

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

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, March 18, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Jack Eddington - Chairman  
Legislator DuWayne Gregory - Vice-Chair  
Legislator Kate Browning  
Legislator Tom Cilmi  
Legislator John Kennedy

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

*Presiding Officer William Lindsay - District #8*  
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Sara Simpson - Office of Counsel to the Legislature  
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Robert Calarco - Aide to Legislator Eddington  
Bobby Knight - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay  
Mike Cavanagh - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay  
Kara Hahn - Director of Communications for Presiding Officer Lindsay  
Jason Richberg - Aide to Legislator Gregory  
Chris DeLuca - Aide to Legislator Cilmi  
Nancy Jacobs - Aide to Legislator Gregory  
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Caucus  
Gail Vizzini - Director/Budget Review Office  
John Ortiz - Budget Review Office  
Jill Moss - Budget Review Office  
Eric Kopp - Deputy County Executive  
Ed Hennessey - County Executive's Office  
Dennis Brown - County Attorney's Office  
Gerard Cooke - Director/Suffolk County Probation Department  
Noel DiGerolamo - 2nd Vice-President/PBA  
Russ McCormick, Suffolk County Detective's Association, Secretary  
Mike Sharkey - Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office  
Anthony Papparatto - Lieutenant/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office  
Hope Callazo - American Red Cross/Community Service Program  
Anthony LaFerrera - President/Suffolk County Chiefs Association  
Suffolk County FRES Commission  
Gilda Avram - Vice-President/Suffolk County Probation Officer's Assoc  
Dot Kerrigan - 3rd Vice-President/AME  
Laura Ahearn - Executive Director/Parents for Megan's Law  
Dionne Walker-Belgrave - Nominee/Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Donna Kukera - Owner/Afterglow Bereavement Company  
All Other Interested Parties

**Verbatim Minutes Taken By:**

Alison Mahoney, Court Stenographer

(\*The meeting was called to order at 10:05 A.M. \*)

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay, we're going to start the Public Safety Committee meeting, and Legislator Cilmi will lead us in the pledge.

***Salutation***

If you would remain standing for a moment of silence. This was a pretty tough week for public safety servants, Police Officers, two of them giving their lives. So I'm going to ask you to give them a moment of silence.

***Moment of Silence Observed***

Thank you very much. Okay, I'm going to -- we have one card for the **Public Portion**, and I'll call Anthony LaFerrera.

**MR. LAFERRERA:**

Good morning. Anthony LaFerrera, President, Suffolk County Fire Chiefs Council. Legislator Eddington, I just want to thank you for your letter of support, as well as the Public Safety Committee and the other 12 other Legislators that signed on in reference to Stony Brook Burn Center and Trauma Center. I appreciate that, for all your help.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Thank you very much. I appreciate your recognition of that. Thank you.

**MR. LAFERRERA:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. Is there anybody else that wanted to speak in the Public Portion? Okay, seeing none, I'm going to ask, before we have our presentation, to take a tabled resolution out of order. It's IR 1025, I make a motion to take it out of order.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? (***VOTE: 3-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Browning & Kennedy***).

***IR 1025-11 - Approving the appointment of Dionne Walker-Belgrave as a member of the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (County Executive)***, and we have Ms. Walker-BelGrave here. If you can just reintroduce yourself, that would be great. Thank you.

**MS. WALKER-BELGRAVE:**

Good morning, everyone, Chairman Eddington. My name is Dionne Walker-Belgrave and I'm here today for consideration of an appointment to the Human Rights Commission, as Commissioner.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. We just have one question from Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Hi. How are you?

**MS BELGRAVE:**

Good. How are you?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Good. Thank you for coming here today. Can you just go into a little bit of detail about your background and your interest in being on the Human Rights Commission?

**MS. WALKER-BELGRAVE:**

Well, I have a financial background, initially, and I also have coupled that with a higher education background and affirmative action. I've served in the role of affirmative action for about seven years at Farmingdale State College, reporting directly to the President of the university.

I have also secured certifications for affirmative action from Cornell and Diversity, I'm also a diversity consultant and trainer and have done such for the Long Island Urban League. In my role as Affirmative Action Officer at Farmingdale, I conducted all of their search processes and trainings, also in conducting investigations with regards to sexual harassment, discrimination, etcetera. And providing training and a proactive effort to correct any errors and to make sure that the university itself was on track and in compliance with all State, Federal and local laws.

I also did special projects for the university as needed and I worked as an Assistant Dean working with our students. My training was not only for professionals but also for students, and I've done it internationally as well as locally.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. Thank you very much. So we have IR 1025, approving the appointment of Dionne Walker-Belgrave as a member of the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Thank you very much for offering to serve on our committee. ***Approved (VOTE: 3-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Browning & Kennedy).***

**MS. BELGRAVE:**

Thank you very much. Have a great day.

***(\*Legislator Browning entered the meeting at 10:10 A.M. \*)***

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

All right. At this time, I'd like to call up Doctor -- Mr. Gerard Cooke, Director of Suffolk County Probation Department. And welcome. I'm going to just -- to my colleagues, I have a number of questions, so what I thought I would do is break -- to give everybody an opportunity to ask questions, to break them into three parts.

The first part we can ask Mr. Cooke about his background, and then we can get to the staffing levels of Probation after that, and then any risk assessments that we might have concerns about based on the staffing report, if that's all right. You know what I'm saying?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Otherwise I could ask 20 questions, and I wanted to give everybody an opportunity. So Mr. Cooke.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Welcome.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Give us a little bit of your background and experience.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I have 39 years of experience in the Nassau County Probation Department, the last several as Director. I worked in virtually every capacity in that department. I've been a Suffolk County resident since 1984, currently live in Huntington.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. Any questions on his background?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay, then let me ask you a couple of questions about the staffing level. I assume that you've familiarized yourself with the Suffolk County Probation Department.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I'm certainly in the process. I've been the Suffolk County Director for the past two weeks and I've been undergoing kind of an intensive, labor intensive workday for the last two weeks trying to familiarize myself with every aspect of the department and all the individuals that work for Suffolk County Probation, yes

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Right. But I'm assuming that before you agreed to the job, you looked at the policy and procedures of what's been happening in our Probation Department.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I agreed to the job about two days before I assumed the job, sir.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Oh, okay. Well, then maybe we'll give you some information.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. I'd appreciate that, if you have information.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Are you presently aware of the number of vacancies in the department, both in Probation and AME?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I believe there are 88 unfilled positions.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. Do you believe that the short -- the current shortage threatens the ability of the Probation Department to do its job and protect the public?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

At this point I do not believe that. I don't think under staffing has reached the level where public safety is impacted.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Are you aware of the monthly report written by your predecessor regarding staffing issues in which in August he wrote that, "It is imperative that a class of new hires be approved and implemented before the end of the year, and that with new requirements and retirements require hiring of at least 15 Probation Officer Trainees and seven AME personnel"; are you aware of that?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I have read all the previous monthly reports that were made available to me. I am aware of what was said. I'm also aware that we're in the process of hiring ten people and that hiring process has begun and the people -- we've been interviewing the people during the last two weeks.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. The decision to not authorize a Probation training class in 2010, the caseloads in our Adult Supervision unit are climbing beyond the levels that anyone can realistically claim to provide necessary service. I mean, according to BRO, we had enough funding to hire either 25 new Probation Officers or 15 replacements for senior positions. Do you believe that your department needs more staff?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I'm in the process of trying to determine how much staffing is needed, sir.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. So I guess what I'm hearing is you don't know anything about what's going on within our Probation Department.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I know as much as I can possibly know during the last two weeks. What I am doing is I am meeting and endeavoring to meet with every individual who works in the Probation Department, in a one-to-one conversation with everybody; me and them trying to find out what they are, what they do, whether or not they're able to do their job, what it is that they see as necessary for the job that they don't have now, who they are as people, things like that. And I've spoken to probably about 70 something people by now and I'm continuing to do this.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Have you reached out to the past Director, John Desmond?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Certainly.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

And what are -- what are his recommendations to you?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

As far as what?

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Well, I just read to you what he had said what we need. In other words, you're going around asking people that are currently in a role.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

And they're telling you -- I mean, it's pretty obvious, they're telling you information but you're not sure yet that we need more staff.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I'm not sure whether or not the current crop of people that are being interviewed to come on board in the department is sufficient. Once I complete my fact-finding, my personal fact-finding mission, if you want to call it that, I will be more able to answer the question. At the moment, it does not appear that staffing levels have diminished to a point where public safety is impacted.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

You know what? I'm going to leave that for the risk assessment person. But it does sound like it's on-the-job training, and it would have been nice if, I guess, if John Desmond was going to leave, but I guess he didn't leave under his own auspices, so. It would have been nice if you had been brought on and had been able to be trained and get a head's up before you hit the ground running, because now you're -- you know, it's got to be a hard situation for you.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

It's, as I said, labor intensive, but I believe that I'm up to the task, sir.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks. Thanks for coming. Certainly two weeks is a relatively short time. I don't think -- you know, I think the Chairman's remark in terms of it would have been nice had you been hired in advance and had some time to sort of get a flavor of the department and the challenges that we face here in Suffolk County, from a public safety point of view as well as from a management point of view. But obviously not having that luxury, now you're thrown into a situation where you have to not only deal with those challenges, but questions related to those challenges, and God bless you for that.

But if you could contrast for us, just in the short two weeks that you've been here compared to the situation that you left in Nassau County, if you could contrast for us the two departments and if you see differences in the challenges and if you see differences in the way we're meeting those challenges. And then if you could also just comment -- and I'm not sure, I'm sorry if this is not in this section of your questioning, but if you could talk to us about any new -- I'm not sure that technology is the right word, but any new sort of ideas that are bound in the Probation circles as to how to deal with probationers and the like.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. Well, first let me say that I'm very, very pleased and hardened in a way to be coming into this particular department. I've met so many intelligent and diligent and talented individuals that work for this department who are still anxious to do a good job and are doing a good job and are

very, very, as I said, diligent, talented, and this is very encouraging to me in a situation like that. And everything that this department does amounts to kind of a wish list that I wish that I had been able to do in my former department over the years. And it speaks well for the apparent support that this department has been given over the years, apparently by the County Executive and the Legislature, that the people in this department are still able to do what it is that they do.

As far as new measures, there are some, one in particular that we employed in Nassau County that I plan to try and introduce in this County. And at the moment, I'm talking to the members of the unit I want to introduce this measure into and seeing whether or not it would be feasible, monetarily feasible to employ, and this is something in the way of remote monitoring of the computer of sex offenders and those who have been charged with computer crime. There is technology available that would enable a department, and we employed this in Nassau, would enable a department to track the computer progress of an individual remotely from the Probation Department. And as I discovered, this was looked into briefly in Suffolk County but has not yet been employed and I'm going to try to introduce that.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Thank you. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Good morning.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Good morning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Welcome.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Thank you.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And I do apologize that you're getting thrown into this.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

No apologies necessary.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

But to be honest with you, I think we're in a bit of a crisis mode, in my opinion, when it comes to Probation. You know, Probation Officers cost less than jails. You know, that's their job is to keep people out of jail, and that costs us a whole lot more money. I know we have, you know, the Ignition Interlock which is increasing the number of Probation Officers needed. But I'm looking at an October report and it's talking about, "The Probation Department is moving ahead with a plan to shift significant numbers of cases to our Level III caseloads," and it continues to talk about, you know, a probationer having to be in compliance and then, you know, in order to be moved to a Level III.

But it says, "Each probationer is assigned a risk score that is adjusted quarterly depending on their progress. In order to be placed on a Level III caseload, an individual must have a very low score. In order to attempt to bring down regular supervision caseloads to a defensible level, it is proposed that acceptable risk scores for entry-level into III be raised significantly." Now, that certainly doesn't sound very good to me. So you're talking maybe somebody who is a multiple DWI, you know, has committed drunk driving charges, has been guilty of drunk driving charges on numerous occasions, and now they could be shifted to a Level III. I'm very concerned.

It also talks about, "Realize, the probationers who have committed very serious new offenses are being supervised on caseloads that could be at 250 to 400 offender levels." It's very clear here that because we don't have enough Probation Officers, the entry-level scores are going to be changed dramatically and we could have someone who has been convicted of multiple charges, you know, and is not really ready to be at that Level III, but now because of our staffing levels is being moved. And, you know, I know Level III is maybe once every three months that they see their Probation Officer?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Level III, the mandate is one personal contact every month, but you are correct, it does not have to be in person. My understanding is that --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, the recommendation is once every month, but what I'm hearing from officers is, "If we get to them once every three months."

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. What I'm hearing, having spoken to a number of the people who supervise caseloads like this, is that they are having contact with these probationers monthly, however the personal contact, the person reporting takes place every couple of months. So that within a three month period, there are three contacts, one of which is personal.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. So --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Now, this exceeds, by the way, the State mandates on Level III contacts. Level III contacts do not mandate a personal face-to-face contact with a Level III case.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

But again, you don't know who these people are that are on the Level III, that's the problem.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Well, let me -- in order -- I think maybe what's needed here is a little bit of an explanation or tutorial, if you feel, about the classification process. The way --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Believe me, we've gone through this. I have spoken to Probation Officers, explained the levels.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

All right. Okay, and then do I -- I presume, then, you've seen the classification instrument that's used? It's a check-off list.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No, I haven't seen the instrument, but I have had officers speak with me about their concerns.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Because the bottom line is you have somebody who's had maybe four DWI's who is -- you say maybe a monthly contact; well, I can call you on my phone, you will not know if I'm drinking or not. And maybe once a month I'm showing up; okay, so the day I show up I won't drink. But in the interim, how many times is that person going out drinking, doing drugs, whatever?

I'll tell you, I was driving home the other night and there was a vehicle swerving on the road, getting ready to get on the LIE, I called 911. But, you know, is that possibly somebody that is on probation? You know, and again, how many DWI accidents have we seen over the past year and they're multiple offenders? We had a Police Officer who was killed and that person was a multiple offender.

So I'm very, very concerned about the staffing levels and the mandates that are being put on, you know, Probation. Rockefeller Drug Laws have been changed, but there was no funding provided to help with that. We certainly need the funding, but at the same time, I just don't know how anybody can supervise. And I will tell you, the Probation Officer that I talked to, when you have a Probation Officer who has a hundred cases? How often does that -- you know, how often do those people get visits or, you know, what kind of supervising are you doing? I think it's being very watered down and I'm very concerned.

*(\*Legislator Kennedy entered the meeting at 10:27 A.M. \*)*

I know you're new. And again, when I read this information, it was an August report and an October report. You know what? I can see that director Desmond was trying to get the message to the County Executive that we have a major, major problem. And public safety is at risk, he states it here in black and white, that protecting community safety is a problem. It's necessary to make sure we have the correct staffing levels, and it's not been done and, gee, all of a sudden he's not here anymore.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. Well, if -- once again, if I can address -- I mean, because you said several things about Level III which indicate to me, are you against the existence of a Level III supervision category? Because this particular category --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

That's not what I said.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. So let me --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I said I am concerned about the fact --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I understand your concerns.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- that they're raising the scores significantly. So now you can take somebody who maybe should be a I or a II and you're shifting them to a III.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

No, but see, you cannot do -- you cannot take someone who should be a I or a II and make them into a III.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, guess what? I think that's what's happening.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I've looked into this a bit. I can't -- you know, quoting statements that were made prior to my arrival in this department, I can't speak to what the mindset of the person who made those

statements was at the time. All I can do is explain the classification process and it's a -- the instrument used is what amounts to a check list where one -- where point values are given to the person's legal history, the crime that got them the probation sentence in the first place, their ties to the community, their mental health status, propensity maybe toward violence, things like that, and point values are given and that's how someone arrives at a supervision level. It's mandated within the State regulations that govern us that this classification process be periodically revisited. And it's mandated, I believe the word in the State regulation is "we shall reclassify at appropriate periods", this means quarterly in this particular department.

The document that's used was first employed -- the document or the classification instrument, the check-off list, was first employed in 1989, 22 years ago. And it was at a time when -- I certainly know in Nassau County, the staffing levels in my former department were twice in 1989 what they are currently. So that document reflected at that time -- again, I can only speak for Nassau County -- the document or the classification instrument that was employed at that time is reflective of classification -- of staffing levels at that time.

So if you're assigning point values, these individuals belong in this level, these individuals in this level, these individuals in this level; this is a system derived from trying to allocate resources where they're most needed. You know, the supervision of a Level I case or a Level II case that most requires supervision, that's -- this is to ensure a department's resource go in that direction.

Someone becomes a Level III after having been reclassified a few times down from a Level I or a II depending upon their progress during their term of probation. No one is going to -- who is a serious risk to the community is going to be made a Level III, ever. Okay?

There also is, on the document itself, a section for an override. A Probation Officer, if somehow the point values assigned are not reflective of a situation or do not call attention to a situation where a probationer poses a risk, there is an override. The person will write in what the reason, why they don't want to classify the person as a Level III and the person will not be classified as a Level III.

**LEG. CILMI:**

To that point, could we just ask a quick question to that point?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Go ahead.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you for your deference, Legislator Browning. Just a quick question on that point. Can it be overridden in the opposite direction? In other words, if the point totals --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Of course.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thanks.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Let me ask you about uncovered supervision. And actually, have you seen this August report and the October report?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I've seen all the previous reports for about the last year, yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Rob, could you -- we can give you copies again. Because like I said, when I read what it said here, I'm very concerned.

Another thing that was brought to my attention, which I believe is possibly one of the reasons why -- and I know at one meeting we brought up about 1,500 probationers who were being shifted to another level, to a lower risk level.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yeah, I discovered the number to be 1,250, but you are correct.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And what I was told was that there was some issue with upwards of close to 300 probationers who are not being supervised at all. Are you familiar with that?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I'm certainly not familiar with any probationer who is not being supervised at all.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

This would go against everything that we do.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Absolutely.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

And certainly, you have to understand, this is -- again, this is something -- I've done this more than half my life. And as far as holding attention to a possible risk to public safety, this would go against something that I've been doing, as I said, for more than half my life, and I would never let that happen.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, I'm glad to hear that. Because we have a County Executive who's not signing SCIN forms, who clearly wants to save the taxpayers dollars, but when it comes to public safety, God forbid if it be you or me or himself that would have a family member driving on a road and someone who is not being properly supervised by Suffolk County Probation could wind up being seriously hurt or killed, then maybe it would be a different story.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Well, again, as I said, I am meeting with every individual in the department. If an officer tells me -- and again, these conversations are one-on-one behind a closed door, they can say anything they want to me without fear of some sort of a reprisal in some way. And I'm trying to find out what it is that they do and what they see as significant and what it is that they need and who they are, frankly.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, you better get used to the word "micromanage", because that happens a lot. And there is nothing --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. This is -- I know how to manage.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Nothing is confidential and kept quiet.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I do know how to manage. But I do think it's important, in coming in to a department in this situation, that I do this, for my own education and also to familiarize the people in the department with who I am and how things are going to go from this point on.

Now, if someone were to tell me that they have -- they're concerned about probationers that they had transferred, individual probationers who they thought present a risk, I'm going to look into every one of those individual situations.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, when you're posed with a problem of not having the adequate staffing, are you going to ask for the additional staff that will be needed?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes, I will. If I determine that the staffing at present is not adequate to meet the needs of the individual Probation Officers in supervising the population we supervise, I will certainly ask for more staffing.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And you will come to this Legislature and make sure that we're aware that the additional staffing is needed?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Nothing will be a secret. Okay? What I do is what I do. I've done this for a long time. I am a Probation Officer, I know how to supervise people, I know how to be an administrator of a department and that's what I'm going to do.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, I'll finish it up with just letting you know that, you know, I hope that you can accomplish what you want to accomplish. However, having conversations with Probation Officers and allowing them to be open and honest with you, we not too long ago learned of some retribution against Probation Officers for speaking up. So you may have some problems.

*(\*Presiding Officer Lindsay entered the meeting at 10:35 A.M. \*)*

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I spoke to one of those officers you're making reference to yesterday. I spoke to her for about an hour, I understand the concerns.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, Mr. Cooke, for being here today. I think you'll find that the members on this committee generally -- genuinely have a concern for public safety, so that's where the context and the frame that their questions are coming from.

So just to get back to -- you said that you -- two days before you took the job you accepted the job, but when were you asked to accept the job?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

As I said, two days before. The -- the idea had been broached to me some time earlier, but the conversation about where and when did not take place till -- it might be three days, it was prior to the weekend. I started on a Tuesday. The initial idea was for me to start on a Monday, frankly, but for some reason my first day was Tuesday, March 1st.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. The reason I ask that is because your predecessor retired. Generally, that's a planned event that would give some time for a transition, and it seems like you weren't afforded that time. So I think it can appear that his retirement was unplanned, or untimely at least, to give you time to transition properly so you wouldn't necessarily have to do what you're doing now as the Director, you could have been doing in the preceding months. So that's -- I find that interesting. And I'm, by no way, a defender of the -- well, I'll put it this way. Your predecessor and I have had our clashes, so I don't defend him, begrudge him or anything, but we certainly had our disagreements.

You had mentioned a program that you wanted to bring to Suffolk County? It sounds very similar to something that we passed here that we modeled from Nassau County, and that was to, the way I understand it, remotely -- I think it was Legislator Montano that pushed the bill, to remotely monitor our sex offenders. So I'm concerned if that program was not implemented.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Well, I don't -- you would have to elucidate a little bit more about what you mean by monitor the sex offenders. I mean, we are monitoring them. I'm talking about computer access monitoring; is that what you're talking about?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right, yes. If I recall, it was like a \$300 -- \$300,000 computer program that would monitor the -- not the whereabouts, but, you know, different sites that these sex offenders were going to, particularly these social media websites because that seems to be a problem, where they -- you know, that they had profiles and things like that. In the current system at the time was that they came in for their monthly visit or whatever, we would look at their electronic devices and then we would do it after the fact. But this, from what my understanding, was this was a proactive measure that we would get flags as these sites, inappropriate sites would come up. And there was some resistance from the Probation Director, if I remember, mostly because of the cost, but it was a program that we had looked at specifically that Nassau had in place and there were some people that actually spoke to Nassau County about it and that was why I think something -- one of the reasons why we adopted it, because it was successful in Nassau and we wanted to implement it here.

So again, I'm concerned that we passed a bill thinking that there's certain protective measures that are in place and it seems like it hasn't been put in place, and that was at least six months ago, maybe even longer.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Okay. Well, again, this is something that -- we may be talking about the same thing, we may be talking about something different. Perhaps you and I can have a discussion.

I'm always reluctant, by the way, to discuss what it is that we're doing in terms of sex offender supervision in a public forum. If you like, perhaps we could discuss what it is that you're talking about and see if it's the same thing I'm talking about?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

We could do that. We can arrange a meeting with myself and the sponsor of the bill so that we can do that.

And that brings another question I have up, or a concern that was brought to my attention about how we deal with our monitoring or case management, if you will, of our sex offenders. There was a point where, from what I'm told, that each sex offender, I guess during the initial stages of probation, were given a lie detector test, and that was to determine the validity of their statements and to set a course of, I guess, faith in that they're being truthful and honest and that somehow determines how those probationers are dealt with. Now we've moved away from that model to a different model where it's -- I don't want to say it's not more interactive, but it's more based on, instead of factual data as far as a lot of a lie detector, it's more on the faith and the relationship between the Probation Officer and the probationer, and that can be problematic.

As these, particularly these -- and you'll know, obviously, better than I, but from what I'm told, that these type of probationer/sex offenders specifically are very manipulative and that's why the lie detector test was so important to be a part of their -- again, I'll use this term loosely -- case management. And the concerns that I have is, or what's been relayed to me, is that we went away from the lie detector test for monetary budgetary reasons because it was very expensive.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Well, it may be very expensive, it's about \$500, but the cost should be borne by the probationer.

I understand what you're talking about, this is something I'm looking into. Just so you know, there are polygraphs given to a sex offender/probation in the beginning about the instant offense, what they did, you know, the crime they committed and their sexual history. There's something called a maintenance polygraph that's given at some point during their term of probation. I am looking into at the moment the -- how often the maintenance polygraph is routinely administered in the population that we're supervising; and if it is not administered routinely enough, it will be administered more.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. Just one last question, Mr. Chairman. So what -- you said that there are 88 vacancies presently.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Correct.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I'm not familiar with how many positions are in the department; do you have that number off the top of your head?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I have a printout. There are 465 positions in the budget.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. All right, so almost 20%, I guess? At what level would you begin to be concerned that your level of vacancies would start to begin to have some negative impact or effect on your department's ability to function effectively?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I cannot, after two weeks, state definitively what level I would determine at this point would be a red zone, if you will. I will. You can -- I can promise you that I will. When I get to a point in my own, as I said, fact-finding and investigation, if I get to a point where I think that public safety would be impacted, I would not be hesitant to call that fact to anyone's attention.

This is what I do. I mean, public safety is kind of the credo of a Probation Department. You know, public safety through offender rehabilitation is kind of the mantra. And as I said, I've been doing this more than half my life, and I would be at least as concerned as anybody here were public safety to be impacted.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. So based on the numbers, then, the department is down approximately one-fifth of the adequate staffing, or the proposed staffing. And, you know, you will be coming to our committee meetings and I just want to let you know that I pretty much say it like it is.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Me, too.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

And I -- then we're going to get along really great. The problem has been the lack of communication from Commissioners and Directors to this Public Safety; in fact, you probably know that at one point we had to subpoena information.

Now, your predecessor, he was really a great guy, but, you know, I enjoyed watching him trying to figure out how he was going to tell us something without really saying anything. It was interesting, from my clinical social work background, to watch him, and he did it very well. But we don't want that. We want the straight facts. Now, I understand you're a retired Probation Officer?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Yeah, see, I think those are the best people to be in government. Because if someone tells you to say something that's not there, your family is still going to eat tomorrow if you refuse the boss. And basically what you said is that, you know, you're not going to have this micromanaged and that you're never going to let certain things happen if they're against what you truly believe as a public servant and a person who has public safety at the forefront.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

And that is exactly all we've ever asked, all we've ever asked. But you have to know, and if you haven't because you were just dropped into it, that's what's been happening, constantly. When you're down one-fifth of the staff, there has to be something going on.

And to be, again, frank, our major concern is because the levels are low, we're reclassifying and doing it that way to avoid hiring the staff to maintain the public safety in this County. And that's our -- and that's my concern and the other Legislators that have told me that, we want to make sure that if we have to do something, I'll say it lightly (said in a whispering voice) *raise taxes*, if we had

to do something to give you the support you need, we will do it. We'll make the tough calls, but we're very concerned with the way things have been going in all the public safety. And you guys are the best bang for the buck because we know it's cheaper --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

-- to keep them out of jail, and I think all the other public safety people agree with you.

So we just want to be able to deliver the service. And a number of us have done ride-arounds. And I can tell you, quite frankly, one that was on this like every two months physical check-up, when I went with these Probation Officers, they had to find the person hiding in the building so they could give her a breathalyzer, and a phone call would have not done it, they need to be there physically; and this person happened to have open containers when they finally got them. These Probation Officers were unbelievable, checking windows to see if somebody is peaking to see them. You can't do it by a phone and that's why we're concerned about the 1,500 that have been reclassified. I am very concerned about it and I'd like you to look into that immediately.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

I am.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Legislator Browning and then Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, I've just received some numbers from BRO as far as how many Probation officers. In 2004 there were 278, 282 in 2010, and present we have 270, so we are down Probation Officers. And over the past, you know, six years, I know that the workload on Probation Officers has gone up. Again, because of the Ruckerfeller Drug Laws, Ignition Interlock, all these other things that have occurred, it's given them more work. Now, you said there's nine Senior Probation Officers were appointed?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

No. What I said was that there were nine new hires from among the Probation Officer Trainee and Probation Assistant categories.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Is there going to be additional Senior Probation Officers?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

There are people at present that are classified as Probation Officers who -- in this particular system, who are undergoing evaluations and desk audits in order to have their job reclassified as Senior Probation Officer.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And is that with pay or without?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

No. Well, right now, if they don't have --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I mean, do they get --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes, there would be a pay increase once it's determined that what it is that they're doing qualifies as a Senior Probation Officer position.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

So you're moving Probation Officers to a Senior Probation Officer level which means you now have vacancies on the Probation Officer level; correct?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes. I mean, it wouldn't be a vacancy, however, that we would apply toward any job function, they would be -- they're already doing the job.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm trying to understand that. BRO, do you understand what he's trying to tell us?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Thank you.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Nice to meet you, Mr. Cooke.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Nice to meet you.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

I contacted Civil Service to determine what outstanding lists that Probation had asked for in 2011, and there have already been nine promotional appointments from the Civil Service list to Senior Probation Officer which, because of the career ladders in Civil Service, those individuals come from the Probation Officer ranks.

What Mr. Cooke is describing is another process whereby if I, as a Probation Officer, feel my work is that of a higher level, if I'm supervising or my caseload is such that I have harder to supervise cases, I might resort to completing a questionnaire through Civil Service and say, "Hey, take a look at me. I'm really a Senior."

So in that case, it's one position that might be here; if Civil Service concurs, that same position becomes higher than it is. It's a different -- it's called reclassification.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

And if I might point out, there are three, four, five, seven lists out -- six lists out to the department. You know, whether you're going to be considering additional hiring would, of course, be your prerogative.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks. I just want to chat briefly with you about the assignment of these different levels of classification of probationers. Is there a prescribed method by which Probation Officers are assigned? In other words, are the Senior Probation Officers, for example, assigned to the more difficult, higher levels? And are there -- just as a follow-up, are there prescribed or typical sort of industry standard caseloads with respect to each level of probationer?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes. I mean, in general, the more senior people, the Senior Probation Officers are assigned to the specialized units wherein the Level I cases are supervised, yes. As far as a prescribed level of supervision, the industry standard, as you would refer to, is about 35 cases in a caseload of Level I's, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thirty-five cases in Level I. And forgive me, but Level I is the low -- is the worst case, correct? Or the --

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes, this is -- and people often get confused because this is the --

**LEG. CILMI:**

It's opposite of sex offender, right?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

-- opposite, correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So Level I would require the highest amount of supervision.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Yes, Level I requires four personal contacts a month, one of which must be -- must take place during a home visit.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

And six collateral contacts a quarter.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So you would hope to achieve at least a level of, or a maximum caseload of 35 cases for those Level I, those who are supervising Level I cases.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Correct. If there is an industry standard, that's the standard number for a caseload like that, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Now are the Probation Officers who are supervising Level I cases also potentially or factually or actually supervising Level II, Level III cases?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Not in the specialized caseloads that just deal with Level I cases, no.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Talk to us about the ideal caseloads for Level II, Level III probationers.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

An ideal caseload? Were I to -- I've done this in the past, worked out a formula about how long it takes to theoretically interview a person, how long a home visit should take. The only problem with this is when you start -- when I've been asked over the years a theoretical, how long does it take to supervise a case, you have to say, "which case"? You know, something -- something could happen to an individual probationer in one day that would take the entire day's worth of attention on just that one case of a Probation Officer, so you cannot really do that. A mathematical formula figuring out, which I've done and which others around the State have done in a Level II type caseload, the theoretical, all things being equal hope for a caseload maximum at that level would be about 65.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And so is it fair to ask, then, by our next meeting, which I guess is in roughly a month from now, if maybe you could report back to us as to your assessment of the complexion of cases within Suffolk County that you're responsible for, and whether or not you believe at that point, having had a month and a half or so of experience with it, whether or not you believe that those cases are properly distributed, properly classified and properly supervised?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Certainly. If they are not, the situation will be addressed before that meeting.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Terrific. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And welcome, Mr. Cooke. It's interesting listening to the dialogue as my colleagues are talking about some of the things that are important to us, and I guess surmising that you spent decades as a line Probation Officer in Nassau?

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Correct; I was in the field for probably 20 years supervising a caseload, yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So I'm sure as you went through that time there were certain things that came to mind.

I'm going to ask two things, I guess. First I'm going to say the County Executive has brought you on based on the fact that I guess he believes you have the expertise, skill and the knowledge to go ahead and deal with what is an extremely complex yet important task. And so your predecessor, I found him to be a great guy, but I think it's something that really requires a lot of hands-on knowledge and a function that's almost constant.

My constituents, I can tell you from firsthand knowledge the things that I'll be interested in hearing from you in detail in a month from now; sexual predators. I ran a primary based on what's going on regarding dealing with sexual predators in our County. No constituent can really have more fear than that notion that on the next block or someplace else, there's some individual who did time and is now back out and committed some heinous sexual crime. I've had an opportunity to speak with some of your Probation Officers, as a matter of fact, who are directly involved in electronic monitoring and the Ankle Bracelet Program, and I'm a huge proponent of that and have sponsored legislation in the past to expand it. There's an expense associated with it, but I do believe that in

some cases you're dealing with psyche that's never going to change, ever. And so the only thing we as a society can do is put all of the constraints and monitoring on it that we can.

So I in particular have an extreme interest in how we handle those individuals classified with sex crimes, and then the other side of the equation also is alcohol offenders. Alcohol offenders, again, because of some of the brain chemistry changes, no matter what happens with the criminal justice system, their brains are inevitably altered and they will crave the drug. So I'm interested in what your folks are doing, particularly with our repeat offenders.

Now, having said that, obviously any criminal or a probationer under your jurisdiction, it's important that you task your resources to properly monitor them. But I'm hoping that when you come back to us, you're going to bring some of your knowledge, your expertise and your experience as to how you're going to deploy your resources to address that whole group of folks.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

You can be certain that I will, sir.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Okay. I heard hope, so we do have hope that things will work out and trust in your word, and I think you can count on us to support initiatives that you try. You bring a new light to Probation and I think we're all very hopeful. And as long as we can maintain open and honest communication, I think we're going to do some great things for the County, and I know you will lead that way. I thank you for coming to the committee and I look forward to seeing you at other meetings.

**DIRECTOR COOKE:**

Thank you. Thank you all.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Thank you.

**Tabled Resolutions**

All right. We have Tabled Resolution, ***IR 1093-11 - Naming the Suffolk County Police Department Range "The Stephen J. Clark Memorial Range" (County Executive)***. This has to be tabled because it hasn't met some of the requirements. So I'll make a motion to table at this time.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Seconded by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)***.

***1121-11 - Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Local Law to strengthen the County's Crack House Law (Browning)***.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Motion to table for public hearing. I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
***Tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

**LEG. CILMI:**

Madam Clerk, please list me as a cosponsor for that bill. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

***IR 1124-11 - Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Local Law to change the formula for distribution of funds and fees generated from the seizure and forfeiture of vehicles (Schneiderman).*** This needs to be tabled for a public hearing; I'll make that motion.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1146-11 - Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Local Law to ban the sale of certain synthetic chemicals being marketed as "Bath Salts" in Suffolk County (Cooper).*** It has to be tabled for public hearing; I'll make that motion.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1176-11 - Accepting 100% Federal grant funds awarded by the New York State Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to Suffolk County Probation Department to continue implementation of support services for the Rockefeller Drug Law Reform (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion to approve and put on the Consent Calendar.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***IR 1178-11 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of a prisoner transport bus for the Sheriff's Office (CP 3047)(County Executive).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1192-11 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$788,000 from the New York State Department of Transportation for the Long Island Expressway High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Enforcement Program in Suffolk County with 100% support (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion to approve and put on the Consent Calendar.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***IR 1193-11 - Accepting and appropriating a grant from the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in the amount of \$1,281,668 for FY2010 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) to be administered by the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office to support operations conducted by the East End Marine Task Force and to execute grant related agreements in Suffolk County with 100% support (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion to approve and put on the consent calendar.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***IR 1214-11 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$30,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), for the Suffolk County Police Department's Participation in the ICE El Dorado Task Force with 83.37% support (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***IR 1215-11 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$25,000 from the United States Department of Justice, Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces (OCDETF), for the Suffolk County Police Department's Participation in OCDETF Operations and Investigations with 83.37% support (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN. EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1216-11 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$15,000 from the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General, for the Suffolk County Police Department's Participation in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Welfare Fraud Investigation with***

**83.37% support (County Executive).** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

**1217-11 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$117,450 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Suffolk County Police Department's Operation Hot Wheels VII Program with 84.07% support (County Executive).** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

**IR 1218-11 - Accepting and appropriating \$5,000 additional Federal pass-through grant funds from the NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Suffolk County Police Department for the S.T.O.P. Violence Against Women Program with 100% support (County Executive).** I'll make a motion to approve and put on the Consent Calendar.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

**1219-11 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$194,000 in pass through Federal funding from the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP) 09 with 100% support (County Executive).** I don't see a -- I don't see if it goes on the Consent Calendar.

**MR. NOLAN:**

(Nodded head yes).

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Yeah, okay. I'll make a motion to approve and put on the Consent Calendar. All those in favor? Well, I don't -- do I have a second?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

***IR 1220-11 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$22,483.67 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 Long Island Task Force with 83.37% support (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1244-11 - Accepting a conditional gift to fund the installation of the ShotSpotter @ Gunshot Location System in North Bellport. I'll make a motion to approve (Eddington).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1251-11 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of communications equipment for Sheriff's Office (CP 3060) (Presiding Officer Lindsay).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1252-11 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the County Correctional Facility C – 141, Riverhead (CP 3014) (Presiding Officer Lindsay).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

***IR 1253-11 - Appropriating funds in connection with renovations to the original portions of the Yaphank Correctional Facility (CP 3009) (Presiding Officer Lindsay).*** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

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

All right. Not seeing any other business, I'll make a motion to adjourn.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:**

Second by Legislator Gregory. Have a great day.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 A.M. \*)***