

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

Verbatim Transcript

A regular meeting of the Public Safety Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Thursday, December 10, 2009, at 9:30 a.m.

Members Present:

Legislator Jack Eddington - Chairperson
Legislator DuWayne Gregory - Vice Chair
Legislator Thomas Barraga
Legislator Kate Browning
Legislator Daniel Losquadro

Also in Attendance:

William J. Lindsay, Presiding Officer
Terry Pearsall, Chief of Staff/Presiding Officer's Office
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
John Ortiz, Budget Review office
Laura Halloran, Budget Review Office
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Leader
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Robert Calarco, Aide to Legislator Eddington
Maxvel Rose, Aide to Legislator Gregory
Ed Hennessey, County Executive's Office
Dennis Brown, County Attorney's Office
Thaddeus Nieves, Captain, SCPD/Chief of Department
Michael Sharkey, Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Joseph Caracappa, Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Anthony Papparatto, Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Tracy Pollak, Suffolk County Police Department
Noel DiGerolamo, Suffolk County PBA
Gail D'Ambrosio, Suffolk County PBA
Fred Sales, Suffolk County PBA
Bob Kearon, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office
Gail D'Ambrosio, Suffolk County Probation Officers Association
Russ McCormick, Suffolk Detectives Association
Hope Collazo, American Red Cross/Community Service Program
Jeff Tempera, Director of Labor Relations
Dot Kerrigan, AME/Fourth VP
Jay Egan, Suffolk County FRES Commission
Other Interested Parties

Verbatim Minutes Taken By:

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:46 A.M.]

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Let's try this again. If everybody would stand, Legislator Gregory will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(*Salutation*)

If you would remain standing for a moment of silence for all those who serve us and protect us overseas and at home.

(*Moment of Silence*)

Thank you very much. All right. I have no cards, but I do know there is a few people that want to speak. So, I guess, what I'm going to -- we have a number of grants that are going to be discussed here, about six, so before we -- I think maybe I'd like to have the discussion on grants before we get to the agenda so that the agenda will go through smoothly. So I believe the Sheriff's Department wanted to come forward to discuss I.R. 2054.

UNDER-SHERIFF CARACAPPA:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. While Mike is getting ready and joining me, obviously, Chief Sharkey, we'd like to take this opportunity to wish you and your families a very happy, safe and joyous holiday season. Mike, it's all yours.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Let's talk dogs.

UNDER-SHERIFF CARACAPPA:

That's "ruff".

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Good morning. There were some questions that came up that you had requested clarification on at the last Public Safety meeting. I'll briefly address those and then take any other questions that may arise after that.

One of the many things that you had asked about, Chairman Eddington, was outgoing costs in reference to the grant being a one-time or repetitive grant. And by way of clarification, it is a one-time grant to cover all startup costs. It related to replacing a Canine Team at the Sheriff's Office. We looked into outgoing costs as far as requirements for maintenance training, in-service ongoing certifications, and found that there were multiple providers that would provide those -- both of those types of training, maintenance and in-service training at no cost to the Sheriff's Office, including -- multiple agencies, including, New York State Police.

To clarify a little bit on the grant language, I can read to you a small segment of the grant language. It says, "An initial response by uniformly trained and certified Explosive Detection Canine Teams is a critical component of the system to keep New Yorkers safe." It further goes on to discuss that the New York State Police have established a network of highly trained and equipped bomb disposal units across the State to support law enforcement needs where an initial response requires technical assistance and mitigation. That goes towards another question that was raised at the last committee, reference, if the mere existence of an Explosive Detection Canine, thereby required the Sheriff's Office to maintain a Bomb Unit or Bomb Disposal Unit, which, in fact, it does not. I can cite multiple examples of --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Can I ask you a question on that, then, because if that's the case, then if you have -- if you have a dog, and let's say at the Jail, and there's a possible detection, who do you call? Because, obviously,

then you have to get services, right?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes, you'd have to call the local jurisdiction that has that capability. I happen to know the Suffolk County Police Department has the capability. So I'm assuming --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

So that would be the --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I'm assuming that their support would be available to us, just as any of their other units, ES, etcetera, are available to us now. Just to expand on that a little bit, the other recipients under this grant -- this grant was specifically targeted towards agencies that did not have an Explosive Canine Unit, this was to develop new units. Schenectady Police Department, it's their first Explosive Detection Canine Team. If they have no bomb tech, then they would contact the closest neighboring agency. Utica Police Department, first Explosive Detection Canine. If they have to bomb tech, they would contact the closest neighboring agency with bomb disposal. Yonkers Police Department, same thing. Town of Wallkill Police Department, they also have no bomb tech, would contact the closest neighboring agency with bomb disposal.

Just to expand on that just slightly, we contacted several agencies, large agencies. The greatest example that comes to mind is the MTA, which operates approximately 50 explosive detection canines. The MTA does not maintain a bomb unit of their own. When they are screening and come across the dog alerts, they contact the local jurisdiction for a Bomb Team response. I guess, at this point, I would take any further questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Well, first, I just want to thank you, because you clarified the financial fiscal issue for me, so I appreciate you responding. Any questions from the Committee?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Just one.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. I appreciate the responses. I just want to touch on the one point you had made about the New York State Police, I think you said, that would -- that could provide the maintenance and in-service training. There's no charge-back for that, that's a service that they provide to agencies throughout the State?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

There is no charge-back. Commitments are from more than one agency.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I just want to clarify that.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

We had commitments from more than one agency and I just happened to mention that one.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Just go over real quickly the intention of the use of this dog. Where exactly would this dog

be used?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Our primary intention with this dog, this is for our own Sheriff's Office use, but, primarily, we would be looking to utilize this dog in securing our correctional facilities in Riverhead and the new facility in Yaphank.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

You know, let me stop you for a second. I always have a problem with our primary -- words like "our primary intention", because that's -- that doesn't tell me really the intention, it tells me "my primary intention". And I'm afraid that we could get -- we had a lighting company come here and tell us the same thing, what their primary intention was, and haven't kind of fulfilled it. So I want to make sure I know what the intention is for this dog.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Just to be clear, our intention is to use this for existing responsibilities that we have now. We have responsibilities for our correctional facilities. We have responsibilities at certain County buildings right here at this Legislature. We're responsible for security at your meetings. I'm sure that that would enhance -- on occasion would enhance your security here in this building. We have a responsibility for the general aviation airport at Gabreski Airport. These are areas we have responsibility for now; that's our intention. We have no intention, nor would we be able to, based on the County Executive's agreement with the County PBA, to expand any functions that would -- that would be in violation of that agreement.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Thank you very much. Are there anymore questions? Then what I'm going to ask is -- I see Jeff Tempera there, and I see Noel from the PBA. Let's -- if I could get you two to come up and just tell us that there is no violation with this agreement, and then -- and then maybe we can move on.

UNDER-SHERIFF CARACAPPA:

Mr. Chairman, we're just going to take a seat and --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I beg your pardon?

UNDER-SHERIFF CARACAPPA:

You want us to stay up here?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

No, I don't. I think you were very clear, you know, I mean, unless you --

UNDER-SHERIFF CARACAPPA:

I'm going to leave Chief Sharkey up here and I'll take a seat.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay, sure.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Can we play music and see if there's a chair left?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I asked you up because I think Legislator Browning last time asked a question concerning the agreement, and I just wanted to make sure that that was totally clarified today. The use of the dog and the financial part I think was very, you know, adequately discussed, so now we just need to have that clarification. Mr. Tempera.

MR. TEMPERA:

At this point, I can't answer the question without getting information we're looking into right now. Number one, you asked how is the dog going to be used. That information is being provided to my office. We've asked the Police Department for information as to what's in their RMP's right now and how do they use their dogs right now. I can tell you without hesitation that the purchase of the dog, and I've heard comments that the purchase of the dog violates the agreement. That is not anywhere close to being correct. The Sheriff's Office purchases equipment all the time, and that equipment could be the same as equipment used in the Police Department. The purchase of equipment is not a violation of the agreement. If we take duties away from those performed by the PBA, that were performed by the PBA in April, and give it to any other sworn personnel in the County, that violates the agreement. If we --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Let me just ask you a question on that, then, because it just comes to my head, that we have the bomb dog, it's at the Jail, they sniff -- they sniff something. That is now -- who used to do that job? There is no -- there is no sniffing for bombs at the Jail presently.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I could tell you definitively that that is not -- there's not been regular screenings done at the facility. So, at the very least, should we even, based on the legal interpretation of this agreement, be told that we're limited -- that function was not -- was clearly not performed by Suffolk P.D. before.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Right, so it's in --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

So, at the very least, we would be able to utilize this dog to secure our facilities.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Right. Okay. It's an enhancement of your capabilities to deal with the Jail. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

MR. TEMPERA:

Well, the other piece to this also is we're focusing on the agreement, and, obviously, it's an important agreement and it has --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Ramifications.

MR. TEMPERA:

It has ramifications that we are well aware of. I've spoken to the Sheriff this morning and the Sheriff has assured me that they would not take any action with the use of this dog that would in any way violate the agreement. Beyond the agreement, and Noel can speak to this as well -- you know, you're focusing on the agreement. There's the Taylor Law as well, and there are issues within the Taylor Law that the PBA could file an improper practice charge if they feel that the Sheriff is performing duties that may have been performed in the past by the PBA, and they can file a charge in -- you know, in that way. We don't want to get there. And I'll tell you, from the County Exec's Office, we are looking at this, we're looking into it, we're gathering information, and I've told the Sheriff in no way would -- will we allow even coming close to a violation of this agreement. But the purchase of the dog in and of itself in no way violates the agreement.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Mr. Sales or --

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Jack. Mr. Chairman, if I could just go over a couple of things. One is I agree with Mr. Tempera, that

we do have rights under the Taylor Law for the exclusivity of bomb work in Suffolk County that we have over every jurisdiction. There is no other bomb dog, nor is there any bomb technician or containment response other than the Suffolk County Police Department. So with that, I agree 100%.

I also want to mention that, like you said, the agreement has ramifications. The Taylor Law does not to the extent this agreement does. If the Sheriff uses their Canine for other than screening purposes and they go out and provide that service to other agencies, there is the potential of the violation of the agreement, which has a maximum penalty of 12 million dollars to this County. That's a very large sum of money to gamble for a dog. If it is truly for screening purposes only, we had a conversation, I know myself and my President, Jeff Frayler, had a conversation with Undersheriff Caracappa and we let them know we would have absolutely no opposition to them using some type of electronic devices or electronic sniffers, as they're called, for bomb detection and screening at the jails and facilities. The concern is the expansion of their use of this Canine and potential expansion of the Sheriff's Department, how maybe it's not their primary intent today, but when it becomes a reality tomorrow, the violation of the agreement does have a very hefty penalty to it and that would be a disservice to everybody in this County. Now, we're all aware of it, the Legislature, the County Executive and now the Sheriff. I think we should proceed cautiously with this in order to avoid any potential problem and any possibility that it would be interpreted as a violation that would have that negative impact the County's budget.

I'd also like to bring a couple of things to your attention. Just a cursory review of our Canine services that we've provided recently in the last several years, we have responded. Suffolk County Police Department responded to DPW building in Yaphank, the Board of Elections, First District Court, Criminal Court in Riverhead, Gabreski Airport, which was mentioned, the Community College, the Foley Nursing Home, Republic Airport. These are all County facilities and some outside of County facilities that we responded to to handle bomb threat with our Canine and emergency services, so an expansion into that realm is a potential violation. That's the position of the PBA. We also provide those services, like I said, County-wide to outside agencies, from Southampton, East Hampton, Sag Harbor, Quogue, etcetera, and the Suffolk County Police Department has never charged back the Sheriff's Department when we responded to any of those calls, as neither would the State.

Being the Local Law enforcement, we are -- you know, the Sheriff's Department has referenced several times, you know, other Police Departments do it this way, other Police Departments do it that way, and they don't have containment or technicians on staff 24 hours. A fact that we keep leaving out is that the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department is not the Police Department. Our Police Department does staff these needs and the Sheriff's Department would not get called. So the need for these additional ancillary services should not be needed by the Sheriff's Department since we are here.

Unfortunately, recently this week, we had a situation where a Sheriff came in contact with what he believed to be a bomb threat, and for whatever reason unknown to me, I'd like to find out because we haven't gotten a straight answer on this yet, is rather than calling the Suffolk County Police Department for our Canine and our Emergency Services, which we had three K-9's on duty at the time, they elected not to. They elected to call New York State and wait for New York State to dispatch an off-duty Canine officer to come and check the -- I believe it was a vehicle they had stopped for a potential explosive. That is a disservice to the public. If there was a hazardous situation there, you unnecessarily delayed the response of qualified individuals. This is not in any means meant as a poke at the Sheriff's Department or the Deputies that are out there doing their job. I think they do a great job with what it is they're tasked to do. However, it shows again that, for whatever reason in the current climate with this lack of communication, the appropriate agency has not been notified. And had there been an issue there, we would have been the ones responding after the fact, and that does not set a good stage for anybody to deal with what a disaster that could have been.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Well, and I appreciate that. But part of the reason that you can see the people that are sitting at this table is because this committee is very concerned with any antagonism between the public safety groups and we want things aired totally. I mean, in the past, I think what we've seen is one person comes in and says something, the next week somebody else comes. I want everybody here to be talking just like before the agreement, so that when we leave, we all are on the same page, and I don't want that happening, regardless. I mean, there is some unintended consequences from this antagonism that's been going on and I would like us to work as a team. You know, I don't want -- I think we've made it clear, we don't want anybody taking anybody's jobs, but if we're enhancing the capability of one group to do their job better and the other group enhancing them in some other way to do their job better, I think we're supportive. All we want to know is that's what's happening, I mean, at least me as the Chairman, I can say that. Mike.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yeah. Just by way of a short response, one of the first things that Noel mentioned was if we were to use the dog for other than screening purposes. I've said on the record now that we have no intention to using the dog for anything beyond screening purposes. Further, he said that the PBA would have no problem with us using electronic means to do screenings at the facilities. It's semantics at that point. You're talking about a tool to do the job. Whether we use a box with the mechanics inside of it, or living, breathing dog that has been trained to detect explosives, if we're using them for the same purpose, it's the same job function and performs and accomplishes the same goal. We're saying, as the Sheriff's Department, that we will not use this dog in any manner that will violate the PBA's agreement.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yeah. And one other thing, just for the committee. I spoke with Undersheriff Caracappa yesterday, and one of my concerns at the last meeting was that we're lowering the ability of the Sheriff to do narcotics searches. And I believe that the Undersheriff said that you would be willing to get another narcotics dog, because that seems to be the major problem at the Jail. I don't think people are sneaking in bombs. You're looking at a proactive approach there, but I was concerned with the reaction. If you had four dogs initially and then you're down one for narcotics, I would like to see the same level of intervention maintained.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I believe I was told about the conversation you had referenced, your preference, that if we were to accept this grant funding, that you would like to see us add an additional narcotics dog. And if that is -- if that is what it's going to take to accept \$50,000 in Homeland Security monies to the County to protect the citizens of Suffolk County, then we're willing to do that.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I think what I'm saying clearly, and I want the committee to verbalize if they're not in agreement, I do not want to limit our capability in any way. I've been on the record for enhancing all the capabilities of our public safety groups, so that's what -- yeah, that's what I was saying.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Mr. Chairman, if I could. I just want to, for the record, clear that there is a very big difference between an electronic box and a Canine. Outside agencies would not be calling the Sheriff's Department to respond with an electronic box, they would be calling us to respond with our K-9's that are extensively trained and the E.S. services that go with that. So there is a vast difference between the two. And in addition to that, you know, the belief that there is no cost to training a Canine is absurd. Even if someone's going to offer you the training for free, you still have an officer's salary, benefits, pension contributions, etcetera, which we've heard time and again from the County Executive's Office how personnel costs in every department are one of the greatest costs to bear. An electronic box does not give you that cost. In addition, an electronic box doesn't take vacation, it does not have a bad day, it does not worry about inclement weather, it's always

available 24/7, and it's there and anybody can use it, not just one particular handler who has it. So to make the comparison between a trained Canine animal and a means of electronic equipment, I would never say they're the same.

MR. SALES:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes.

MR. SALES:

If I could, just so I can quickly introduce my --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Put your name on the record, please.

MR. SALES:

Yes. My name is Fred Sales. I'm with the Suffolk PBA, but I'm also a 20-year member of the Emergency Service Section and an F.B.I. trained bomb technician. Just to speak on a few points here.

This application is predicated on the fact that an MOA was reached with the Sheriff's Department in Nassau. As early as this morning, I spoke with the Nassau County PBA and their opinion is that that MOA that was entered into violates what's called the Bayville Agreement, which gives the Nassau County PBA exclusivity on that work, and their office is awaiting a letter stating that that's the case, and that may, in fact, completely void this grant. That is -- that's one point.

A few other things that were brought up were the fact that such Police Departments as Utica, Schenectady and other jobs did, in fact, apply. These Police Departments are in rural areas. I'm completely familiar with the area. I have a home in Upstate New York. They are great distances from response from either the State Police or other units, so the comparison is not the same. Between Nassau and Suffolk, we have no less than 16 bomb-trained dogs between the two Counties, so it's apples and oranges.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Mr. Chairman, if I may. Possibly something that could assist everybody right now is rather than everybody going back and forth with this, maybe what we could do is table this. You know, that would be up to you, of course, but then it would give an opportunity for someone from the Executive's Office, the Sheriff's Department, the PBA, any other interested party to sit down and discuss how the dog would be used and what would be -- how it would be used, for what purposes, and any potential agreement that we could do with them to accommodate what their needs truly are. It's not the intent of my organization to hinder another department's ability to do their job, it's only to protect the work that's currently done by ours. So, if there's an opportunity for the Sheriff, someone from the County Executive's Office, my organization, to all have an understanding of what it is that our agreement protects and what it is they need to accomplish, we're more than happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

And I appreciate that recommendation. And I'm going to be talking to the committee about a recommendation, a discharge without recommendation, so we can get it before the whole body before the end of the year, but -- the Presiding Officer.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I was in my office and I had the speaker on and I heard about opening the agreement again or violating the agreement and it kind of got my attention.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Just a little.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It's been -- it's been at least two weeks since we've talked about this and so, you know, I'm getting -- things are getting a little slow. So I don't think any of us want to, you know, after the past year, want to go into that again. It was a tough year with all of our labor contracts, to get the concessions we needed to exist without laying anybody off. And everybody put a great deal of effort into that and nobody wants to upset that. By the same token, my father used to have a theory about -- he said, "If it eats, leave it there, if you can eat it, take it home." When somebody offers us money, it's hard for this body to turn our back on it. But, by the same token, I certainly understand the committee's concerns about the residual effects of a tough year, and I don't think anybody wants to open those wounds right away. And I think what Noel suggested and the Chairman articulated is certainly worthwhile following to see if everybody can understand what the other person's is doing, you know. I think that would be very beneficial.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I would ask, on behalf of the Sheriff's Office, that the committee consider a discharge without recommendation. We can have the discussions with the PBA, etcetera, between now and Tuesday. And there seems to be an idea that there is no sense of urgency with this. The New York State Department of Homeland Security is well aware of the discussions that are being had over this grant. You know, they're looking at, you know, okay, if they don't accept it down there, they're already looking for the next recipient to take the money.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you. We have -- I know the PBA has asked for us to table it, and the Chairman has mentioned a discharge without recommendation. I know if we don't move on this, we can't accept it. So I don't know if we want to accept it, but that's another comment. The question I have, or the concern that I have is that something that Noel had brought up that wasn't really addressed and that was the incident earlier this week with the bomb sniffing dog, and there was no communication to the PBA, and you had called an outside agency to respond. Is that true, and if so, why is that -- have we gotten -- have we really gotten to that point yet where we're not communicating, we're going outside our boundaries, if you will, to bring in outside services?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I don't know fully the details of the incident. I can give you a little bit more information. This was an incident that took place at a truck inspection that was being done on the Long Island Expressway, and it was being done in conjunction with the State and with the TSA. The TSA, as a matter of fact was using electronic devices to look for anything that would key up suspicions. Apparently, there was something that keyed up on their machinery that was suspicious. I don't know if it was the TSA that followed up with that or the State or the Sheriff's Office, being completely honest. I know that a State police dog responded and that was mitigated as a non-threat.

LEG. GREGORY:

There was no deliberation as to call the nearest -- you know, the PBA, I mean, that's here?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

The P.D.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

P.D.

LEG. GREGORY:
Did I say the PA?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
PBA, you said PBA.

LEG. GREGORY:
Oh, the P.D. I'm sorry.

CHIEF SHARKEY:
I was not there. Nor involved directly in that decision, so I don't know who made the call, and I don't know how long the response was.

LEG. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Good morning. You know, I have to say, it's very difficult because I understand your argument. I understand that you're looking for this other dog. My real concern is trying to get that legal opinion to make sure that this 12 million dollar agreement isn't going to get blown up by what you're doing, that's my major concern; I think Bill said it. And I know a lot of it has to do with the lack of trust, because -- but it's not because of the people I'm looking at. You didn't create this and it's -- I'm really, really getting tired of this, it's gone out of control. You're all law enforcement and this -- it shouldn't be this way today. And that's what really upsets me is that you should all be working together. I know that Mike had said about sitting down and meeting with you.

I don't want to see a duplication of services, I don't want to see anybody taking anybody's work away, but I don't want to take away from the Sheriff's Department what they feel they need to do and if their -- they're being offered free money to get a dog to do a service and enhance what they're doing. I'm not necessarily against that. But, again, I'm concerned about making sure that we have a legal opinion that says you're not going to blow up the 12 million dollars and the agreement that's been made.

You know, I would be willing to support the discharge, but I do -- I do think it would be necessary for you guys to talk and come up with a written agreement between yourselves that nobody's going to take over anybody else's work. And I think that's -- and again, the trust is not there. I understand that, but I just -- I just feel that -- and it's not your fault. It's not your fault, it's not your fault, but somewhere along the line this has to stop.

So I could support the discharge. I don't know that we have a legal agreement that it's going to hurt the 12 million dollar deal. So, if we can get an opinion on that by next Tuesday, I would certainly appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Just very quickly. We'll put on the record here that all sides are completely aware of what the ramifications of a violation of this agreement are, all parties have signed off on this. As an independently elected official, I'm pretty certain the Sheriff would not want to be responsible for costing the County 12 million dollars. I think that wouldn't bode too well for him in the future.

I do still have some concerns here. What was brought to my attention about the Nassau -- that Bayville Agreement, that's something I'm going to look into. I'm actually going to call Nassau County right after this meeting. So, if this is going to get to the full floor of the Legislature, I think we need to have the questions answered, you know, that were raised here, get that information in place, make sure that this agreement is valid on its face in the first place, that we will actually be able to enter into it, being that it is a Bi-County agreement, correct? So, you know, that's something that we are going to have to have information-wise before we cast a vote on this as a full body. So I really appreciate everyone coming forward and bringing this information to us. I know it was a short cycle, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. If there's nothing else, then I'm going to make a motion to take I.R. 2054 out of order. Do I have a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0).***

Okay. We have ***I.R. 2054 in front of us - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal pass-through grant funds for the New York State -- from the New York State Office of Homeland Security in the amount of \$50,000 for the "Creation of an Explosive Detection Canine Team under Homeland Security 2009 Explosive Detection Canine Team Grant Program to be administered by the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office in partnership with the Nassau County Sheriff's Office.*** I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***(Vote: Approved Discharge Without Recommendation 5-0-0-0).***

Okay. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Thank you.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. I will go to the rest of the agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

I.R. 1589 - A Local Law to ensure the timely filling of vacancies on the Human Rights Commission (Montano). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *(Vote: Tabled 5-0-0-0)*

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I.R. 1597 - to maintain the integrity, continuity and independence of the Suffolk County's Community Oriented Police Enforcement (COPE) Units of the Suffolk County Police Department (Kennedy). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *(Vote: Tabled 5-0-0-0)*

I.R. 1708 - A Local Law imposing a surcharge on wireless communication services in the County of Suffolk (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *(Vote: Tabled 5-0-0-0)*

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I.R. 1860 - Directing the Director of Real Property Acquisition and Management to locate property for a police substation in Huntington Station (Cooper). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *(Vote: Tabled 5-0-0-0)*

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I.R. 1924 - Amending the 2009 Capital Program and Budget and appropriating funds for the purchase of furniture and equipment for the new Fourth Precinct (CP3184) (Nowick). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. GREGORY:

Second.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I'll second that, Mr. Chairman. Just on the record very quickly.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Second by Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

On the motion.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

This is something that we are going to have to take up early next year. I spoke with Department of Public Works. It is pushed out a bit further from what Legislator Nowick and Legislator Kennedy were originally told, but there is still a lead time associated with ordering the furniture and equipment for that building. So early next year this is something we are going to have to take up to make sure that that facility is ready to accept officers for its occupation date.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. Okay. I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Tabled 5-0-0-0)**

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. ***I.R. 1959 - Naming the new Fourth Precinct building after Cyril J. Donnelly.*** Motion to table.

LEG. GREGORY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Seconded by Legislator Gregory.

LEG. BROWNING:

Jack.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

All those in favor?

LEG. BROWNING:

Jack, did I hear the Naming Committee?

MR. NOLAN:

It didn't get out.

LEG. BROWNING:

Oh, it didn't get out?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

It's tabled in that committee.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, sorry.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. I got a motion to table. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Tabled 5-0-0-0)**

All right. ***I.R. 2055 - Accepting the donation of 50th Anniversary commemorative license plates from the Suffolk County Police Historical Society for display on the Suffolk County Police Department Vehicles in 2010 (Co. Exec.).*** I will make a motion to table.

LEG. GREGORY:

I think it's been amended. I think it's been amended.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Oh, it has?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Perhaps we can get someone from the County Attorney's Office.

MR. BROWN:

What is this?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

This is about the 50th Anniversary commemorative license plates. Was the agreement hammered out?

MR. BROWN:

Yes. Actually --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No pun intended for making license plates.

MR. BROWN:

Yes. Actually, it was -- the original resolution talked about the Historical Society being able to sell the license plate to existing and retired PBA members. But our code provides that when the seal is used and a sale is made, that there be a sharing of the revenue between the County and between the not-for-profit that's using the seal. And in this case, the Historical Society has elected to do away with that aspect of the -- of the program relating to the sale of the license plate to existing and retired PBA members. So now the resolution just authorizes the use of the Police Department emblem, which contains the Suffolk County seal, and since the use of the Suffolk County seal by a not-for-profit has to be approved by the Legislature, the resolution's now consistent with the County Code.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Then I'll withdraw my motion to table and make a motion to approve by Legislator Losquadro, I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

I.R. 2069 - Approving the reappointment of David Carrigan as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission. I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I.R. 2103 - Accepting and appropriating 75% Federal pass-through grant funds from the New York State Office of Homeland Security in the amount of \$150,000 for the for the "Year 2009 Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program" (IECGP) administered by the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion to approve by Legislator Losquadro, I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

I.R. 2111 - Extending the date upon which the Tax Force on Hate Crimes in Suffolk County

submits its written report (Gregory).

LEG. GREGORY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve by Legislator Gregory, I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)*

I.R. 2113 - Accepting and appropriating Federal grants (funding) in the amount of \$16,903 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the FBI Joint (Terrorism) Task Force with 85.14% (support) (Co. Exec).

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve by Legislator Losquadro, I'll second that. And on the motion, I just wanted to ask our Counsel, these -- we have like five different grants and they basically are paying our departments, whether it -- for the overtime, whether it's ICE, or the FBI, or DEA, or U.S. Marshals. They're paying our department for the time they're helping?

MR. NOLAN:

Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. NOLAN:

Right, they're helping to offset those costs. And the County share, incidentally, is already included in the budget. So, if the committee would like to put these on the Consent Calendar, they may.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Oh, okay. All right, great. Okay. So we have a motion to --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion to reconsider 2113.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yeah, I didn't --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Oh, the vote wasn't called?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

We didn't vote, yeah.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Oh, okay, fine.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

So we have a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

And place on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

And place on the Consent Calendar. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. **(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0).**

I.R. 2114 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funds in the amount of \$30,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in ICE El Dorado Task Force with 85.14% support (Co. Exec). I'll make a motion to approve and put on the Consent Calendar, second by Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. GREGORY:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

On the motion.

LEG. GREGORY:

Is this Task Force a similar Task Force where in the past their tactics have been called into question, where Nassau County withdrew its support because some of the raids that they performed were not just on targeted individuals, it was more on gang members, if you will, but it was on just people with questionable documented status in general?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR NIEVES:

Good morning. Deputy Inspector Thaddeus Nieves, Executive Officer, the Chief of Department. This is simply a renamed Task Force. This was the old Customs Task Force that we've had for many years. They renamed it the El Dorado. It deals with -- it's a Tri-State Multi-agency Task Force that deals with international money laundering and narcotics trafficking. We've provided a few Detectives to that Task Force for many years; they simply renamed it.

LEG. GREGORY:

This is not the same Task Force that they do the home raids?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR NIEVES:

No, sir, this is not involved with illegal immigration, this involves money laundering and narcotics trafficking.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. I believe we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

I.R. 2115 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funds in the amount of \$16,000 from the United States Department of Justice, U.S. Marshals Service, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Regional Fugitive Task Force with 85.14% (support) (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

I.R. 2116 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funds in the amount of \$84,516 from the United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Agency (Administration), for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the DEA Long Island Task Force with 85.14% support (Co. Exec.).

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Same motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)

I.R. 2117 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funds in the amount of \$16,000 from the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the ATF Task Force with 85.14% (support) (Co. Exec.). same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)*

And before I close, I did get a card a little late, but Jay Egan wanted to address the committee, if he's here. Yeah. Why don't you come forward and you have three minutes. Thank you, sir.

MR. EGAN:

Good morning. My name is Jay Egan. I am the newly elected Co-Chair, Vice-Chair for the Suffolk County FRES Commission. My reason today just to come to speak in front of you individuals is primarily because there's been many discussions with regard to adding increased attendees to the Suffolk County FRES Commission. It's an issue that over the time of now we hearing about it, it was never brought to the FRES Commission at all. I know all the members or many of the members know have been -- discussed it with some of the people from various organizations, as well as the FRES Commission itself. My attendance today here is not to try to rehash that. I know the agenda is definitely full. What we'd like to do is ask that the Commission, now that the -- excuse me, your committee, now that you're actually bringing new members on, possibly, with the changing of positions, look to add or have someone from this committee attend the FRES Commission. It has been -- always been in the Charter, excuse me, that someone from the committee would attend the Commission, however, the last person we've seen on a regular basis was Angie Carpenter and Mr. O'Leary before that. There has been some Legislative Aides before that, and after that, but there really has been no consistency. On the same part on our side of the fence, we haven't come here on a regular basis either. So I guess what I'm basically asking is, if the committee could actually put it on their agenda, we all have a lot of meetings to go to, to make that meeting once a month, and the same for us, we will do the same, either the Chairman or myself, will make sure we're in attendance regularly. So, if there is any issues to discuss, we don't have to get to a point where we have to continue going on and on and on.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Just to respond, I wanted to let you know that the Presiding Officer and myself have asked Mr. Knight to represent us at the meetings and he has been keeping us updated. And what I'm going to do is I'm going to get together with the Presiding Officer and maybe we can make it a little bit more official, because I would like to have consistency with someone there updating me, and Bob has been able to do that, rather than have somebody come different. So I will get together with the Presiding Officer and we'll let you know what our decision is on that.

MR. EGAN:

Very good. I know there's a letter coming from the Commission that I -- that's why I'm coming here, maybe to not soften the blow, but at least get here ahead of the curve, all right, on the same -- like I said, we will also be here on a regular basis. So any questions that may come between this stuff -- and Bobby has been there in consistency. Bobby has been a great friend to the Fire Service, all right, and I guess he's been a great friend to you guys as well. And it is a great liaison position. There are some times, though, where, you know, we really need to talk to the people that actually make the decisions. All right?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I got a comment.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I just have to comment on this whole issue of not being informed. Every ten years by Charter we have to form a Charter Commission that we pick from citizens across the County to look at everything in the Charter. They met for 18 months. They published public hearings across the County that anybody and everybody could come and speak. This wasn't done in a closet, they came back with recommendations. The recommendations aren't recommendations by anybody at this body, they're from this group of citizens. Since they've come forward with their recommendations, I've met with people from the fire service, the ambulance service, about wanting to modify what the recommendations are, or do this, or install that. We're just forwarding what the Charter Commission recommended, it's as simple as that. So this nonsense about not informing the FRES Commission, the Charter Commission doesn't inform everybody across the County, their recommendations affected a lot of things the way we do things, not just FRES. FRES was probably the smallest change in any recommendation they made, and the recommendation is to increase the strength of your body, what, from 19 to 21 by adding two ambulance representatives? I mean, it really isn't a big, big issue in terms of some of the other recommendations that were made when they studied the Charter.

So, you know, you guys got it in your head that nobody -- you were kept in the dark. I resent that, I really do. I mean, they published their public hearings, they were held here. Anybody and everybody could come and speak.

MR. EGAN:

Nobody on the FRES Commission is stating, and not looking to aggravate anybody to the point where you say you take objection to it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I do take objection when you say that you were kept in the dark.

MR. EGAN:

Let me explain, let me expand on that. We were -- this was done by one member within the organizations that never, and it has nothing to do with the Public Safety Committee or Commission, that never came to the organization itself. They worked from the inside, they did it to their own agenda. Everybody has their -- a lot of people have different agendas to try get things accomplished, and that's how government works and that's how people try to get things better. All right? Somebody did it within our own organization, we understand that, and we have -- are addressing that within our own membership.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But you're wrong. This was done by 18 citizens of Suffolk County that served on the Charter Commission. They came back with this recommendation. It wasn't done by one individual. How they came to this conclusion, I have no idea because I didn't attend every one of their meetings. I did read the transcript. A number of citizens came forward to testify on different parts of the Charter that they thought should be changed. And most -- you know, a great deal of the recommendations from people were examined and rejected, some of them were approved. And they've come to us so far with a whole series of recommendations, and thus far, the body here has turned down most of those recommendations, but that's the process and it isn't done in the dark without notifying the FRES Commission.

MR. EGAN:

Okay. Public hearings, we agree, we understand the public hearings, yeah. And we're not saying that the individuals or the citizens that made these recommendations did it without -- what we're saying is it was before that fact. Now it did come up once when we caught wind of it, and however we caught wind of it, whether it was because someone was at a Public Hearing or heard it, we -- it

came up at the FRES Commission. The individual that had brought it to the citizens committee had stated that, "Oh, no, we're only looking to do this because there was many discussions about EMS falling under FRES." And if we fall under FRES, it would be a good addition. However, that has since ceased. The New York State stopped EMS from being part of FRES, so it's still going to be two separate entities now, and that's when it was -- so it got tabled and stopped by us because we were told it was going to go no further. However, the same individual continued --

P.O. LINDSAY:

First of all, I don't know who told you that.

MR. EGAN:

Drew Silverman.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, was he authorized to tell you that.

MR. EGAN:

He was the chair -- he was the individual who was pushing --

P.O. LINDSAY:

I would say -- I would say, if you are that concerned, then you come to the Public Safety meeting and you pay attention to what's going on in government. But don't -- after the process goes through, don't start accusing people of keeping you in the dark, all right? And don't you have an ambulance company person on the FRES Commission now?

MR. EGAN:

Correct, and that is Mr. Silverman.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. So --

MR. EGAN:

He's the one who wants the additional people.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But -- and from the fire service is what, 18?

MR. EGAN:

Eighteen. But if you look at the numbers, we actually --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

MR. EGAN:

The fire service answers more ambulance calls than they do.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And the proposal is to add two more people from ambulance.

MR. EGAN:

You know, this may sound very trivial.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It does.

MR. EGAN:

Okay. It may sound trivial, and it may be an ongoing debate. In all the time, I'm sitting on the FRES Commission probably a good 12, 14 years now, there's never been one time when anybody from the ambulance service has come up and asked for anything on that floor that they did not get full support of the FRES Commission for.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, that's --

MR. EGAN:

Now to try to change -- you said something about, you know, if it's not broke, don't fix it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I didn't say that.

MR. EGAN:

Well, I know you didn't, but I'm saying that. You had a little proverb before which made sense, and I'm saying, if it's not broke, don't fix it. They're looking to change something that's really going to draw a line in the sand. We've had issues like this in -- with REMSCO that we've gotten passed because of the negotiations and discussions. Now we're going to be put something into a County Charter which is going to completely --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

MR. EGAN:

It's not going to --

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll go back to my last statement and just leave it here. The Charter Commission has made a series of recommendations. They are -- I agreed when the Charter Commission started before I saw recommendation one. Whatever you folks represent -- present I will put forward in a resolution. Whether the body will pass that resolution or not, I cannot assure you of that. But if these citizens spend 18 months of their time studying the Charter, which is very dry work --

MR. EGAN:

Agreed.

P.O. LINDSAY:

-- they deserve their work product to come before this body.

MR. EGAN:

Agreed.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And that's all I've ever agreed to. All right? And I'm just tired of hearing that this was done in secrecy, and the FRES Commission wasn't notified. And, you know, you just threw out a challenge that nobody comes from this Legislature to the FRES Commission. I reverse that. FRES Commission should get down here. This is the seat of government, not the FRES Commission.

MR. EGAN:

Mr. Lindsay, I'm not really -- I'm not here for a big debate, I'm not here to cause animosity between the organizations, I'm not here even for a fight. I'm here to say that we are trying with the new officers of the FRES Commission to move forward, okay, and get to a point where we come to you and make sure we are here on a regular basis and we have someone come to us on a regular basis, so we eliminate any issues like this in the future, and that was the main purpose of how I even

started my discussions.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It wouldn't have been eliminated because 18 citizens got together, studied the Charter, and came back with this recommendation. Their recommendations are coming before the body. You guys are here speaking about it, that's how the process works.

MR. EGAN:

Agreed. And how it would be eliminated if we would have been more -- if we would -- let me just finish saying --

P.O. LINDSAY:

It wouldn't have been eliminated. The 18 people studied the Charter and made this recommendation.

MR. EGAN:

It may have been eliminated if we had been more proactive by being here, talking to people, and the same person -- if we had conversations back and forth, that's all I'm saying. It possibly could have been eliminated, because we would have been able to stop it sooner or had discussions about it sooner where it wouldn't have gotten this far.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Losquadro would like to speak with you.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. I just -- I understand the Presiding Officer's frustration.

MR. EGAN:

So do I.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I believe these individuals now are aware and involved, and I think that is a good thing.

MR. EGAN:

Great.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

However it comes to pass that people figure out what the proper protocol and what the proper process is, as long as we finally get to that destination, it was a good journey.

Now, as the Presiding Officer said, these are recommendations that were made by these individuals. Could we have had a situation where it was a one-sided discussion, and because a particular group was not involved and did not testify at those Charter Review Committee hearings, that those people feel like that recommendation is, you know, not beneficial -- yes, that's entirely possible. As you said, most of these are turned down, it comes before the body, that's the process.

Just to clarify one point. You do have an 18-member board right now, but ten of the positions are held by the ten towns. You have six that are made up from three different aspects of the fire service, one that's the ambulance corps. I forget what the other one is right now, because that only makes 17.

MR. EGAN:

Fire Marshal.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Fire Marshal. And one of the past Chairs, the individual who was mentioned, was the ambulance company representative. So I don't see that anyone has been excluded from this process. I'm certainly willing to look at amending the makeup of the Board. But, as the Presiding Officer said, I can understand his frustration, this is how the process works, this is the recommendations that were made. It's going to come before us. Whether we vote it up or vote it down is up to this body. But I'm just glad that whatever mechanism transpired, that now this -- the Board is aware and involved. This Legislature is fully engaged with the Board, as it should be, and we move forward from there with all parties understanding how the flow of information is supposed to work at this point. So I appreciate you coming down.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And I got to get out of here because I have a meeting at 11:00. But was pointed out to me just now, that the verbatim minutes of the Charter Commission are online, that anybody could see, and that the notice of the Charter Commission meetings, FRES was on the list that was notified when they were.

MR. EGAN:

FRES, not the FRES Commission.

P.O. LINDSAY:

That's what the note they just gave me says.

MR. EGAN:

FRES, meaning FRES individuals. I think it's Joe Williams, or whoever was the Chairman of the Commission at the time. They are always on those lists, the FRES Commission normally isn't.

MR. PEARSALL:

Individual members of the FRES Commission were E-mailed where we had E-mail addresses.

MR. EGAN:

Okay.

MR. PEARSALL:

And I'll share that list with you.

MR. EGAN:

By all means. Again, my purpose here today was not to bring up that part, my purpose today was just to go -- to move forward. We would like to just have communication between the two, and on our part we're going to try to do that and we're just asking the same on this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

And I appreciate that, Mr. Egan. And your point that the communication wasn't as adequate as possible is well taken, so we will all work on that.

I'll make a motion to adjourn.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Adjourn.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

So moved.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Barraga.

LEG. GREGORY:

Third.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Third by Gregory. Bye-bye.

[THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:51 A.M.]