

Public Safety 10-02-14

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, October 2, 2014, at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson
Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair
Legislator Kara Hahn
Legislator William Spencer
Legislator John Kennedy

Not Present:

Legislator Monica Martinez

Also in Attendance:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Lora Gellerstein - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Jason Richberg - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory
Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning
John Ortiz - Budget Review Office
Gail Lolis - County Attorney's Office
Robert Braun - County Attorney's Office
Bill Shilling - Aide to Legislator Calarco
Tom Vaughn - County Executive Assistant
Lisa Santeramo - County Executive Assistant
Tim Sini - County Executive Assistant
Joe Williams - FRES Commissioner
Joseph Busweiler - Lieutenant/Office of Chief of Department/SCPD
Tracy Pollak - Suffolk County Police Department/Headquarters
Lt. Robert VanZeyl - Suffolk County Police Department
Vincent DeMarco - Sheriff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Michael Sharkey - Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Kristin MacKay - SCSO/Director of Public Relations
Patrice Dlhopsky - Director/Suffolk County Probation Department
Jim Roddin - SOA
Colleen Ansarelli - CJCC
Gregory Thompson - Suffolk County Deputy Sheriff
John Becker - Suffolk County Deputy Sheriffs PBA
Thomas Bivona - Suffolk County Deputy Sheriffs PBA
Philip Doukas - Suffolk County Deputy Sheriff PBA
Noel DiGerolamo - SCPBA
Arthur Sanchez - DSPBA
Suzanne McBride - AME Police Emergency President

Zach Viola - AME/Legislative Liaison
Laura Ahearn - Parents for Megan's Law/CVC
Thomas Beirne
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Good morning. If everyone could please rise, we'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Legislator Kennedy.

*(*Salutation*)*

Okay. Please remain standing for a moment of silence for those who defend our country at home and abroad, and also for Police Officer Nicholas Guerrero. He is still in the hospital, and we hope and pray that he will be okay. And for Tom Cutinella. He's the Shoreham-Wading River football player who was killed yesterday.

*(*Moment of Silence*)*

Thank you. Okay. I don't see any cards. Do we have any cards? No? Excellent. Okay.

MS. MAHONEY:

Just one, Kate.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, we do have one. Okay. We have Thomas Beirne. Is he in the room? Thomas Beirne? No?

MS. MAHONEY:

He's right here.

MR. BEIRNE:

Right here.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So I guess -- is there anyone else in the room who would like to speak? Oh, sorry. Why did I not see you? I apologize. Go ahead, Tom.

MR. BEIRNE:

Okay. Good morning, and thank you for this opportunity to talk about the Foley Building and its potential use as a substance abuse and transitional center.

For the past eight years, I have been a volunteer and I've mentored men in the County correctional facilities and in the communities after their release. First, a few financial statistics, because this move has to save taxpayer dollars, and then I'll say a few words about the substance abuse

treatment center and how it might be structured.

The total annual cost for 1500 inmates at the jails is \$110 million annually, and at the Foley Center, based on a two-month stay, would help 600, with a savings of \$14 million annually compared to incarceration. And that is using 150 beds and not the 250 that's available. I believe this information might be helpful with respect to the feasibility study currently ongoing that will be coming before the Legislature.

And now from the humanitarian side, from my perspective as a mentor, the greatest problem for many is bridging the gap, leaving jail and going back to the same places, things, and persons that they had -- where they had originated from, because they have no other alternative. Many use, get rearrested, and end up back in jail.

Now, there are many excellent programs with professional staffing in place in Suffolk County that provide the support needed for successful community re-entry. However, the needs today exceed current resources, even without considering the heroin epidemic. Consider the fact that there are 4500 released each year back to the County, if we use a stay of four months for each person at the correctional facility.

While staying at the center, men would be assigned work, in addition to the substance abuse treatment. They'd be assigned work for laundry, maintenance, kitchen, etcetera. They'd be required to complete any elements of the National Institute of Corrections toolkit that are outstanding and -- I'm sorry. And everyone would also complete a course in criminogenic thinking, using the RSA rational self-analysis manual produced by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. And, also, we would like to see a mentoring program established.

Through a mentee I have known for many years, I came in contact with the Southwestern Behavioral Center in the Midwest recently that validated my thinking on the subject, and this information is available for review. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And do we have anyone else in the room who would like to speak? No? Okay. Sheriff, if you'd like to come up and begin your presentation.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So, Noel, go ahead.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You're going to speak?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Please.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Go ahead.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

I'm sorry, my apologies. I'm still settling in in the back. I just wanted to speak briefly on the Park Police merger, and bring the Legislature, at least this committee, up to speed, and I know I'll be back on Tuesday to discuss it further.

The County Executive's Office and the union has reached a tentative agreement on the merger of the Park Police. It was signed by the Governor's Office last week. And as we had planned to reach a merger agreement that will provide significant cost savings to the County and merge the two departments together, that is finalized at this point and will be coming before this body on Tuesday.

I just wanted to confirm for everybody that it does address all of the needs that we spoke about previously, which would address staffing, the savings that was anticipated, and the oversight of those officers within the Police Department moving forward. I'm very pleased with the way it was worked out in such a timely fashion, so we can get it implemented as soon as possible and achieve those goals. And if there are any questions that the committee had, I'd be more than happy to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Anyone have any questions? I think I -- actually, previous to this, I did speak with Lisa and Tom with regards to what are we doing next year, next summer, because we were saying we didn't notice anything for Park Rangers for next year in the budget. So I assume that they're going to get back with us with an answer. I'm curious, though, if -- in fact, I'm assuming that you will support monitoring the parks if in the event that there are no Park Rangers.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Actually, to that extent, there's going to be additional savings that's potential for the County, because rather than having anything with regard to Park Rangers in the agreement, we've agreed to waive exclusivity to civilianization within any of those patrols. So it wouldn't necessarily have to be a Park Ranger, it could be any civilian employee, or even subbed out, if the County wanted to, no restriction.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, but one of my biggest concerns is with certain parks like Smith Point where there's music, activity in the evenings, there's, you know, alcohol being served. So we clearly need law enforcement there, and I have strongly expressed my feelings towards that, that, you know, we do need Police Officers. I don't want, you know, a Park Ranger hanging out down at the beach without having any kind of law enforcement abilities down there. So I'm hoping that they'll have that resolved by next summer.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Madam Chair, I don't believe that's the intent, to leave it abandoned to civilians just to patrol it during those --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

-- high volume seasons, but I will allow the Department to speak on that and their staffing strategies for the high-volume time of the year.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, thank you. John?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Two things. One, my questions today still are the same that I had back in last March and April about the impact associated with the pension benefits and the migration of the Park Police Officers over into P&F from ERS how that would span out, whether or not there was going to be a bridging of the benefits or what the cost impacts are. We've talked about it a lot. I attempted to get guidance

from the State Comptroller. I never received any kind of reply, other than I was redirected to the State sponsors. But as of today, I still have no info on that.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Well, with regard to the pension system, there is no negative impact to any of the 35 members who have the ability to come over. I say the ability because we don't know who may or may not choose to retire prior to this merger. I believe there is a couple of people that were contemplating retirement already this year, so whether or not they come over is a separate issue.

But with regard to the pensions, the P&F is a richer plan as far as pensions are concerned than ERS, and any time spent in the P&F is allowed to be rolled down into ERS. So if somebody was hypothetically within two years of retirement under the current ERS system and they did two years under the P&F after this merger, that time would count toward their retirement and they can still leave as they had previously planned.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But leave under the ERS retirement schematic, not under P&F.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Correct. As I said, there would be no negative impact to anybody. There would only be a potential enhancement to their retirement, should they stay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Will they be able to bridge ERS time in the P&F, or would they still have to hit whatever the requirement is, Noel? I think it's what, a minimum of 20 in P&F to go out?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

The bridge works the opposite direction. You go from a higher level of plan into the existing plan that you were in. If somebody had spent 23 years in ERS and their last two years in P&F, as they turn 55, they would bridge down into the ERS and get the exact pension they would have been entitled to from the beginning.

LEG. KENNEDY:

This one is -- okay, thank you, I appreciate that. The other component that I wanted to try to get at, and I don't know whether it's negligible or not, but there is a difference in the contribution rate, as you know. Typically, for ERS, I think it's calculated at something like 17 or 18% of total payroll for membership, and I believe that P&F is 27 or 28%. So on the part of the County from the employer's contribution perspective, I wondered whether or not there was any compare or contrast on that as well.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Well, I didn't do a comparison on the cost analysis between ERS and P&F contributions, but when this was proposed last year as part of the budget, and I'm sure BRO did their analysis of it, contemplating the savings that are achieved by not having to go through the Civil Service process of testing and training for six months in the academy while they're collecting a salary to do just basic training and not be on the street. These people are going to, after a quick refresher, be infused right into the police force and be able to save significantly on the current overtime costs that we're running. So once that's taken into consideration, and the fact that they are going to be treated as new employees under the current step program of the new contract, so they will be coming into a salary base that's very close to where they are right now. Everybody would be lateraled in within a margin of 3, 4%, that they would be coming into the new pay scale. So the savings that you'll realize on the training, the savings that you'll realize by putting them into the police force at a faster rate and avoid the overtime, is going to far outweigh the difference in that contribution.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Again, it may very well. And I had just -- I'll go back to the briefing that BRO had done, because I would like to refresh my recollection on it. You mentioned something earlier. So let me -- let me make sure that I understand then. And whether it's yourself or maybe it's Mr. Vaughn or somebody from the department. Is it the County Executive's intention to bring forward a CN on Tuesday to effectuate this?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

That's my understanding, if Mr. Vaughn wants to speak to it.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, Legislator Kennedy, it is our intention to bring forward a CN on on this on Tuesday.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So then let's stay on that for a second. Noel alluded to it. Amongst the many different issues that we had spoken about there was some discussion about the variation amongst the training component that the existing Park Police Officers had undergone. Those that were on more recently had academy attendance that was equivalent, I believe, to what our regular Suffolk County Police Officers have had. Those who came on prior to '96, '95, had a training component that was not at the same level as our six-month academy. Is that something that Commissioner Webber or Chief Burke are going to look at? How will that be addressed?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

That is addressed in the agreement in that the department will do an analysis of the transfer process, determine what training is necessary for certain officers to bring them up to speed, and what simple refreshing courses may be required. As with any lateral transfer, and even with someone who has taken the test and moved over from another agency, they always make them retest on deadly physical force, search and seizure, so I'm assuming that those will be done again as they always are. But in the agreement it gives the County the latitude to do any training and evaluation they deem appropriate to ensure the proper transfer of these people into their new role.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And from your perspective as the bargaining agent, the PBA agent, you are amenable to that, and actually I would imagine you want to promote that. Typically what does that involve, Noel, if you're going to bring somebody in for some of those segments, time wise what are we looking at?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Well, in the past, the academy classes that have -- we've had officers roll over from Park Police into the P.D. in the past who were assigned to the Sheriff's Office as Deputy Sheriffs come into the Police Department in the past, through Civil Service testing and so forth, and they have been accelerated through the Police Academy with a multiple week refresher course, again, just on deadly physical force and search and seizure. As I said, the department's going to do the evaluation. Sometimes, depending on when the person graduated the academy previously, in those circumstances I spoke of, will determine how many weeks they give them in the academy and in field training.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So let's stay on one more point with this if we can, then please.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

I'm sorry. I don't mean to interrupt. If I could just -- it's a very fluid system whereas it depends on the individual's training, their capabilities, and when they trained last.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Sure, I can understand that. Is it permissive on the part of the department as to how many of the Parks Police Officers the Commissioner elects to bring in or is it all whatever we have, 35 at this point are transferred subject to whether or not Parks Police Officers elect to retire?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Every Parks Police Officer will be transferred into the Police Department.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Really? Okay. So that's something a little different than what the Commissioner and I had spoken about.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

I think there was one person that was contemplating retirement. They weren't sure and --

LEG. KENNEDY:

This wasn't on retirement. This was a different question. This was about individuals -- something that I'd prefer not to have a conversation here on.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

I think I know what you're referring to, and without putting anything further out right now on the record, I believe that's been addressed yesterday. The individual confirmed their retirement.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. Well, I will, you know, crack the books and get a look at the numbers crunching again. There's no doubt about it, we need the personnel, we need the personnel desperately. We had a \$6 million spike in our overtime. And this is not for you. I guess I'll ask it just of BRO and/or Mr. Vaughn. In addition to what we see with the CN on Tuesday regarding this, I would like to see what we have had this year in separation or retirement of Police Officers and what that does regarding where we're at. I am assuming that most all of these officers or all these officers are to go directly into patrol, correct?

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Our Collective Bargaining Agreement does not give a right to any specific assignment, so all assignments within the Police Department are the sole discretion of the Commissioner.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So, again, that's a conversation I'd have to have with the Commissioner.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

I could not commit to whether they go into patrol or not, or if somebody may have a specialty that they want to take advantage of.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I understand.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

You know, there could be someone who's a helicopter pilot and has training and ability that others don't, that they might want to utilize in some other capacity, and as always that should be the Commissioner's discretion to utilize his resources.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. So you'll be able to have some of that information for us on Tuesday then, Tom,

just what we've experienced here this year as far as total number of retirements and where we're at as far as the size of the force?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, sir. And in addition, and as always, we would just like to continue to, to quote Jon Schneider, "The door is always open". We realize that there may be a lot of the questions regarding this and we are happy to answer any and all questions leading up to Tuesday, on Tuesday.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Sure. I'm going to make my best efforts, as a matter of fact.

MR. VAUGHN:

Prefer to have the question prior to Tuesday.

LEG. KENNEDY:

My days are pretty packed, but I'm going to make my best efforts to speak to the Commissioner. But I would encourage you to have him or the Chief or somebody from the department on the department side that can speak to the mechanics of how this is going to go.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, sir.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I appreciate Noel bringing it forward, but I'd like to hear from the Commissioner as well.

MR. VAUGHN:

I think that's certainly very reasonable, sir, and we will accommodate that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Noel.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Is that it? Any other questions? No? I guess no more questions.

MR. DIGEROLAMO:

Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to speak and I appreciate your support. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Okay. So Sheriff, I guess we'll start with your presentation. For everyone's information, the Sheriff has recently been appointed as Chair of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Counsel, so he's here to discuss what his goals are for the CJCC in the upcoming years. And I guess we'll have some other questions. I know there was an article in the paper and I would like to get some clarification. And I don't know if you want to do it, I know we have the County Attorney here. I don't want to have you have to sit here all day and wait, so maybe we could let him -- would you be okay with that if we let him respond to that issue?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Sure, sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There was the newspaper article regarding jailed immigrants and deportation, and I think it might be a good idea to, like I said, let the attorney get out of the here and get back to work.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Let me just give you a quick how this came about. There were two Federal lawsuits. I'm not going to get into the legal stuff, I'll let the County Attorney do that, or the Assistant County Attorney. Two Federal lawsuits that were brought to my attention by the State Sheriffs' Association, the National Sheriffs' Association and the ACLU. I read the information on them and I forwarded them to the County Attorney and asked for an opinion about holding people solely on an ICE detainer after they're in jail, after their charges -- all their criminal charges are dismissed, the detainer. The thought was gave you the ability to hold somebody in jail solely on the detainer for 48 hours. These lawsuits conflicted with the practice, and I asked the County Attorney for an opinion.

MR. BRAUN:

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good morning.

MR. BRAUN:

Good morning. The Sheriff is correct. He referred some correspondence he had received to us for an opinion, and we've done some research, and it's our opinion that the situation is such that it's not appropriate for local law enforcement agency to hold someone in their custody solely on the basis of what the courts have characterized as a request by ICE that they be held for 48 hours while ICE decides how and when to pick them up. There are six Federal Circuit Courts that have all referred to this as a request by ICE, not a mandate. And despite the fact that the Federal regulation says that they are to hold these people for not more than 48 hours excluding weekends, the locality is not protected by relying on that regulation. So that if someone were to bring an action against, in our case the County, for holding a prisoner beyond the time when they would otherwise have been released, whether on bail or because the charges against them have been resolved, or whatever the case may be, the County leaves itself open to liability for that continued retention of that prisoner.

So the conclusion of our research is that unless there's some other probable cause to continue to hold the prisoner, which would, for example, be a judicial warrant from another jurisdiction, or from even from the Immigration Court itself, without this other warrant or some other basis for probable cause, the County leaves itself open to liability for that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I guess no one else has any more questions regarding it. I mean, I know that the Sheriff and I, we've talked about it in the past, because I know ICE does come in and takes people out. However, you know, are they really deporting them? And that's one of the things, and you know, Sheriff, I don't know. Can you tell me, have you seen some of these people that have been removed by ICE and seen them back in the jail again?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

You know, I don't have numbers and names, but a lot of the people that they did take when we were -- had the practice of holding people for ICE, a good portion of them were taken, taken to a Federal detention center in the city. They saw a magistrate within a certain amount of time and they were released and told to come back and they wound up back in the jail within a short period of time. So a lot of people were not being deported anyway, they were just seeing a judge and being told to check in and they would just go back home. Home meaning home here.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah. And, again, the cost of that lawsuit.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

And just one other thing. I just want to let everyone know that before we -- while we were asking the County Attorney for an opinion we met with the ICE officials that we deal with from the city. They came out a couple of times and, you know, they were a little disappointed that it appeared that we were going in this direction just because, you know, it's a change for them. It's happening all across the country. We're actually a little behind the curve here with this, so. But we did keep them in the loop, they're still a partner, we still work with them on a lot of different cases and, you know, there are things that ICE -- ICE has administrative warrants, so you might hear that ICE can issue warrants, but they're administrative warrants and just so you know, the courts and the County Attorney have both informed me that the administrative warrant will not hold up. It has to be a judicial warrant. So you might hear conflicting things, *but ICE issued a warrant*. There's a difference between an administrative warrant and judicial warrant. Just so you know, in case you hear from a constituent or from someone else.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You know, just one thing is clearly if they've committed a serious crime they're not going anywhere anyway.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So, I mean, so basically most of these people are not serious offenders?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

No. This is for, you know, if someone commits, you know, a forced felony, a violent felony. Their bail is -- either they have no bail or they have an extremely high bail and, you know, they're going to be held in the jail until their case is disposed of.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I thank you and like I said, we'll -- we didn't want to hold you up and keep you here for too long.

MR. BRAUN:

Thank you. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. So with that, Sheriff, if you would like to move on, and I'm sure we'll hold off any questions until you're done.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yeah, just a couple of things that I want to hit on. You know, one is just give you how we're doing on the budget coming to the end of '14, overtime wise. The 2014 budget included two -- funding for two classes of Correction Officers, one in March, one in September. That did not happen, so our overtime number for this year is a little skewed. We were supposed to have a class, like I said, in March and September. We had one class go in in June that is getting out in a week or two. So this year we will probably be a million over the adopted number, just because the hiring plans weren't followed, the Deputy Sheriff vacancies weren't filled, and the Correction Officer vacancies weren't filled.

But the good news is that we will be \$2 million under last year's number, so that's the good news in it. And being a million over the adopted number this year, considering the amount of people we didn't hire, is actually -- puts us in pretty good shape when you look at the salary accounts and the

money that we didn't spend. So we're pretty much on target.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Wait. I know we're going to have, you know, our committee meetings with regards to the budget, but certainly I think there's a few questions with regards to the budget. You know, the \$4 million retro is not in the budget, so I guess we'll try and find out why. And what's the plan with that \$4 million in the event, you know, I know we have a pending suit. And is that, you know, I'm just curious. Is the plan to bond that? And, you know, I'd like to get some more information with regards to civilian employees, and what the reduction is in civilian employees and has that had an impact on, you know, let's say for like evictions, certain, you know, civil jobs that need to be done by the Corrections Officers. Has there been a hold up on that?

And I guess the pay raises, because I know they don't have contracts. So I see that John Becker is here, so I did send out a request to the -- to Dennis Cohen asking about the contracts and how they're moving along. So we'll save that for after your presentation. And, you know, we'll kind of touch back on that in a few minutes.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So go ahead.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

John is going to come out, John Ortiz from Budget Review, is coming out to see us next week and we're going to go through the budget before we come here to do a presentation.

I also wanted to give you a quick update, I think it's been six or eight months since I was here, just to give you a quick update on the Youth Tier Initiative. Overall our numbers of incarcerated youth are way down over the previous year, partly due to the work of the Youth Re-entry Task Force and also Judge Camacho's Youth Felony Part. Today we have only 16 young people between the ages of 16 and 17, and 115 between the ages of 18, 19, and 20. So all together, that's 131 youth under the age of 21, whereas last year we had 236 people under the age of 21. So we're making a lot of progress here. And, you know, I have to give a lot of credit to the Youth Re-entry Task Force who show up to every meeting. Legislator Browning is there all the time, too, Legislator Hahn is a big part of it as well. And also Judge Camacho, who's been a wonderful partner.

We have been going around, my office and Judge Camacho, to all the youth -- town youth bureau's to try to -- to make them a bigger part of our Task Force and also of the Youth Felony Part, this way each town, when the kids are coming back and while they're in jail, can take -- give us some resources and give Judge Camacho some resources to come up with a plan, transitional plan, for the kids. The town youth bureaus have been wonderful. We have a few more that we have to hit, but everyone that we've been to has -- actually most of them have wound up joining the Youth Re-entry Task Force after we met with them, so it's been great.

As you know, the Youth Tier Initiative is aimed at providing intensive rehabilitation for those youth who will be with us for six weeks, most of them in the program are here for three months to a year, and we've worked with 150 youth since the inception and the recidivism rate is under 15% over a three-year period, so that's a pretty good thing. As you know, we work with interns from Stony Brook University who provide internal case management and transitional planning for males and now females of the ages of 16 to 24. So we've expanded it to females as well now, been able to do that.

And very recently, I think you may have seen in the newspapers and on the news that New York City, Rikers Island, has been under a lot of pressure from the U.S. Attorney and the Southern District about how they -- some issues they've had with youth in the facility. Their new Commissioner, who's a reform minded Commissioner from the State of Maine, recently came out with his new Deputy, Errol Toulon, to come visit our Youth Tier to try and get some ideas about how they're going to reform the way that they deal with youth. So we were very happy to host them and I think they were very impressed with our program.

And one thing I did want to mention, I have spoken with Legislator Hahn and also Legislator Spencer about the one thing we do need is a post release case manager for this initiative. And, you know, that person, you know, could come from existing non-for-profits that the County has contracts with or, you know, a new position in the County, but that would go a long way in helping us once these kids get released, because they do need to be followed for a short period of time after that. I've had intensive discussions with Legislator Hahn and I believe she may be working on something to make that happen. So we appreciate that.

We do have a short presentation that I just want to show you on a PowerPoint. It is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and we've had a program here in the Sheriff's Office that is administered by the New York State Sheriffs' Association for all Sheriff's Offices throughout the State. It's a victim notification system. It's run on a grant that's administered by the State Sheriffs' Association, so that grant allows us all to participate in this. And it's a -- you can go online, you could do it by phone, but we have the online version up here on the screen.

If you are a victim of a crime, you can go on here and register to be notified when your offender is getting out of jail. It's a very powerful tool. A lot of people use it, but we'd like more people to use it, and we work with a lot of the crime victims agencies and we'd like to work with you a little more, and we're going to get you some information on this. So if there is a victim of a crime and they know that their offender has been caught and is in jail, they can register here online. There's an icon on our web page at SuffolkSheriff.com. You click on that and you can pick your -- the facility, a County jail, a State correctional facility as well, and you can register to be alerted by email -- is it text message now, too? Text message or phone call when your offender, the person who committed the crime against you, is getting out. Very powerful tool. There is also now a new app that you can put on your cell phone if you're an android or iphone user. It's free and makes it very easy to get the notification, you know, right on your cell phone.

It's very easy. As you can see, like most apps these days are pretty self-explanatory. You hit search offender, you pop in a name, and a feature that they've added over the last couple of years is you actually get a picture of the person, name and when, you know, when they get out you'll know. And if the picture's changed, you know, if they've changed their appearance over time you'll know, too.

Another -- here's an example of, you know, where you would click to register to be notified when the person is getting released. And, you know, if you live in Suffolk County and, you know, your offender happens to be in the Nassau County Jail, you can still -- you can register any facility in New York State. And also across the country. A lot of states participate in this, too.

Another thing that we are turning this into, a couple of Legislators over the years have said that on our website we don't have an inmate locator. So if you have, you know, someone you want to know if they're in jail, there's really no way to look them up on our website because we just, you know, we only have like five IT people and it was very hard for us to build that out. But working with the State Sheriffs' Association and VINELink, we are going to have this on our home page too, and we can use this as an inmate locator, which I think will be very helpful to you, because I know some of you -- because I get calls from you, you get calls, *Hey is this person in jail?* You can still

always call me, I'll always help you out, but you on your own computer, or a staff member, and even your constituent, can go online and look it up themselves now once they know about it and they can find out. *Where did this guy go, I haven't seen him. Is he in jail?* Very easily look him up and you can search across the county as long as that agency is participating. So it will be a great tool. It's free and we don't have to build the inmate locator program, so. I think it was Legislator Cilmi who was really hot on this, but he's not here, so I'll make sure I reach out to him. So we very shortly will have an icon up as an inmate locator on our website, which I think will be a great resource for a lot of you, because I know you get calls.

And there's just examples, this is a search page. It's all -- it's, you know, once you go through it a couple of times it becomes very easy. Obviously the app is a little better organized and touch screen because it's your phone. And we have some literature that we'll have for you and we'll send a bunch of stuff out to your office. Like I said, if you get a call from a constituent, you can always direct them to me, too, if you can't figure it out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I appreciate that, because actually we did have -- I had an incident with a constituent who was followed by someone who sexually assaulted her. She didn't know he was out of jail, so it was kind of scary. And so I'm definitely going to make sure she has this information, because I think he might be back again.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

We'll get you the literature so you can have it in your office.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And CJCC, you want to talk about that?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

We had our first meeting yesterday. I believe Tim Sini is here from the County Exec's Office who is --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Tim, you're welcome to come up and join him.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

-- a new County employee. So we had our first meeting yesterday and, you know, working with the County Executive and Tim. For the next year our big focus is going to be on reducing the jail population, a pretty intense focus on that, and reviewing our ATIs and building more robust ATIs. I think the County Executive in the budget has put some additional monies into Probation for ATIs, which is a great thing. So I'm sure, you know, over the budget process that will be hashed out and I know Tim has been great. I've met with him a few times before the meeting and really hit the ground running as a new employee. He's getting things done pretty quick and really making some progress on some of the issues that we need to do to lower the jail population. And there's a big commitment from the County Executive's Office on this which is nice to see, and the whole system will benefit from this effort, so.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Is there any other things you'd like to talk about? I mean, I -- I don't know if it's something that you want to talk about right now, but as far as employee background checks, have you changed -- I believe you're changing some of your policies on that?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Well, you know, we do intensive employee background checks when -- through the hiring process

through our personnel investigations process. But there is a new Federal Law, the Prison Rape Elimination Act now requires us every five years to do a background, cursory background check every five years on someone, and so that is ramping up as we speak. All prisons and jails across the country have to be PREA compliant and audited by an accredited auditor. We are in the process of implementing all the PREA standards. It's a pretty intense thing and they keep extending it out because the guidelines are very tough, but one of the standards, which is kind of easy, is the every five years doing a background check on your current employees.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And it's my understanding that a law enforcement officer is required when he gets -- is in the vicinity of where a crime has been committed, that he is required to report that he was present at an event.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

That would be --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So now this will basically --

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

That's usually like a departmental in your rules and procedures guide. There are guidelines in there that state certain things.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

However, if that person gets arrested and doesn't report to you, it's eventually going to come back to you.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Right, right. Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Kara?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

And just so you know, too, if you have someone who is an employee of any law enforcement department, usually the law enforcement department that had the interaction will give your Internal Affairs Office the cursory *Hey, you know, we had contact with this employee of yours*, so we usually find out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Kara.

LEG. HAHN:

So, the Federal Government now has this Prison Rape Elimination Act, the PREA.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Which mandates the background check.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Every five years for current employees.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Right.

LEG. HAHN:

Does it mandate the firing if some kind of hit comes up on that background check?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So what --

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

That's something as we go along that I'm going to have to talk to the County Attorney about, because you have Collective Bargaining Agreements, you have Civil Service Law and then you have this Federal statute. So we are --

LEG. HAHN:

Figuring that out.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

In conversation, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So obviously there's certain level of offense that could be found that would mandate.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Well, you know, when it comes to jails and prisons, there are certain, what they're looking for in this act, obviously, it's the Prison Rape Elimination Act, it's sexual offenses, so, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So need to figure that out and is it in full force yet?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

I believe that statute, yes, that part of it is in effect, yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Can you detail what would -- a conviction of a sexual offense at any time in someone's background? Is there a --

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

I don't know. I mean, it's a huge section and I'm not an attorney, and that's why we eventually will. But, you know, I think what you're getting at, that the person that you're talking about is, you know, termination is being sought anyway, so.

LEG. HAHN:

Right. Okay. Thank you. Well, not only of course -- we're not only concerned about that individual, that individual is known.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Right.

LEG. HAHN:

I'm concerned about who isn't known as well.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Right.

LEG. HAHN:

Because it's worse when they're not known and they're in secret and they're a predator hiding in with -- amongst very vulnerable individuals. So, you know, I --

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

I think that was a unique situation that I don't -- (knocked wood) hopefully we'll never see that again.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Thank you. We rely on you, but we need to strengthen and make sure that that's never allowed again. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Trotta, you had a question?

LEG. TROTТА:

Just a quick question. Was the Federal prisoners -- can you get the app on your phone for the Federal prisoners when they get released?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

I'm not sure.

MS. MACKAY:

It doesn't.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

No, I think it's just states opt in, state prisons and county facilities. I don't think the Federal Government is part of the VINE Program.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. John?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Check on some old cases?

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah, I'm worried.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Sheriff, thank you for showing us the program, and it's an important tool to have. I want to stay on the domestic violence aspect for just one second in two different facets. First, when a victim or a person has an Order of Protection in place and the stay away party, the offender, becomes incarcerated and they do let's say a 90-day stint with you, with OP in place for a year or typically I think now the max is it can go up to two years, I forget. When that individual

comes out, do we have any -- this is a permissive thing that somebody can elect to sign up to. Do we have any affirmative obligation that we have to notify parties if somebody's been in, and specifically just in the area of where an Order of Protection is in place?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

No, but we do have -- we do make -- anybody who comes into the court, to Family Court, as a petitioner and has an Order of Protection issued, that petitioner comes to see our Domestic Violence Unit and they're interviewed, and so we can get information about the person that has to be served, where they work, where they live, do they have weapons, does the Order have weapon seizures, you know, are they going to be excluded from the household. So we interview the petitioner and when the petitioner is there we give them the literature for the VINE Program. We tell them we can help them, you know, with that. But sometimes people get Orders of Protection and they don't become incarcerated.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Oh, no. I'm fully -- I'm familiar with it. I've been down there, as a matter of fact.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

In order to find out they would have to sign up for the program, but we give them the information to do that. We're trying to advertise it more and more and with your help, you know, we would like to have, you know, all crime victims that have someone incarcerated sign up for this. It's good information to have.

We also have -- there is also another program which we're going to talk about later, which is SAVIN-NY, which is where a petitioner can sign up online and be notified when that Order of Protection has actually been served. So, you know, sometimes, you know, it's served in court, sometimes it's served the night it was issued, sometimes it's served, you know, a day or two later depending on where this person is. They could be out of the State, they could be in another county, so that the petitioner can sign up and they'll get an automatic notification that the Order has, in fact, been served. That's another great tool that we're going to talk about.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Actually good, I'll look forward to hear about that. And then, so the second part of that question, I guess, was over to CJCC, and if that is going to be an area that you're going to go back into with where we're at at this point with our processes with domestic violence and with OPs in particular. They -- I know there's tens of thousands of them out there, and by and large they serve the purpose that they are supposed to serve, but, unfortunately, when we hear a situation or circumstance that goes bad it's always, you know, like, you know, the perfect storm.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yeah, no it is. And, you know, the one thing that everybody has to remember is that, you know, it's basically a piece of paper.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes. It's a piece of paper, but it kind of brings back in the Executive's Order A1A that still stands at this point from back in '88; correct?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yeah, County mandatory arrests.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. I just wanted to make sure that we were -- and that will be part of, I guess, where CJCC winds up going again, right? Well, to review processes and make sure that particularly

in the area of DV we're hitting all of the elements and protections that are in place and it's fully operational.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

That is something that we can look at.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Good. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Kara.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah. There is concern that OPs, and I've had one, really are just a piece of paper and I am working on something. So I look forward to bringing you in on that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good.

LEG. HAHN:

And thank you for all your work on this. And I do believe that crime victims advocacy and domestic violence advocacy organizations also assist victims in the VINE sign-ups.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So, you know, our contract agencies are on top of that and are very active.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Very much so.

LEG. HAHN:

And making people aware about that, but for the newspapers in the room, you know, it doesn't hurt to remind folks that they can sign up to be alerted.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Because unfortunately a lot of crime victims don't seek the services that are out there, so a lot of times, you know, we have to get this information out in other ways.

LEG. HAHN:

Well, and there's also services that are provided at a time to individuals who are extraordinarily stressed and it's a time of immediate survival when they have interactions with law enforcement, and they're told many things, and may remember few in terms of --

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Sure.

LEG. HAHN:

-- the resources that are available.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

That's why the more we have it out there.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, it's always good to get a reminder that that is something they can sign up for and we have that resource for them.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. The floor is yours. Is there anything else that you'd like to? Nothing?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

I think we hit what we wanted to hit.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And again, you know, I don't want to put you on the spot, but I know the civilian employees they're not, you know, that work in your department, like I said, with any kind of civil actions that have to be done, the paperwork, you know. Who does Orders of Protections? Do you have civilian employees that do any of the paperwork?

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

We have civilian employees who enter them into the system, you know, for the most part, you know, we're pretty good there. That's a priority for us.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

And we have a backup system when people are off. We have other civilians that work in different -- a different department in the courthouse and they come in and cover. We get swamped, too. So we have a -- you know, that's obviously a priority, so we make sure that they get entered in the system as quick as possible.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You don't, because I just want to make sure, too. I've heard that there is possibly a shortage of civilian employees in other areas, maybe in the evictions. I just want to make sure that you're not having officers doing paperwork or back -- you know, trying to cover for that.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Like everyone else with the -- over the last few years with layoffs and budgets, you know, we took some lumps there, too, so we are, you know, we're short but, you know, we're making due. And sometimes, you know, that might require an officer to do something that a civilian had to do in the past. You know, we try obviously when we have people who are on light duty, you know, that those are things we try and have them do, but you don't always have that situation. But, you know, we're doing the best we can to keep up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And like I said, for our budget purposes, you know, definitely Correction Officer staffing levels, your Deputy Sheriff staff levels, you know, anything that you can provide us. Again, we didn't see anything in the budget for the \$4 million is not being accounted for. And depending on how the lawsuit goes, pay raises, you know, clearly the Corrections Officers and the Deputy Sheriffs have not settle a contract yet. I don't know if they're going to be going to arbitration or not, but, you know, it didn't seem like there was really any money in there for their salary increases. So I would assume, and I'd like to think that they're going to have a contract at some point real soon.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Well, we will -- like I said, we're going to meet with Budget Review next week and go over some numbers.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Great.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

And I'm sure, you know, we'll do our presentation when it's our turn, and I'm sure that the County Executive's Budget Office can answer a lot of the questions that you're asking about.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, we appreciate it. So I guess there are no more questions. And thank you, and I guess we'll see you at the budget meeting.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There was a couple of things here before we get to the agenda. Where to start. I guess I will -- I guess our Commissioner is here from FRES, Joe Williams. Joe, do you have anything you'd like to report? I want to make sure everybody gets an opportunity.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Thank you for the opportunity. The only thing I'd like to mention is that the thing you'd be considering today on the vests for the auxiliary police. It's a little known fact, sometimes people ask me that, but the auxiliary police actually fall under FRES because of Civil Service. Most of their duties are with the Suffolk County Police Department. But I cannot say enough about this organization and the people that belong to it. They go out there every day, they help the Police Department, they've helped us. With these vests we're going to offer them a level of protection, I believe, that they deserve. There was a tragic event in New York City a couple of years ago when the auxiliary -- right now the current members of the Auxiliary Police Department have to buy their own vest. What we're proposing with this bill would be that we will be providing a vest to every 132 of the auxiliary police and I'd ask for your favorable consideration for that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, you do, you have my support. I can't speak for everybody else. You know, I know that this is something that our Presiding Officer brought to our attention, I believe, last year, and so we definitely -- we did make sure there's money in the budget for that. So we'll look forward to voting for that one today. And again, I believe some of the auxiliary officers are here today. I just want to recognize them if you want to stand up. And, you know, again I've seen you --

*(*Applause*)*

You're kind of like a silent group of people out there. I can tell you, you know, any events in my district we always see the auxiliaries and I know all of us see you, and we certainly appreciate your service. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

MR. WILLIAMS:

Thank you. That's all I have, thank you, unless there's any questions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No questions? Nope. Patrice, do you have anything you need to report?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

(Shook head no.)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I know that in the budget there's -- and again, we can save it for the budget meeting, but I did see that we have some new positions that are being filled.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes, we did.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Which we're happy to see. But, again, maybe we can get a caseload number for the next meeting because -- say again?

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Average caseload size.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Average caseload, because it's important if we're doing alternatives to incarceration. We always say that Probation is probably the most important part of it.

LEG. HAHN:

And also of the caseload, the percentage of individual's cases that they're handling that are, you know, priority one, two three.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

The risk criteria.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, risk.

MS. DLHOPOLSKY:

Okay. Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And who did I miss? Okay. The Police Department, I did put in a request regarding our infrastructure improvements. I know that an RFP went out. I don't know if there's anybody here can -- because it's certainly -- it's not just affecting our Police Department, it affects FRES, the Sheriff's Department, all of our EMS, fire departments. There is a need for infrastructure improvements, you know. And I can tell you, I know I've been talking to some people for quite some time, and when I hear that we have such antiquated equipment that's starting to break, I have some serious concerns. I don't know if, John, if you -- any new information?

MR. ORTIZ:

(Shook head no)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No? But that is something that we need to make sure that it gets done ASAP, because I don't want to hear any tragedies occurring in Suffolk County because of communications problem. There was a sex offender comptroller report. I know Laura was here a minute ago.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, she just stepped outside.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So maybe we'll have her come back. I also received some -- I did send some correspondence, because I know there's been questions about contracts. I think the only two contracts left, I could be wrong, are the Corrections Officers and the Deputy Sheriffs. My request to Dennis Cohen was basically to get an update on where the contracts were, if we were close to having settled with the both unions, because we -- it's been very clear. The County Executive stated quite some time that, you know, to negotiate is rather better than to arbitrate. And I did make a request as to when the last time they met with both unions, and again, one of my other questions was the legal fees in the current lawsuit, what we're at right now. So I can let you know that the current legal fees, the County's legal fees, is approximately \$86,000 since October of 2012. And I guess they said Sheriff DeMarco has also retained counsel and that is at approximately \$68,000.

So it seems to me to negotiate and settle with the Deputy Sheriffs could possibly end that lawsuit and our legal costs. So I don't want to put our -- John, you're here for, you know, your Deputy Sheriffs union. I don't want to put you on the spot, but I did receive an email saying that the Corrections Officers union met on Monday, and the Deputy Sheriffs, it was over a month ago, but not much progress has been made. You're welcome to come up if you want to respond and kind of give your side of the story and how you feel things are going. Sure, you can have a seat. It's been a while and I'm, you know, curious when -- when did your contract expire?

MR. BECKER:

Good morning. Our contract expired in December of 2010, so as the new year approaches we're now working towards our fifth year of being without a contract. Additionally, as you had mentioned, we also have this pending litigation reference the Highway Patrol issue. We've stated time and time again that we were willing to negotiate this issue and work with the County, because we feel it's in everyone's best interest in moving forward. However, those negotiations seem to be at a standstill. We had a meeting -- the last meeting we had was back in August. There was an additional meeting scheduled in September that was canceled at the last hour early the morning of that meeting. Our phone calls have gone unanswered to reschedule a new meeting, so basically our talks, our negotiations, are at a standstill.

I represent a group of people, 250 Deputy Sheriffs, who are extremely frustrated. They really seem to have no answers as to why the contract is taking so long to be negotiated. We're being very reasonable. Additionally, the Highway Patrol issue, we'd like to have that resolved as well. Again, we feel it's in everyone's best interest moving forward. But again, we just seem to be spinning our wheels. We'd just like to know what the delay is, and additionally, where is the monies that have been allocated. Part of our agreement was that we deferred \$4 million of our retro money as part of that Memorandum of Agreement back in 2011. To date, we do not see that in the 2015 budget, so obviously my members are very concerned. Does the County intend to pay that money. We also don't see the pay raises in that budget as well, so are they serious in these negotiations.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, again, so I appreciate you clarifying, because I guess the email says it was over a month, so it definitely was over a month.

MR. BECKER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So I -- how many times have you tried to schedule meetings with the County Executive's Office, since August?

MR. BECKER:

We've -- I've personally made a phone call. My other member, Arty Sanchez, has made a phone call as well. Both calls have gone unanswered. When the meeting was canceled that morning, we were told that a meeting would be scheduled and we just never heard back.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So I guess, and like I said, negotiation is better than arbitration.

MR. BECKER:

Correct. It was our belief.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Arbitration is only two years; correct?

MR. BECKER:

Yes. And it was our belief that the County wanted to negotiate long-term deals for financial stability for the County. All we're asking for is the same yields that the other unions were afforded. We're not asking for special treatment. We're just asking for fair treatment.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

All right. Well, I guess Tom is here. Maybe at some point you can get a response back or I'll respond to Dennis myself anyway, and ask when they plan to meet with you guys. I don't think there's anybody here from Corrections to kind of give me their take on how things are going, but certainly August is -- we're into October. And I think that really they should be wrapping up their negotiations and try and get this done before the end of the year. That's my opinion. But who am I? So, anyway, if you could please -- yeah, there you go. Does that work sometimes? But I certainly think the message needs to go back to the Executive to say let's get moving, because it's my understanding that arbitration proceedings have already begun with the Corrections Officers. And we know that cost is \$38 million in retro from the last arbitration, so it just seems to make sense that we get these contracts moving. So thank you, John. Is there anything else you have?

MR. BECKER:

Yeah. Additionally, also what we're not seeing in the budget is any allocations for new Deputy Sheriffs. It's my understanding that an academy class is scheduled shortly. The last time that we did a hiring we only got two Deputy Sheriffs. Recently we've had a lot of retirements, so from my end we don't want to see the numbers dwindling down. As was talked about earlier, we have programs such as our Domestic Violence Unit serving the Orders of Protection. We never want public safety to be compromised. We want to make sure our numbers are there so we can have the Deputies to do the job.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And, I guess, while we got you, John, maybe like you did with the PD, try and provide us, since the past like five years, what the staff levels were.

MR. ORTIZ:

No problem.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Appreciate it. I'll have that for the next budget meeting. Okay. Thank you, John.

MR. BECKER:

Madam Chairman, I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Anyone else have questions? I hope I didn't miss anybody. Laura walked in. There was -- I know that there was the Comptroller's report on the sex offenders and, you know, it certainly seems that there -- I looked at it myself and some comments that came from the Comptroller's Office that, you know, sex offenders were being reported to the Police Department. The Police Department wasn't -- they tried, I guess they're saying that the Police Department weren't responding on a couple of reports, and I know that you've spoken with the Police Department regarding this, if you can give us an update.

MS. AHEARN:

Sure. The State Comptroller took a look a number of jurisdictions, I believe it was 15, across the State to evaluate their implementation of SORA, Sex Offender Registration Act. And they were really looking for the interaction or the communication between DCJS and local law enforcement, and if local law enforcement was taking action when DCJS was notifying them of say failure to registers or photographs being updated. And I have to tell you that Suffolk County Police Department did remarkably well comparatively to the other jurisdictions. And, in fact, in the report it cited that they were -- they looked at 49 instances of DCJS informing Suffolk PD of address registration failure to registers. So in two instances they said that Suffolk Police did not take enforcement action when there were two registrants that were out of compliance that DCJS claims to have notified Suffolk P.D. on those two instances. And Suffolk's position was that one was actually DCJS said they sent the notification via email, and one was by snail mail. And Suffolk purported that they never received those notifications. So it was really -- it's a communication issue, and from our position, Suffolk Police did remarkably well.

And just on a side note, since the implementation of the Community Protection Act, photograph -- photographs were significantly not kept up-to-date in the beginning before we started implementing Community Protection Act, but now last look, we were at nearly 100% compliance. And I only say nearly, because of the 1% of 2% that are not in compliance, those are guys that are -- there's a warrant issued and maybe they've absconded and they can't locate them. Or a particular individual who -- actually it is absconders and that's it. There's like one maybe they can't locate. But they're doing remarkably well.

And on the photo issue, just on a little bit of background, the agency was doing notifications to the Police Department early on in accordance with the Community Protection Act. We were informing them of offenders that their photographs were out of date, and it caused a little bit of tension between our organization and the Division of Criminal Justice Services, because there's a process that DCJS has to go through, and that's identified in the law, and there were questions in terms of the implementation on their side of their notifications to local law enforcement. So I think in the end what the Community Protection Act did locally is not only made the registry more up-to-date, provided resources for law enforcement, but also on a State level, there were some -- there was some confusion regarding certain forms that were being used and whether or not the appropriate form was being used for the District Attorney to be able to prosecute effectively. But in sum and substance here, what we're talking about is DCJS had to comply with the law in order for local law enforcement to be able to make an arrest and the D.A. to prosecute. And if they weren't following what they had to follow in the law, then we were falling apart on a local level.

So now, one year later, fast forward, photographs are nearly 100% compliance, we're seeing some significant statistics now finally after one year worth of data we are happy to report. I stood here before the Legislature and asked you repeatedly to pass the Community Protection Act. We fully supported it. All of you were on board and now we can say it's effective, because what's happened

now is we can say that there have been no hands on sex crimes since implementation of the Community Protection Act against citizens of Suffolk County by registrants. So it's been very effective, and I thank you for that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I know that things have been going well, and like I said, I know that -- I always want to say thank you, because I know my office will call you on occasions with regards to notifications that come in. And, you know, I always appreciate the fact that now your website responds to someone who moves out of the district, because, you know, I think the beginning of the school year I got a couple of calls from people because they got notifications about a sex offender who moved to the community, which is something I want to try and resolve with the school district, because it wound up that they're not new to the district, they just moved from one street to a different street. So they're new, they're just transient and moving around within the community. And I think that's something that people need to understand, that that happens as much as we don't want them. But I know that there's another one that I've been working with your office on. I want to say thank you for that one, too.

MS. AHEARN:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Okay. With that, we will start with the agenda. We have tabled resolutions.

Tabled Resolutions

1324-14 - Directing all County departments and agencies to update multi-line telephone systems to directly dial 911 (Trota).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Spencer; second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. Congratulations. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Martinez).***

1659-14 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to strengthen Public Nuisance Law (Cilmi). I'll make a motion to approve. Actually this is something that I have amended, and there was a question, was asked of -- with regards to, because I know that when an incident occurs on a property that the Crack House Law comes into effect. Now, the question was is let's say I report I see criminal activity going on outside my home, it's right outside my property, and the police come. Is that going to put me in jeopardy of now the Crack House Law even though I don't know those people? That was, believe it or not, the question. Yes? No?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I plan on seconding the motion that you made, Madam Chair, but I just had a question. I don't know if anybody from the County Attorney's Office can speak to it. I mean, to me it seems to be pretty self-evident that if the individual is taken into custody and then subsequently arrested at the station house or whatever, the conduct is conduct that occurred at the dwelling, and so we should be able to invoke crack house I would think.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

What it is, is let's say you see drug activity going on, there's some drug dealers pull up outside your property. You don't know them, and they're, you know, doing a transaction outside your home. Or maybe they frequently show up at, you know, and you happen to be on a corner, and they show up at your property, by your property, on a frequent -- on a regular basis to do their transactions. Believe me, I know it happens because I've seen it where there was a car pulled up outside a property, actually just a block away from me, and they were frequently showing up at the corner, and we called the police. We had do not -- no parking signs put up and whatnot. But if that's outside my home and this type of drug activity is going on, is the Crack House Law, the question was, does the Crack House Law apply? Could I be in jeopardy of having that because activity was going on outside my house.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We have a bunch of lawyers in the house, but I'd say that they would be trespassers. They would not be on the subject property. There was no nexus, they weren't there with consent. They're not bona fide tenants. It's all conduct outside of what we're trying to regulate I would suspect.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It's not my question, it was the question of a Legislator who's not here.

MR. NOLAN:

Legislator Kennedy is absolutely right. I don't think that would invoke the provisions of the Crack House Law, no.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, I would assume that the Police Department would have the discretion, right?

MS. LOLIS:

Well, there are times when we will actually send a notice to a homeowner who actually called the police on the tenant.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

MS. LOLIS:

But then once that homeowner contacts -- and they'll get the notice because we don't realize, but once we're contacted we use our discretion and the police will, too. If it happens off of your property, first of all, that does not implicate the law. If it occurs on your property, the law is implicated but then we will look further.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, I know of a home where drug activity occurs outside the property. Now, it's the kids sit in the car right in front of their own home on the street, so that the -- the Crack House Law does not kick in even though -- because they're on the street.

MS. LOLIS:

They're in a public place. They can't abate the nuisance.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right, right. Okay. I'm assuming everybody understands, then, what this is about. Do you need any?

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Shook head no).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So with that, I guess there was a motion to approve and a second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. I believe I'm a co-sponsor on it. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Martinez)**

1741-14 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to extend the Red Light Camera Program (Co. Exec.).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Is that closed? Yes?

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes, motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Motion to approve, Legislator Calarco.

LEG. SPENCER:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Second, Legislator Spencer.

LEG. HAHN:
Explanation.

MR. NOLAN:
It just extends the Red Light Program, the camera program, for another five years. The State just authorized us to do so and this is the implementing resolution.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KENNEDY:
I'm opposed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Opposed, Legislator Kennedy. It's approved. **(Vote: 4-1-0-1 Opposed: Legislator Kennedy; Not Present: Legislator Martinez)**

Introductory Resolutions

1759-14 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues (Schneiderman).

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

This has to be -- no, it has to be tabled for Public Hearing, am I correct?

MR. NOLAN:

No, this is a resolution.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh. I thought that --

MR. NOLAN:

1752 is the police report.

LEG. SPENCER:

Wait a second. The police report.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, this is the one, safety sales and compensating use tax revenues, 1759. We did 17 -- oh, hold on. I missed 1742. I apologize. Okay. Let's go back. **1742-14 - Repealing Suffolk County Resolution Nos. 1055-1984 and 1262-1985, establishing a Uniform Motor Vehicle Traffic Accident Report within the County of Suffolk (Co. Exec.).** How are we doing on that?

MR. VAUGHN:

Actually, Legislator Browning, we're doing very well on that. Unfortunately, I think the only thing that we didn't amend was the title to this bill. We have amended the bill, and what we have done is we have changed the form into a third party witness form, which is available to be used at the scene of an accident should we need a third party witness or should it be requested. So I think we were able to accommodate the concerns that were presented at the last committee meeting by making these changes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay?

LEG. KENNEDY:

George, can you speak to that? We had an awful lot of conversation about this.

MR. NOLAN:

I think the intent is to allow the PD or that they would collect those independent witness statements, but I'm looking at the Resolved -- the only Resolved clause states that it references the prior resolutions, and it says that they are amended to state that the PDCS 1010c, renamed Motor Vehicle Crash Supplemental Report for Third Party Witness Form, PCDS 1010d. So when I read that I'm not sure that that Resolved clause is accomplishing what I think the Police Department wanted to do.

MR. VAUGHN:

Well, pardon me, Mr. Nolan, but based on the concerns that were presented at the last meeting, it was apparent to us, and we then went back and spoke with the Police Department, that a full phase-out of this -- of this form was not going to pass through this committee. We went back, we looked at how we could accomplish what the concerns were that were presented to us by the committee, and that is why the new Resolved clause just refers to the form simply being renamed, which is what has happened. The form has been renamed and it is a supplemental report for third party witnesses. So it will not completely phase out the form.

LEG. TROTТА:

Do you have a copy of it?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes. It's attached to the backup and I have a copy of it in front of me.

LEG. KENNEDY:

How is an individual going to become aware that they can actually submit something along these lines, Tom.

MR. VAUGHN:

During the debate it was said if somebody requests a form that they will be given it and our Police Officers will have -- will still --

LEG. KENNEDY:

So they will still carry it.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And if somebody says I'd like to go ahead and provide -- okay.

MR. VAUGHN:

One-hundred percent.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right.

MR. NOLAN:

The form is attached and I assume that's what the PD is going to use, so --

MR. VAUGHN:

That is the form.

MR. NOLAN:

-- it probably accomplishes it, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Go ahead.

LEG. CALARCO:

Tom, the individuals involved in the incident, the two parties that have the incident, you know, the accident. They both still have some sort of form that they're required to fill out --

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, sir.

LEG. CALARCO:

-- that's done electronically, that's the case here?

MR. VAUGHN:

Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

And then anybody in the car with them, they're a party to that form or do they do this third party

form.

MR. VAUGHN:

I think they would -- I'm not an expert on the forms that need to fully be filled out during an accident, but it would be my understanding that, yes, the individuals who were witnesses would then fill out this form.

LEG. CALARCO:

And the Officer is going to carry this form still with them.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Given that it's a paper form, and I know that that was the idea, eliminate as much paper as possible, but sometimes, you know, you just can't do that.

MR. VAUGHN:

So I think, Legislator Calarco, what we tried to accomplish was this. The PD had concerns about the -- about this form, this form, the one that we're talking about in this amendment, not fitting with the electronic -- being able to make everything as electronic as possible. I don't know what the word is that I just wanted to use there and I apologize.

LEG. CALARCO:

Reduce paper, right?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes. We wanted to reduce paper. There are other forms that the two drivers involved in an accident would need to fill out. Those forms are going to become digital. The idea was to try and eliminate this form because of the information being captured on the other forms. There was concerns here about, that you and Legislator Kennedy both raised, as to well, what about the other people who may have seen it, may have it, may have been tangentially involved in it. So the PD went back and looked and they said look, because we're reducing the paper in terms of the other two forms and this is not something that occurs with every single accident, they thought that this provided a much more workable system.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So how are we doing? I guess --

LEG. TROTTA:

Are they required to hand these out to people at accident scenes or for severe accident are they required to? On the old forms you were required to. You had to give them to people. If you wanted to fill them out they filled them out, if they didn't want to, they didn't want to. Is that still going to be in effect?

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator Trotta, the only thing that this resolution does is rename it and so, yes, they will have the form to handout.

LEG. TROTTA:

I didn't ask that. Is the Police Officer going to be required to say to them if you want to fill this form out you can, and if you don't, you don't have to.

MR. VAUGHN:

I can't speak for the Police Department. I don't know what the --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, we do have -- Lieutenant Busweiler's here if he wants to speak.

MR. VANZEYL:

Ma'am, I was asked to attend.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't know. If you want to come to the mic and identify yourself.

MR. VANZEYL:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

MR. VANZEYL:

Press the button, right? My name is Lieutenant Robert VanZeyl. I'm the Commanding Officer of the Planning and Operations Bureau at the Police Department. So I can answer -- I believe I should be able to answer your question as to the form.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I wish we would have known you were here for that. We would have started with you.

MR. VANZEYL:

At the last minute I was asked to respond.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Can you respond to Legislator Trotta?

LEG. TROTTA:

There is a form, I'm a little bit familiar with this. You give it to somebody and they would fill it out if they want. You'd say if you want to, you could. If you don't have to, you don't have to.

MR. VANZEYL:

Right. Well, what we're going to now, for the third party, what will be called the Motor Vehicle Crash Supplement Report for Third Party Witnesses, in the event of a motor vehicle crash investigation, the investigating officer determines the existence of a third party witness. Then he would or she would identify the witness and request that the witness fill out the form. Of course they can refuse, but we would make every attempt to obtain the statement of any third party witnesses that we identified at the scene of a crash.

LEG. TROTTA:

The rules and procedures of the Police Department can be changed.

MR. VANZEYL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

They are going to be changed to conform to that.

MR. VANZEYL:

Yes. The forms order directing on how the form is to be filled out will be changed. We have a draft --

LEG. TROTTA:

Do you have a copy?

MR. VANZEYL:

I have a copy of the forms order. The -- a copy of the draft forms order, but the R and P amendment, the general order changing the R and P's is still being written.

LEG. TROTTA:

I think that would be something that you'd want to look at. I mean, I don't know, I think that it should be made available to people and they shouldn't be forced to do it. If they want to fill it out --

MR. VANZEYL:

No, of course not. We would never force -- we can't force somebody.

LEG. TROTTA:

Of course, but I just want, you know, to be able to say the cop should be able to say, hey listen.

MR. VANZEYL:

Right. If in the event, and our officers will be directed that, of course, as part of a normal motor vehicle crash investigation you'd make every attempt to identify independent third party witnesses to the accident, and then we would direct our officers, if they do identify a third party witness to the accident, to make every reasonable attempt to obtain that witness's name and information, and ask them to fill out the statement form. I'm sorry, sir?

LEG. TROTTA:

What's the difference between this and a Rizzo form, than what we --

MR. VANZEYL:

Well, the form -- the form is essentially the same, we just changed the title. What the difference is, is how we use the form. In the past, we would give the form out to both drivers and anybody else that was at the scene and ask them to fill it out. We're no longer going to ask the drivers to fill out the form. It's no longer going to be required to give to the drivers to fill it out. Most of the time they didn't fill it out, they filled it out wrong, no information. But now we're -- the form is just going to be used for third party, independent third party witnesses.

LEG. TROTTA:

So the two drivers of the vehicles, they could always fill out a form or say something later on.

MR. VANZEYL:

Well, they would tell us what happened in the accident, we would indicate there -- we would write, the investigating officer would write their statement that they told him on the MV104A, the State Accident Report, and then each motorist is required to file an MV104 on their own to the Department of Motor Vehicle. So they have multiple opportunities to tell their side of the story, as it were. The importance of this form is in the event that the crash investigation reveals the presence or the existence of a third party witness, a lot of times a third party witness can offer --

LEG. TROTТА:

Basically you're taking away the two drivers. They can fill it out at a different time, a passenger --

MR. VANZEYL:

Well, the driver wouldn't fill this out. The driver -- we're taking out the two drivers. The drivers would fill out the MV104 accident report and send it to Motor Vehicles, and the -- they would verbally give their statement to the investigator --

LEG. TROTТА:

You're no longer giving this to the two drivers of the vehicles.

MR. VANZEYL:

I'm sorry, sir?

LEG. TROTТА:

You're not long giving this to the two drivers.

MR. VANZEYL:

That is correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

But you'll still require the copes to give it to any witnesses.

MR. VANZEYL:

Any third party, independent third party witnesses that we identify.

LEG. TROTТА:

Does that include passengers in the car?

MR. VANZEYL:

No, I don't believe it would include passengers. It would be independent third party witnesses. Now, we would get the names of the passengers and they would go on the 104A and they would probably -- would go on the form as being present at the scene, but we wouldn't give -- we would not give the form to the passengers. We're looking for independent third party witnesses. Because an independent third party witness makes the best witness, so we would not want to lose that information. So that's what this form is designed -- would be designed to obtain the information, a statement from a third party.

LEG. TROTТА:

And of course all serious accidents are handled totally different, so.

MR. VANZEYL:

Exactly. Any serious accidents are handled by Detectives. The Detectives would take notarized sworn notarized statements from everyone. They would try to find as many third party witnesses as they can. It's a more involved process.

LEG. TROTТА:

You just want to try to reduce the paperwork for simple rear-end accidents.

MR. VANZEYL:

Uh-huh.

LEG. TROTTA:

I got it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And everything's on computers these days. Okay. So we had a motion and a second I think.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Madam Chair, could I ask one quick question?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

John.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you for coming, Lieutenant. The impetus or what I recall hearing the last committee meeting was, again, elimination of paper and an ongoing process in your department to take -- is it the field reports or the MV104A's? Something is being -- electronically migrating from a paper system to an electronic system?

MR. VANZEYL:

That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. VANZEYL:

We're going to be using the State system called TRACS, I forgot what the acronym actually stands for, but all motor vehicle crash investigations and the reports of that will be done electronically, and entered electronically, stored electronically. We can print them and we can have -- we do have the ability to print them for motorists who want copies. But it'll be -- everything will be electronic. These forms, when we do identify a witness, then will have to go to Central Records and they'll have to be manually scanned into the system.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But, at the outset, then, the work that we typically see that an officer does now with that field report that they're manually preparing, that's going to migrate and now that will be generated or done on the laptop?

MR. VANZEYL:

To the best of my knowledge, I don't even think we do field reports at accident scenes anymore. Now we just do the MV104A and then we have a form similar to the field report where we put the information out to a system motorist -- each motorist in their exchange of information. Because the field report essentially was designed to --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Capture all the pertinent -- right.

MR. VANZEYL:

And assist the motorist in the exchange of information for their insurance company. So we have a different form for that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But this process is not going to impede that.

MR. VANZEYL:

None whatsoever.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So did we have a motion and a second?

MS. GELLERSTEIN:

(Shook head no.)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We didn't? Okay. I'll make a motion. Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: 4-0-0-2 Not Present: Legislators Martinez and Spencer)**

Okay. Introductory Resolutions.

Introductory Resolutions

1759-14 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues (Schneiderman).

I make a motion to table for Public Hearing.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled for Public Hearing. **(Vote: 4-0-0-2 Not Present: Legislators Martinez and Spencer)**

1763-14 - Establishing an Anti-Graffiti Task Force (Muratore).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand.)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Kennedy. Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved and I believe I'm a cosponsor on that, please, and Legislator Hahn. **(Vote: 4-0-0-2 Not Present: Legislators Martinez and Spencer)**

1774-14 - Approving a temporary increase to the fleet for the Suffolk County Police Department's Narcotics Section at no cost to the County through the use of Task Force Reimbursement Funds (Co. Exec.).

I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: 4-0-0-2 Not Present: Legislators Martinez and Spencer)**

1781-14 - Amending the 2014 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Custom Fitted Ballistic Soft Body Armor Vests for the Suffolk County Auxiliary Police Program (CP 3517) (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Martinez)**

1782-14 - Accepting and appropriating grant funds in the amount of \$21,000 from the State of New York Office of the Attorney General for a Community Overdose Prevention Program with 100% support (Co. Exec.).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Hahn, and place on the Consent Calendar. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Martinez).**

1800-14 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal Grant funds awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice to the Suffolk County Departments of Probation, Police, Sheriff, and District Attorney (Co. Exec.).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Spencer, and place on the Consent Calendar.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Martinez)**

And before we close -- thank you, John. I got the numbers. It looks like January 10th, around 258 Deputy Sheriffs positions. It went as high as 273 in '11, and we're down at 245 today. So there has been a very steady decline in the numbers. And that's even, I guess, since the guys came off the highway. So there's been a steady decline. They also -- thank you, John, again. The Detective Investigators, Probation Officers and Parks Police Officers are without a contract also.

However, I'm assuming the Parks Police issue is in the process of being resolved. Thank you, John, for your quick response. So with that, no more on the agenda.

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator Browning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. VAUGHN:

I apologize. I really should have said this earlier in the meeting when it came up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, that's okay.

MR. VAUGHN:

In terms of the County's 911 bill, we do support it. We are happy to see that the committee approved it out of -- approved it out today. We did not want to see it time out. We may, however, have to ask you for a tabling motion as we are continuing to have -- to try and have negotiations with Verizon on this matter. But we do appreciate the fact that you did pass it out of committee today and we just wanted -- we didn't want to surprise anybody. We know how we would feel about surprises.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, and then again, we're coming into the budget process.

MR. VAUGHN:

Exactly. I'm -- we're very satisfied that the bill is on the floor and that's where we think it should be right now. As I said, we do support it and we'll go forward from there.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you. So motion to adjourn, second, Legislator Calarco. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 11:39 a.m.)