

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

A 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, July 24, 2014, at 10:00 a.m.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson  
Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair  
Legislator Kara Hahn  
Legislator William Spencer  
Legislator Monica Martinez  
Legislator John Kennedy  
Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory

**Also in Attendance:**

George Nolan - Counsel to the Suffolk County Legislature  
Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature  
Lora Gellerstein - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature  
John Ortiz - Senior Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office  
Josh Slaughter - Aide to Chairperson Browning  
Bill Shilling - Aide to Legislator Calarco  
Mark Malizia - Aide to Legislator Spencer  
Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy  
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory  
Tom Vaughn - County Executive's Office  
Tracy Pollak - Suffolk County Police Department  
Michael Sharkey - Suffolk County Sheriff's Office  
Suzanne McBride - AME Police Emergency Unit President  
Rabbi Steven Moss - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Jennifer Blaske - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Dr. Augustus Mantia - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Luis Rodriguez - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Dr. Wang - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Luis Valenzuela - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Michele DelMonte - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Bonnie Cannon - Suffolk County Human Rights Commission  
Joseph Busweiler - Lieutenant/Chief of Department's Office/SCPD  
Sergeant Michael Mallin - SCPD/Motor Carrier Safety Section  
Russ McCormick - Suffolk County Detective's Association  
Arthur Sanchez - DSPBA  
Christine Lark - SCPOA  
All Other Interested Parties

**Taken By:**

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Good morning. We do have a presentation. And Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, Rabbi Steven Moss, and Director -- Executive Director, Jennifer Blaske, will be presenting for us, if you'd like to come forward. If there's anything else -- yeah, anyone else you want to bring with you, feel free.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Here?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yes, yeah. There may be more people than there are seats.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Good morning, everybody.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good morning.

**RABBI MOSS:**

I do want -- oh, I'm Rabbi Steve Moss, Chairperson of the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. And I do want to introduce those who are here with us this morning. To my left is our Executive Director, Jennifer Blaske, whom you'll hear from later. And then we have Dr. Gus Mantia, and Luis Rodriguez, Dr. Wang, Luis Valenzuela, oh, and Michele. Oh, there you are, Michele, Michele DelMonte, and these are our members of our Commission.

So I hope everyone's having a good day and enjoying nice weather today. Shalom, peace to everyone, and certainly my prayers for peace in the world, and particularly in the Middle East.

I do want to begin by thanking all of you here on this committee, and also all of the members of our Legislature for your support of the Human Rights Commission, and, of course, for the recent nominations of myself, as well as everybody else who came up for nominations. As some of you might know, a third -- about a third of our Commission members comes up for nominations every year, so that there's a revolving kind of a situation. And, of course, I do want it to go on record, a special thank you to our County Executive, Mr. Bellone, and his office and staff for supporting us as well.

I've been asked to make a presentation this morning and my presentation will deal with some of our current things that we're doing, as well as a little bit about the history, since, looking around, some of you are relatively new to the County Legislature, and so might not be familiar with the Commission and its history. And then I'm going to turn it over to Jennifer.

The Suffolk County Human Rights Commission is a County agency that was created in 1963 to enforce the various laws against discrimination. The Commission consists of 15 Commission members, all of whom we volunteer our time to meet monthly, establish policy, and other things that you'll hear in a few moments. And currently, we have four full-time paid staff members. The primary objective of the Commission is to work toward the elimination of bias and discrimination in our County, and this is achieved through public education and complaint investigation. But let me take you back in time.

The Human Rights Commission celebrated, believe it or not, its 50th year last year in 2013. And if you were to look at the press releases during the first 25 years, and I did so when County Executive Pat -- Bob Gaffney made my first appointment to the Commission, and you look at the Human

Rights Commission members during those 25 years, you would see that they were a tumultuous time, with headlines being made, Executive Directors being fired, and fights between Board Members being made publicly -- public in the news. Well, thankfully, thank God that hasn't happened since I've taken over.

I became involved in the Human Rights Commission through my position as Chair at that time in 1991 of the County's Antibias Task Force, which was formed during the last year of County Executive Pat Halpin's administration. At that time, there were some Legislators who were trying to defund the Human Rights Commission out of existence. The rationale was that since there was a State Division of Human Rights, there was no need for a local one, although there was a backlog of cases on the State level because of -- because, and therefore there were complaints, that literally people had to wait years to have them even heard, no less dealt with and adjudicated. And so there definitely was a need for not only our local Commission, but those throughout the State. It was proven then and to this very day that there is a need, and, I guess, we could say for all -- unfortunately, there shall always be a need for a local Human Rights Commission.

The Antibias Task Force was successful at that time in keeping the Human Rights Commission alive, and, in part, during the 22 years as my Chairpersonship, I have seen this as the primary goal of the Commission, and that is to ensure that there'll always be a professional staff of investigators, secretarial assistants and an Executive Director to fulfill its mission of protecting the human rights of all the County's residents in the face of discrimination.

As most of you know, what in part saved the Human Rights Commission 22 years ago was placing it under the County Attorney's Office. And, certainly, I thank all of the County Attorneys over these years who have been supportive of our work. Although this has been beneficial in many ways in the eyes of some, it is always brought into question the important apolitical, unbiased work that a commission must pursue and must be perceived as pursuing. And so it has always been our hope that some day we'll become our own Bureau once again.

Over these decades, the Commission has seen its role as threefold. One, to ensure the continued existence of the Commission's professional staff by advocating for budget allocations and staffing. Two, to be reactive to incidents of discrimination in the County. We have always worked very closely with what became known as the Hate Crimes Unit of the Suffolk County Police Department when called upon. We mediate community issues, when called upon, to act upon and assist, and assist through advocacy when called upon by individuals and communities. Three, to be proactive by developing conferences in the areas of discrimination and bias, holding community meetings when needed, cosponsoring conferences held by various agencies and organizations, and mediating, when called upon, to help communities work out concerns regarding discrimination in their towns.

Some of the things we've accomplished: By County Executive order, the Commission has been able -- available to take complaints by citizens against the Suffolk County Police Department, and further such complaints to the Internal Affairs Bureau of the Department. We do not and have never investigated complaints, but we were seen as being an -- offering opportunities to citizens who do not feel comfortable, let us say, going to a precinct to make a complaint against a police officer, of going through us. County Executive Steve Levy added to this order our ability to take complaints regarding acts or words of bias on the part of the police officers. Since this occurred about three years ago, we have been working at trying to get particularly the East End police departments to sign on on their own level to something like that, an Executive Order. I believe, at this point, two towns have done so.

The Commission was instrumental in working with our County Legislature to have Suffolk the first county in the state to include sexual orientation as a protected category within human rights law. This was accomplished here in our County many years before and ultimately became a part of the

State Law. We hold biannual dinners at which we recognize individuals, schools, educators and businesses for their work and effort in the areas of human rights. We have sponsored many conferences and programs dealing in areas of health disparities, housing issues, and educational disparities. And many here sitting on our Commission have helped in both the creation, and the development, and the running of these conferences. It was through the Human Rights Commission and the Antibias Task Force, of which I've been Chair/Co-Chair for 23 years, that I was able to establish the Stop Bias Program, which I'm very proud to talk about for a second to say it is the only educational program in the County for people who have committed bias or hate crimes.

In addition to when people are sent to jail, they have come to the program. In the 23 years of Stop Bias, we have had over 500 defendants come to the program, sent by the courts or by Probation, obviously, with the cooperation of the Police Department and the District Attorney's Office. The youngest person, defendant, we've ever had in the program was 10 years old, the oldest was 64 years old, and we've had cases come before us as recently as last week.

And, finally, the Commission has worked closely over the years with the Suffolk County Police Department and the Hate Crimes Unit, and receives reports from them on a regular basis, and stays in touch with them, as they do with us. The Commission has been asked to give its input into the Department's many programs appropriate for our work, such as the hiring of minorities, education of recruits in the Academy, and recently we assisted in the construction of the Community Liaison Program, the CLOs. And we think this is a wonderful program and applaud the Department in forming this program, and we look forward to hearing much about this in the future.

Last year, the Suffolk County Antibias Task Force moved out from under the Office of Minority Affairs, where it had been for many, many years, to become a subcommittee to the Commission. This was an excellent move, and, of course, with the agreement of the County Executive's Office, as both our goals, the Task Force and the Commission were the same, and some of the same people sit on both. A perfect example of this is how we recently went out to speak to the Town of Riverhead Board to work with them on the reconvening and the establishment of a Town Antibias Task Force in light of the recent rash of assault robberies of Hispanics going on in the Riverhead community. And we will actually, and I've been asked to, be at their September 30th meeting of the newly formed or reformed Antibias Task Force there in order to inspire them to begin their work once again. By the way, the Riverhead Task Force was one of the first ones that was established going back to 1992.

Twenty-two years ago, I became involved in this area of the community dealing with bias, prejudice, discrimination and hate out of my own personal sense of social responsibility, which was set out before me through the teachings of my religious tradition, Judaism. I do it from my own spiritual base. I wanted to do my part in repairing the brokenness of our world, and I have been grateful to be able to serve in all the capacities I have over these years.

I cannot tell you how meaningful it has been to me to receive the nomination as Chair by four County Executives. I've tried to the best of my abilities to work to ensure that no one should ever feel helpless against hate, bias or prejudice. I thank you for allowing me to continue as Chair, and I hope I'll be able to do so for many, many years, until, finally, maybe some day I actually do retire. I pray that I will be able to continue to do so with your support, and I and this Commission will be able to do so with your blessings, that is of the Legislature, and, certainly, Mr. Bellone's. And, certainly, we will continue to accomplish all the work that we try to do by the extraordinary efforts of the woman who is sitting here to my left, and that is our Executive Director, Jennifer Blaske. She is unbelievable.

And, by the way, in my 22 years with the Commission, I think Jennifer is my fourth Executive Director. And, actually, when I first came on, when we were having those difficult times with funding and all, actually, I played Executive Director for about a half a year. I was very happy

when we finally got the money to form -- to hire a new one. And, certainly, Jennifer's staff, which is extraordinary, and all of those with whom we work for each and every day in this very, very important arena of society, and that is to attempt, and hopefully succeed, to the best of one's ability in protecting the rights of all the citizens of our County, as well as everyone who comes to this beautiful, extraordinary place to work, to recreate, to live, and simply enjoy each and every day of life. Thank you.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Thank you. That was so nice.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. And I think we do have a couple of questions. Legislator Spencer. Oh, Jennifer you want to speak first? What do you want to do, Doc, you want to wait?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'll wait.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Good morning. I'd first like to thank the Presiding Officer, the Committee Chair and all the Committee members for providing us with this opportunity to make our presentation on the work of the Human Rights Commission. I also have copies of our annual report for each of you. Some of my comments will overlap with Rabbi Moss'. We prepared these separately.

So, as you know, in 2013, the Human Rights Commission celebrated its 50th anniversary. Our advocacy for the rights of all Suffolk County residents and our work to end discrimination and to promote equal rights was recognized by County Executive Bellone and by this Legislature. County Executive Bellone declared 2013 the year for human rights. We are very grateful for the strong commitment he holds promoting equal rights, and also for the same commitment shown by this Legislature. We are also very fortunate to have an exceptionally hardworking and dedicated team of staff and Commissioners whose commitment to furthering the cause of human rights is reflected in the many accomplishments we present to you today.

During 2013, the Human Rights Commission staff provided assistance to nearly 2200 individuals and investigated 145 newly filed complaints of unlawful discrimination primarily in the areas of employment, housing and public accommodations. The Commission maintained a presence at community meetings and participated in programs which focused on resolving the issues facing our increasingly diverse communities. In addition, the Commission provided education on human rights and diversity, conducting trainings and presentations to organizations, community groups and to new recruits at the Police Academy. Our active enforcement led to the closure of more than 150 cases, and the early settlement and resolution of numerous complaints. Some examples of benefits received by complainants prior to a hearing were reinstatement of employment, recovery of lost wages, payment of medical benefits, reasonable accommodations for disabilities, and, in other cases, for religious necessity, and changes in policies or procedures which greatly improve the work or housing environment.

The importance of our role and the services we provide to those in distress, many of whom have or maybe about to lose their livelihoods cannot be overestimated. Each complaint brought to the Human Rights Commission is thoroughly and fairly investigated. The Commission is a neutral fact-finding agency, and is not an advocate for those who have filed charges. While the Commission respects the fact that those individuals who make the allegations believe that they have

been discriminated against, in order for the Commission to determine reasonable cause, there must be evidence to show that the alleged discriminatory basis was the actual reason for the respondent's actions. Of course, if a probable cause finding is imminent, our role at that point may shift to advocate for a fair settlement for the complainant. However, our emphasis during the investigative process is on impartiality.

The first contact from complainants is usually made by telephone. Thereafter, we make every attempt to set up a personal meeting and conduct an intake interview. Once we have all the available facts from the complainant's perspective, we promptly notify the respondent of the allegations. Whether a formal complaint is filed or a letter of inquiry is sent will depend on numerous factors, such as the statute of limitation, the likeliness of a quick resolution, and other relevant circumstances. Although we have some flexibility in how we determine to proceed at the outset, we operate under strict time frames for investigation. Our investigations are completed within 180 days from the date of filing.

Although the path of each investigation evolves differently, they typically will include a review of pertinent records and documents, locating and interviewing witnesses, onsite visits to gather information, and fact-finding conferences. Throughout the course of the investigation, there are multiple opportunities for conciliation of the matter. And because we have a more flexible approach to the initial handling of cases than either the State or Federal agencies, cases filed in our office may be conciliated more quickly. This limits the accrual of damages, such as lost pay, and also avoids the cost of lengthy and expensive litigation to the benefit of both parties.

If the matter has not been conciliated, then when the investigation is completed, the information that has been gathered is carefully analyzed and documented, and the investigator prepares a detailed investigative report, along with recommended findings. The report is submitted for further review and a decision on a finding. If a determination has been made that there is probable cause, then the matter will be referred to a hearing before an administrative law judge. If a determination of no probable cause is made, then the matter will be dismissed.

In addition to our enforcement role, the Commission also furthers its mission through our community outreach and by promoting positive intergroup relations to prevent racial tensions and community conflict related to bigotry and intolerance. We continue to work closely with businesses, government agencies, schools, private organizations, and community groups to foster equal opportunity. We also assist employers and business owners who contact us with questions related to discrimination, to support them in understanding how to remain in compliance with the law.

Over the last year, working through the Suffolk County Anti-Bias Task Force, Commission members met with officials and residents of several towns throughout the County to promote and assist in the revitalization of town anti-bias task forces. The shared mission of these task forces is to work to prevent and combat prejudice and racism. Most often, when a situation is brought to the attention of a Task Force, members will reach out in an impartial manner to bring the affected individuals, community groups, government officials, parents, or school officials together for dialogue to achieve a resolution or to diffuse the situation, and hopefully avoid a potential escalation. Town Task Forces have greater knowledge of the unique aspects of their own communities and, therefore, are often better equipped to address issues which arise locally, knowing the history, the schools, the community.

The Suffolk Anti-Bias Task Force also supports and participates in programs of education in local schools and communities. As Rabbi Moss mentioned, we hold an awards convocation each year to promote the principles of inclusion and equality within the schools and community. The event is highly successful, and encourages schools and students to continue their important work in this area, and to further develop anti-bias programs.

The Commission continues its collaboration with other agencies and community groups to better address the needs of County residents, and to plan and organize important events, highlighting diversity and equal rights, such as "Suffolk County Unity Day," the "Embracing Our Differences" program, and "Our Immigrant Nation." These events promote a deeper understanding of who our new immigrant neighbors are and how we can work together to build stronger Long Island communities.

Coming up in the Fall, the Commission plans to host a public forum on human rights, affecting -- on issues affecting children. The forum will be held on United Nations' Universal Children's Day, November 20th, and will include panelists speaking on issues affecting our youth, such as domestic violence, divorce, sexual exploitation and gun violence. The purpose of the conference is to raise awareness of these issues and their impact on our youth, and to focus on solutions.

I just want to thank you for your time, and answer any questions that you might have, and present our report at the conclusion. Thank you.

**RABBI MOSS:**

I just want to introduce Bonnie Cannon over there, who is also one of our Commissioners, and she's one of our newer Commissioners from the East End.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Maybe you want to reintroduce everybody that's here. I don't think you introduced everybody at the beginning, did you?

**RABBI MOSS:**

Oh, I did, but I can do it again.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Well, actually, why don't you do it yourselves, starting with Michele.

**MS. DEL MONTE:**

Michele DelMonte.

**DR. MANTIA:**

Dr. Gus Mantia.

**MR. RODRIGUEZ:**

Luis Rodrigues.

**MS. WANG:**

Yu-wan Wang.

**MR. VALENZUELA:**

Luis Valenzuela.

**MS. CANNON:**

And Bonnie Cannon.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. And we do have a question. Doc?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Good morning, and thank you. I really appreciate your presentation. And I had asked the Chair, I think we had the privilege, Rabbi, of just kind of just reappointing you as Chair.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Yes, thank you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And reappointing your position. And I think on the record, I had just wanted a chance to have you come in and talk to you. I was happy to support both appointments, and I think that looking at your Chairmanship, I wanted to just kind of get an update and just kind of get a sense. And I'm very happy that I stepped out on faith, so to speak, and supported that, but I feel I have an obligation to make sure that just if I'm voting for you as Chair, that it's kind of an affirmation that I'm aware of the direction that the Commission is going in.

And, Jennifer, you've been phenomenal. You've responded to me in -- with concerns that we've had, and came to my office, spent a lot of time addressing some issues, and we've had a great working relationship.

My questions are more related to what we have before us this morning, later we're going to table for public hearing, but the proposed amendments to the Human Rights Law. Or have you had a chance to familiarize yourself with the amendments?

**RABBI MOSS:**

I'm going to turn this to Jennifer, since she is more expert in this.

**MS. BLASKE:**

I am familiar with the amendments. I am planning and prepared to present a -- or to comment on that on Tuesday, I know when the bill was being brought up for the public hearing. Is there -- if there's anything that I could, certainly, I will, off the top of my head. But the presentation I had planned for today had to do with the report from last year.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

One of the things that when we were looking at public accommodation, age was removed as a protected category in public accommodations. What -- why was age removed? Or can you -- I didn't understand the reason for removing a protected category.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Sure, sure. State Law also excludes age from the category of public accommodation because there are certain places -- public accommodation where there are age requirements, like 21 or older to get into a club or a bar. So that would -- removing the age allows a bar to do that. And so since we have those constraints on certain places of public accommodation, there's no age category. It was probably an oversight to leave it in initially, maybe.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I guess the converse would be that there could be discrimination based on age and situations where age shouldn't matter. So I guess it was a protected category to prevent discrimination on the basis of age. So how do we, if we remove it as a protected category to address that particular issue where it is appropriate, how do we stop discrimination where it's -- on age, where it's not appropriate?

**MS. BLASKE:**

There are other categories in the law where -- and you'll see in other parts of the law, there are places where certain protected categories are not there for different reasons. And the age category not being there, and public accommodation, is because -- I suppose that it was a decision made by the State Legislature at the time to exclude it to allow certain places of public accommodation, like a restaurant that serves liquor or alcohol to keep out -- or maybe to make it 18 or older. If we were to put it back in, then we would have to take complaints for those -- from anybody being excluded from a place of a public accommodation, such as a bar or restaurant that serves liquor, or a club, because of their age, and then we would run into other difficulties with maybe State Law. I'm not really prepared to discuss the State Law that might -- we might be in conflict with, but I could certainly look that up.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No, certainly. And what you're saying makes a lot of sense, and I totally agree. But I was -- I always think of -- that if it was a protected category to begin with, that there may be situations where now someone could inappropriately discriminate on the basis of age. So I just -- I don't know if there's a way, as we're discussing or looking at this, to be able to separate the situations where it is appropriate and where it is inappropriate, and I don't know if the law is silent on that.

I had the chance to sort of look at, and we'll get -- I will kind of not get deep into a discussion. I do have a lot of questions. I am supportive of --

**MS. BLASKE:**

Thank you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

-- of the changes. And, you know, I did realize it was over 100 pages. And just like with any sort of laws that are over 100 pages, it's a little -- I take pause, because my colleagues and I think we have an obligation to kind of read the whole thing. I have some of the abbreviated version looking at the changes, but if we pass this law and it's signed and I'm responsible for everything that's in those 100 pages -- and I always worry that there are unintended consequences when we look at something that is this broad-based and has this much depth to it. And I'm really going to be relying on you guys to make sure that you have a very intricate understanding of the unintended consequences, and I've got a feeling that it's going to be a very extended discussion to make sure that we do our due diligence.

But, anyway, I don't need to prolong that now. So I know it's going to be a long meeting whenever we discuss this. But thank you, Rabbi, for coming in, and thank you for what you do. I'm so glad I went ahead and supported it. Initially, I said, "Well, I want to hear from him first," but, you know, my colleagues impressed upon me the importance of moving it and supporting it and said, "I would not be disappointed," and I am not disappointed.

**RABBI MOSS:**

It's always my honor to be able to meet with all of you, and only saying I guess that's one of the drawbacks of doing something for so long. In the earlier years, we did make a report, actually an annual report, which I'm now going to pledge that Jennifer and I will do from now on. When the office finishes its annual report in a written form, which we have for you, we will make a presentation, and also make sure -- I pledge that in the future, three years from now, God willing, when I'm renominated, I will come before and let you know. But, anyway, you can call on me any time.

But I do want to also say in regards to the questions just asked, and, you know, seeing the possible

consequences of things being left out, left in, whatever, is that that to me is the unique role of the Commission itself. There are very few governmental agencies that have both a professional staff that is so knowledgeable and works it out on a daily basis what the law is, or the laws are, and a Commission of ourselves as volunteers. Because let us say, as this law is passed and it's noted that there are certain problems with it, then that's the job of the Commissioners to investigate what the problems are in the law and then to advocate for changing the law, and working on that. And that's the beauty of having a community-based Commission such as we have. We're all, obviously, residents of the County, and people who care about the County, working together with a professional staff, and, obviously, with all of you. And so, as time goes on, as it has been with other laws that have been passed in the years that I've been involved with the Commission, in which certain problems have come up, and whatnot, we've been able to advocate one way or the other.

Recently, and just to say, that last year, when working on this in the State Legislature, it was brought to my attention, actually through Stop Bias Program, that the State Hate Crimes Law was -- had needed to be tweaked a little bit. There were certain problems in that law. And Lieutenant Hernandez, who at that time was the direct Commanding Officer of the Hate Crimes Unit, he and I had talked about this. We had meetings with Mr. Spota and the Director of the Probation Department, and actually this past year, both State Senator Zeldin and State Assemblyman Ramos both placed bills into Albany with the hope of being able to tweak the law to make it much more workable on a daily basis for police departments throughout the state. And so they're up there in the cyberspace of Albany. I don't know if it will get passed this session, but maybe in the future. So that's the beauty of the work the Task Force does and the Commission, and that we're able to advocate when there are the loopholes in laws.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Certainly. And I think this is so important for the Commission, because this is essentially changing your playbook, and this is a major overhaul in how we do business. And as I just look at each line there, I can see the benefits and why it's been added, but I can also see some unintended consequences. And I think, you know, I'm going to bring all of these up to try to kind of get a sense of how we're going to address those, because we are adding protected categories, we're taking away protected categories, and on each one of those things we're adding or taking away, there's going to be particular areas of vulnerability or consequences to employers and things of that sort, and I just want to make sure that we are doing it in such a way that is reasonable. So you have your work cut out ahead of you. I think this is probably the part with the biggest task in 10 years when I look at this. This is a big deal. So I do believe you're up to the task.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Thank you. And just to say, is that quite a few years ago now, when there was a discussion about the Human Rights Commission and having subpoena power on a certain level, and the Legislators, some of the Legislators were quite concerned about giving that to the Commission and to the Chair. And as said then, obviously you put your faith in us because you appointed us all. And I'm certainly not going to be here forever, no one is, obviously. But the beautiful thing of the system is that we're nominated by a County Executive, but confirmed by a Legislature, and I think that that, hopefully, assures the fact that you will always have a Commission -- that whatever comes out of the Commission, whatever we do, whatever is legislated for us to do, we will do so, certainly, and always, and I don't say this -- I'm not meaning this defensively, but saying this proudly, I pledge that we will always do this as long as I'm here, and I'm sure in the future as well, to doing things in a responsible and beneficial manner for everyone, because this is why we put this time and effort into it. And I thank you for your support and faith.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll yield.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. Presiding Officer Gregory.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to take a moment to say thank you to the staff of the Commission, and the Commissioners, for all the work that you do. It's obviously very important and valuable work that you do and we appreciate it. And any way that we can be of assistance to help you to accomplish your task, you know, we're willing to work with you. So thank you again for coming today.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

John.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you for being here, folks. I apologize that I've been out of the room for most of your presentation, but, nevertheless, over the course of the years, I'm pretty familiar with the good work that you do.

My questions are just to -- maybe a comment and a question, the comment being I believe that you have taken over an intern that we had working in our office, a young woman who -- a middle-aged woman who actually has quite a bit of skill. And I had hoped and thought that she might be able to bring those talents to you, and I'm hoping. I'm always a big believer in no news is good news. Having heard a lot, I know that you spoke with Ali, but I believe she's doing well.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Excellent, good.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Yes, she is. Thank you very much.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No, no. Thank you for going ahead and putting someone with a great bundle of skills and talents to task that's very much in need of advancing.

And by segue, then, Rabbi, I'll go to you. In the past, we've had conversations about the numbers of folks that you've had there that are actual hands-on investigators and staff to go ahead and process claims. If you spoke to that already, I apologize, I did not hear. Has that gotten better, has it gotten worse, or is it the same?

**RABBI MOSS:**

Three, the same.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's the same, okay.

**RABBI MOSS:**

I mean, it has not changed.

**MS. BLASKE:**

We have a staff of four, which includes our investigators -- paid staff of four, which includes our

investigators, a Spanish-speaking clerk typist and myself. We also have two interns working with us. One is an attorney, who you referred to our office.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Who's been working out wonderfully, Nadia. And we are hopeful that, you know, maybe with this law, this is something that the Legislature wishes to pass, and there is some revenue possibly to be generated, that maybe this is something that could help fund the hiring of additional investigators in the future.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How is the revenue going to be generated? I'm sorry. I guess that's a question for Counsel.

**MS. BLASKE:**

You're asking? I'm sorry.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Jennifer, yes, how would the revenue be generated?

**MS. BLASKE:**

Because now the hearings would be held at the County level under this Local Law. And so, when the hearings are held at the County level, if there are fines or penalties to be imposed against respondents, rather than the State collecting those, they would come to the County.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

They would come to the County and they would come to the County by virtue of the fact that we would have a dedicated fund or an enterprise fund? Is that part of the proposed legislation? Anybody here from BRO or anybody? You know what, listen. When I see the bill, that's what I'll be looking for.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I would be happy to support that with the proviso that anything that was remitted would wind up going directly to the Human Rights Commission. Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You know, you actually touched on the issue of, you know, complaints with regard to law enforcement. I'm just curious, because I know generally that's internal investigations, it's personnel issues, and even we don't get access to that. So when you get a complaint with regards to law enforcement, how do you handle that?

**MS. BLASKE:**

What we'll do is -- it depends on which law enforcement agency it is, because, as Rabbi Moss mentioned, our Executive Order pertains only to the Suffolk County Police Department. If it has to do with one of the East End towns that we don't have a Memorandum of Understanding with --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, but we also have Deputy Sheriffs, Corrections.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Right. The Executive Order pertains solely to the Suffolk County Police Department. As Rabbi Moss mentioned, there are a few East End towns that we've entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with, and so they would be handled in a substantially similar way. And what we do is we interview the complainant, find out what the allegations are. If they are allegations of some kind of discriminatory policing, maybe racial profiling, or just treatment that speaks of a discriminatory nature, or if there is undue force alleged, what we would do is take that complaint, draft it, we'd put it in writing for the person, we forward a copy to the -- we send it over to the Commissioner, the Police Commissioner, and a copy goes to the County Executive's Office. And Internal Affairs completes the investigation, and they keep us apprised of the outcome. And sometimes during the investigation, they will get in touch with us for one or two reasons dealing -- in dealing with the complainant, if they can't locate the complainant, or if there's a discrepancy, maybe, or a confusion about the complaint itself or what the allegations might be, they might reach out to us at that point. But they conduct the investigation, and then they let us know what the outcome is and we track. You know, we keep a log of the complaints that are received, and if we start -- if we were to start to see a pattern, say a particular precinct, a particular officer, or something like that, we would certainly bring it to the attention of the Commissioner and move from there.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, thank you. But now explain why the Deputy Sheriffs and Corrections don't --

**MS. BLASKE:**

Well, my guess is that because it's an Executive Order and the Sheriff is an elected official --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, okay.

**MS. BLASKE:**

-- that's why they're not included.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, I get you.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Actually, that was something that was -- came out before either of us were on board, right?

**MS. BLASKE:**

Oh, the original?

**RABBI MOSS:**

The original Executive Order was before either one of us.

**MS. BLASKE:**

Right.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, thank you for that. Anyway, does anybody else have questions? No? Okay. Well, we appreciate it. Thank you always for your service and your hard work, and we'll look forward to seeing you again. Thank you.

**RABBI MOSS:**

Thank you. So, okay, we will begin with the agenda, or finish with the agenda, I should say.

Oh, before that, I have to say I did receive a call from Commissioner Williams. He actually has some meetings he had to attend this morning. I don't believe -- if anybody does have any questions or anything, feel free to send them to me and I'll get them to him.

Patrice Dlhopsky, the Director for Probation, I know we ask frequently about a Probation Officers' class. They're currently interviewing candidates for a new class. They're scheduling the agility, and physical, and the psych testing with the Health Department. So I don't know if -- Tom, do you know anything yourself that you would like to report? I guess she's saying that hopefully August or some time in the end of August, September they're going to start with the new Probation Officers' class. Do you know?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Sounds good to me.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

(Laughter) That sounds like a good answer. So, anyway, I will certainly keep you apprised, because we keep talking about alternatives to incarceration, and that doesn't happen without probation, so okay. Mike, if you -- Sharkey, if you could come up for a minute. Legislator Calarco has a question regarding some incidents that have occurred at the jail. And I guess if -- I'll ask you about the DWI trailers again, I guess, on the record.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Good morning, Chief Sharkey. I apologize for putting you on the spot. I had actually intended to give you a call about this, but I got a call yesterday and heard that we've had a couple of recent, I guess, assaults happening in the Riverhead Jail, a little bit more violent than anything that we're, I guess, used to getting. We had a guy yesterday or two days ago that got assaulted apparently from an inmate who had some psychological problems. Are you aware of what's happened or -- and is there anything that we're going to be able to do to maybe try to prevent these types of things happening in the future? I know it's a difficult situation. Obviously, the Correction Officers have a very dangerous job. But if there's things that we can do to maybe make it little safer or a little better, especially if we're dealing with a population that we know might pose a specific problem because of the exact type of offenses they're coming in for and their psychological state that they're expected to be coming in with.

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

Okay. That was a little lengthy, but I'll try to break that down a little bit. There is always that possibility of assaults in the facility. And I do agree with you, that Correction Officers have a very difficult job, and they do a -- they execute that job very professionally. I have not noticed any uptick or reduction in, you know, inmate-on-officer assaults. There was, in fact, one yesterday. There was no serious injury as a result of it. However, that doesn't make it any less serious to us. You know, we investigate each of these incidences. The inmates that are involved in them are appropriately charged, or additional charges on top of what they're already with us for, but our officer safety is very important to us and we take it seriously. I'm not really sure what the core of your question was. There's no new pattern or increase.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It was in Riverhead. I guess there was just a question, especially the one that occurred yesterday. It was my understanding the individual who committed the assault on the officers there came in with a pretty -- he had committed a pretty violent offense that got him there in the first place. He had only been in our custody for a few days and then he was pretty -- it was expected that he had some sort of pretty severe psychological issues that led to the offense that got him into our custody in the first place. So just maybe if there's any -- any plans to do any kind of review on how we treat or

handle those inmates, so that we make sure that we're maximizing the safety of the officers, as well as the other inmates in the jail for that matter, if we have specific individuals that we have knowledge are coming in with specific issues.

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

We deal with all levels of offenders every day. Sometimes there's a misconception that a local jail houses only minor offenders; it's completely untrue. We handle everything from your minor offenders in your vehicle and traffic, right up, you know, to the more heinous crimes of murder, etcetera. And we regularly review how things are handled to make sure that we provide for the safety of our employees and the safety of the inmates in our care.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Well, I appreciate that, and we could certainly have further discussion offline.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I do believe you do have a policy if someone was identified with a mental health problem, that there's an evaluation that's done on them when they first come in; am I correct?

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

It's not something I can speak to in detail with you. This is not something that I was asked about ahead of time, so I wouldn't be able to give you any detailed answers on that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And, you know, maybe -- I believe the Sheriff is going to come in next meeting, next committee, I believe, right, Josh? Is it next committee?

**MR. SLAUGHTER:**

(Nodded yes).

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah. He's going to come in on a couple of issues, but, you know, maybe giving us a little bit of a breakdown on what the policy or what the procedure is when someone is running intake with a prisoner. And, you know, also, you know, with the expansion of the jail, is the Jail Medical, is that running 24/7?

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

Are you referring to the Yaphank facility, the new facilities?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, right.

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

I would suggest that you perhaps discuss that with the Health Department.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

They have to provide to me --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

They'll be here later today.

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, okay. So -- and the DWI trailers, we did speak earlier, they're closed. Are you going to be moving those trailers away, getting rid of them, or you're going to be holding onto them for a little bit?

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

All I can tell you for now is the DWI trailers are closed for the purposes of inmate housing. The DWI Program continues in our Yaphank and Riverhead locations. As far as the ultimate fate of that physical building, I don't know that that's been determined whether it could be, you know, repurposed for something other than inmate housing, or if it's going to be, you know, razed and ultimately demolished and removed. But any -- you know, even that would have a cost attached to it, so I don't think there's any rush to proceed with it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah. And this was based on the Commissioner of Corrections that you had to do this?

**CHIEF SHARKEY:**

Yes. That building always had an anticipated life span and it reached the end of that life span, and we subsequently moved the inmates out.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? No? Okay. Thanks, Mike. And for the next committee meeting, we are going to have -- Chief Burke, I believe, is going to be in to give us some updates. And, you know, they did a press conference on the crime stats, so I guess to give us some information, but more detailed information on crime stats. And they expect that they'll be able to give us the 2014-to-date crime stats. So I think we'll have a bit of a busier committee next week -- next committee.

**LEG. HAHN:**

FRES?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

FRES? He is unable to attend. Did you have questions?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I was wondering if maybe Tom Vaughn could come up for a second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Tom? He doesn't know anything, he says. No, I'm just joking.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I don't know.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But if you do have any specific questions, we can always get them to the Commissioner.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I was just wondering if you -- back on May 8th, do you remember the May 8th meeting?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Vividly.

**LEG. HAHN:**

We had Mr. Holley here from the Fire Academy, and we were talking about the success of the online training, and there were plans to expand the online offering to include Hazmat refreshers, and some other expansion of some offerings online for our vullie -- volunteer firefighters. He was having some problems with County I.T., and I'm just wondering if that's been worked out. I wanted to follow up on that.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Perhaps I don't remember that day as vividly as I thought I did. We will follow up on that.

**LEG. HAHN:**

The only reason I remembered it is because I'm reading the transcript here. I'm trying to remember exactly what was said, so I'm not claiming I have a vivid memory.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Those transcripts always get me into so much trouble. I will be happy to --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Transcripts are really good to have.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'll be happy to look into that for you.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Excellent. Thank you very much. I'm going to want -- hopefully, we can get an update, because now it's been a couple of months, and we can get an update on where we are on that. I'd really like to see us -- you know, the legislation we passed. Getting some of that training for volunteers, you know, online really helps the efficiency at the Fire Academy, and really helps the volunteers able to not have to travel to Yaphank. They're volunteering their time and for our community, and we'd really like to see as much as we can get online. Thank you.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Understood.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. And with that, I guess we'll go to the agenda.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

***1045 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues (Sponsor: Jay Schneiderman).*** I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Opposed.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Two oppositions, Legislator Spencer and Presiding Officer Gregory.

1324, directing all -- it's tabled. **(Vote: Tabled 5-2-0-0/Opposed: Legislator Spencer and Presiding Officer Gregory)**

**1324 - Directing all County departments and agencies to update multi-line telephone systems to directly dial 911 (Sponsor: Robert Trotta).**

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Motion to approve, Legislator Hahn, and I'll second it. And, Tom, we were told that we would have this done and that by this meeting it would be good to go. Are we -- are you up to tell us it's not?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I am up to tell you that we have made significant progress, and here is the progress that we have made: Verizon has done two pilots. We have two types of switches in the County, we have AT&T switches and we have Verizon switches. So Verizon has done two pilots to try and make this work. The first pilot was successful on the old AT&T switches, but not so far on the Nortel phones. So we still don't have an idea of how much this is going to cost us from Verizon yet. We have been in touch with the sponsor and made him aware of this. They are still working their way through this. We still would like a cost prior to the adoption of the resolution, but there has been significant progress made on it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Kara, I know you want to say something.

**LEG. HAHN:**

This is very frustrating. Hopefully, you feel the frustration, Tom, because I think it's been several months now.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Right. And what I would -- what I would point out is that the delay has not been a delay on the part of the County. We have been working very closely with Verizon to get this -- to get this done. We have been -- we have made it clear to Verizon that this is a priority. I believe that the Legislator himself may have even written a letter to the President of Verizon to tell him how much of a priority this is.

We remain committed to the program, but we do want to know what it would cost. And there's -- I would say that there are two main reasons for why we would want to know what it costs. One is so

we can figure out how we would pay for it, or number two would be how we can convince Verizon that it is in their best interest to pay for it. But without that information, it's awfully difficult to be on the side of having this adopted at this moment, but we remain committed to the program and remain committed to the idea. It is not for a lack of effort.

**LEG. HAHN:**

So have we asked their competitors what it would cost if we were using them?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I don't think that we're planning on switching out the County's entire telephone system at this point in time.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Well, I mean, for them to take -- this is like not customer-friendly for them to take this long. To get us an answer on something that we've, you know, said is this important, I really don't get it. This is a very long time to have to wait as a customer for an answer. I'm sticking with my motion to approve.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, you know, I know that that was something that we had passed some time ago, was when you put in a bill, it's going to have a dollar amount attached to it. I believe it was Legislator Stern's bill that shows you have to have an offset. I know that the Operating Budget Work Group is going to be forming at some point soon, and at this rate, I'm thinking that maybe that is something that we should be considering for the Operating Budget, so -- or would that be Capital? I don't know.

So I guess I'll withdraw my second on the approval. And, Kara, did you want to withdraw your --

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No? Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Go.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Tom, if I'm getting this right, our issue right now is that we don't know what it's going to cost because Verizon can't get us a number?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

The issue right now is that it's not -- the issue right now in a larger scope is that this is, unfortunately, not a simple process. We have a very large, pretty complicated telephone system, from what I understand, here in the County. And while it's great that for me the telephone system is just a matter of picking it up and dialing it and it works, I guess for the people who make that magic happen behind the scenes, it's not quite that easy. So right now, what Verizon is doing is working through a source, or working through a solution, pardon me. And my understanding, from the email that I've gotten from Pat Connolly, who is over in I.T., and he has spoken to the Legislator as well, is it -- is that there are eventually two types of switches that they are working through, and

that it is the AT&T switches and the Nortel switches that we have. The AT&T switches, they've been able to come up with a solution that allows for both 9911 to work and 911 to work at the same time. On the old Nortel, they have a solution that has worked, but, unfortunately, when dialing 911 directly, there was a 24-second lag time, and that 24-second lag time was deemed unacceptable for obvious reasons. So they're still -- they're trying to come up with a refined solution.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Are those Nortel switches outdated? Is this a situation where we should be looking at doing some sort of -- this isn't an issue, then, with Verizon not being able to correct the problem for us, it's an issue -- it's an internal issue for us that we have outdated hardware?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I can't speak to the data of the hardware, I don't know, Legislator.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, I guess that's the question, is if this is -- are we dealing -- the switches we're talking about, are they County-owned switches?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Again, I don't know. It is my understanding that it is our County-owned system, yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So maybe we should be looking at a program to update our switches so that we have stuff that is a little bit more current than --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So we have looked at the updating of the telephone system in the past, and I do believe that under Don Rogers, moving to a Voice Over Internet protocol was one of the things that he was looking at. My understanding that --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, that's what Legislator Hahn -- you know, Legislator Hahn just mentioned about switching providers and seeing what they can do for us.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

One of the things that I would say, though, is that even at -- in my limited knowledge of telephone systems, other than the fact that you dial and it connects, my understanding is two things. One, the system is pretty robust and that it stands up when we have problems such as during the storms that we experienced over a couple of years ago. Number two is that we are -- is that the program, despite the phones, despite being old, are, from what I understand, budgetarily a pretty decent deal for us. And that's pretty much where we are right now. I can be happy to look into the age of the Nortel switches, though, for you.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, it just seems if we're dealing with something that's outdated that's not allowing us to have a simple public safety upgrade that we're talking about in this resolution, I mean, this is really a common sense type of thing to do, that maybe we should be looking at making those upgrades, if that's what we have to do.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And, again, I think that that's one of the things that -- one of the reasons why we want to get a full solution and appraisal from Verizon before moving forward with this.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, it sounds like it's a solution we have to come up inhouse. It's our switch, it's Verizon's that have the problem.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

It is Verizon that is working on making sure that it can -- that it can do both the 911 and the 9911. We are not developing the patch inhouse for that. It is -- Verizon is our provider who is doing that work. It's not something that Mr. Connolly is working on, it is something that Verizon, as our provider, is working on.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. To Counsel, what's the -- no Counsel right now.

**MS. SIMPSON:**

I'm here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

The sponsor is here. To the sponsor, what's the implementation date on this resolution? Do you know --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Hold on. There is --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

-- how much time we --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sarah's here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Oh, Sarah's here. Either/or, whoever can answer the question. I'm just looking at what's the timeline in terms of implementation? Is it upon passage, do we give them a couple of months, do we give them --

**MS. SIMPSON:**

That would be 120 days from passage, so four months.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So it sounds like everybody is committed to wanting to make this happen. Perhaps if the sponsor gave you more time to implement it, we'd be a little more comfortable moving forward.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I think actually the sponsor has been very accommodating --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I think he has been, too.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

-- on this, on this legislation. I know that Mr. Connolly reached out to his -- to his office the other day about it. I don't -- I don't think the issue, Legislator, is the implementation date. I think the issue is wanting to make sure that we have the proper information before the piece of legislation is adopted. And even with the patch that has been developed for AT&T, it's still a matter of trying to -- trying to figure out what the cost of applying that through -- I believe the number that was just

given to me was like 14,000 phones. And what that -- what the cost of applying that patch across those 14,000 phones is --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

We have 14,000 lines? Perhaps that's an issue for us to look at --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Fourteen thousand six-hundred.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

-- in terms of reducing unused lines. I know that's something that has come up in the past. Are you okay with tabling it?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yeah, the portion with the County. Yeah, I spoke to them yesterday and they were fairly positive, you know, they were going to get something down the road.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I would hope that I'm conveying that we are -- that despite that there has been a delay, that we have not liked, that the outcomes, that we've made significant progress, that this is moving along, just perhaps not at the speed with which we would all like it to have moved along. But I think everybody thinks that we are going to arrive at a good solution ultimately. We're just asking for the time to arrive at that solution.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. I'll make a motion to table, but I hope we get that solution a lot sooner than later. You'll have a month's time before the next committee. I hope we could have something by then.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Me, too.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And like I said, I guess since we don't know how much it's going to cost us, we have to find what the dollar amount is.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

My feeling is it's going to cost us nothing, because we're paying I think two million a month or something, two million a year, two million something for a system that doesn't work. So they should be responsible for fixing the system. I mean, if I bought a phone system for my house and it didn't dial 911, I'd expect them to fix it, and I would think the County would have the same position, and I recently wrote a letter to the CEO of Verizon expressing that, that the system is broken, it needs to be fixed, and that at some point he better fix it. So we'll see what happens.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I think we've got more than one provider, that's the other issue. DuWayne, did you have a question or comment?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. So, Tom, do we have a time frame? Is it Verizon that's kind of having the problem or -- I forget which one had the problem and which one was okay. The Nortel was having the problem?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So Verizon is our provider. The switches, and this gets into a complexity that I don't understand. The switches are AT&T and Nortel. I don't know why that makes Verizon our provider, but it does. So the delay is on Verizon working through -- through the fix. And as I said, they have -- they have done two demo programs, one on the AT&T switches and one on the Nortel switches. The AT&T switches were deemed a success. The Nortel one was deemed less than a success because of a 24-second delay that occurred when you dialed 99 -- when you dialed 911 directly, and that is -- that's what we're trying to rectify now. So I certainly think that we're getting pretty close to an ultimate solution. And I would agree with what Legislator Trotta said, that we -- you know, that this is moving in certainly the right direction.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So do you think that the solution will solely consist of work at the switches and not necessarily having any programming or changes of the phones?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

You know what, Legislator, I would have to -- I'd have to confirm that with our I.T., with Pat Connolly in our I.T. Division. And I apologize, but I don't have the answer and I wouldn't want to -- wouldn't want to guess.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Because that would be, I would think -- because when I was Commissioner of Human Services for the Town of Babylon, we had to change, and I was in charge of this, I.T. and our phones, and amongst other things, and it was costly for us at the Town of Babylon. You know, we had copper wires, and we had some Optimum stuff. And, you know, you don't think about it, but these phones could be like \$300 a phone, and thousands of phones.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yeah. The phones that sit on our desk are pretty costly pieces of equipment.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

That would significantly reduce the cost if it -- you don't have to do anything with the phones, but it's just solely contained in the switches.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So all of the updates that I have been receiving so far have spoken directly to dealing with the problem at the switches, I can tell you that. But beyond that, I will be more than happy to follow up with Mr. Connolly and get a clearer idea.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But to go to the point, I think, that Legislator Calarco had mentioned about updating and upgrading our system, I think that's something that certainly I think I.T. will have to be involved in, and, you know, FRES --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Sure.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- and our Emergency Management. You know, if there's a storm, you know, readiness, and those types of issues and concerns, we have to be prepared, because copper is an old system, but it's a reliable system.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I think that that's -- I know that in the limited discussions that I have been involved in that have revolved around technology and the phones, irregardless of before this issue came up, that has always been one of the -- one of kind of like the circular debates. We have a system in place that right now is pretty hardened and pretty robust, it will stand up, but it is old and aging. The challenge is do we -- what type of model do we move over to. Do we go over to a Voice Over internet, or do we stay with this, or do we develop some type of hybrid system? But that's all things that are separate, yet somewhat connected to this, to this bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So I think we had a motion to table. Do we have a second? Was there a second? I didn't actually, but I guess I'll second that motion to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Opposed. I'm opposed to tabling.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, one opposition.

**MS. GELLERSTEIN:**

Are you opposed?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'm opposed. *(Vote: Tabled 5-2-0-0/Opposed: Legislator Spencer and Presiding Officer Gregory)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And, you know, again, I think this is something we'd like to see happen sooner than later, and it's getting later. Okay? Thank you.

**1325**, another reason why we want to see it sooner than later, *adopting a Local Law to ensure access to emergency services via telephone (Sponsor: Robert Trotta).*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Rob, I -- is this one ready to go? This is your -- this is the one --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It is.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It is ready to go, because I thought there were some issues the last meeting.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

No, I don't think so.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to approve.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Motion to approve, Legislator Calarco; second, Legislator Kennedy. And again, we're imposing something on hotels, and we're not paying attention to what it's costing them, but, yeah, right, and other businesses. So we'd certainly like to try and be just like them.

So there was a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, it's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-0)**

**1387 - Appointing Peter Gunther as a member of the Suffolk County Vocational, Education and Extension Board (Sponsor: William Spencer).**

Legislator Spencer?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

We're still working on this. We're going to probably -- hopefully we'll resolve this by September, but we'll table it one more cycle. So motion to table.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So Legislator Spencer is making a motion to table, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. **(Vote: Tabled 7-0-0-0)**

**1390 - A Local Law to amend the Administrative Code to expand the requirements for appointed officers of the Suffolk County Police Department (Sponsor: Robert Trotta).**

We do have to table for a public hearing, so I'll make that motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. **(Vote: Tabled for Public Hearing 7-0-0-0)**

**1508 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County property to Nissequogue Fire Department (Sponsor: John Kennedy, Jr.).** Legislator Kennedy?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes. As a matter of fact, I'm going to make a motion to approve, Madam Chair. If you recall, this involves a surplus piece of equipment from the Marine Bureau. We initially were going to move this over to the Nesconset Fire Department. There's been further dialogue. In fact, the piece of equipment will be better stationed and suited at the Nissequogue Fire Department, which is literally within an eighth of a mile of the Nissequogue River. That's primarily what the collective Smithtown Chiefs Council is looking for is a piece of equipment to help with kayak and canoe rescues. People

love to go out on the river, but, for whatever reason, they also seem to get stranded constantly.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So we've got to get a way to get out there, and it is a wide, flat expanse of mud. And so, this being a flat-bottom boat, it's well suited to system recovery.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Tom did you have a comment?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So two questions -- two things real quick. One, Legislator Kennedy, I noticed that you were trying to ask me on the laser gun, we will be doing a CN for that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Outstanding. Thank you very much, I appreciate that.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

You're welcome. So now that I've delivered the good news, the bad news is we were concerned about this piece of legislation, and our concerns relate to the safety concerns that surround the boat and --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So what if I offer this as an alternative, Tom. And you're refreshing my recollection now. Unfortunately, I've been caught up with a bunch of different things over the last week or so, haven't I?

Yes, there is a question of liability, and there is a question that we want to make it very clear that, in fact, the receiving department in no way, shape or form has a misunderstanding about what, in fact, it is they're getting. In essence, basically what we do in the legal community is we have a recipient sign something that says that they take whatever the item is, in essence, for what it's worth, for all intent and purposes. There's no representation on the part of the donor. It has no value, it may have no function, and, in fact, it probably doesn't rise to the scrap value that you would get if you brought it down to Gershow's.

As an alternative, what if I offered to the committee a motion to discharge without recommendation, and Legislator Trotta and I will be in contact with the Nissequogue Fire Department today? I'll work with Dennis Brown to draw up a declaration that we would make sure would be executed before Tuesday, and then we would take care of the concerns of the Administration? How does that sound as far as an accommodation?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

He's so accommodating.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, John, I mean, obviously, the Police Department's not using this boat anymore, correct?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No, they are not, and they are not using it for a variety of different reasons.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Or I can answer.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And I -- Mr. Vaughn is bringing an important point up, which, for a variety of reasons, I don't want to talk about in any greater detail or anymore specificity. However, he's right. For us, we need to have some writing executed on the part of the Department. I'm saying this: I don't know if I can get the Board, the Nissequogue Board of Fire Commissioners to approve that writing before Tuesday. But what I do know is if we wait until September, the season's gone. You know, over the month of August, there'll be slews of boaters there in the Nissequogue River. By the latter part of September, you know, you're not going to see much of anything. So there really -- this is an issue that is somewhat time-sensitive.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So the way I see it is that, obviously, if there's a Hold Harmless Clause -- George, jump in any time -- that if something happens to anybody on that boat, they have signed a Hold Harmless Clause. I believe the County Attorney can draw that up. And if -- I mean, between now and Tuesday, if they say, you know, "No, we're not going to agree to that," then we just don't move the bill.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Either way.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And, you know, George, I mean, the Hold Harmless, I mean that's -- sometimes you have these clauses and could they come back and --

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think the County Attorney could draw up language that would protect the County in this transfer. And as Legislator Kennedy said, if the Fire Department agrees to it, that's great. If they don't, then we don't move the bill.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Are we using the boat?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We are not using the boat, and I think that --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Are we planning to ever use that boat again?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

No, but could I expand upon that answer?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So the boat was surplused to us by the Coast Guard, and then it has now been surplused by us. The reason that we are not using the boat is that we don't have people who can operate the boat safely, and that is a paramount concern to us before handing it over to another organization. The boat has an engine on it that apparently is a quite powerful engine, and we don't have Police Officers in the Marine Bureau who can operate the boat safely, and this is a chief concern of ours. And I can

have Lieutenant Busweiler just reiterate the exact same thing that I'm saying. Look, we -- I came before this panel, I asked Legislator Browning to please table her bill when she wanted to donate expired bulletproof vests for the same reason of safety. I think that it's for the sake of -- at least the sake of consistency, but more for the sake of safety. We have serious reservations about the bill and we'd prefer to see it tabled.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So let's -- there's a couple of issues, because I think some of us were under the impression it was a different boat than the one you're talking about.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Definitely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I don't think I want to say anything right now. We'd have to have a -- yeah. I think if Lieutenant Busweiler would come up, but the -- well, the other thing is, is do we know if there's people with the Nissequogue Fire Department that are going to be trained --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Sure.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- to use the boat?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Sure.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

How many of them possibly have some kind of license and are training to operate boats? That's a question.

But, Lieutenant Busweiler, there was a boat that we -- we were under the impression that it was a different boat that was purchased --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Madam Chair.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- not one that we received from the Coast Guard.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No. This is the rigid hull inflatable 22-foot with an onboard diesel propulsion engine. It is not the fan boat. There's another issue with the fan boat.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

This one, as Mr. Vaughn has said, Nissequogue -- Nesconset and members of Nissequogue went down to Marine Bureau, met with Detective Inspector Esposito; is that it? Who's the Detective in -- the Deputy Inspector?

**LIEUTENANT BUSWEILER:**

Deputy Inspector Vitale.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Vitale. I'm sorry. I have a habit of mangling names. What can I tell you? And they felt quite comfortable that there would be no issues with operations whatsoever. And we're fully aware that it is a piece of equipment that, for whatever reason, doesn't suit the Marine Bureau's purposes, but, in fact, there has been an effort on the part of multiple departments in the Town of Smithtown now. For the better part of seven or eight years, they've been dogging me to try to go ahead and get a boat. And they are quite comfortable that they can use it properly, that they can operate it well.

And I would -- you know, in all deference to the Administration, you know, with the additional proviso of a Hold Harmless, I mean, I'll even suggest, if you want, Tom, we take a whack at this reso and then, you know, talk to the Exec's Office, talk to Dennis and John, and maybe with the right inclusion with a Hold Harmless right in the body of the reso itself, we'd get the degree of protection that we would need for the -- you know, us as a corporate entity, and the Department, you know, they're --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. John, we were going to let Lieutenant Busweiler speak, and I don't think he got to say a word.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Probably not. Go ahead, Lieutenant.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You're filibustering your own bill.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

This is true, I've been known to do that.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Can I just, before the Lieutenant -- I would just say that I'm looking at an April 16th email regarding the -- the subject line specifically says 22-foot Reb (phonetic). And the response that I have is that we don't -- "Please understand, however, that we have deemed it surplus, because it is difficult and nearly impossible to safely navigate." And this is from -- this has Mr. Vitale's name right on it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, yes, I'm familiar with that.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So "nearly impossible to safely navigate" would be our chief concern.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Let Lieutenant Busweiler speak, because we got him up.

**LIEUTENANT BUSWEILER:**

Good morning. Let me preface my statement by saying my only experience with boats is during the years in the Marine Corps, and they just threw me on and threw me off, so I have no personal experience with boats.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

But I did research a little bit on this. This boat is a 22-foot Silver Ships, Fleet #30178. We acquired it from the U.S. Coast Guard Shinnecock Station, an agency with a very similar mission to our own. The boat had -- still now it has minimal hours on its engines, which means they didn't use it much. They gave it to us, we didn't use it much. We're looking to get rid of it. It's shrink-wrapped right now and not being used at all.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Is it a fan boat?

**LIEUTENANT BUSWEILER:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No.

**LIEUTENANT BUSWEILER:**

It's a jet-powered diesel boat, which is very good for low water, but it's very difficult to drive. So it doesn't have a propeller, it just has a jet, like a jet ski.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So, if we discharge without recommendation, and you speak with Nissequogue, and could we possibly have them have a conversation with our Marine Bureau?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

As far as the operation and how it works.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yup.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

John, did you make a motion?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But, again -- he made a motion to approve, and there was a second, I think. No?

**MS. GELLERSTEIN:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

What I'll do, Madam Chair, is let me withdraw that motion to approve based on the dialogue we just had. Instead, I'll substitute a motion to discharge without recommendation. We'll take up the issues. I'll talk to Mr. Vaughn, we'll have a conversation with Mr. Brown, and perhaps we'll have it all together by Tuesday, maybe we won't. But at least we will have made a good-faith effort to try to go ahead and get the equipment out there while it can do some good.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It's just -- I mean, the Marine Bureau guys, if the Marine Bureau operators are saying there's an issue with it, and they particularly don't care for it as far as its operation, I think -- I understand

where they're coming from, that we need to make sure that if the Fire Department, if they're taking it over, that there's people qualified and capable of operating it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, what we might do is, you know, the in between here may be just pull the motor out of it, you know, donate it. I mean, the rigid hull is still intact, and, to your point, very well-suited for low depth. And maybe the Department will elect to go ahead and put something else on it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Doesn't have anything to do with the motor.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'll second the Discharge Without Recommendation.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Let's vote it. Let's just vote it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Did we have a motion?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Kennedy discharged without recommendation, Calarco seconded it.

**MS. GELLERSTEIN:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So we had a motion and a second. And, hopefully, before Tuesday, we'll have figured out what we're doing with it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. It's discharged without recommendation. ***(Vote: Discharged Without Recommendation 6-1-0-0/Opposed: Legislator Hahn)***

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And I think -- I definitely am going to try to do some follow-up on that.

**INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS**

***1603 - Accepting the donation of a Road Warrior Speed/LPR trailer from NDI Recognition Systems for use by the Suffolk County Police Department (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. HAHN:**

Question.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

What is that?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Did they say it was safe to operate (laughter)?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I have the utmost faith in the Suffolk County Police Department to operate our equipment safely, and then to --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Oh, it's a license plate reader.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

However, I would say this: We would like to thank Officer Paul Salas, who apparently won this on behalf of Suffolk County while at a convention in the middle of winter in Philadelphia.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well done.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Raffle prize?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, he won it as a raffle prize.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Really?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, that is literally, apparently, how we won the thing, so we appreciate it. We would like to thank --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Do we have to reimburse him for that raffle ticket?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I don't believe that we do.

**LIEUTENANT BUSWEILER:**

It was a business card.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Oh, so he didn't pay for the raffle ticket, it was his card.

**LIEUTENANT BUSWEILER:**

No. It was a business card dropped in and they pulled it out.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So we owe him a card, a new business card.

**LEG. HAHN:**

He doesn't want to have it in his personal car as he drives around.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So there was a motion and a second, yes or no?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Lora.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Was there a motion and a second?

**MS. GELLERSTEIN:**

No, I don't have a motion.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I'll make a motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-0).**

***1620 - Adopting a Local Law to amend, update and reorganize Chapter 528 of the Suffolk County Code to incorporate changes adopted by the State and to facilitate continuing advancements and modifications of the law in the future (Sponsor: County Executive).***

Motion to table for public hearing by Legislator Calarco; second, Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? And it is tabled. **(Vote: Tabled 7-0-0-0)**

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Madam Chair, if I can just before we adjourn, relative to Mr. Vaughn's statement before, there will be a C of N that comes before us on Tuesday.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

All right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It involves a speed gun that was obtained by the Village of Lake Grove, and, in fact, they are donating over to us for use by the Fourth Precinct. Again, in an effort to try to go ahead and get acquisition on the equipment and put it to work as quickly as possible, I asked for and the County Executive has very graciously agreed to do a C of N on Tuesday.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

One more, Legislator Browning.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sing a happy song. Sorry.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Always.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

What we -- there is one other CN that we wanted to make the committee aware of regarding -- actually, it's not a CN regarding the Police Department, it is the acceptance of a grant, and we have the Sergeant here, Sergeant Mallin here to just make a quick statement on that, if the committee would like to hear.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Sure, it would be great.

**SERGEANT MALLIN:**

Good morning. I'm Sergeant Mike Mallin, Commanding Officer, Highway Patrol Bureau, Motor Carrier Safety Section. And this will be the third year that we've been the recipient of a generous grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to conduct enhanced commercial motor vehicle and bus enforcement throughout the County. The grant is a total of \$311,000 -- \$311,000, just over, and covers enforcement efforts to conduct additional safety inspections on commercial motor vehicles and buses, limousines throughout the County, as well as purchasing of equipment, and attending two Federal Government sponsored conferences to discuss commercial motor vehicle enforcement issues throughout North America. And like I said, this is the third year that we've received this grant.

And I just want to say, in the past, too, I've appreciated the support from the Public Safety Committee, that I've been before you before, and the full Legislature in supporting us in the Motor Carrier Safety Section. As you know, we've been utilizing the inspection site off of Crooked Hill Road on a regular basis, and I look forward to continued support from the Legislature.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

While we've got you, just curious, do you have a number of what the revenue is that's come in through Motor Carrier from the work that you do?

**SERGEANT MALLIN:**

I mean, overall, no, and I tend to shy away from that. I don't want to give the impression we're some -- we're about generating revenue.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, it's about enforcement. And it's because of your enforcement the revenue comes in, it's not that you're -- no, I know what you're saying. But I know it is a revenue-generator, the work that you do, and you're making sure that the vehicles that are on those roads are safer, and that's the right thing to do, so --

**SERGEANT MALLIN:**

I mean, just in the past on a regular basis, just in weight fine violations, we've issued over three million dollars a year in just weight fine tickets.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That's quite a hefty number. But again, if those vehicles were in compliance with the law, you wouldn't be bringing in that kind of money.

**SERGEANT MALLIN:**

Correct.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So -- and Tom, just to let you know, I did put in a request on staffing levels. I know that it's the end of July already, and I did put in a request for the staffing levels over the past five years with each precinct, and all of the specialty units, and Motor Carrier, Marine, because I think we need to make sure. And also on the overtime costs, I know -- to see what our overtime costs are like and what we've been budgeted for. So that is something that John is working on for me.

And if you can come back with a date or a time when a new police class is going to be starting, because we know that we budgeted for 60 this past year, and we always know that there's a lot more retiring than there is coming in. So I don't know what the numbers are like these days as far as staff levels. So we will be looking for that, and as soon as you can tell us when the next class starts, we'd certainly appreciate that. Okay? Thank you.

And with that, there's nothing more on the agenda, so I'll make a motion to adjourn.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Calarco. We're adjourned.

*(\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.)*