

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 December 12, 2006.

Members Present:

Legislator Jack Eddington • Chairman
Legislator Kate Browning • Vice•Chair
Legislator Vivian Vilorio•Fisher
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Joseph Caracappa
Legislator Daniel Losquadro
Legislator Jay Schneiderman

Also In Attendance:

Presiding Officer William Lindsay • District #8
George Nolan • Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz • Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
Robert Calarco • Aide to Legislator Eddington
Linda Burkhardt • Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Bobby Knight • Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Catherine Stark • Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Jill Moss • Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn • Assistant County Executive
Brian Beedenbender • County Executive Assistant
Dennis Brown • Bureau Chief/Municipal Law Div. •County Attorney's Office
Alan Otto • Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office

Joseph Rubacka • Deputy Warden/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Aristedes Mojica • Inspector/Chief of Dept's Office/SCPD
Robert Scharf • Lieutenant/Support Services/SCPD
Joseph Williams • Commissioner/Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services
Tom Henry • Suffolk County Probation Department
Hope Collazo • Director/Community Service Program•American Red Cross
Debbie Eppel • Public Information Office
Tom Muratore • Vice•President/Police Benevolent Association
Michael Sharkey • President/Deputy Sheriff's Police Benevolent Assoc.
Matt Mullen • Vice•President/Deputy Sheriff's Police Benevolent Assoc.
Jose Nunez • Recording Secretary/Deputy Sheriff's Police Benevolent Ass
Danny DelValle • Vice•President/Probation Officer's Association
Catherine Hoake • Suffolk County League of Women Voters
Mary McLaughlin • Suffolk County League of Women Voters
Sandy Sullivan • Legislative Liaison/AME
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney • Court Stenographer

(* The meeting was called to order at 11:37 AM*)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, I'd like to call to order the Public Safety meeting and I'd like to start with the Pledge and have Legislative Aide, Paul Perillie, lead us.

Salutation

Thank you. All right, I'd like to start off with our first card, Tom Muratore; if you would come forward, Tom.

MR. MURATORE:

Mr. Chairman, here?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

That's good, right there is fine.

MR. MURATORE:

Good morning, Mr. Eddington and members of the Public Safety Committee. First let me wish everyone a Merry Christmas and a happy holiday season, hope everyone stays safe and happy.

Again, like you said, it's Tom Muratore again from the Suffolk County PBA. I would just like to bring to light, I presented to the members some •• just some numbers that maybe we can go over together, everyone should have a copy of it, it deals with manpower and with positions. The first sheet I prepared is rather simple, it shows the number of Police Officers assigned to the department; now remember, we're just talking about Police Officers, we're not talking about any Sergeants or Detectives. On 12/21/03, there were 1,931 Police Officers; now, that included a class that was hired on 10/20/03, just before the present County Executive came into power. Now, looking down you see a diminishment, a diminishment, and then on 11/09/2006 the number is 1,813; so we have a net difference of 118 Police Officers assigned to the department.

The next page I gave you, it's precincts assigned to the 10 Command. Now, the 10 Command is the Patrol Section of the precinct. So if we look down the chart we see that on 1/1/2005 in the 1st Precinct, Command 110, there were 190 Police Officers assigned; 210, which is the 2nd Precinct, 168; 310, 196; and we just go down through the numbers and we see a total of 1,050 on 1/1/05.

Now, if we look again, 1/1/06, looking at the same commands, going through the numbers, the total for that date is 996 Police Officers, which is a reduction of 54. This is the ten command, so I don't know how statements are being made that there are more Police Officers in the precinct Patrol Sections when these actual numbers. I mean, a lot of these numbers are based on our dues and our dues are important to us and if the County is not paying us what we're entitled to, I think we have to look into that. And if he's saying that there's 50 or 60 or 130 more, that means the County owes us not \$130,000 in back dues, so we have our Treasurer looking into this also.

The next sheet I give you is the comparison of PO's and it's rather close, it's from 9/26/06 to 11/09/06. If we look through the precincts, all but the 6th and the 7th Precinct have a negative change. We lost one in the 1st, five the 2nd, six in the 3rd, three in the 4th, five in the 5th which gave us a net difference of 20 that we just lost in a matter of two months. So again Patrol is diminished.

The last sheet I made up for the committee, it shows what's happening to the other commands other than Patrol. Now, the 20 command is •• that's Crime Control, plain clothes; the 30 command is the COPE Section. If you look at the numbers, you see that the vast majority of these commands have been depleted. In the 1st Precinct, Crime Control we lost two, we stayed even in COPE; in the 2nd Precinct we lost two in Crime Control, we stayed even in COPE; in the 3rd Precinct we lost three from COPE and three from Crime Control; 4th Precinct we lost two from Crime Control, we were able to •• we did appreciate one in the COPE command, and right on down the line. So not only is Patrol suffering but the others are suffering.

And I know COPE is a big concern to Legislators and you have been told that the department does not backfill the COPE, that he would not do that, yet I have an order here dated December 9th ••

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I'm going to have to ask you in a minute, though, to just kind of summarize.

MR. MURATORE:

Okay. What he's doing is there are orders out there to take people out of COPE and put them in sector units, so the numbers are falling. We appreciate the fact that you did put another 25 in that hopefully we can hire 75 next year. But realize in January when I come back, these numbers are going to be even lower because January is a big retirement time. So I thank you for your time. If you have any questions ••

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Sure, we have Legislator Vilorina•Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Sorry, I'm sure you said this but my •• the vibrator was going on my phone, I got distracted. About the COPE units, I'm looking at the diminishment of other commands, that page; can you just walk me through that, please?

MR. MURATORE:

Sure.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Because I'm seeing •• it says that the COPE Section is the 30 section, right, and it's even, even and then in the 3rd Precinct it's down three; is that how I'm reading this?

MR. MURATORE:

Yes, the red numbers mean a diminishment, so if it's a minus, minus three.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Right, but the first number of the code is the precinct number, right, and then 30. So overall we have •• it's only up one in the 4th Precinct and in the others it's either even or diminished; is that correct?

MR. MURATORE:

Correct, that's correct.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay, I just wanted to make sure I was reading it correctly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. Some of these comparisons from •• didn't compare dates that I would have liked to have seen so I just did a quick math here.

(* Presiding Officer Lindsay entered the meeting at 11:44 AM*)

From 1/1/05, based on the numbers that you're supplying us here for the 10

Command, on the second page.

MR. MURATORE:

Correct.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Those numbers, if I then go to the next page of 11/9/06 for the 10 command and I compare those numbers, from 1/1/05 to 11/9/06, I see a decrease of 35 officers in the 10 command; is that correct?

MR. MURATORE:

Correct.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Well, I just •• as I said, this •• you broke it up into shorter time frames, but going back, the number is actually larger from 1/1/05 to 11/09/06, I see a decrease of 35 in the 10 command.

MR. MURATORE:

Well, that's from promotions or designations that's making •• remember, the source for promotions and for Detective designation comes out of Patrol. Every time they make a Detective, every time they make a boss, a Sergeant rather, they diminish Patrol. And what happened in that span from 9/26 to 11/9, they did make a load •• they took a lot of PO's out of Patrol and put them into the Detective Division. And what happens, initially when that PO leaves and goes to the Detective Bureau he remains a PO for six months, so he's still on the roster as a PO. He's getting paid as a PO, but he's working in the Detective Division and because of contractual requirements, after six months I believe it is he automatically is designated Detective.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I'm sorry, I see one thing here in that 9/26 to 11/09; is this a typo? In the 710 command it says 112 in one column.

MR. MURATORE:

It's a typo, it's a typo. If you add them up ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

In the next one, if you look over at 11/9 it says 1/22 ••

MR. MURATORE:

Yeah, it should be ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

That should but 112 also?

MR. MURATORE:

Yes, it's a typo.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

So, I'm sorry. So my numbers are actually negative 45 then, because I factored in ••

MR. MURATORE:

One twenty•two?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

•• 122 there, so that's only plus two.

MR. MURATORE:

That's possible with the number of Detectives and Sergeants that were made.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

So the number that I see then, from 1/1/05 to 11/9/06 is a reduction of 45 in the 10 command. Okay, I just wanted to clear that up.

MR. MURATORE:

Yeah, that was a typo. Did you add up •• what if you add up 11/9's total, what does that come to; does it come to 1,001?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I haven't done that math yet.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

We'll send him home with that assignment. Are there any other questions?

LEG. BROWNING:

So this 122 is 120.

MR. MURATORE:

Yeah, it is a mistake, it's a typo.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

I think it adds up correctly.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yeah.

MR. MURATORE:

It does add up correctly?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yeah.

MR. MURATORE:

Well, then the other one must be a mistake then, because I know they were even.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Any other questions; no? Okay, thank you very much.

MR. MURATORE:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, at this time I have a presentation by Cliff Hymowitz. If you would come forward, please, Director of Suffolk County Transit Advisory Board.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I want to thank Legislator Eddington and the members of the Public Safety & Public Information Committee for the opportunity to address you today. And best wishes on behalf of my fellow board members to you and your family for the happiest and healthiest holidays.

My comments to the committee today are a result of discussions surrounding testimony brought up at the May 5th Public Hearings held by the TAB. The comments were regarding bus shelter location decisions not by Suffolk County Transit but by entity with jurisdiction of the property where the proposed locations of the shelters. The problematic conduct of a small number of passengers on Suffolk County Transit buses that result in driver and/or passenger security concerns. Unlawful and/or questionable activities that take place at bus stops and as a result draw people that are not necessarily bus riders but rather participants in these activities.

It was a consensus of those involved in these discussions that locating bus shelters away from public activity only encourages unlawful and/or questionable activities, and us drivers should not be responsible to oversee or deal with the problematic conduct of passengers. I quoted, "Bus stops should be next to existing land uses such as stores and businesses to enhance surveillance of the site"; and on the final pages, a footnote from where the document or that quotation came from.

When contacted, a representative from the Suffolk County Police stated, "We have not put officers on buses to monitor unruly passengers. We cannot have a sector car and/or COPE monitor bus stops to see if there's any unlawful activity. I have no problem with a driver making a 911 call if he or she feels their safety or the safety of the passengers is at risk."

The public safety issues on County buses and its stops require examination through review of records maintained by County operators and by law enforcement agencies at the County and town levels. None of these sources, and as an individual, provides complete information on crime on County buses and stops. In order to effectively address the transit-related public safety issues, records of these instances need to be accurate and complete. Issues that result in confusion over definitions of the incidents

and discretionary reporting practices need to be addressed. There is a national recognition that crime statistics and police agency records from which incidents are compiled do not identify crimes on the basis of a specific location. According to the same representative of the Suffolk County Police, "We don't keep a separate category for incidents on public transportation, so trying to get stats will be impossible."

To overcome the current capacity to track transit-related public safety incidents and address public piece of mind/acceptance of risk, security equals satisfaction, a uniform transportation crime reporting system is proposed.

Another circumstance that impacts transit public safety and deserves additional exploration is the underground economy that exists in the sale of bus tokens. Some specific areas of concern are the use of Suffolk County Transit bus tokens for non-emergency medical and social service related trips and are these trips accessible by public transportation? In other words, are people just given tokens without looking to see whether or not they can take the bus to get where they're going because they're not eligible for taxi service? Exploring possible alternatives, for example, using a Department of Social Services ID card as a Transit SmartCard.

As the chairperson of the TAB and on behalf of my fellow board members, we look forward to working with Suffolk County Transit, Suffolk County Police and the Department of Social Services to explore these issues further and jointly identify prospective activities for this committee's consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you, Cliff. Just hang out for a minute and I'm going to ask the Director of Suffolk Transit, Bob Shinnick to come up and just give us a little update on what proactive and reactive activities they're planning.

MR. SHINNICK:

Is it still morning?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

It is.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Just.

MR. SHINNICK:

Good morning. I'm here at Legislator Eddington's request to respond in part to the issue that Clifford had discussed, but specifically I'm prepared to talk a bit about the incident reports that drivers do issue on Suffolk County Transit buses.

To give you a little background, for those who may not be familiar with the system ••

MS. MAHONEY:

Could you speak directly into the microphone?

MR. SHINNICK:

I will do that, okay. The bus system itself is operated for Suffolk County under contract by six private bus carriers. On a daily basis we have 138 transit buses operating, over 50 bus lines. We have approximately 200 drivers in service on the system and each operator, each bus driver really works for a private company and they perform pursuant to their labor agreements with the bus carriers and basically the same rules and regulations regarding incident management on the buses, but there is some variation.

To tell you, in 2005 we carried 5.2 million riders on the system, over seven million miles of service, and we each day provide at least a thousand trips of scheduled bus runs. We don't normally collect data from the companies regarding crime and passenger incidents, but we did contact each of the carriers in response to the Legislator's letter asking them to provide us with all of the incident reports that are written up by the bus companies, the bus drivers actually, with regard to the situations that may relate to unruly passengers, it has to do with passenger behavior or their relationship with the passengers themselves. We received a total of 78 reports, that's for the entire year•to•date, and 63 of those reports had involvement with a police

call being made. Some of those calls were carried through with the police showing up, in other cases the matters were resolved prior to the police coming and, as is the policy when the incident is resolved they'll call their dispatch and have the 911 request canceled.

The categories of situations that occurred, and I'm going to read these so I don't get them wrong. Basically the most frequent report that had to be issued had to do with passenger behavior. Beyond that, the next •• and that was 26 reports. Beyond that, fare disputes, people getting on the bus and say they paid the right fare or believe they were entitled to a different fare, represented 18 incidents. Passengers either cursing or harassing the driver was eleven times, and the numbers drop off quickly after that. Passenger being hurt or having become ill on the bus was five reports, failure to follow directions with the driver, had issue to the passenger was only five; alcohol, strictly alcohol related incidents were only four; and somebody threatening a driver was only once. Alcohol has a presence in most of the passenger behavior reports, things like that.

We do have constituents, people not on the bus, that caused incidents to occur. We have people throwing rocks at the buses, or in one case we had an individual who kept jumping out in front of the bus until a security guard at the mall had to take the individual away, and someone else jumped in front of a bus down William Floyd Parkway insisting on getting on, the police did show and eventually took that individual to Stony Brook Hospital for a psychiatric examination.

Legislator Eddington's letter had also asked which bus lines have the most problems, and these are very low numbers. Remember, we've had over a thousand trips a day being provided and a half •• you know, five hundred and •• five million, excuse me, passengers a year using the service. On the S40, which is the bus line that runs along Montauk Highway between Patchogue and Babylon, we had 14 reports; the S58, Middle Country Road, East Northport all the way out to Riverhead, eight reports; the S1, which is our largest bus line, carried 640,000 riders last year, had eight reports. The top five routes in terms of the frequency of reports represented 43 reports and one and a half million riders all total.

So we don't have a pervasive situation with crime or people acting out on the buses. However, when these incidents do occur, they can be serious. We've had fights on buses, we've had people threatening people, a lot of the activity does occur outside the bus stop. The bus drivers are instructed, when they have a situation they cannot resolve, to pull the bus over to the side, leave the door open, that's to encourage the people to actually leave the unit which helps matters greatly, and they try to resolve the situation; if they can't, what they do is they contact the dispatch and receive instructions from dispatch. Quite often when the word police are used, 911, things like that, that also encourages the individual to leave the bus and the matter gets resolved.

So many of these situations that could be police matters don't actually carry out to the point where they become such. So the statistics we have are only based upon the reports that are issued, that the drivers need to put on file and are not complete in terms of the entire package, but basically, we do not have a system that's populated by a lot of crime activity.

We are looking to do a few things that will help. One is the "If you see something, say something" campaign that came out of New York City, many transit systems are adopting that. It has many, many uses and it does encourage people to make phone calls, so we're going to be looking to put that throughout the system. And we will be experimenting with surveillances cameras on board buses. The order of hybrid buses that we'll be pursuing will have cameras on board and we're going to use that as a learning period to see what value they have, whether we can go system wide, whether they really do work. A few years ago they were very much new tech, new ideas and had some problems, the current candor of technology that exists today kind of tells us that this is something that we should be looking at and what that would do is capture activity on the bus for a record purpose, and periodically those things can either be saved, or if there were no events on the bus be dumped.

Basically, what's what I came here to tell you. I don't have a report to give you, if you like we can reduce this to writing. We did spend the better part of the weekend putting this information together so that I have something to tell you today.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, Legislator Viloría•Fisher. I'll get to you, Cliff, for sure.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

Okay, I just wanted to have an opportunity to respond.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

I just have a question, Bob or Cliff, to try to reconcile something in my own head. Now, according to the Transportation Advisory Board, it says, "Locating the bus shelters away from public activity only encourages unlawful and/or questionable activities." But from what you're saying, Mr. Shinnick, you're talking about •• in my own head, when I thought of the activities, they would be on the bus rather than the bus shelters. So are we talking about two different things? You're describing activities and incidences that occurred on the bus itself, with a fight breaking out on the bus or somebody threatening a bus driver. And Cliff, you're talking about activities that people may be breaking beer bottles in bus shelters, that kind of thing?

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I'm talking about activity that occurs ••

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

You need the mike, Cliff.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I'm talking about activity that occurs both on the bus and at the bus stops. But I think the point that I just would like to respond is I did a lot of, you know, research on this also and we will be the first transit agency that feels •• you know, that reports all go through them. I was on the bus the other day in Riverhead when they called directly to Riverhead Police and we had to wait on our bus for the driver we were on to go on to the other one. I'm sure that the numbers that Mr. Shinnick has is quite accurate. I guess what our concern is is there a uniform way ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

I didn't understand what you said. They called the police and then you said we had to wait for our bus driver to go on ••

MR. HYMOWITZ:

Well, right.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

I didn't understand that.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

Our bus driver that I was on got off our bus to go on to help the bus driver on the bus in front of us.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

And what happened to the police call?

MR. HYMOWITZ:

Well, he had to wait for the police to come to give them a report of the incident. So therefore, all the riders on my bus were missing their transfers because we were waiting there for Riverhead Police to come.

So I guess what I'm saying is that there are a lot of other entities that get reports. And in •• you know, so I'm not •• I don't doubt and I'm sure it's very accurate what Bob is saying, but I believe that there is a need for a central way of looking at it and ensuring that there's consistency in which reports are recorded. And I •• you know, I think I made it clear in here that we didn't •• we don't feel that this is a Suffolk County Transit issue, it's a public safety issue and it involves more than just Suffolk County Transit. So I just wanted to make that clear that, you know ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

I just wanted the answer about the bus stop, though. Mr. Shinnick?

MR. SHINNICK:

Your assessment was correct. I came to tell you about what happens on bus because that's what we know about and the Legislator's letter did address

the issue of incident reports. What happens at the bus stop, yes, that's a whole other matter. Clifford's opening remark about the placement of bus stops is essential; if they're out in public where people can be seen, if they're well lit, if they're where activity is going on and not tucked in the back of a parking lot or something, it's a much safer environment, a more inviting environment for people to use the buses. And the more people that use the buses you have the value of other eyes watching what's going on it and does suppress some of the undesirable activity there.

In terms of SmartCard, Clifford had mentioned the use of that with individual programs. The industry has developed to the point where SmartCards are almost •• they're actually technologically ready to be used in public transportation but it's very much still an experimental item at the present time. New York City itself is spearheading a pilot project in the Manhattan area and they're not ready to move on the use of SmartCards probably for another year or so but they're moving probably also as quickly as they can. We like to watch what people do with the technology and, if it's successful, try to mimic them, but I don't know if we're in the capability right now of doing something by ourselves.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I wasn't suggesting that was the answer, I was merely raising the point of the underground economy, I think that's the issue I was trying to raise.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay, I had another quick question. Are the cameras in the Capital Budget?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Use your mike.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Oh, I have it on, I guess I'm not close enough. Are the cameras in the 2007 Capital Budget.

MR. SHINNICK:

They are in the context that the buses are in the budget and when we get money to buy units, the componentry that goes inside is all part of the package.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay, it doesn't have to be a separate line item.

MR. SHINNICK:

No, no, no.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay.

MR. SHINNICK:

Not for this application, we're just talking about a handful of buses right now.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. So then the only point that I see right now is that we may not have a common reporting agency and that maybe you could reach out to the companies and make sure that they do get •• even if they do call, you know, a town public safety or a Police Department, we could make sure that you get notified so we could keep a more accurate account.

MR. SHINNICK:

We can do that.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Excellent. Okay. All right then, thank you very much, gentlemen, for your presentation.

MR. SHINNICK:

Thank you.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

Thank you. Also, I just wanted to lastly, we still •• at some point I would like this committee to address the safety at bus stops also. Thanks a lot.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

We've got one more question by Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, Vivian and I were talking about the incident you were talking about in Riverhead, because every bus has a radio, right, to dispatch?

MR. SHINNICK:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Because your concern about your driver getting off the bus and going to the other bus to help, I mean, you know, being the school bus driver and having been involved, let me tell you, all the reports you're seeing, it's exactly the same on a school bus, the only negative is you can't throw them off the bus.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Or in front of the bus.

LEG. BROWNING:

Oh, and they jump in front of buses, too. However, when you were talking about your driver getting off the bus to assist another, you know, they have radios to dispatch for direction and your driver getting off your bus to go assist the other driver, you know, was he required, did dispatch direct him to do that? You know, in all reality, that driver had a radio to contact. I mean, unless it was a really serious situation where he was being attacked or something, I see no reason why your driver had to get off the bus and leave and he should have continued with his route.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I think because •• not to be a sexist, but the other driver was a woman and she felt threatened enough that she wanted somebody else to be on board

the bus. And it goes back to another recommendation that we had made about a transfer policy; he couldn't possibly make calls to all the different operators that would potentially have transfers on his bus. So, you know, I think he did the right thing, but I'm just using an example, you know, is what resulted, you know?

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, thanks.

MR. SHINNICK:

Standard procedure, though, is for the driver to talk to dispatch about doing anything such as that first.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, thank you very much. Okay, moving on to Tabled Resolutions. IR •• yes? Legislator.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Are any of the members from the Police Department present to comment? I have a few questions. And specifically, I think I provided your office with a copy of a letter that I had sent to the Commissioner and I was wondering if anyone was present to answer any of the questions that I raised. It's very quiet. What are you doing here, Mr. Zwirn? I don't believe you're a member of the Police Department.

MR. ZWIRN:

Through the Chair?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes, Mr. Zwirn.

MR. ZWIRN:

If that's sufficient, Legislator Losquadro?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes.

MR. ZWIRN:

Chief Moore •• I don't see Chief Moore present today and the Commissioner is not present. I didn't know that there was anything on the agenda that they would have to respond to, having looked at the agenda in advance, so we didn't ask them to be present here today.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

If I may, Mr. Chairman. According to Chapter 149•1, Section D of the Suffolk County Charter, if a Legislator makes a request it shall be responded to within five business days. So regardless of whether or not there was something on the agenda, I did make an official request in writing of the Commissioner and have not been contacted via mail or telephone. But specifically in the letter I requested that this be discussed on the •• at the December 12th meeting of the Public Safety Committee, so I'm a little surprised no one in the department was aware that I wanted this discussed today.

MR. ZWIRN:

That what would be discussed?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I think I can address that. I did call your office Friday and I did call again yesterday validating that since I set the agenda and it wasn't on the agenda that I would not be asking the Police Commissioner to come, and that if you had a request I would have hoped he would have reached out to you personally. But if in the future you would like somebody to come to the committee, by all means do what the other Legislators have done, notify me and if I can work it into the agenda. You're going to see, my policy usually is one presentation per meeting and since Cliff had called me months ago, that was the agenda.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I apologize for not getting to you until a bit later, Mr. Chairman, obviously you can hear I've been a bit sick this past week. But notwithstanding, I did make a request to the department and have not received any information back from them. Unfortunately, this is the last meeting of this committee

for the year and I guess at this point, if we could please pass along to the Commissioner or to Chief Moore at this point that I am •• I'm still awaiting response. And the content of my letter, it appears I am not the only one who has a concern regarding the staffing numbers in the department since Legislator Eddington has a bill on the agenda today requiring a detailed report in the process of civilianization and the movement within commands that would be before us today, and I'm sort of surprised the Commissioner or the Chief of Department wouldn't want to be here to discuss that piece of legislation.

MR. ZWIRN:

I think there have been some discussions with respect to that that you may not be aware of.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Well, as a member of this committee, I would like the opportunity to have those discussions with a bill that I'm going to be asked to be voting on. Again, notwithstanding, I would like for the Commissioner or the Chief to at least give me a status report, as is required by Chapter 149 of our County Charter. I have made a formal request and I would like an answer because this issue of these numbers of staffing within the department have been persistent and they're not going away and every time we appear to get an answer, it just raises more questions than it actually gives us answers to.

So I wrote a very detailed letter, I have been analyzing these numbers since the last Public Safety meeting and I would very much like a response to this. I guess in the absence of having it on the record today, it's going to have to be in writing.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yeah, that's fine. Mr. Chair, I know that the PBA representative submitted some documents to the committee and if that would be possible, a copy could be made available to the County Executive or the Police Commissioner so that he may have an opportunity to respond to exactly what was referred to, that would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

No problem.

MR. ZWIRN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, thank you very much. And please just to add on, make a note to the Commissioner that I would like to also make sure that he does respond to Legislator Losquadro in a timely fashion; his presence not being here did not exclude a response.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

By the way, Mr. Chairman. Again, I'm not sure what day it may have arrived to them, but my letter is dated December 4th.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, well noted.

Tabled Resolutions

Okay, Tabled Resolution ***IR 2173•06 • A Local Law establishing crime prevention requirements for scrap metal dealers (County Executive)***. The public hearing was recessed so I believe we need to table that.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to table. Do I have a second? Second by Legislator Viloría•Fisher. On the motion, I just want to mention that I'm hoping that we're going to be able to deal with it, I've had the Suffolk County Police Department continually call me, as the Chair of Public Safety, about how important this issue is to be dealt with, so I'm hoping we're going to be able to get the closing and moving on with it. Okay, on the tabling motion, all those in

favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).**

IR 2241•06 • Authorizing the County of Suffolk to enter into a contract for the provision of ambulance service to County Correctional Facilities and to compensate local ambulance districts for such services (Schneiderman).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Browning.

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chairman, may I just have a ••

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes, Mr. Zwirn.

MR. ZWIRN:

On behalf of the County Exec's Office, we'd like to thank Legislator Schneiderman for working with our office on some amendments that he made to this bill, and we are in support of it and would recommend that the committee approve it out today and go to the floor.

We are also going to ask •• we may ask for additional language in the form of a CN at the General Meeting of the Legislature and the language will refer to this as not being •• as this to be an exception to the rule, that it would be specifically tied to correctional facilities so that we don't open the door. The language is not in there presently. And even though all the language that we recommended to Legislator Schneiderman he has accepted, we were looking at it this morning just saying that we got some calls from different people who were concerned that this was going to open up the precincts to the County Center and to other County facilities, and while we are

empathetic and we think this bill makes sense for the Yaphank Correctional Facility and for the Riverhead Correctional Facility, we might add a paragraph and it would be just related to that, just so that •• because we've had that sense of the Legislature that they wanted it just to apply to the correctional facilities, we would just like to codify it along with this legislation, if that's •• and I talked to Legislator Schneiderman and he didn't seem to have an objection with that.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Vilorio•Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

I just find it strange that the title of this is •• says County Correctional Facilities.

MR. ZWIRN:

Right.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

So then why does there have to be a CN clarifying that it's County Correctional Facilities?

MR. ZWIRN:

Because we're afraid that it's going to be expanded and we just want to get a sense of the Legislature ••

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

But you would need other legislation to expand it, because this says specifically •• you know, it's just, Ben, that we've been sitting here really in good faith saying to Jay that as soon as things were worked out with the County Executive he's got our support and Kate has also said that they've got this, and I was just ready to get this out of committee and get it out there.

MR. ZWIRN:

We're not trying to hold •• we're recommending that it be approved.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay.

MR. ZWIRN:

We're looking for a belt and suspenders approach.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

So buy why are we going to have a CN then? Is it going to be ••

MR. ZWIRN:

The only language it would change is to make sure that everybody •• it's a belt and suspenders approach, that's all, only because we got some inquiries today.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

But would it supercede this? I don't understand what you're saying.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It would, I guess, technically ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

This is coming out of committee.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think the bill is pretty good in its current form and I do have •• you know, these changes that were made were at the request of the County Executive. What I believe Mr. Zwirn is saying is they want additional language to really distinguish the correctional facilities from other types of County facilities.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

No, I'm asking a procedural question.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The bill does do that ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

But this is a procedural ••

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

•• but I haven't seen the exact language that Mr. Sabatino and Mr. Levy are looking for, so

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Okay, let me just go back to my question, maybe I'm not couching it correctly. We have a bill before us, we're going to approve it out of committee today I hope, it's going to go to the full meeting on Tuesday. Now, there will also be a CN at the meeting on Tuesday.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There may be.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Now are we then anticipating not to pass this one and to pass the CN or is the CN a separate bill that's saying, "We don't want this to be a slippery slope"?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think the CN, if there is a CN, it will be my CN, not the County Executive's CN.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Well, the CN has the County Executive and you as a cosponsor, correct?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, on •• no, it would be a CN on my behalf and it would add this additional language which I have not seen yet.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Okay, so it would supercede this. I'm just asking the question about procedure, it would replace this.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't •• I think the bill is pretty clear and I think the Legislators have been

pretty clear in terms of distinguishing the correctional facilities from other County facilities. But if the County Executive feels that an additional sentence might prevent opening a Pandora's box in the future ••

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Well, it's too bad you didn't know that yesterday, you could have just added that additional sentence to your bill.

MR. ZWIRN:

That's absolutely true, Legislator Vilorina•Fisher, it's true.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

I mean, it's just Jay has been working on this for a long time.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

For a long time.

MR. ZWIRN:

And it's his initiative, it was a good idea. I mean, there's going to be •• apparently this ambulance company years ago used to get money from the County for doing the very same thing and then it was just continued over a period of time because there were some disputes within the district itself.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Okay, I'm not trying to beat you up, Ben. I just wanted to know what the purpose was of the CN, that's all.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

All right, let's ••

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

I was just truly asking a question because I wasn't understanding where you were going with this.

MR. ZWIRN:

I understand, and it's a fair question. We're not trying to change the bill, we're just afraid, we're just afraid that we're going to open this up for every facility in the County.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, let me just ask our Counsel what his feeling is on this issue.

MR. NOLAN:

The bill very clearly applies only to the correctional facilities. I don't see any language in it that opens a door for somebody else to come in and request money under the provisions of this law, so I don't know that a CN is required, Ben.

MR. ZWIRN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, then you know what? Let's just deal with this here and see what magically appears on Tuesday.

MR. ZWIRN:

Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

All right? So I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•0)**. On the record, I just want to compliment Legislator Schneiderman; you have been very patient and hard working on this issue, I'm glad to see it happen.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Hoo•ah.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, **IR 2268•06 • A Local Law to strengthen ATV seizure and**

forfeiture provisions (Presiding Officer Lindsay).

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

This has to be tabled.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, recessed and it will be tabled. Okay, motion by Legislator Vilorina •Fisher.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).***

IR 2290•06 • A Local Law to require landlords to register with the Department of Probation prior to renting to sex offenders (Browning).

LEG. BROWNING:

We have table this.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Table by request of Legislator Browning, I'll second that.

All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).***

IR 2347•06 • Authorizing the County Sheriff to monitor registered sex offenders.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, we will have to table again. We did have a meeting but still working on the language, amending it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Legislator Browning says table, I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).***

IR 2415•06 • A Charter Law to expand sex offender notification requirements (Eddington). I'm going to ask to table that, I need to work on it.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Viloría•Fisher. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).***

IR 2459•06 • Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the second floor construction, Special Patrol Bureau/Police Department (CP 3139) (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve by Legislator Browning.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I'll second that, but on the motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I think Joe was first.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Oh, question?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No, the Chairman recognized you.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yeah, on the motion. The offset, which appears to be movable bridges, what exactly is that project? I think I recall seeing that as an offset perhaps in the ••

LEG. HORSLEY:

There was something else there.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

The AVR offset perhaps? I'm wondering from Budget Review, after the resolution that we just passed, if there's still funds available in that program as an offset?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, we passed ••

LEG. CARACAPPA:

We just passed a bill, or was it tabled at the last meeting for bridges?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, we passed it. No, we passed an ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I know I saw movable bridges.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Very recently we did see movable bridges.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Last meeting.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

That was one of the ones that went through.

MR. MAGGIO:

I'll have to go back and check that one then; I'll just run back real quick and check it.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

If you could, please. We need to know whether or not it's a valid offset.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. You know what, we'll just put this on hold, we'll move on with the agenda and come back to this.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I have questions.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes, go ahead. I'm sorry, Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

We did a Capital Budget Amendment last meeting, I don't know if it passed or not in all the hubbub on Capital stuff, but there was a resolution, I'm just not sure if it passed. Is this the Aviation Unit?

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Yes, this is the Special Patrol Bureau at McArthur Airport.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

You have to come up to the mike, please. Sorry, Jack, I'm just yelling out, sorry.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

It's okay, I was about to say that.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Lieutenant Scharf, good afternoon.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

How are you? We had done Capital spending on this many years ago, I

think it was around 2000, 2001, after a long and lengthy debate about the cost and the need. What has happened with that Capital expenditure where are we and what does this include?

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

This project has been going on, as you said, since 2000 and there was planning even prior to that, but monetarily since 2000. I believe the initial appropriated amount was 600,000, the project itself came in over bid, it went back; got another 200,000 two years later, it again came in over bid. There was a lot of red tape with the Town of Islip to get permits approved it, it lingered on and on as a result. A connected part of the project was a \$110,000 generator, it was a separate connected Capital Project because it went over five years with no money coming out of that account, we actually lost it due to a County Law. This \$280,000 that we're requesting now, 130 of it is for the generator that we lost, 50 of it is for a new runway which we have already repaired and took that money out of our initial amount so we need to replace that into the Capital Project, 100,000 of it is for inflation and contingency fees because the project has lingered on so long, inflation has affected it tremendously.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Are you telling me no work has started?

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Nothing.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Wow.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

There have been some ••

LEG. CARACAPPA:

It's coming up on seven years and lengthy debate when we originally passed this resolution.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Sure.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I understand permit problems, but seven years? And I remember the urgency of it all back then and, I mean, it was a tremendous urgency to do this work. You're still working •• the EMS component of Aviation is still working out of trailers I believe within the hangar.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Low wires running through the hangar. Some of your Superior Officers work out of trailers as well in that building and here we are almost seven years later without one stitch of work being done and now more money coming back here. Its a sad state of affairs.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

There have been a few cosmetic things done non capital wise that originally were supposed to be part of the capital, like lighting for instance, but the second floor addition has not started whatsoever.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yeah. Well, I'm certainly not blaming the Aviation Unit, you've had to put up with ••

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Bureaucracy.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

•• a bad situation for far too long, especially in light of the work that you do. I guess it just goes right to Public Works and to two administrations, the past administration and the current administration; this work should have been done a long, long time ago.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Viloría•Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

What is the status at this point with the permitting process and the Town of Islip?

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Approximately six months ago we did finally receive a permit from the Town of Islip, so we now need this money so we can go out to bid.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay, so I think, Legislator Caracappa, that's an important issue there, too. Because we've had before us many issues where the cooperation between the County and the Town of Islip, vis•a•vis the airport and all of those issues have come before us and we anticipate the type of cooperation that we should have between municipalities. You know, the County has made many representations to builders of affordable housing that we try to speed through the processes, we try to help commercial entities with speeding through the process, the permitting process and the County has been a victim of that bureaucracy. So six months ago we just received our permitting.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Approximately six months ago.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

That's my point.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

That's pathetic.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

In 2000, before 2000, planning ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

I was a new Legislator when we fought for this.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

When planning starts on a project such as this, that's when the permit process usually begins. And to have it seven years later without those permits, regardless of political fighting over the airport or whatever it may be, coming and going of council people and supervisors, it still ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

It shouldn't be a victim.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

This is way too long, way too long.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Well, we all agree, I guess, that you've been waiting a long time and it's well deserved to have this construction, now we just have to wait for BRO to give us where the offset is coming.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

I do believe the project coming in over bid twice and needing to go back for more money is probably the majority of the delay.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

But still, seven years.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's been seven years.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

That's a lot of time. Mr. Chair, if I recall, those offsets that were in that large package, most of them didn't raid the entire project, they took parts of a number of projects, you know, amounts from a number of projects. So it would seem to me that this wouldn't have been depleted completely, but I guess BRO is coming back with information.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And here he comes.

MR. MAGGIO:

November 21st there was a resolution that passed appropriating \$300,000 for planning funds for that project, so the funds in the construction line are still available.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

In what amount? I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

In movable bridges?

MR. MAGGIO:

In the moveable bridges.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes. I'm sorry, in what amount? Is there sufficient funds in that program to cover this \$280,000 expenditure.

MR. MAGGIO:

There's 550,000 left.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

What was the bill we did on Tuesday?

MR. MAGGIO:

Planning, it was planning money for that project; just planning, this is construction money.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

This is construction.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

That's what we did on Tuesday? You said November 21st.

Okay, thanks.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

It had to be December 5th. Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Any other questions? Yes, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I would assume that a large component of this, as we're seeing with the jail project, are materials cost increases ••

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

•• associated with construction.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Unfortunately with the delay in the permitting process, every month or two that you wait unfortunately cost you money in an increase in labor and materials cost and everything else ••

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Yes, sir.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

•• associated with that. Okay, very good. Thank you.

LIEUTENANT SCHARF:

Thank you very much.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thanks for your patience.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Did we have a motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

We had a motion, I made the motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, we have a motion and a second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, **carried (VOTE: 7•0•0•0)**.

IR 2460•06 • Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of digital photography equipment for the Sheriff's Office (CP 3062) (County Executive).

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve by Legislator Browning.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Viloría•Fisher.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Just on the motion, very quickly.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

On the motion, yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I see it's the same offset ••

LEG. BROWNING:

It's \$500.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yeah, it's still under that amount that Budget Review said, so that's fine.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

We're good to go.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yep.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. Okay then, all those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).

IR 2487•06 • Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$16,000 from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee for the Suffolk County Police Department to continue a Child Passenger Safety Program with 100% support (County Executive).

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve ••

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

And place on the consent calendar.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

•• and put it on the consent calendar. Second by Legislator Viloría•Fisher. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Approved and placed on the consent calendar (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).

IR 2488•06 • Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$84,000 from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee to enforce motor vehicle passenger restraint regulations with 84.5% support (County Executive).

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve by Legislator Viloría•Fisher, second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).

IR 2514•06 • Requiring a detailed report on the progress of civilianization within the Suffolk County Police Department (Eddington). I'm going to ask Mr. Zwirn to respond; we were talking earlier.

MR. ZWIRN:

I understand that •• we've had the opportunity to speak with the chair and sponsor of this bill and I understand that you've had some conversations with the Police Department and we just ask if you if we can tweak it a little bit, just for one cycle so that we can go through it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

All right. You know, I want to make sure we're on the same page. I know that Legislator Losquadro is going to be getting the information and I want to make sure that we continue to get it in a timely fashion and complete. So I will table this for one session but I want to remind the Police Commissioner that obviously Legislator Losquadro will be getting this information. So I will make a motion to table.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I'll •• well, actually I won't second it. On the motion; if someone wants to second that.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'll second it.

LEG. BROWNING:

Did you second it?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Sure, I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Horsley. And on the motion, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Obviously it's the prerogative of the sponsor of the bill, but I read through the bill very carefully. In fact, I made one suggestion of something that I thought that the sponsor might want to change, he took that recommendation and filed an amended copy which I was very happy to see and I agreed to be a cosponsor on it. I think it is a very well written piece of legislation and I think it doesn't leave a lot of wiggle room. So I'm not sure what the potential tweaks in this might be because I think it's pretty black and white, I think it's a very good piece of legislation and it's something that I'm looking forward to this Legislature implementing.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Excellent, I appreciate that. And like our Legislator Schneiderman, I want to give every opportunity to the County Executive to look at it and if I can •• if I can find some gray I'm willing to go, but we will be working on this. Okay, then we have a motion to table and a second. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

One opposed.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Two.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Two opposed. Abstentions? Okay, ***the motion is carried***
(VOTE: 5•2•0•0 Opposed: Legislators Caracappa & Losquadro).

***IR 2515•06 • Authorizing the Department of Information
Technology to develop a web page for the tracking of Brownfields
properties (Horsley).***

LEG. HORSLEY:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Motion to table, apparently Counsel has a couple of changes that he would like to make in the legislation.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, motion to table by Legislator Horsley, I'll second that.
All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).***

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Why is it in this committee?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I beg your pardon? Do you have a question, Legislator?

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Why was it assigned to this committee? I'm sorry.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Do you have a question?

MR. NOLAN:

It will also give us an opportunity to reassign it to the right committee.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Oh, okay.

MR. NOLAN:

It shouldn't be in this committee.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, thank you for that clarification.

Okay, ***IR 2535 • 06 • A Local Law to facilitate screening of hot • line employees (D'Amaro)***. The recommendation from the author is table for a public hearing; I'll make that motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Tabled (VOTE: 7 • 0 • 0 • 0).

We'll recess this session. I appreciate •• oh, one more, Mr. Zwirn.

MR. ZWIRN:

If I might, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to apprise the committee at the General Meeting on the 19th that we will be presenting a CN on behalf of the Police Department on a grant from the State, it will be over a million dollars, I think between one and \$2 million, for reimbursement for Highway Patrol work. When they're doing work on the Long Island Expressway, we have Highway Patrol Officers there to direct traffic and to provide for their safety; we lay out the money and then the State pays us back. So to get that money back before 2006, since this is the last meeting, we are going to be coming forth with that grant proposal and would ask that you pass it at that meeting, but I just want you to be aware that it's coming.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Show us the money.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to adjourn, second. Meeting is closed. Thank you.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 12:38 PM*)

***Legislator Jack Eddington, Chairman
Public Safety & Public Information Committee***

{ } • Denotes Spelled Phonetically