.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Just so you're aware that I have also requested the same information from the villages and towns as to how many times they've called for, you know, major squad investigations and

Medevac investigations and things of that nature. Because I want to reconcile the numbers, I don't want the department coming up with a number that they may feel, you know, can't be justified or isn't justified, and conversely that they don't come up with a number that you feel is not justified.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

If I may, you've got to be careful with the numbers that you get from them versus our numbers. If Emergency Service responds on an incident to Riverhead, as they did the other day, there may be six people on the call, but it's just an Emergency Service response which is one response. If we calculate it at ours, we figure in the six officers, you know, so the Town of Riverhead might not count it as six officers, they might count it as two ES units or something. So, you know, we've got to be careful with the numbers.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, it's true because when one of the police officers that was here this morning was asked how many times do they reach out to the County, he said just a handful, but that handful could really represent an awful lot of resources, as you're saying, one call could be six officers.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We should •• maybe CC numbers would be another way to look at it, you know, the central complaint number, because that's given to every incident that we handle and the village would have the same or town would have the same •• should have the same incident. So, you know, we can do it that way and then we could also include the hours involved, but you can understand that this takes awhile to get this stuff.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Oh, I understand. Can you give us an idea of how long it may take you?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

If you could give us a couple of weeks on it.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

That will be great.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I'll just give you a quick example. Our Candidate Investigation Unit does interviews and background checks for everybody in the County •• towns, villages and the County •• so to break it down, they had to go through all their interviews and backgrounds for the year to come up with the number. The same with the Police Academy, we train people all the time, in •service recruit for the villages and towns, we do terrorism training constantly going on for everybody in Suffolk County, so we have to get the Chief to give us the number of lectures, where he did it, that kind of thing. So, we have to get a better way of gathering the information, I understand what you're saying, so that we'll have this.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yeah. Maybe you can create an internal form that every time there's a request for service outside the district, you know, somebody is responsible for filling that in and sending it up to the Chiefs so you can maintain a log.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, if they enter it in a computer, into a database, that's really the best way of doing it because ••

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I agree.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, so that's a good suggestion.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Through the Chair, please?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just to the stay on that point, I have to ask this question, then how was the number of 70, 75,000 hours supplied to the Task Force Committee; how was that number reached?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

That's the first time I heard that number, I have no idea. I heard •• oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Am I mistaken?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

No, that was actually what was shared with the task force.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I mean, the very thing that Legislator Caracciolo is asking from you is what the committee asked and that's the number that we received, I don't know •• obviously I don't know how they reach that conclusion or that number.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I just got a note that Research and Development is coming up with a form and it will be entered with the Chief of Patrol when there is services outside the 015 Fund ••

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Great.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

•• which I think is what you're asking for, that 01 Account. Although some of the 15 units do assist outside the County, just be aware of that. They may be in the 15 Fund, the district fund, but if there's an emergency in Riverhead or Southold or someplace, we go, we don't worry about the fund, we worry about that later, you know, we have to do what's right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

As of those communities you just mentioned, let's keep in mind those residents do pay General Property Fund taxes and that's what they're paying those taxes for.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Oh, by the way, I'm not complaining about that.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Just so you know.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, I know. No, but sometimes when we make statements •• not you, but, you know, statements are made, if they're not put in the proper context it sounds like we provided a free service; nothing's free.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I know.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Thanks, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

I know everyday.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Commissioner, I don't want you to get the impression that you're a ping pong between myself and Legislator Caracciolo on this issue, there is another issue in another committee that is the reason why we're asking these questions.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

We need the information.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, exactly.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Okay.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But an example of the 15 Fund being used outside the district, would that be like the U.S. Open?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah, that's a good example.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Would that be an example of funded positions in 15 being used outside the district?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Yeah. Another example, if I may; K•9 is in the 15, and if Riverhead has an incident out there we send K•9 out. Aviation, actually, and Special Patrol is the only one in the County in the 01 Fund, but if Emergency Services got to roll, you know, again, they go. I mean, mutual assistance, if we have an issue and Riverhead can help us out at the east end of our borders they will. You know, so it works both ways. And it's just getting the numbers together, and hopefully we'll have that within a couple of weeks and we'll make sure you get it.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thanks very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

What kind of strain on your resources is this Extreme Makeover putting on the department?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, we're doing pretty good with that. You know, I haven't got the overtime figures but I think they're managing it pretty good. We do •• by the way, we do have to give police services to an

event like that. It's just like U.S. Open or anything else that happens in the County, we can't just ignore it, there's a traffic issue, there's a safety issue, so we're responding to that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I'm certainly not questioning the validity of why we're doing, it's certainly very, very appropriate. But it's the kind of thing that sometimes when we're looking at or the media is reporting on the overtime budget in the department, that people forget, you know, events are scheduled, communities have events and they expect to be safe and they want the police there, whether it's at Sagtikos Manor last Saturday •• or Sunday, rather, the Long Island Arborists Association came with 80 landscapers and all kinds of equipment to donate services to Sagtikos Manor, but crossing Montauk Highway and getting equipment in and out really required some police assistance. And the Central American Day Parade and the runs and everything else that communities schedule, the first thing they say is, "Will the police be there to help direct traffic?" You know, they want the resources. So sometimes, as I said, we don't always remember that when we're looking at what the cost is of these services that the public deserves and expects.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, we •• yeah, we're covering it adequately.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And pays for.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

We're not spending extra money but we're doing what has to be done to keep the site safe, keep the people safe with the traffic and all the other stuff that comes with an event like this. So we're doing what has to be done. We have a Chief, Assistant Chief assigned to that detail to make sure everything is coordinated properly and it's working fine. And I think it's terrific, we're very happy for the officer and for his kids, so. But I don't know what the impact is at this point, I think it's minimal, just so you know, we managed it very well.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, hopefully it will be offset, too, by the economic development impact of all of these people coming in to the County and utilizing services and spending dollars and increasing sales tax revenues. Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

And just to •• good morning, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Good morning.

LEG. NOWICK:

Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Good afternoon.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes, just to follow•up what Legislator Carpenter had said. We recently in St. James, we have had a similar situation where we had crowds of people coming in to watch Extreme Makeover do a home, and I think if it wasn't for the Police Department being there and controlling traffic •• and it's not just •• it's not just that they're there for show, because we were experiencing 1,500 people walking in and out, and had it not been for that police presence, the danger of people being in the wrong spot when equipment was being brought in, and I don't know the names of these things, but catapillars and •• very, very dangerous equipment.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Celebrities.

LEG. NOWICK:

But no, no, the equipment itself to demolish a home, had it not been for the presence of the police, this could have been dangerous to the pedestrian, because everybody wants to see, everybody wants to go around the fence and everybody puts themselves in danger. So to backup what Legislator Carpenter said, it is important.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, again, the Suffolk County Police Department, when we have a big event, steps up to the plate and does the right thing, so. And we made sure that we managed it properly, too, I just want to emphasize that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. Are there any ••

LEG. NOWICK:

Well, I know the people in St. James thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

•• other questions or comments for the Police Commissioner? Okay, thank you very much, I appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Oh, sorry.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Sorry, one more. Regarding the old 6th Precinct facility, I've had some discussions with the Department of Public Works and right •• I know when we last discussed this I had said that the Legislature had appropriated funding for the renovation of that facility and we have. Currently the Department of Public Works is not moving forward with that because they need guidance from the Space Management Committee as to what the facility is going to hold. They can't very well do planning or renovations until they know what the configuration of the building should be.

So I don't know if you have any of the information with you, but do you have any suggestions

of units such as auto crimes or any of the other units within the County Police Department which may have inadequate space or facilities right now that you would be interested in moving into there? If you don't have that with you that's fine, but if you could please give some direction to the Department of Public Works and to the department •• the commission of Space Management as to what units could possibly be serviced in that facility, it would be greatly appreciated this way we can get that process moving in terms of the renovation of the building. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

So I take it you don't have that information?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, I don't. I'm sorry, I thought ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

That's fine.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

No, I don't have that because, you know, like you said, everything is at a standstill with the 6th. And we had indicated that we would put a police presence in there, we don't know what it would be yet because we have to talk to the people involved, because moving the operation out of Headquarters may not be the best thing for them. But, you know, we may be able to come up with some kind of a presence there for the community.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

As I said, if you could just give some direction to the Department of Public Works and Space Management so they can proceed with that process. Because I know there are some other groups who are interested in occupying potentially a portion of that space, but again, this is all hypothetical until we can give them some sort of direction to proceed with planning. So I'd

appreciate it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Finally ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just one ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just a comment, Commissioner. I just wanted to congratulate the department on its recent recognition as being one of the best dressed departments, is it the country or the County?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

In the country.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I know that. I know that, I'm only kidding. But my congratulations to the department.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Number one in the County, Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Number one in the County but number two in the country, that's great. And is there •• Chief Webber, is there a reason why you're not in your battle blues or is it an option that you can wear the white shirt?

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, I told him we weren't going to have a battle today, so he said, "I'll come in white."

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. But Chief Moore always comes in his battle blues now, right? All right, thank you. And congratulations again.

COMMISSIONER DORMER:

Well, I appreciate that. Thank you. And I'll pass it on to the men and women of the Suffolk County Police Department.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you. And I'm so glad we went forward with the new Quartermaster Building, keep all of that equipment in good shape. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Chief Moore now looks like Chief •• former Chief Gates of LAPD.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, exactly.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

It's Webber. I'd ask Commissioner Williams to come forward just to give us a very brief update on what is happening with the PSAP issue that he has been so diligently working on.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Good morning. We have been working on it, on the response with the PSAPs and FRES, we're continuing to have our meetings. We had a little bit of a setback last month, we were talking to a vendor that was kind of promising us that we can get this database on a form. We had a meeting with him and at the end of a two and a half hour presentation basically we realized that he could not give us what we were looking for. He was using the PCR form, we have spoken to the State, the State would not let us change that.

What we've done, I've spoken to Suffolk County IT Department, people in my own department. What they've come up •• they're going to be doing a presentation on April 6th to the committee, what they're proposing is a strictly response form, it would be Internet based, it

would be easy for us to implement. This form would be filled out by the PSAP or the paid dispatcher at each fire department, it would not carry any type of patient care, all it would do is ask •• give us the information that we're asking for.

We've had meetings with the Director of EMS, we have asked her exactly what she wants, what she wants to see, we feel we can accomplish that. We have a couple, a number of subcommittees working on the other items, on some we will will be working with Legislator Bishop's office on some of the wording that we'd like to add or subtract, we have a meeting set up for the beginning of April with him.

The confirmed things that we've done, it definitely will be a website type of report. The reports will be sent to FRES with being passed on to EMS. Some of suggestions that we •• that came up during the meeting, the original bill still states, "Annually this report will be sent to EMS." The feedback we have gotten from that is that we'd like to change that it is to be sent to FRES monthly, this way we can use the intention of this bill to help the service. If we •• the people on the subcommittee kind of felt that the •• if you do have •• we do have a problem, certain times of the day, back and forth, we wouldn't want to wait the year, let's look at it every month. We're working on it, everybody's working really hard on it, they've put a lot of time into it, we have at least one meeting a month of one subcommittee, we had the full committee at least once a month and they are continuing very hard with it.

The other option to do that's going to help us out is that after July 1st, FRES' CAD system comes on board, that's going to allow us to capture 60 departments that we dispatch for, all the times, including the time that the original call was answered at Suffolk County PD. Because it will enable them to send us their screen over on to our CAD system and we can capture what times, so there is going to be progress with that. So starting July 1st, a good percentage of the 138 departments that we got in the County will be getting some time zone.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Commissioner, the Capital Program for this year, did that allow for everything that you need or is there something that needs to be addressed in the future for the CAD program?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

We did talk •• there is a second part to the CAD program that we've put in as a Capital Project.

What that's going to do is allow us to put the screens out into the cars, very similar to what we have in the Suffolk County PD cars. It will also enable us to maybe put some screens out into the individual firehouses, even with the hospitals that capture all this time; the project is in.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Was it in the County Executive's recommended, is he supporting it?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I have not seen it yet.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

We have spoken to his people, we've explained it to him. There is one clause in there that I think maybe sticks a little bit, to be honest with everybody, to have some of the departments come on board with it through the second phase of this, it could be costly for some of the departments, it could be that screen that we would not be supplying into each individual fire apparatus or ambulance, it would probably run about \$10,000. And there was some concern about how the volunteer services would pay for this, so we have been working through that with the budget people and getting everybody on board on that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay, thank you. Any questions? Legislator Caracciolo followed by Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

On a different topic, so if you want to stay on point I'll wait.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay, is your comments or questions on this?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes, it is.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

All right, thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Commissioner Williams, first of all, I applaud you for the effort that you're putting into this project to try and bring back some kind of system that gives us the response times that I think a lot of us have been looking for.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What troubles me is I always envisioned that we could have some kind of form that would overlay the State form that would give us the additional information that we were looking for that wasn't on the State form; I guess that isn't possible?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

That's the avenue we wanted to go in because there is a form already. And what's happening is the State of New York has this PCR form, patient care form, it's mostly •• exactly what it states, a patient care report.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Right.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

When we spoke to them about response times, initial times, they will not change the form, they will not let us put any more boxes in, they only accept it a certain way. This individual vendor that we spoke to, he has a special form that he had to get approved by the State of New York also, but he also deals with numerous EMS agencies, so that's how he managed to do that.

We tried the other way because we figured •• we even talked about trying to get a touch tone, a touch screen, similar to the UPS people or the Fed Ex driver; we haven't found that. We have been talking to the EMS Director, they're out looking at some options for them, they definitely want to download one where they can just take that and just download it back into the ambulance and the information we send electronically. Right now it hasn't been found, so in the

interest of trying to get these times, we've come up with the RIT Department who, at least the people that I have spoken to have said, is not really a costly thing, it's not going to cost us an awful lot to do this, there's going to be some cost to it, but not to the degree of a lot a lot of money.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Well, I think it would •• you know, if the PSAPS kept the information, you know, it was done by the dispatchers, it would take some of the argument away from the volunteer service that it's going to be time consuming and more costly to the individual ambulance companies. You know, I think you're on the right track there, I just always envision something that would overlay the State form, that the State form would be left intact, a copy of it, but an additional box could be added on the bottom but you're back to a paper system again, if you can do it electronically you're better off.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Well, even the one that we looked at is the same form that the New York City Fire Department is using, North Shore First Responders are using. And we were kind of disappointed because what we were led to believe, and it's not the vendor's fault, this is what we thought, was that the •• they're still filling out, hand•filling out the form, then after they hand•fill it out they're scanning it, so they're doing double work on it. So it wasn't the original intent anyway of what we thought we were going to get.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay, thank you.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

On this point.

LEG. CARACCILO:

On this? Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yeah, I'm sorry.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Sorry, Legislator Caracciolo.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I have another thought on this point. You were saying that IT said they could do it relatively inexpensively, wouldn't the result in savings in the efficiency offset a potential additional cost incurred? You know, if we go to an electronic type system, that would be far easier to capture the information we're looking for out of?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I think it would. The trouble is I guess the interest of time. You know, we may •• we've been talking to them, we're not looking to spend •• we're trying to get the information and that's why they talked about an Internet type of thing. The ideal situation, just like Legislator Lindsay brought up, would be to have one form, when you're out there all the data is put into it, they come back to the vehicle, they plug it back in and it downloads. The time frame, if that could happen, I couldn't even give that because we have not found anybody able to give us that right now.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

All right, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you. Commissioner Williams, I want to take this opportunity publicly to thank you for the presentation you presented to Legislator Nowick, Losquadro and myself on LNG facilities and responses to LNG fires, or worse, catatrophes.

During that presentation, you mentioned that KeySpan has a property, a landbase property in Holtsville. And we talked a little bit about some of the rather severe consequences that could occur to the local immediate area, I think you described as a one square mile area, if there was a complete failure. If a plain on flight path to Islip hit that facility and there was a complete

rupture, what would be the consequences to the surrounding area and what would be our ability to respond to that type of catastrophe?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Well, since our last meeting, we have had a meeting, a couple of meetings with KeySpan on that facility. All their test data they show, they always refer to a leak. What they reassure is that the diking around that particular vessel there is that nothing would escape from there. As far as a plain hitting it, our last meeting we had gone back to them because they really didn't have all the answers to it.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

They've called me, too, so I'm familiar with this.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Right. They really didn't have all the answers to it, we're setting up more meetings because we asked some of those same questions on if something like that was to happen, we talked about an evacuation, how far we'd have to go; we have not gotten back with them, they haven't gotten back with us yet on those final answers. They had to go back to ask their experts what they felt. And I guess everything, also, you know, is the best guess computer scenario on it, that's what I'm interpreting from them.

But as far as our ability to respond to that, you know, between the fire services and the emergency services, the Suffolk County PD, we can respond to that and we would do •• in that situation we'd use the maximum knowledge we have and be cautious on the safer side.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, given the fact that LNG emits a vapor cloud ••

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

•• which if you have an ignition source, which in the scenario I presented you would have •• you'd have a very large plume that could possibly spread over a wide area.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I appreciate what you told us then and, you know, what you've indicated about further studies. And that really brings me to the fact that the Legislature has authorized the hiring of a consultant to undertake for us a study of the proposed Broadwater/LNG Facility, off-shore. I'm thinking that perhaps we should include some additional money in there to have an analysis. I don't want KeySpan's analysis or, you know, the industry's analysis, I want an independent analysis; would you concur?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you, Commissioner. I believe we will move to the agenda, if there are no other questions.

-
TABLED RESOLUTIONS
-

IR 2059•05 • To prevent misuse of Volunteer Ambulance Service in Suffolk County (Bishop). Legislator Bishop?

LEG. BISHOP:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion to table, second by myself. All those in favor? Opposed?

The resolution is tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).

2290•05 • Streamline Emergency Medical Services (EMS) coordination and improve

response time (Bishop). Same motion, same second?

LEG. BISHOP:

No, I ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Oh, I'm sorry, okay. I'll make that motion to table as the committee is still moving forward.

Second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **The resolution is tabled VOTE: 7 •0•0•1 Not Present: Legislator Mystal).**

IR 1113•05 • Adopting Local Law No. 2005, a Local Law to permit the seizure of vehicles to protect Suffolk residents from unlicensed drivers (Carpenter). I will make a motion to table that, I will make those changes as the Police Commissioner alerted us to. Second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **The resolution is tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).**

1123•05 • To establish an alternative to incarceration website to keep all stakeholders in the County criminal Justice System apprised of these programs (Bishop). Legislator Bishop?

LEG. BISHOP:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion to approve, I'll second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? **The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).**

1127•05 • Adopting Local Law No. 2005, a Local Law to prohibit the use of mobile telephones by persons under the age of 18 while operating a motor vehicle (Cooper).

LEG. LINDSAY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

We have a motion to approve. Is there a second?

MS. CAPUTI:

Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion fails for a lack of a second, ***the resolution fails.***

-

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Okay, ***IR 1254•05 • Accepting and appropriating an additional \$386,522 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to fund the Project Impact Program in the Office of the District Attorney and the Department of Police, Health Services & Probation with 100% Support (County Executive).***

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

This is a 100% grant. I'll accept that motion to approve and put on the consent calendar.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. On 1254, we have a motion to approve and put on the consent calendar by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Losquadro.

All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

IR 1266•05 • Amending the 2005 Operating Budget in connection with twenty (20) new Deputy Sheriff I positions in the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office (County Executive).

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I'll make that motion, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

IR 1267•05 • Amending the 2005 Operating Budget in connection with forty (40) new Correction Officer I positions in the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office (County Executive). I will again make that motion, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

On both of them, is this in line with the budget that we adopted just a few months ago?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I'll let Budget Review respond; I believe it is.

LEG. BISHOP:

Is that •• that's fine then.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

This is the next step of the process.

MR. MAGGIO:

Actually, what both resolutions are doing, they're just realigning positions that are already in the budget. When the budget was adopted they were in the wrong units that the people were going to work and then we're just putting the positions in the correct units. They're not adding positions.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you very much. So we have a motion and a second to approve.

All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

1279•05 • Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of heavy duty vehicles for the Police Department (CP 3135)(County Executive). Motion, second by

Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed?

The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).

1280•05 • Appropriating funds in connection with the replacement of laser measuring equipment (CP 3135)(County Executive). I'll make that motion, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

1281•05 • To establish a pilot program called the "Safe Communities Initiative" authorizing the expanded use of security camera systems to deter crime and assist law enforcement efforts (Cooper).

LEG. LINDSAY:

It's ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion to table.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

We have a motion and a second to table.

LEG. LINDSAY:

If I could be recognized?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Certainly. On the motion.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, just to convey some of the wishes of the sponsor. It was mentioned before that this is something that should be done by a bid or a local Chamber of Commerce.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Uh•huh.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And just to clarify the record, the program that Legislator Cooper envisions is in addition to •• it's my understanding a bid is going through with the installation of cameras throughout the town and this is to expand that purpose.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Losquadro •• I'm sorry, Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes, Madam Chair. How much has been set aside in this year's budget for Legislative initiatives for each Legislative District; Counsel, do you recall?

MS. KNAPP:

I know there were two separate allocations.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

A couple of hundred thousand dollars, as I recall. That said, Madam Chair and Legislator Lindsay, I would suggest to the sponsor that he consider using some of that money for district •related issues like, you know, surveillance cameras; I think that would be, you know, a good use for his money.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. We do have a motion and a second to table. And just for the record, Legislator Cooper did call the office and requested a tabling, so this is in line with what he would like. All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

IR 1304•05 • Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal grant funds awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice under the FFY 2004 Local Law Enforcement Block Grant to the Suffolk County Departments of Police, Probation, Economic Development and Workforce Housing and Youth Bureau (County Executive). I'm going to make a motion to table, it is a grant.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

You skipped 1285.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I'm sorry. **1285•05 • Adopting Local Law No. 2005, a Local Law to amend Article II of the Chapter 270 of the Suffolk County Code to provide further protections under the "Crack House Law" (Cooper).**

Yes, we have to table pending public hearing.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Oh, a public hearing?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yes. So we have a motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Losquadro to table pending the public hearing. All those in favor? Opposed? **Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).**

1304•05 • Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal grant funds awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice under the FFY 2004 Local Law Enforcement Block Grant to the Suffolk County Departments of Police, Probation, Economic Development and Workforce Housing and Youth Bureau (County Executive). I'll make a motion to table, there was some concern about this on the part of the department. Motion to table, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Just before we call the vote on that. I mean, it's not that I object to the tabling, but this is the acceptance of a grant; would we jeopardize that money by tabling it, do you know?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

No, I don't believe so. I was told that that was not problematic, but what was was how the money was going to be appropriated or where it was going to. So we'll hopefully have that all

resolved before the next committee meeting.

LEG. O'LEARY:

On the question?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yes, Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

On the motion. Just reading this, is it •• Fiscal 2004, is that a typo or is that accurate, should that be 05?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Jim, can you respond to that, or Mea?

LEG. O'LEARY:

On the agenda, Jim, it has under the FFY of '04; is that a typo or is that accurate?

MR. MAGGIO:

No, that's accurate.

LEG. O'LEARY:

It is? So is there •• is timeliness a problem with this?

MR. MAGGIO:

No, that just refers to the Federal Fiscal Year that the grant funds come out of.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

They're a little slow in Washington.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, okay. All right.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. We have a motion and a second to table.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yeah, just to get back to Legislator Lindsay's question. It says here on a document, "Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program, Suffolk County. You have 45 calendar days to accept this award and 90 calendar days to complete the request for a draw•down process"; when did that period begin?

MR. MAGGIO:

I don't know.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Do we know? Because that's in the backup. You know, I don't want to table it as well if we're going to jeopardize ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

In the •• if I may, through the Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Certainly.

LEG. O'LEARY:

In the WHEREAS of the res itself, it's a two year expenditure period, November of '04 to November of '06, in the first WHEREAS; does that answer your question?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I don't know because I'm looking at a document that apparently is either from the Federal agency •• it is a Federal agency, it's got a seal of •• I don't know if that's Homeland Security, it looks like an FBI seal to me, but it's blurred so you really can't read it.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

That says Fiscal Year 2004.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yeah. And again, it says in in bold type, "You have 45 calendar days to accept this award."

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, and the date of the award is July 30th of '04.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yeah. So, I mean, is this an exercise or has this been extended, do we know?

MR. MAGGIO:

We'd have to go back and check with the department.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, I would ••

MR. MAGGIO:

They were here.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

•• suggest discharge without recommendation and let's get an answer for the next Legislative committee •• Legislative session; there's no harm in doing that.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, I would just •• I really don't want to do that because I know the County Executive's representative said they had no problem with tabling this, nor did the Sheriff's Department. And there really was some concern about the allocation of the funds and if there had been some question about the timeliness, I know it would have been raised. So I'm going to stick with the tabling motion. So we do have a motion and a second to table and if there are no other questions, I'm going to call the vote on the tabling.

LEG. BISHOP:

Madam Chair, I just want to know ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yes, Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

•• what's the rationale for tabling it, what's the potential problem? I mean, we might be tardy which would be bad.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

There were concerns about where the grant monies were being disbursed.

LEG. BISHOP:

Oh; where are they being disbursed?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

To the Department of Economic Development.

LEG. BISHOP:

For the airport, I would take it, right?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Right, but the security function at the airport are being done by the Sheriff's Department.

LEG. BISHOP:

Oh, I see.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

So ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

Oh, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Again, we have a motion and a second to table.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, I think ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I'm opposed.

LEG. BISHOP:

I'm opposed.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

The resolution is tabled with two oppositions. (VOTE: 5•2•0•1 Opposed: Legislators Caracciolo & Bishop • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).

Okay, ***1305•05 • Appropriating funds in connection with the replacement of the equipment shelter at the Mount Misery Radio Tower Site (CP 3203) (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Losquadro, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. O'LEARY:

I have just a question; where is Mt. Misery?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Oh, is it in Huntington?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I was just about to ask that.

MR. HOGAN:

Billy Gardner is in the back from the Police Department.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Where is that tower site? Mt. Misery Road is in Huntington.

MR. GARDNER:

Mt. Misery Road in Huntington.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

In Huntington, okay. Well, we have a motion and a second to table. All those in favor? I mean to approve. All those in favor?

The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 Not Present: Legislator Mystal).

LEG. BISHOP:

Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Can I just ask a question about the prior tabling?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

In the budget, if you can refresh my recollection, didn't we move the Sheriff's Department out of the airport security ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

No.

LEG. BISHOP:

•• or did we reaffirm our commitment to it?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

No, we had reaffirmed our commitment to keeping them there.

LEG. BISHOP:

I forget what the final outcome was.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Yeah, because of the Homeland Security issues and the potential targets of that kind of facility. And without going into too much detail, to compromise security, it really was decided it was better left with where it was.

Okay, that takes us to ***1312•05 • Appropriating funds in connection with the repowering of Police patrol boats/diesel engine purchase (CP 3198)(County Executive).***

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Motion.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

1324•05 • Establishing a County Policy for use of foot patrols and bicycle patrols in Huntington Village (Binder).

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Explanation.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

We had an explanation by the Police Commissioner and members of the committee on the ••

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'm going to make a motion subject to call.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

•• foot patrols and bicycle patrols. Did you need other questions answered, Legislator Caracciolo?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Just •• I'm reading the •• I'm looking at the resolution now. This is Legislator Binder's resolution, correct?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Uh•huh.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes it is.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

All right, go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Do we have a motion?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I have a motion to table subject to call.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion to table subject to call, and I believe •• was there a tabling motion?

LEG. O'LEARY:

I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion to table by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All those in favor of the tabling? Opposed? ***The resolution is tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

1327•05 • Adopting Local Law No. 2005, a Local Law establishing responsible standards and controls for alarm systems that require Police Department response (Cooper). This has to be tabled pending the public hearing. Motion by myself, second by Legislator Nowick.

All those in favor? Opposed? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

SENSE RESOLUTIONS

Sense 18•2005 • Sense of the Legislature Resolution to increase penalties for the unlawful sale of law enforcement insignia and equipment (Caracappa). Motion by Legislator Nowick.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed?

The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).

Sense 20•2005 • Sense of the Legislature Resolution requesting the New York State Legislature to enact a tough "Anti•Gang" Law (Losquadro).

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion by Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. BISHOP:

Explanation.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Second by Legislator ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

As opposed to soft anti•gang laws.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No, it's •• the title ••

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

•• O'Leary and an explanation by Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

The title is a bit misleading, it's actually very specific and hopefully we'll have a Home Rule Message very soon, I have a New York State Senator who's working on this. It actually has to do with making criminal penalties for gang recruitment and having different classifications for recruiting under•age members, right now there's no criminal penalty for that. So we should be seeing State legislation very shortly on this.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? ***The resolution is approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•1 • Not Present: Legislator Mystal).***

And unless there is any other business to come before the committee, we stand adjourned.

And thank you.

***Legislator Angie Carpenter, Chairperson
Public Safety & Public Information Committee***

_ _ • ***Denotes Spelled Phonetically***