

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Of the

Suffolk County Legislature

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Public Safety Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 10 am.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson

Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair

Legislator Kara Hahn

Legislator Leslie Kennedy

Legislator William Spencer

Legislator Monica Martinez

Also In Attendance:

Legislator Robert Trotta - Legislator District No. 13

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature

Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature

Jason Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

DJ Russo - Legislative Aide/Office of Clerk of the Legislature

Robert Lipp - Director/Legislative Budget Review Office

John Ortiz - Senior Budget Analyst/Legislative Budget Review Office.

Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory

Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning

Bill Schilling - Aide to Legislator Calarco

Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy

Elizabeth Alexander - Aide to Legislator Spencer

Maria Barbara - Aide to Legislator Cilmi

Brian Sapp - Aide to Legislator Lindsay

Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern

Lisa Santeramo - Assistant Deputy County Executive

Katie Horst - Director-Intergovernmental Relations/CE's Office

Kerry Suoto - County Executive Assistant

Robert Braun - Deputy Bureau Chief/County Attorney's Office

Patrice Dlhopsky - Director/Suffolk County Probation Department

Edward Webber - Suffolk County Police Commissioner/SCPD

Stuart Cameron - Chief of Department/Suffolk County Police Department

Brian Coltellino - Lieutenant/Chief of Department's Office/SCPD

John Sumwalt - Lieutenant-Chief of Department's Office/SCPD

Fred Webber - Lieutenant-Police Technology Bureau/SCPD.

Vincent DeMarco - Suffolk County Sheriff/SC Sheriff's Office

Michael Sharkey - Chief Deputy Sheriff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office

Russ McCormick - Sgt-at-Arms/Suffolk County Detective's Association

Lou Tutone - 1st Vice-President/Suffolk County Police Benevolent Assoc

Jim Roddin - Trustee/Superior Officer's Association

John Becker - President/Deputy Sheriff Police Benevolent Association

Artie Sanchez - Secretary/Deputy Sheriff Police Benevolent Association

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

Thomas Bivona - Treasurer/Deputy Sheriff Police Benevolent Association
Ben Zwirn - Suffolk County Community College/Director of Government Affairs
David Schneider - Suffolk County Community College/Executive Director of Risk Mitigation
Suzanne McBride - AME Representative/Police Emergency Unit
Jodi Pagel - 911 Dispatcher/SCPD
Cheryl Castiglione - Emergency Complaint Operator/SCPD
Jennifer Nunns - Police Service Dispatcher/SCPD
Caitlin Chandler - Emergency Compliant Operator/SCPD
Hector Gavilla Jr. - Dix Hills Resident/Red Light Camera Program
Allison Chaikin - Huntington Station Resident/Red Light Camera Program
Eugene DiGyeronimo - St. James Resident/Red Light Camera Program
Stephen Ruth - Centereach Resident/Red Light Camera Program
Ron Bracco - Melville Resident/Red Light Camera Program
John Ballard - Setauket Resident/Red Light Camera Program
Charles Clampet - Red Light Camera Program
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer.

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

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good morning. If everyone could please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Hahn.

Salutation

Please stand for a moment of silence in honor of those who give of their lives at home and abroad.

Moment of Silence Observed

Thank you. Okay. Good morning. My cards have disappeared, so we'll be getting them back in a sec. I guess -- here we are. Before we start, I'd like to just say a few things.

I know we're having some difficult times here in Suffolk County, and I always say we make choices and we are responsible for our choices. And I hope that having had conversations with many police officers who get up every day, do their job and are professional, and not just the incident that occurred yesterday, but also within the Sheriff's Department -- again, individuals make choices and they have to respond to those choices -- and I just want to make sure that, you know, the general public do not look at our law enforcement officers in a negative way. We respect them, I believe that they all do a good job; 99.9% of our members in law enforcement, in the Sheriff's Department and the Suffolk County PD are professional and do a great job for our residents here in Suffolk County. So I just want them to know that we respect them and that the general public, I do not believe, do not feel in any way negative towards them because of incidents that occur here in Suffolk County by other individuals. So with that, let's make sure that they see our support and that the general public will give their support, because they are professionals and they do a good job.

We have some speakers, we have quite a few speakers. We will be having a presentation. Legislator Hahn had a resolution, I believe it was back in 2013, to look at active shooter -- I'm trying to remember what the name of your resolution was.

LEG. HAHN:

All-Hazards Protocol for Staff.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, all -- thank you, All-Hazard Protocols for Staff in County facilities. And we do have the Commissioner and Chief Cameron who are here and also Sheriff DeMarco to respond, and I believe also the Community College to respond to what they have put in place, and basically on a lot of what's been happening recently. And we want to make sure the Suffolk County residents know that there are plans in place and that there is preparation and they are prepared in the event of any incidents that occur. But we will -- we do have some cards, so we do have to start with those, and the first speaker is Jennifer Nunns.

MS. NUNNS:

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for taking the time to listen to our unit's concerns and for trying to help fix our numerous issues. To some of you this may be repetitive, I did read it yesterday and I did send it to a few of you Legislators, and some of you have responded.

Hello. My name is Jennifer Nunns. I am a PSD in the Communication Center at the Police Headquarters. That being said, I call upon you again to help with the disgraceful results of the salary and appeals presentation. I know some coworkers have reached out to the Legislative board to try to rectify this degrading decision. I started as an ECO in 2009, and I can safely say that I am horrified by this decision. I can, in no way, imagine a 911 operator being classified in a lower grade than a jail baker. No offense to the bakers, but reality is their job is much different than that of an ECO. At no point will a baker have to hear a mother's cry as she finds her child has committed suicide. Never will a baker have to hear a family scream for help as they watch their house on fire, fully engulfed or lost. I cannot imagine a time when a baker would have to respond to hearing someone has been shot and getting help to that person within minutes. Again, I am not trying to degrade the job of the bakers, I'm showing the glaring differences in the responsibilities.

An ECO is not simply a data-entry function. There are numerous other details that go along with that; using a map to determine where someone is, trying to get as much detail as possible, relying on cell phone/cell tower information to gauge a caller's location. Currently we are launching the first phone upgrade with the latest technology to include text-to-911, that is a reality and it's coming next year. It's not some futuristic function. Language barriers are real; Spanish, Mandarin/Chinese, Cantonese, French, Polish, others. Being verbally abused by some callers and having uncooperative callers are commonplace.

The steady flow of negative situations create mental stress on such levels, most people want nothing to do with this position. With paying into benefits, retirements, the threat of lag pay, the six extra X-days a year that we do for free, mandates, and this latest slap in the face of no step or grade increase, the unit will be hard-pressed to keep ECO positions filled. There is no incentive to work overtime voluntarily, so mandates will occur more often. With the feelings of being forgotten, stressed, mandated again, the public is suffering as we cannot be at our best. There is now a rift between the ECOs and the PSDs, that's Public Safety Dispatchers. The morale is at its lowest since I've started.

We've been told we are non-essential personnel. How could that even be possible? We are the first two responders on every call; the first, the ECO who takes the call; the second, the dispatcher who gets the call out on the street to the officers. I am asking that you help investigate the situation with whatever resources are available. I feel the ECO group has been unfairly treated and the decision made basically says that their job is not as important as the rest of the unit. That couldn't be further from the truth; without our ECOs, we are useless.

I'm proud to work for Suffolk County Police Department. It's time we are treated as part of the organization. Thank you for all of your understanding in our ever-changing unit, and I look forward to a resolution to this issue with your help. Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And the next speaker we have is Allison Chaikin; and after that will be Suzanne McBride.

MS. CHAIKIN:

Good morning. This is my third time before you guys, so I'm kind of getting used to this. I'm here about the red light issue, and I'm speaking about the safety of it. I have a daughter who -- oh, I didn't know if you were calling someone. I have a daughter who is 16 in December and she's going to start driving. It's winter, it's icy, and I'm very concerned. The yellow light used to be six seconds and now it seems to be three seconds, and I'm watching people not knowing; *should I gun it? Do I have enough space? Will I get a ticket? Should I slam on my brakes?* Cars are slamming into each other. My issue with the whole thing -- I'm just a Mom, I have no agenda, just two daughters that I would like to keep them alive -- and I'm noticing there's a ton of accidents; T-bones and just everything happening in that intersection where everybody is going, *What do I do?* We would just like more time with the yellow light. The cameras, when we stop and we make a dead stop, some of us are actually counting in our heads or waiting for someone to beep behind us because the camera are non -- they keep flashing and they're catching us like on a side turn, and then we come and we try to fight it.

So my daughter, like I said, turning 16, she's got enough on her plate to start saying, *Do I have distance? What is that flashing?* And again, my third time here, I don't mind coming every week, I really just hope that you will take a community member's opinion when you go and you decide these things. So thank you for letting me come every week and speak.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Next is Suzanne McBride, and after that is Hector Gavilla.

MS. McBRIDE:

Good morning, Madam Chair, Legislators. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I think it's pretty clear there's nothing more important to the citizens of this County than public safety. The 911 operators are an integral part of that public safety.

You all know I've been here time and time again, since 2012, speaking on the staffing issues in my unit. Unfortunately, we're in a worse position than we were still before I came in 2012; in 2012 we had 137 employees, today we have 133. We do have SCINS that are signed awaiting to be filled, I believe it's eight of them; however, we all know that process to fill those SCINS for an ECO Operator will take quite some time and the training will take four to six months.

We have another issue that we're now facing in our unit that I think it's going to make it very difficult to keep those ECO Operators once we get them, and that is, as Jen Nunns said, they were denied a grade increase while their coworkers in PSD I and PSD II positions were given a grade increase. This is just unfathomable that these people, who are the first first responders, could be overlooked like this. The position for all of our employees has changed over the years since we got our last grade increase back in the late 90s. In 2004, New York State implemented strict guidelines and training rules for all PSAP operators, that includes our call takers and our dispatchers. They have to undergo at least 200 hours of training and an additional 21 hours each year to keep their certifications. They have to be certified through FEMA and Homeland Security, they never had that before. These are all things that have changed in their duties and responsibilities and their training. If there is anything that this body can do to help us get those ECO operators the grade increase they deserve, we would be extremely grateful. Thank you, as always, for your time and for your support.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Suzanne.

Applause

Oh, hold on, Suzanne, a question.

LEG. HAHN:

Suzanne, the numbers that you began with, 137 in 2012 and 133 now?

MS. McBRIDE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

So -- and then there's eight SCINS that were --

MS. McBRIDE:

I believe there's eight outstanding SCINS that haven't been filled.

LEG. HAHN:

Eight outstanding. And in 2012 times were desperate, it wasn't enough, the 137 wasn't enough, and we're at 133 now, that's a difference of -- let me do the math, four; so maybe four additional over those tough times. How many expected retirements? I know that we have -- is it still true that we have an aging group of 137 that have been around a lot?

MS. McBRIDE:

We definitely have an aging group, unfortunately all of us are getting older every day. I do know we have -- I believe it's two people that are expected to leave in early 2016. One of our members just terminated service, actually, yesterday, and there are several that I am aware of that are currently undergoing the process of finding other employment, that I'm told they are possibly very close to getting approved for that other employment that will be leaving us as well.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. I think that this is just really important for the folks who are responsible for signing the SCINS, or at least making that happen. That clearly, you know, eight signed SCINS may not be enough, especially with the rigorous several months process it takes to fill them, that we really need to be on top of this. We need to be at a place where mandatory overtime is used for emergency situations, not because we are short-staffed. I think it's absolutely expected on the part of the individuals who work there that when there's a hurricane, when there's an ice storm, when there's, you know, a blizzard, when there's holidays where we expect a large number of calls, you understand about mandated overtime, you understand you need to be there. But when we understaff our department, it is not fair to have mandatory overtime for those purposes; it's outrageous. And I hope the powers at be will recognize this and will sign adequate SCINS to not only get us up to a place where mandated overtime is only necessary in emergency situations, but also will cover the expected retirements and those who just quit and hope to do so. We need to be on top of that. You're an important, integral piece to our public safety, so thank you for all that you do.

MS. McBRIDE:

Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Leslie, did you have a question?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Suzanne, just --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Suzanne, if you could come back up again? Legislator Kennedy had a question for you.

MS. McBRIDE:

I'm sorry.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, that's okay. Hi, Suzanne. You know, we are all aware and respect everything that the ECOs do. We would be in tremendous trouble as a County if we did not have all of you working and assisting the citizenry. My question is on the SCINS; you got 10 SCINS signed; is that correct?

MS. McBRIDE:

Yes, we got 10 Emergency Compliant Operator SCINS; those were divided between the Emergency Complaint Operators and the Spanish Speaking Operators. I don't know the exact breakdown of the two titles, but there were no Dispatcher SCINS or supervisory SCINS or POA SCINS signed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So what are the eight SCINS waiting; are they the supervisory?

MS. McBRIDE:

Those are the ECO SCINS, the ECO and ECO Spanish-Speaking; those SCINS have been signed and are awaiting the process of hiring. From what I understand, canvas letters went out. I believe the candidates are undergoing the background checks at this time, but I'm not a hundred percent certain on where they are in the process. But we need SCINS for PSD I, PSD II and POAs, which is Police Operation Aide.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Then my next question is for an administrative individual; Lisa, someone, can I just ask a question? Hi.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Hi.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The eight SCINS that are waiting on the County Executive's desk for these positions, I got a memo about SCINS, that if they're not done by the end of December they're gone and I would assume have to be resubmitted; is that correct?

MS. SANTERAMO:

I believe so, but I'm not in charge of personnel. I can find out.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You can find out?

MS. SANTERAMO:

Did we confirm; are these SCINS on the desk or are they in process?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I do not know.

LEG. HAHN:

I thought she said they were signed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Leslie, why don't we let the public portion go, because this is -- we're still in public portion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So this is not the right time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right.

MS. SANTERAMO:

I'll get an answer.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And maybe you can take some time to --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Look it up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- find out what you need to find out for us.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Next speaker is Hector Gavilla.

MR. GAVILLA:

If it's okay, Stephen wants to switch places with me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You're letting him go before you? Does he have a card?

MR. GAVILLA:

Yes.

MR. RUTH:

If it's all right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Stephen Ruth.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

MR. RUTH:

Thank you very much. Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, God, for letting me speak before you today and thank God for everyone being able to make it today.

One thing I'd like to talk about was the physics behind the yellow change interval on the red light camera. The yellow change interval right now, as it stands, we have 45 miles per hour is 66 feet per second. So basically at a deceleration of 10 feet per second per second, we need 6.7 seconds of braking time at 45 miles per hour without a reaction time.

(*Legislator Spencer entered the meeting at 10:29 A.M. *)

The reaction time for a commercial vehicle is 2.2 seconds. So if we add 6.6 seconds plus the 2.2 seconds for commercial vehicles reaction time, we need well over double what we have now as far as yellow light interval. Okay? And that's not on the turning arrows which you need to slow down to make. This is just if you're going to remain constant speed, you need 6.6 plus the commercial reaction time of 2.2 seconds, and that's at 45 miles per hour. Okay, guys? Please take that into consideration.

Also, in regards to the Suffolk County Police Department and our respect for them, I respect them dearly because they were the ones that called me up and told me about this. And when I called Lee Zeldin's office, Lee Zeldin's office they told me that the Police Department had been calling them regarding the short yellow lights. So believe me, the Police Department is very concerned with the short yellow lights because the intersections all got many more accidents after the lights were shortened. Nobody can make these short yellow lights. With the bad weather coming, everyone's going to be slamming into each other, because not only do you have to worry about the light in front of you, but also the amount of cars between you and the light. So if they're stopping and your vehicle is much bigger and you can't stop, you're hitting them. That's another thing.

In regards to the \$30 surcharge, you can't charge an extra 30 bucks, it's a felony under Title 7, Article 24, Section 1111-B5, Paragraph E, *"The liability of the owner shall not exceed \$50 for each violation."* That's overstepping your enabling statutes; it's a felony, you can't do it. Okay? You can't charge an extra \$30. It's in the New York State law that the maximum you can charge is \$50, and it says *for each violation*. You're overstepping your enabling statutes.

Commercial vehicles needing a 2.2 second reaction time and only giving a one second reaction time or perception time is the same as a bridge engineer constructing a bridge for your average size car so that it fails when a bus goes over that bridge. It's not fair to the public, people are getting hurt. You guys have to take this into consideration. This is just regular high school physics, that's all it is, regular high school physics. I have it right here; if anybody wants to take the time to learn it, you might save a life. Does anybody have any interest in saving a life?

LEG. SPENCER:

Of course we do.

MR. RUTH:

Okay. Will you guys please read this over and discuss it with me? Will anybody agree to read this over and discuss this?

LEG. HAHN:

Submit it to the Clerk.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

This is a testimony, you need to give the information. We are not here to answer questions.

MR. RUTH:

I would like to give it to you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, give it to the Clerk. Just give it to the stenographer. Okay? Thank you.

MR. RUTH:

You're welcome. Like I said, we totally respect the police because the police are the ones that called me and told me about this. They were the ones that have been calling Lee ZeldIn's Office telling Lee ZeldIn's office about it. The police want this rectified as well, that's why when my ex-wife got into a car accident the other day, they told her that they totally support my efforts. Okay?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

MR. RUTH:

You're welcome.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Gavilla?

MR. GAVILLA JR:

Okay, some information I would like to pass around, if that's okay. Thank you. Hello. My name's Hector Gavilla and I oppose the red light cameras, as you all know. Now, I hope you appreciate when I come here each week that I only talk about facts, okay. And one of the things, for example, I saw the interview with Kara Hahn on News 12 where she was talking about how people are not paying their tickets. Part of the problem is that with the red light tickets and other tickets is that people are crossing the white line unintentionally, they're being trapped into it. So what I'm passing around is a better solution than the current system that we have.

See, I buy a video camera to record information, like record the birth of my children, record soccer games and different things like that, but a video camera does not prevent accidents. What you need to demand or require of the vendor is to install something known as a collision avoidance system, similar to what airplanes have. When you travel on an airplane, they have a cushion avoided system to make sure that airplanes don't collide against each other. This technology exists. And you know how I know it exists, there's that potential? Because when we had the hearing where the traffic engineer testified, he actually said that Xerox upgraded the system so that it could detect if a car is about to go into the intersection; not for safety, but to make sure it triggers the camera so that it could give you a ticket. So my reaction at first was like, *Oh, my God*. Why can't we use that same technology to make sure that all the lights stay red, so that if a car is approaching the intersection and it's going to go in and slam into the intersection, let's keep all the lights red so that we keep everyone safe until that red light runner goes through. And you know what? If he goes through that red light, he deserves the ticket, but we also saved the lives of anybody else who could have potentially went into that intersection. It makes common sense. And it's not expensive because the software is already in there, all they have to do is just change the microprocessor, change the programming in there just a little bit, tweak it and they can make this happen to make it safe for everybody as well. So that's what I wrote in that first paragraph to give you an idea of what we can do together, and it will work very, very well.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

In addition to that, what I would like to see is a countdown timer, just like on the wall it says I only have 33 seconds to speak. Why not have a red light, yellow light and a green light up there? Why? Because I need to know that now I have only 25 seconds to speak. So we need to put a countdown timer in there in place of the yellow lights so that we know exactly when we need to stop, and that would be a great idea. Also, when you're reviewing the video, you know exactly if someone crossed over, there's no question about it, we don't have to go to the red light court and say, *Hey, I made it, it was only a fraction of a second.*

The other point I want to make is also let's change the rules slightly and give everybody a one second delay. Because with the inclusion of a countdown timer, if we could see in the video that it was one second, then they deserve it. If you see in the video it says one second, then clearly they violated the rules. And another rule I'd like to implement is no right-on-red, because the no right-on-red signs where the red light cameras are, if you really believe that this is a dangerous intersection, why are we allowing people to make lights on red?

And then the last thing I'd like to include is that I would like to, in the next election, put on the ballot to allow the residents of Suffolk to vote whether or not they want to keep the red light cameras. Yesterday we went around to a public place and within two years I got 50 e-mails and names of people who volunteered, 50, over 50 people --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Gavilla, your time is up.

MR. GAVILLA JR:

Okay, I'm sorry, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

MR. GAVILLA JR:

-- who want to get rid of the cameras. So I know that none of you have asked your constituents, but we're doing it for you. So anyway, have a wonderful day. Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No questions. Thank you.

MR. GAVILLA JR:

Thank you. Bye-bye.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I am going to have to dispense with the public portion at this time. Chief Cameron has an issue he has to attend to, so I will dispense with the public portion so he can come up. We will resume the public portion after we get his presentation, and we also have Commissioner Webber.

And Commissioner Webber, it's good to see you. This is our last Public Safety of the year meeting and we appreciate having you here. And I know all of my colleagues, we wish you a lot of luck. We appreciate the work that you've done. It's been a difficult few years because of our budgets, you have done a phenomenal job. We do say, we understand your need and your desire to retire. I know we've had many conversations about family and grandkids and I know that what you've been doing the past four years has pretty much taken a lot of time away from your family. So I certainly

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

understand that desire to want to spend more time with your grandchildren, and I know you're going to want to go see that granddaughter do more Irish dancing (*laughter*). So, but anyway, with that -- and again, Chief Cameron, congratulations. Suffolk County is in very good hands with you as our Chief.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So we do have a resolution that Legislator Hahn introduced some time ago, establishing a program to develop all-hazard protocols for staff in County facilities. So if you would like to proceed.

Also, before we go, maybe after you leave, give us some updates on the issue with the ECOs as far as the SCINS and whatnot. We would appreciate any information you can provide us. But with that, I know that something's come up that you need to leave soon, so if you would like to go ahead and start.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you. I appreciate you accommodating my schedule and I apologize to the people that had cards that are going to have to wait for me, but it was unavoidable. We have a lot, obviously a lot going on in the Police Department, I have to get to address something. You want to talk about the ECOs first or go right into the --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, we can get that at another time from you.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But I prefer that we take care of this issue. Obviously, in light of the incidents that have been occurring in San Bernardino at the DSS building. It is a concern, and a couple of my colleagues have reached out to say, you know, what's Suffolk County doing? We have a lot of public buildings here in Suffolk County and we want to make sure that the public's aware that, you know, we're not ignoring what's going on. And I think sometimes people are not aware that, you know, they may not openly know what's going on, but I think it's good to let them know that you have something in place and that you are -- you do have procedures, protocol and you know how to respond to these issues. So, and I know that you're definitely an expert on this.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Well, in general, I would just like to tell you that the Suffolk County Police Department has been involved in the Homeland Security game prior to 9/11. After 9/11 we were able to create a far more robust program, because some of the Homeland Security grants came on-line and it allowed us to purchase equipment that we would not have otherwise been able to obtain;; some of it is fairly prohibitively expensive. But I believe, and I know for a fact, that many of our Homeland Security programs have been nationally recognized as being outstanding in best practices. And I've seen an ebb and flow over this and I think it's entirely appropriate for the Legislative body to touch base with us occasionally, with events like San Bernardino happening, just to see are we prepared. And I can assure you that our preparedness is consistent and ongoing and it's a process that will evolve and continue. I could provide you a much more in-depth briefing, if you would like, at some future time. I would recommend that it be done in executive session, because some of what I would like to discuss with you is really for official use only information.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

With respect to the all-hazard plans for the County buildings, as Legislator Hahn knows, I was intricately involved in that when I was Assistant Chief of Patrol. And she expressed concerns, and I forget what the triggering event was, but it was another widely publicized, active shooter event; it may have been Sandy Hook, I don't recall what it was.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

CHIEF CAMERON:

She was primarily concerned about the active shooter protection of the County employees and I suggested at that time that that's certainly one hazard that effects County employees, but there's a myriad of hazards. And that may not be -- despite the fact that it's widely publicized, that may not be the most frequent threat to effect County employees, so I suggested that we go the all-hazard route, which is what we did.

We were tasked, the Police Department was tasked with coming up with all-hazard plans for three County buildings: The H. Lee Dennison Building; rest assured, this building, so you can all breathe a sigh of relief; and the DSS building in Deer Park. I personally wrote the plan for the H. Lee Dennison Building because it was really the most challenging building because it's a multi-floor building with the greatest number of employees in it, to basically create a template for the building. Then staff within the Chief of Patrol's office created the plan for the DSS building and this building, utilizing that template. And I think it's important that there be a County template so all the terminology is the same to facilitate interdepartmental transfers and to facilitate our ability to do training.

Additionally, within that bill was the requirement that we develop training for County employees, and what I suggested is that we emulate the Police Department's video training system which we've had for years which has evolved from VHS tapes to computer-based, on-line training with testing. We worked with County IT and we've developed that and that is ready to go. I would suggest that the first video that be posted on that is a video about how to respond to an active shooter event, and that is ready to go with a video that was produced by another agency that I believe is of very high quality that would provide the instruction necessary for the County employees to know what to do should they be faced with an active shooter event. And then I would advocate that we add some test, multiple choice test questions after that just to ensure that people didn't click on the video and walk away, that they actually absorbed the material and our preparedness is up to par. That will probably be followed up, potentially, by some in-person training where people would have the ability to ask questions about the content, and then potentially some actual drills and exercises that we could do to really beef up the protection for the County employees.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Question?

LEG. HAHN:

Sure. So we're still waiting for this happen. The Police Department has completed it's portion and it just stopped.

CHIEF CAMERON:

The plans for the buildings are done. The Sheriff's Department was tasked with creating a plan for the Riverhead Center. We shared our template with them, again, to provide that universal aspect to everything, that the plans were very similar, the terminology would be the same. The video system is ready to go, so it's just a matter of launching it and rolling out the training.

LEG. HAHN:

Right. And so the training hasn't happened yet. We need to make sure that that happens.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, of course.

LEG. HAHN:

Do we have a timeline for that?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It will probably be almost immediately. I think they're going to just put out an all-employee memo to advise people on how to access the training and then it will be in progress immediately.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Any other questions? No. When you say there's a memo that's going to go out; who – I believe the Police Department's taking the lead role? So who's sending out this memo?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I believe that will come out from the County Executive's office. We've discussed it and they're working on that, I believe.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You know, one of the things, you know, growing up where I grew up, I was -- over the summer time I had family over from Ireland and we went to the Statue, and someone left a bag sitting. And of course knowing where I come from, when you see an unattended bag, you get away from it and you report. And it's always, you know, you hear the expression in the City, if you see something say something. And I was shocked when we walked away and a security guard got -- it was brought to his attention and he went over with a stick and picked up the bag. And I thought, *Oh, my God.* And my sister, my brother-in-law and I were looking and saying that could have been a bomb and it could have went off, could have went off. And so I don't know, I just feel like sometimes people here are just not as aware that that was a dangerous thing to do. And they didn't -- they didn't even attempt to make people move while he was picking it up, and he's walking through the crowd.

So, you know, I think that sometimes there's just not -- people are not paying attention and being as cautious as they should be. And I'm just wondering, you know, when you look at our buildings, you know, locations of garbage cans. If you go to a train station in London, you will never -- or anywhere, you'll never find a garbage can anywhere. The only place the garbage can will be is next to a vendor. And I know -- I don't want to scare people, but it's a reality that we're living in these days. And just wondering, are we paying attention to those kinds of things? Is that something that we're going to do just to make sure that everyone's safe?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I would say the Police Department is definitely paying attention to that. And one of the things we've done -- and again, this could be part of a comprehensive briefing -- is reaching out to having a public/private partnership. We've done tons of training for private entities, schools, colleges, movie theatres, the airport; I mean, the list is endless; and I don't have it in front of me, but we have done a lot of that. And as Chief of Department, I do intend to increase that type of coordination between public/private. I think there's a lot of value to that. I think the harder that we can make the soft targets and the more aware we can make people, the better prepared Suffolk County will be, but we

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

have to find a balance between maintaining the American way of life and not overreacting to these events, because we don't want to change things.

And I had the opportunity, Commissioner Webber was gracious enough to allow me to go in January of 2013 on the Anti-Defamation League trip, Senior Law Enforcement trip to Israel, and no one is in greater threat than Israel. They're surrounded by threats from a bunch of different groups and they go about their business every day. They're aware of the threat, but you would never know it from interacting with them and I think that's really kind of the model that we may need to follow. You don't want to make people paranoid, but they do need to be aware.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, and I agree, because obviously that's something that I knew. We lived our life every day. It wasn't always in your head that something might happen today, but if an incident occurred, we knew. And I think maybe doing some kind of public announcements, doing advertising, kind of the same as the City does to try and do some public service announcements on what you should do if there's an unattended bag, you know, you don't pick it up and you get away from it and you report it, you know. Simple things, and it's very simple. Like I said, it didn't change our way of life. Everybody went to work, you went to school, you did what you had to do every day, but you were more aware because -- you know, I got caught up in an explosion, you know, when I was coming home from work one day. It happens, and you -- but you know how to handle those types of situations.

So I just feel like people here, their guard is too much down when it comes to some issues. Maybe it hasn't left me, it hasn't left my mind, you know, what we lived with. But I do feel people do need to have some more of a guard, especially unattended packages and things like that. So did I hear Kara has a question?

LEG. HAHN:

Sorry, I had one more question. While we did list those three facilities to be hazard protocols established within 120 days, the intent certainly was to have all buildings have some sort of protocol established. You know, we agreed not to force it to happen immediately, to do those three first as a way of, you know, getting into this, seeing what it takes. What will it take to make sure -- I mean, we have lots of buildings, I'm not even quite sure of the full number. What will it take to just make sure that we have protocols in place? Some of them may be able to be replicated, you know, at similar type of buildings, but what will it take to make sure all of our buildings are covered?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Well, there are a lot of County buildings and they vary greatly. Some buildings may only have a few employees, which does not mean they should not have an emergency plan of some sort, but their emergency plan would look very different than an emergency plan for the H. Lee Dennison Building. I had discussed that because I did recall that when we discussed the bill back in 2013 with the County Executive's Office and we will look to move a path forward. I would recommend that we do the buildings that have the larger populations in them first, because it just makes sense to me that there's more people in there and that may be more of a target for someone that was looking to do something. I would also advocate that as we drill the plans for the buildings that exist, we incorporate lessons learned into new plans.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. No more questions? Okay. I do know that you need to get out of here, but I appreciate you coming in. Commissioner, do you have anything you'd like to add?

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

We're doing our best and we're well prepared. We have a world-renowned individual in charge of the Homeland Security. He was about to write a book, and now we're taking too much of his time up for him to do it, but he is probably one of the most trained and educated in that field in the country.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, he is. And again, like I said, we are extremely lucky to have you. And again, Commissioner Webber, we wish you a lot of luck. I believe we might be seeing you on Tuesday, correct?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So with that, there are no more questions. And we will look forward, I think after the new year we'll try and set up those meetings for Legislators so that they can be updated and briefed on what you're doing. But I do believe that the public should be aware that you are prepared as best as you can. You know, there are incidents that occur, nobody knows when it's going to happen, but you are prepared to handle those types of situations.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you. Again, I thank you for the time accomodation and I wish everybody a happy holidays.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Same to you. Thank you.

With that, Commissioner, do you have anything else you'd like to add?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, I'm signing up for the alarm law. You have some questions on that?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The --

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The alarm law?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, I don't think so.

MS. HORST:

It's 1928 that's on your agenda today.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Can you stick around? Because I was going to bring up Sheriff DeMarco and try and stay on topic and we have to get back to public portion.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, I'll make myself available. Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That would be great. Thank you. I kind of want to stay on topic. Sheriff DeMarco, if you'd like to come up. I know you've been tasked with the County Center out in Riverhead.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

Yes. Good morning. And I, too, want to congratulate Chief Cameron on his appointment to Chief of Department. He's a very respected man and a true professional. And I also want to congratulate Chief Webber -- Commissioner Webber on his retirement and wish him well.

As far as the County Center goes, we have been tasked with a plan for the County Center. We have been working with the Police Department, specifically Chief Cameron's office, as he said, on templates and common language. But over the years we've had a County Center patrol, we actually have a small, little office in there where, in between assignments, Deputy Sheriffs get assigned, and we also do walk-thru patrols consistently through the business day. As you know, the Clerk's office -- the Legislature, the Clerk's Office and the, I guess, Treasurer/Comptroller have employees there, we have been in contact with them. And on the County Intranet site, there actually is a training video for active shooter for County employees, it's called *Run, Hide, Fight*, it's pretty well done. And we have encouraged the Clerk's -- Nicole DeLuca in the Clerk's Office and Doug Sutherland from, I guess -- is it still the Treasurer's Office? I don't even know.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Not for long.

SHERIFF DEMARCO:

You know, to make sure that their employees are aware of it and they should be encouraging them to take a look at that video. But other than that, we have been working closely with Chief Cameron's Office on enhancing our plan.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I know we have Mr. Zwirn here and his Executive Director of Risk Mitigation. I believe there is some kind of coordination going on with yourself, with the Riverhead campus? Maybe if you want to stay. And maybe Mr. Zwirn, would you guys like to come up? Mr. Schneider, David Schneider, you are Executive Director for Risk Mitigation?

MR. SCHNEIDER:

Correct.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I know we have the Riverhead campus, I know we have our other campuses in the Police District.

MR. ZWIRN:

Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Ben.

MR. ZWIRN:

Good morning still. Ben Zwirn from Suffolk County Community College. I'm here with David Schneider who is the Executive Director of Risk Mitigation for the college. We have had some conversations really today. One of the things that the college is doing, they have a plan in place, I'll go into it a little bit, I don't want to go into too much detail for obvious reasons. But one of the things that we've, talked about at the college is perhaps to get -- because there are so many students on these campuses during the day, I mean, there's sometimes 10,000 students at one location, either have a Deputy Sheriff's car assigned or a Suffolk County PD sector car assigned to the college, so that in the event that there's an active shooting incident we have somebody there right away. The quick response is critical. And often the case, you know, police officers and Deputy Sheriffs are doing other tasks at the time when they get a 911 call to show up at one of the

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

campuses and it just takes travel time as quickly as they can to get there. So that's a possibility that we may be requesting. Even though we know that personnel is down, you know, in law enforcement across the County, it might be something that we would ask for.

John Gallagher is a former Police Commissioner, he's going to head up a task force at the college to come up with additional programs and plans; the President has asked for him to do that and he has agreed.

We are mostly dependent on Police Departments to respond. We had a false alarm last year. It came across on a social website where there may have been -- somebody brought a gun onto campus and was heading towards the library and the Suffolk County Police Department responded quickly. We had people go into lockdown mode, so it became a drill. We are increasing our capacity to notify students through text messaging, through the video screens that we have in all the campuses, to let people know, to get instructions in the event that there is a problem on campus, that they can lock themselves down.

There is a video that has been prepared and is shown to all new students and to faculty at the beginning of the year, and usually the faculty, in the first class of the year, will show that to the student body so they know what to do in the event they're given instructions to move forward.

We have a -- the Police Departments reply, our Suffolk County PD, the Sheriff's Office, the State Police, which has a location nearby, the Brentwood campus, so they can be called on. And even though the Police Academy is on our Brentwood campus, they're not -- they don't respond. We have to get the sector cars to respond, and that's our main concern. We have security officers on campus, about three dozen of them spread out across the three different main campuses and in Sayville, and in the culinary school in Riverhead, but they are not armed.

There is some talk that there is State legislation that would allow us to hire peace officers so the college would have -- it's like Stony Brook University has its own Police Department. We think maybe we could avoid that by having, you know, a sector car assigned to the different campuses. You know, we would like to have the people that are trained right now handle the situation. But we have a very detailed plan that has been prepared with David's office and we will make that available to you to peruse at your leisure and we'll answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You mentioned you were doing videos at the beginning of the year with the new students. I know in our school districts, throughout the year they have drills. Do you have drills at this time, or would you consider planning a drill? Because to see a video at the beginning of the year, you may not necessarily pay attention.

MR. SCHNEIDER:

Yeah, I'd be happy to answer that question. We do conduct drills on a regular basis, both announced drills and random drills, to get people to sort of stress test the system. We conduct drills in each building, fire drills on a regular basis, as dictated by the fire codes. We also conduct evacuation drills, both at the campus level, at the building level and at the systemic institutional level. I can tell you that we did a recent drill where we evacuated our child care centers, which we consider one of our more vulnerable targets, and that drill went extraordinarily well in that our public safety department was able to respond in less than -- I think it was less than two minutes. We were able to have a car at the scene, we were able to have the children and their supervisors out of that facility and into an alternative, safe location without any delay or complication.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

In addition to that, we do regular shelter-in-place or secure-in-place drills, and as time goes on we're going to be -- we'd like to coordinate a little bit more closely with the Police Department, with FRES, Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services, to make those drills slightly more realistic and to be able to bring our partners or stakeholders from the security services and from the emergency services to the college so they can understand the dynamics, the geography and some of the factors that make our institution slightly unique from another County facility.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yeah, the protocols have changed, the FBI protocols. It used to be that they would wait at the scene before going in, now the protocol is to go in right away. The first officers on the scene go after the shooter and try to get them down before they can do more damage. That has changed, and we are -- we've conformed to that as well.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Any questions? None? Wow, everyone's quiet today. So with that, I would like to say thank you. And again, for yourselves, when we reach out to Chief Cameron, maybe we could do a coordinated effort to meet with the Legislators and get that briefing so we can see County-wide what exactly is going on. And of course our community colleges, we have plenty of campuses that we want to be sure that our students are safe.

So with that, there are no more questions. Have a great day and enjoy your holiday, if we don't see you beforehand.

Applause

Okay, now we'll go back to public portion. The first speaker again is Caitlin Chandler.

MS. CHANDLER:

Good morning, Legislators. As a lot of my coworkers have spoken, the recent salary and appeals decision to not give the Emergency Complaint Operators a grade increase has brought us all into a little state of outrage because we would rather have had none of us get it than only half of us get it.

It was mentioned before the Government Ops Committee yesterday that another idea besides another salary and appeals decision would be to basically change the way that we're looked at, to change the fact that we're listed as *clerical* instead of *emergency personnel* in our job titles. So I know we've invited you a number of times to come to the 911 center and sit with us and speak with us; from schedule conflicts, most people can't come. So with your permission, I brought a 911 call to you, if you wouldn't mind listening.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure, go ahead.

MS. CHANDLER:

In January of 2010, Frank Hensley called the Hancock County Indiana 911 Center because he was having a heart attack. Since he couldn't speak, his five-year old daughter Savannah Hensley took the call for him.

(*Begins to play audio of 911 call*)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Turn it off a minute. On the mic, please.

MR. BRAUN:

Yes, good morning, Legislators. I don't believe that 911 calls can be played in public, they're not even disclosed in the context of litigation. And although I'm sure the content is illustrative of the point that the speaker would like to make, it's not appropriate to play it for the Legislature in this forum.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Let me ask you; this was a call from Indiana, not Suffolk County, so how did --

MR. BRAUN:

Is that the case? Is it an Indiana call?

MS. CHANDLER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes.

MR. BRAUN:

I'm sorry, I missed that part.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, that's why I -- we saw you rise up.

MR. BRAUN:

No, no, all I heard was that we were going to hear a 911 call, I didn't realize it was not ours.

MS. CHANDLER:

No, it is not ours.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. BRAUN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So we're good to go then. Go ahead, I'm sorry, continue.

*(*Continued Playing Audio of 911 Call*)*

MS. CHANDLER:

The call actually goes on for over six minutes, and that's something we handle every day. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, thank you. We appreciate it. I think a wonderful little girl that she was able to handle that.

MS. CHANDLER:

She did a great job.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

She did. So I don't believe there are any questions, but do know, I have been to your center. And I worked 911 myself at one time, so I understand the issue. You know, I've already spoken to our Counsel, as has Legislator Hahn and Kennedy, to see what we can do to resolve this. I don't know that we can at this point in time, but we are looking into it to see how can we do this. Certainly, the County Executive's Office is here, maybe there needs to be a follow-up with the County Executive's Office to see. I understand that the dispatchers at the Sheriff's Department got that salary change, and basically do the same job. So I don't understand how one group gets it and the other one doesn't.

MS. CHANDLER:

Either do we.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That will be a follow up conversation that we will have for you guys. Okay?

MS. CHANDLER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

Applause

And the next speaker, I hope I'm correct, Eugene DeGeronimo.

MR. DEGERONIMO:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You have very interesting handwriting. Thank you.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

Good morning, all, and thank you for your time and happy holiday. The reason why I'm here today is in regards to Traffic and Parking Agency, which in my day was Motor Vehicle. There's a situation that's going on with the residents in Suffolk County, that they're sending fines in and they're not being notified that the agency is not receiving the fines. Then what the agency does is two years later they place a judgment against you without notifying you and not knowing that your -- they never received the fine that you sent.

It happened to me just recently, and the only reason why I found out that there was a judgment is my wife was refinancing a mortgage and it showed up on the data report. The ticket was originally \$400, which I had the money, a bank check which I showed them, and now the fine is -- the judgment was originally 1300, now it's 1600 three months later, and they're stating that's interest.

The most important thing here is when I was over at Traffic, it's happening to people there all day long, because I was talking to them. And also, if we didn't find out now and we waited until we sold the house and retired ten years from now, that fine could be 20 or \$30,000. I think it's, you know, criminal and extortion that the agency isn't notifying you that they're not receiving your payments. Also, I understand they're not suspending your license because if they suspended your license they would have to notify you. So with them not notifying you, the fees go up, the fine goes up, and then they place judgments against you. And I think it's, you know, criminal what's going on. And, I mean, I have an 800 credit score and here the agency is playing with, you know, my credit, my

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

livelihood and my family.

The other thing is when you go over there in Hauppauge, they have more security guards there than you have in the airport, and the security guards there are abusive and bullying people constantly. And I think that we really need your help. You've made Suffolk County, all of you, a much better place to live, and we need to protect everyone that lives here against this going on. I thank you for your time and help and I hope you'll look into it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You said your fine was how much?

MR. DIGERONIMO:

My fine -- I had a speeding ticket and the fine was pleaded down to a parking violation.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

I was fined \$400 and I sent them a check in May of 2013.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. But you have a canceled check that --

MR. DIGERONIMO:

I had a canceled check, but what also happened, believe it or not, they deposited it in Nassau County. So they're stating that they never even got the check, but even though I never knew they didn't get the check, and it was a bank check, an official bank check.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But you didn't pay the judgment because you were able to show that you paid it, correct?

MR. DIGERONIMO:

They're not doing anything about it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Have you paid the judgment, yes or no?

MR. DIGERONIMO:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

No, I refuse to pay the judgment.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

You know, from 2013 to now, they want \$1,600.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. What I'm going to do is, I have your card with your information, I believe your Legislator would be either Legislator Kennedy or Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm going to give them --

LEG. TROTТА:

I actually saw the -- I'm working on it. I saw the check.

MR. NOLAN:

Okay.

LEG. TROTТА:

It's a cancelled -- the check is made out to the Suffolk County Traffic Violations Bureau, somehow it was deposited in Nassau County's account. It's bizarre. I'm working it out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So you're aware of it.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we will ask -- obviously the Legislator will work on that. You paid the check, you've done what you're supposed to do, I do not believe you should have to pay that judgment and I would assume that that's what your Legislator is working on.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

I appreciate you helping me, but this is going on throughout the whole County.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, thank --

MR. DIGERONIMO:

And I think you should look into it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I appreciate you bringing that to our attention because I think that is another issue that we will bring to our Director in the Traffic Court to address that issue.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

Good. Thank you for your time and understanding, everyone.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, thank you.

MR. DIGERONIMO:

Have a great day.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, next speaker is John Ballard.

MR. BALLARD:

Good morning. I am here speaking about the red light cameras. I ran into Steve yesterday outside of the court across the street dealing with an unrelated speeding ticket, and a couple of months ago some friends of mine and I put together a benefit concert, for lack of a better word, to support his cause and I decided that that wasn't enough, so here we are.

The red light cameras were put up at "dangerous" -- *"considered dangerous and high traffic intersections to promote safety and to decrease the number of red light runnings and accidents inside of the intersections."* You've done that; not you, they, the cameras, they've done that. That's fantastic. What they've also done is nearly tripled the number of rear-ends, accidents and pre-light collisions in Suffolk County, which is not okay. You have people slamming on their brakes to avoid getting a ticket, which is not safety, it's not a safety net, so to say, as it is a blanket of fear. People are stopping because they don't want to pay money. Winter is coming, bad traffic conditions are coming, people can't drive as it is, and now we have people who have to stop at even shorter yellow lights that aren't registered to respond at the New York State minimum required six seconds. I was on my way here this morning and I saw somebody who almost hit somebody else because the light stopped at -- changed from yellow to red in two-and-a-half seconds; one, two, red light. That's not okay. That's not safe, that's not proper, that is dangerous and it's illegal.

The red light cameras do not do the job that they're supposed to do for the right reasons. The original lights that were set up in, I believe, 35 separate intersections have moved, not because those intersections are now safe, they haven't gotten better, they just stopped bringing in the revenue that the contracts in the red light -- sorry, the contracts for the red light cameras stated are not being met, which is also illegal. The numbers of revenue are not being met and, therefore, the cameras are being moved to other *"high occupancy intersections"* to bring in more money. Not to make sure people are safer, not to make sure people don't go through red lights for the right reasons, but for revenue; that's not okay. And I'm not a concerned parent of two kids, I'm not somebody who can tell you the high school physics behind the red light and yellow light intervals, I am a 22-year old kid from Setauket who just had something to say about this. Thank you for your time and listening and I hope you have a happy holiday.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

Applause

Next speaker is Ron Bracco.

MR. BRACCO:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Ron Bracco and I'm from Melville. The reason I'm here this morning is to speak about some of my concerns with the red light cameras.

First of all, I feel that they are totally for money and not about safety, that they're just revenue generating machines. Studies have actually shown that these cameras increase accidents rather than decrease them, because of the dilemma zone. During that time period when you're in the dilemma zone, you need to make a quick split second decision whether or not to go through the orange/yellow light, or to slam on your brakes and stop.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

I find that just approaching these areas where the cameras are creates a lot of stress unnecessarily. You know, so it's like a preparation-type thing and the stress. Then you go through and you see all these flashing lights behind you and then you have stress for another week or two wondering if you actually got a red light ticket. That's happened to me many times where I've come real close, or there was a truck in front of me that slowed down and I was behind the truck and then I see a light turn red and then I have to decide, do I want to go back up or do I want to go through this light? Like you kind of like don't even know what to do. I've made the decision to go through the light; fortunately I haven't gotten any tickets yet, but I did have the stress of every day looking at the mail to see if I got one. And any time I saw anything from the County, you know, of course I'd freak out thinking, *Oh, they got me*. So, you know, you have all the stress, I don't see why we have to add that to the driving which is already stressful.

I also feel that it's an invasion of privacy. There's a date, there's a time, there's a location stamped on this. One of my biggest pet peeves with the cameras is that they're an eye sore. I think it looks hideous to drive around and see all these cameras aimed at citizens. We're not in North Korea, we're not in East Germany, I don't see why we have to look like a communist nation. Why can't we look like the country that our Founding Fathers had in mind and not have these cameras everywhere.

I also feel that these cameras are opening up a Pandora's box. They actually are leading the way for an Orwellian nightmare. For example, we have the red light cameras now. Once we start spending this money; like that always happens, you always spend your budget -- and we need more money, then we'll add speed cameras, which already some states already have. Then you have speed cameras, then you might as well add stop sign cameras. That's not enough, we still need more money, so why don't we have drones hover around and look for people doing, you know, minor infractions? Well, that's not working good enough, so why don't we just put black boxes in every car and then we'll monitor everything the driver does and we'll ticket them, we'll give them a bill every month for every little infraction, everything they do wrong. This is opening up a Pandora's box for a dramatic increase in the Orwellian state.

*(*Beeper Sounded*)*

Also, there's no police officer discretion with these cameras. A woman could be on the way to the hospital in labor and because a police officer would be able to say, *Oh, you're in labor? Let's go, hurry up, get to the hospital*, or you could have a child having an allergic reaction and you're rushing the child and you might have to make a split decision to go through a yellow light, and that's not available with these red light cameras. Many states have already banned the cameras, Mississippi has said that they're unconstitutional. It's time for Suffolk County to take down the red light cameras. Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, sir. Okay, there are no more cards. Is there anyone else in the room who would like to speak? Do we have anyone else in the room who would like to speak? Okay, Mr. Clampet.

MR. CLAMPET:

How did you know? When you all vote -- Kara, Kate, Robert, Monica, Bill, Leslie and Robert -- when you all go out and vote, don't you send out fliers and say *Vote for me because I do this, I do that?* Why can't all 18 County Legislators put on those little cards and say, *Look, we want to do red light cameras. Look, we want to do speed light cameras. Look, this is what we want. What's your feedback?* You can send out all those money for those cards, they're inundated, my post office box gets jammed. I'm like, Oh, my God. And then the robo-calls; oh, my God. Well, then, you can do

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

robo-calls; Do you want the red light camera? People say yes or no. Take your vote that way. Why is everybody on the County Legislator's seat afraid of the PBA? We talk about bullying; the PBA is bullying the County Legislators. And tell me they're not doing it. Tell me they're not doing it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Mr. Clampet. No, I am not -- I am not being bullied.

MR. CLAMPET:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I don't appreciate that comment.

MR. CLAMPET:

It's not Policemen Benevolent Association, it's called policemen bully association, okay? It has to stop. And I know that I'm going to hear repercussions from this, I know this is going to follow me till the day I die, because I know who's sitting in the back. This is wrong. The FBI, I'll be going to Pinelawn Road to talk to them and then also go to 26 Federal Plaza. People are going down. You want to play games with the people? You're playing with the wrong people. The sleeping giants are waking up. Have a good day.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

With that, there are still no more cards. Would anyone else like to speak? No? Okay, we will go to the agenda.

We have one bill that I believe will tabled. And the next one, Commissioner, is I believe the one that you're here for.

Tabled Resolutions

So Tabled Resolutions, ***1815-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law establishing a Domestic Violence Fatality Analysis Commission (Hahn)***. Legislator Hahn?

LEG. HAHN:

It has to be tabled, so I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, we're going to take this back up and another one in the Spring, working with County Exec's office. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So there's a motion to table for public hearing. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

1928-15 - Adopting Local Law No. 42-2015, A Local Law adopting a requirement for the registration of alarm systems (County Executive). I believe this is why you're here, Commissioner? Okay. So before we do anything --

LEG. HAHN:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There was a motion by Legislator --

LEG. HAHN:

For purposes of discussion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Motion by Legislator Hahn. Do I have a second?

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Calarco. So there is a motion to approve. Okay, Commissioner, if you can kind of give us some information on what this is about?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, good morning. And thank you for the kind remarks earlier. I just want to give a brief overview of the presentation for the alarm laws that we presented, it's currently in the budget, and then after you can ask any -- respond to any questions that you may have as a body.

We continue to review our operations for effectiveness and efficiency, and one of the things we do is review our calls for service. In 2014, over 90,000 false alarms were received -- actually, 97,679, which represents 17% of our calls for service, or one out of six calls. So what we have to do is attack the problem. We realize it's a problem, they are false alarms.

Interestingly enough, the original alarm law that's still on the books in 1979 talks about 30,000 alarms, false alarms; so we've gone from 30,000 false alarms to 97 (*sic*) false alarms.

Nationally, there's three courses of false alarms; it's the malfunctioning equipment, human error or installation problems. We don't have too many of the installation problems, but we do have the malfunctioning and human error. Just as an example of three cases of commercial violations and three cases of residential violations, last year in 2014, 145 calls at one location in South Huntington, 126 in Bay Shore, 111 in Yaphank; those are commercial. Residential, 54 calls false alarms in Dix Hills residence, 52 calls in Huntington Station and 31 calls in West Islip. We have to have a disincentive for people to not fix their equipment or not be educated on how to operate the equipment that they do have.

There are some great benefits that we see in this. It's the improvement of response time. Obviously, if we're not going on false alarms, 17% of our calls of false alarms, it does increase dramatically our response times. We increase officer productivity in that now they have more time for proactive patrol and VNT enforcement among other things. We reduce the 911 que time.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

We heard earlier today the calls coming in to our 911 center, if you take the 97,000 and divide it by 365, that's about 267 calls a day that are false that we don't have to respond to. So now the calls in que get answered much quicker because we're reducing the workload of those people answering the calls.

There is a cost involved in sending the officers to these responses. It takes around 20 minutes to respond to a call, to walk around the premises to make sure there's no break, and then to do the appropriate paperwork. At our present cost, at 97,000 calls, that's about 2.2 million that we're spending on this endeavor; it doesn't include the ECO/Dispatcher time, it doesn't include the wear and tear on the cars, the gas and so on. And then there's an officer complacency that comes into place. Legislator Trotta I'm sure will remember, you keep going to the same place every day, the alarm goes off, you're not as sharp as you should be when you're responding because you just say, *It's just another call we're responding to.*

There are also some other police benefits that we reap. We used to have an alarm notification law -- and again, Officer Trotta will remember that -- on all commercial businesses, voluntary, so that if something happened during the course when you were closed, we would know who to contact. The system -- they buy and sell businesses so often, we had abandoned that process because when you had a break in a store front or the rock goes through it, at three in the morning we call the owner, or the last registered owner, and we found out that he had sold the business three, four years ago and they were very annoyed at getting the calls at those times.

So what we're looking to do, by annual registration, is require the owner e-mail address, cell phone number, telephone number, alternative person to contact. We also want to know whether there's chemicals, guard dogs, ammunition for the commercial establishments. We want to know what kind of cameras you're using so that it would help us if we're investigating a crime, how long do you retain them, is it IP based? So it would give us a vast amount of information we don't have now. And of course, we'd like to be able to say, because so many people today get notified by the alarm company that their house alarm went off, that we would like to send an e-mail notification to them that we've checked your house and it's secure, no apparent break.

So there are a lot of benefits to having the alarm law in place. And with that, I'll open it up for any questions you may have.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. Okay. So I got -- there's one -- we have an alarm system at my home and it went off; chicken cutlets, a little overcooked --

(*Laughter*)

-- so it set the alarm off. And there was an 800 number that you can call to let them know. It's ADT, and we called to let them know it was a false alarm, *I'm home. What's your code?* But the fire department still showed up. So what do you do in a situation like that? If an alarm goes off and you call your alarm company and say, *I'm sorry, it what was a false alarm, you know, I'm shutting off the alarm,* will the police still show up and is that considered a false alarm? Because I know that, you know, we get the call, your alarm went off and, you know, so you're trying to prevent anybody from having to show up, but sometimes they do. So how do we handle that situation?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

That's why we allow two free false alarms, in case there's an error of some sort.

LEG. HAHN:

You actually had something burning, you just were able to deal with it; I wouldn't consider that a false alarm (*laughter*).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, it was a false alarm. The room got smoky -- and granted, I mean, I wound up moving the smoke alarm so that it wouldn't be as affected, but it still -- there's still like that kind of gray area, because it could happen again, that maybe there's something. And, you know, like I said, I moved the detector to another room so that when I close the door the smoke doesn't get in there. But again, you know, somebody's home cooking and they leave that one door open to that room, it sets it off again. So I thought I fixed the problem, but -- do you know what I'm saying? It's going to be making sure that you think you fixed it but it could still happen again.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Again, there is a cancel -- I'm surprised that the alarm company didn't call, that the fire department came. Did the police come?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Okay. The alarm company didn't make the proper notification. Again, that's why we have two alarms for a 12-month period that were considered false without any penalty; it was an accident, we wouldn't charge you for the first two.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right. Okay, so now this bill will only pertain to a police response. So if the fire department chooses to come, they choose to come. Am I going to -- if it accidentally goes off and I think I resolved the issue, is the fine going to still exist because the fire department showed up?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

No, we're speaking of police response.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But it's only police response.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, police response.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I think I'm good. Anybody else have a question? Doc Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:

Good morning, Commissioner. Thank you so much for your presentation. As I'm looking at this, so we're saying that the alarm system, so you have to obtain a permit and register it and there's a fee, an annual fee that you all have; is that correct? Am I understanding it correctly?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

That's correct.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. And it looks like that the fee will be \$100 and then \$50 for renewal?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

There's a difference between residential which is 50 and commercial which is 100. And the annual requirement is to keep our records up-to-date for emergency notifications.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure. So one of the things that I'm balancing here -- and I think that you make a very strong case; for 90,000 false alarms, it doesn't seem like a great utilization of resources. And I'm balancing that between looking at alarm systems in terms of their impact on overall public safety, and I think that there's very strong data out there. And I think I'm trying to weigh what the cost is of responding versus overall numbers of crime that occur in homes that are alarmed versus homes that are not alarmed.

So my concern would be a situation where we're trying to promote business, we're trying to support families, we're trying to -- especially in light of the current climate that we have as far as public safety. That on the surface of looking at it just as a straight forward point of view; as you described it, false alarms cost money, we need to do something to inhibit that. I don't want to have unintended consequences of disincentivizing people. Because typically a response now -- we've added another fee, and so we're starting a whole nother program, and we've been hearing testimonies for the last three months, I guess, on the red light camera issue.

So one, I'm concerned that residents who don't have the economics won't get alarms; two, I'm concerned that we have a situation where residents who have alarms will just inactivate them. And I'm weighing those 90,000 calls and resources there versus overall well-being and public safety of the community in terms of looking at -- obviously homeowners insurance will give you a substantial reduction when you have a home alarm in place, they make a big difference when those homes are marked. And I'm having a very difficult time struggling, because I think there are unintended consequences. I don't think it's impossible -- I don't think it's fair, nor do I think it's impossible for you to be able to respond to that to tell me what the impact is. But that's what -- I agree with you in principle, but at a time where I am listening to a national discourse of terrorism and safety and gun control, the idea that we could have a negative public impact -- because now -- you know, I think we want people to go out and get alarms and to have the right to protect themselves. And I'm concerned when you start a registration program, I don't know, neither do you, but I think that it's going to plummet, and I'm a having a tough time with that.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

If I could just respond briefly. First of all, by not responding to the calls, the officers will have more proactive policing and, therefore, have a more positive effect on public safety.

In addition, we don't charge if it's a real alarm, it's only false alarms. And only 7% of the alarms received are an actual emergency that the alarm was designed for, whether it be entry, attempted entry, holdup, fire; only 3% of the alarms we have actually address that. We don't charge you if there was an actual problem, obviously that's what we do, that's what we get paid for. It's the false alarms, it's the misuse of our resources that we're looking to curb. And you need a disincentive, that's what the alarm is for, for people to actually go and repair their equipment or to adequately learn how to use the equipment. We don't mind going. We obviously are there to respond to any actual true emergency, that's what we do.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure. I agree with that. A couple of more things. We're talking about -- and one is almost hard to measure. I agree that the active prevention, having someone actively police where you have 10,000 police officers in a County of 1.5 million people, I think there's a huge prevention component that we are allowing technology to be able to assist us where we may not have the public funds to have as much, as many police officers as we need. One is you're talking about active individual officers

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

going out addressing issues versus hundreds of thousands of homes that may or may not have an alarm and what that prevention number is. I don't know what the answer is, but I am concerned that there could be a negative impact there. But I do think your point's well taken, it's not lost on me what you were saying.

And my other concern, and what I would love to see in this legislation, I don't like the two. I've had a situation where I have had a professional electrician come in and install an alarm system in my office, I diligently put the batteries in the system, I've had it tested, it worked well. There was a boisterous situation, there was a situation where it was cold and settling of the house, several -- you know, there are two alarms, it just seems like we're putting a whole nother program of registration and fines. I don't like the word violation, it shouldn't be a violation. I understand it's -- you know, there are people that are perhaps not diligent, that are not negligent. But it's not a violation. They're not doing anything wrong here, and this seems to give like false alarms as if it's a punitive sort of impact. And I could tell you as a diligent business owner that did everything possible to bring out the electrician, have it installed properly, and I still had four or five false alarms. So I would love to see that number be a bit higher.

But, you know, those are my concerns. And again, you know, I have a lot of respect for what you're saying but, you know, these are the things that I'm weighing and I'm having a difficult time with.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you for your comments. Just something maybe I was remiss in saying. Riverhead, Southampton Town, Southold, Northport, Lloyd Harbor, Sag Harbor, and of course Nassau County, our sister agency, they all have alarm laws in place. Some of them are much higher than what we're proposing.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay, fair enough.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. We have Legislator Kennedy is on the committee; Rob, you're not. Do you mind if I indulge? You're last because you're not a member.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll be quick. Thank you, Commissioner, for coming out and speaking on this bill. I have some reservations. I've read it and all the backup information on it. I just want to let you know, very rarely does my office get more than 10 or 15 calls on a potential resolution; I got 60 on this from residents. Not only do they feel over taxed on everything, and not just this, the complaints that they're making are pretty similar. If there is a problem with their system, it's not them, usually, in the final outcome. It's a problem with the way it was installed, as you said, or a problem with the alarm company that is maintaining it. And as Dr. Spencer said, it can take up to two days to get it fixed, with most of the people that I spoke with. So you can have 40 in a period of two days.

You can't penalize them for protecting themselves. This bill has to be rewritten, in my opinion, and tweaked a little bit before I can vote for it. I understand why you're doing it; our personnel is stretched, there's much better usage of police time that would come from this, but it needs a little tweaking so that our residents don't get punished for something that's beyond their control. Just my opinion.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Legislator Kennedy, again, well taken. However, there is an appeal process, so if such a situation occurred, they would be able to appeal it and the fine would be waived.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Didn't we do this once before? Over here. Didn't we do this once before?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, we did.

LEG. TROTТА:

What was the -- I forgot the problem.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The problem was enforcement at the time, and it wasn't as robust as we're looking to do now. We couldn't capture -- it was all manual, now it's going to be done electronically. And the systems have improved rather dramatically over the years. I think it was in the 80's that we did it.

LEG. TROTТА:

I remember it, so it must have been the late 80s or the early 90s.

I know we were charging for a while, it was like -- I mean, you know, clearly, I mean, we pay a lot of taxes here. We pay a lot of money for our police service, and if a guy has 50 alarms, no doubt he should be charged, no doubt. But a guy who's, you know, if the wind can cause it, thunder can cause it, a power surge by LILCO can cause it, a police helicopter flying over can cause it. These alarms go off all the time. As everyone, you guys know, that when a thunderstorm comes through, the alarms go right down the line. So now the guy doesn't -- I mean, there's a lot of variables. I have no -- I mean, I understand you have an appeals process, you know, there was a thunder storm and 50 alarms went off in one sector, because it does happen, a power surge happens. Now you're burdening the people with a power surge. I mean, is there going to be some mechanism to say, *Okay, all 6th Precinct alarms where this power surge went through, we're not even going to send them a bill*, because now you've got guys getting a bill and these alarms went off and they really didn't -- it wasn't their fault. And there's a lot of variables with this.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

If we're aware and it's particularly excluded in the law, hurricanes, power outages, interruptions by phone line or whatever may trip it -- if we're aware of them, we don't --

LEG. TROTТА:

But what if you're not aware of them?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Again, there's an appeals process.

LEG. TROTТА:

I -- you know, I'm not on this committee, but I would think that --

I agree with Doc, I mean, two or three is a little bit -- you know, I would like to see five or six, because there are problems, you know, with people's alarms. You know, I think if a kid's coming from -- I have an alarm at my house, I never set it in 25 years.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You never set it?

LEG. TROTTA:

What am I going to do? There's nothing to steal anyway. Someone comes home from college and doesn't put the code in right, or you changed the code, or now you have, you know, a situation where kids are coming home and setting it off or a fire alarm. It just seems to me that that should be increased a little bit. It just seems like, you know, if someone's going to get three alarms, they're going to have to pay, whatever it is, \$200 or something. They're paying a lot of money. People are running -- and agree I with Doc, if I had this, I would shut my alarm off. I think the number's like 99.9% of alarms are false alarms. Well, I know what you're saying, it could be something else that triggered it if it was a true alarm, it wasn't necessarily a crime that was committed.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Right.

LEG. TROTTA:

Okay. I just think that the number, you should really have more than two. And I think that what Doc said, people are going to black out, they're not going to hook-up, and it's an unintended consequence, and all we're doing is nickel and diming people here.

But on the other side, believe me, I've handled hundreds of alarms. Almost every alarm I went on was a false alarm. And I might disagree with you on the fact that sometimes the alarms get the cops out going to places in certain sectors, you know, Stony Brook for instance, Kara.

*(*Laughter*)*

I worked there, I enjoyed going on the alarms because it wasn't the most active place. There's two sides to every story and I really think that maybe you should consider raising the number, or we should consider raising the number. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Legislator Hahn, for Stony Brook.

LEG. HAHN:

I'm not going to even go there. Okay. Who will be administering the alarm database and processing the applications?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

We're purchasing a software program that's used in over 500 municipalities, and they do the process. They are integrated with our CAD system, so most of it will be done electronically. They'll know how many false alarms have been sent out, prepare a letter for either -- we're hoping to do a lot of this electronically. People can register electronically and we'll notify you electronically, so you'll get it very quickly, feeling that there would be a small group of employees who would be notifying them in writing.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. And so the notification of homeowners, you're envisioning, will be like an e-mail or something.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

That would be one alternative, yes, we would prefer that method. But when the officer goes, we're anticipating dropping off a notification so you know that the alarm went off and you know that the third one from now that you would be receiving a fine. We want to have as much notification as possible.

LEG. HAHN:

Sure. So the officer who arrives at the scene and determines there was no problem and they leave the notice, it will say this is your -- explain the law, especially the first year or so, right, you know, when people don't necessarily know this is happening. And maybe we should require the alarm companies to be notifying their -- you know, their customers. But can there be -- you know, digitizing the appeals process as well, you know, I think would be helpful, especially in the early roll out months of this, you know, making sure folks can easily try to register some sort of explanation, I think would be helpful.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes, that's one of the major things we're looking to do is to do it electronically, make it easier on the residents and commercial -- homeowners and the residents, so they can notify us quickly and we can respond quickly.

LEG. HAHN:

Do other jurisdictions do this?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes. As I mentioned, the firm that we're looking at has over 500 municipalities.

LEG. HAHN:

Is there a way to hold the -- I hope you didn't address this earlier. Is there a way to hold the companies, you know, responsible when they don't -- you know, do we have any mechanism in this to -- obviously the customer themselves, if they're claiming that the company's not responding, the company's not fixing what -- they can cancel their contract, they don't have to utilize that company anymore. But are there bad actors in the industry?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

That I'm not aware of, any particular company. But again, we allow two free under the present law, proposed law. And the third one -- but of course, you don't have to pay your bill if it's not working either. So, I mean, there is some recourse.

LEG. HAHN:

Well, that was my point, is that they could cancel the contract if there are serious problems with the alarm system and the company's not responsive and, you know, obviously the customer can walk and bring their business elsewhere. But I'm just wondering how much -- I don't have a -- well, I guess I shouldn't say that, but I'm not familiar with how these things work, so. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I think Legislator Kennedy had another question.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Each precinct, are they aware of repetitive offenders?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes. We know electronically how many people are offenders, and we actually classify them by numbers. I can tell you how many are more than five, how many more than six, so on.

LEG. KENNEDY:

If this gets to the point where there's revisions made, perhaps there should be harsher penalties on repetitive offenders.

My concern here is your average resident at this point in time. Some of our -- my phone calls and e-mails have been overly cautious, they don't want to give out any information to the PD, their personal cell phone numbers, they don't feel that anyone has a right to know. And other fears is who's going to have access to this? Is it going to be a police officer only? You're getting the software from a firm; is that firm going to be -- is it going to be similar to the TVB where they review everything and they send out the letters, or will it be a police officer?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

It will be residing on service within the Police Department; it's Police Department information. And it's not required to give, this is just ways we can contact you, so if you have a cell phone you don't have to give it out, you don't have to give your phone number. But again, it's difficult to contact you if you don't give us that information.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But you'll have everybody's location just from the alarm going off, correct? And the GPS from alarms; isn't there a GPS system with alarms, or when somebody calls about a 911 alarm, if it didn't go through you? Isn't there a way to tell what the address is?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The alarm's notifications come from the alarm companies.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

So they're not coming from the individual.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

And yes, there are -- if you call us, we do know -- they call it ANI-ALI, we do know where you are and we do know the number. We've got the numbers it's assigned to.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Correct. So people are very leery about giving out personal cell phone numbers. I'm just letting you know what my callers have said. You're not asking -- and I do want to clarify on the record; you're not going to ask them what the pass code to their alarm system is, correct?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, because that was another fear that they thought of. Not -- they don't know who's looking at the paper work. Is it going to an outside company? Is it going to people that aren't police officers? There have been questions like that. I got most of my questions -- oh. The firm you're going out to is just for the software, for no maintenance or additional information whatsoever, right?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

No, there would be annual maintenance fees, because like all software programs require constant maintenance and upgrading, but that's minimal amounts.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But they will not have access to any of the information that comes through.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

No, no, it's all being handled by our internal IT.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

One last question. You mentioned that persistent violators get charged more; there is a schedule, so it goes up as you violate.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I see that, but you already know now who persistent violators are. Do we have to go through a schedule? That would cut down police time right away.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

There's no authorization for us to charge anybody anything until a law is passed, so.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, correct.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

So we can't do anything with it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It can be modified. There was something else but it's escaping me at this moment, so.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I would like to see if everybody would indulge, we have a lot of 911 operators here who deal with these calls on a regular basis. And so, Suzanne, if you would come up, because I want to know, as an operator, the impact on you. And before you start, Rob -- Robert, Mr. Lipp, if we could get -- I believe Legislator Hahn was going to ask a question about the budget impact.

MR. LIPP:

Yes. So the adopted budget, which we as a body voted for, includes over 7.3 million for this particular fee. So if you do not vote for it there will be, other things being equal, a \$7.3 million hole in the budget.

That being said, what you might want to consider, and depending upon your view of the type of fee this is, whether or not, you know, you could do a study over the first year to see how it's working and what tweaks or elimination you might want to do after that. But if you vote against passing this, that would create a problem with the budget.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Rob, you thought the number was a little different. But while we're there, Suzanne, you guys are sitting back there and I'm looking at a lot of faces and comments, and certainly it seems like the 911 operators would love to see this come into place.

MS. McBRIDE:

I can --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Can you give us a little bit of info of the impact on you guys?

MS. McBRIDE:

I can speak for all of my operators, we would love to see this bill get passed. Chronic alarms are one of our biggest problems, the Commissioner cited the numbers. It's very frustrating when you're dealing with life and death calls that we keep getting repeatedly, the same house alarms, the same business alarms. We're the ones who deal with the alarm companies, and I wish there was some way to implement a fine on the alarm companies rather than just the home owners.

Applause

We're the ones if there -- if it is a real alarm, we have to contact the alarm companies to try and get a rep to respond to the business or the home. Nine times out of ten they don't have contact information for the homeowner or the business owner, which means we now have to leave a police officer sitting there sometimes to guard the business until business hours. It's a complete misuse of police officers' resources. They have much better things that they should be doing rather than baby-sitting someone's business or home. With all due respect to business owners and homeowners, they need to have a little responsibility on their own.

Legislator Kennedy mentioned their hesitance to provide a phone number to the Police Department in this case. Apparently they're that hesitant to provide phone numbers through their own alarm companies that they're paying for. Without that contact information, we can't get a hold of them. If you want a house alarm, the purpose is to protect it; you should be able to respond if there is a problem at that residence. We do need to find a way to cut down on chronic alarms to save time, both in the 911 center for my operators and the police on the roads. And I forget exactly who said it, one of them mentioned about possible complacency on the part of the police officer. We can hear it in their voices when you keep giving them the same alarm five, six, seven times a shift. *"Headquarters, I've been there before," "Yeah, headquarters, it's a chronic," "Yeah, headquarters, I'll get to it."* It's a case of crying wolf. We need to cut down on the false alarms. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, I appreciate it. Because again, someone is waiting for a life and death call, trying to call in on a life and death call and you're responding to a false alarm. So we understand the priority, where it needs to be. And I don't want to see you guys having to spend too much time on alarms,

MS. McBRIDE:

And if I could mention one other thing. I forget again who mentioned it, but there was some discussion about the weather-related alarms and the false alarms with power outages. Honestly, I can't remember the current system, but I know we used to have a system in place where when we closed out the call for the police officer on our end through the computer system, we designated whether it was weather related, whether it was a power outage or whether it was an active alarm. I'm sure that if it's not currently in our system, that that could be easily implemented to work with whatever software they're planning on implementing to make sure that those situations are not improperly fined.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Uh-huh. Do you see the issue I had, like when my alarm went off and I called ADT and I told them it's a false alarm; are they -- do they notify you it's a false alarm?

MS. McBRIDE:

Most times --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

How does that work?

MS. McBRIDE:

-- they do, yes. We do have a policy where most times we will still respond on false alarms, depending on the circumstances, I don't want to get into too much detail. But most times the alarm company will advise us it's a false alarm and, again, the officer would close it out. Again, it may be a designation on our end that, you know, *We were notified it was false, they attempted to cancel*, and that wouldn't generate a fine, that the homeowner was aware and attempted to remedy the situation so it wouldn't generate a fine out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So basically you like this because it will relieve a burden on you to respond to the real 911s.

MS. McBRIDE:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Suzanne.

MS. McBRIDE:

Thank you.

Applause

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Doc Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

I think part of the problem is that residents are paying sometimes 30, \$40 a month for these companies for monitoring services and they are not providing monitoring services, they're just really just dispatching or shirking that responsibility and shifting it over to our 911 system and our officers.

Some observations that I have made is that because 99% of the alarms are false, it probably shouldn't even go through a 911 system. I've seen legitimate alarms where it's going to 911, but most of the time, at least at my business and from what I've seen, is that the officers may take a couple of hours to respond because of the whole -- since they're kind of like car alarms that are going off. And so I disagree with my colleague in that I do think the police should have a way to contact the owner. You know, and I understand the concerns, but I think that really we need to shift a lot of this bill or the onerous on the monitoring companies that are making exorbitant amount of monies and they should have a protocol where they reach out, that they troubleshoot it before they pass it on, because they're making all the money on this. Or the County maybe should pass on a fee based on the number of residents that they have registered where they pay some of that money to the police; if they're getting 30 bucks a month, then maybe they should pay \$5 to Suffolk County.

But I do have -- when I see ten alarms where someone could literally be out of the country or be away and they have a lot of unrest and they have all of a sudden ten alarms that go off and they're getting 100, 150, 200, 250, 300, 350, and if you look at the accumulative amount of that, that's very scary, but it will be the law. And I understand that we're saying that we can give some reasons that this may be the case, but we're about to enact this.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

And I think it's very scary, though, when we ask our Budget Director what's the hole going to be in the budget. We're really getting hammered. Yes, I understand we have a budget crisis, and I understand that my colleagues and our leadership has worked very, very hard with the Administration to figure out how we can solve some of these issues. But I can't look at this as a budgetary issue. This is a public safety issue and we're getting a lot of criticism for that because, you know, there's the appearance that we're making policy for how we can solve our budget needs.

But I would also like to consider, when you say the money, that it would save us, Dr. Lipp. Are we talking about savings in police time, or are we strictly looking at an amount of fees we're expecting to collect? Is there any savings as far as with this policy, if we -- what impact that would have in terms of police officers, overtime, and is that being considered, or this is strictly the fees we expect to incur?

MR. LIPP:

The number in the budget was an estimate, it remains to be seen if it'll come to fruition or not, we'll know only in hindsight, but it was just for how much money would be brought in. What you're talking about, which is relevant but very difficult to determine, I don't think we can, to what extent it would curtail at all overtime. If it did, then that's a plus, definitely. And if overtime was reduced next year, then we'd look at it is there any possibility that any of it might be attributed to this particular fee. But it would be very difficult to estimate that quantitatively.

LEG. SPENCER:

Well, I think that we have to do better when looking at policy, that if we're talking about 911 operators that are dealing with life and death situations where someone who doesn't have vital signs has six minutes to survive, and mixing that in with false alarms, I think we need to look at taking the whole system that maybe false alarms with these companies should be channeled to an entirely different que or system. I just think we can do better.

I don't -- I'm frustrated by this policy, I know my colleagues might be frustrated with me. But I just feel that we're shifting more fees on people that are trying to seek out safety, and I think that we can figure out a policy where we can really put more responsibility on these companies that are making millions and millions of dollars for a monitoring fee while they sit by idly and shift the responsibility over to the County. So I just -- I'm having a very difficult time, and I don't feel comfortable passing policy that I have so many concerns with. So I won't belabor it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm going to jump in a little bit. We do have Kara and both Robert -- both Roberts. But there's a certain amount of responsibility on the part of the person who has the system in their home. I had the system in my home, the alarm we went off twice, same issue. I called a company and I said, *"This is a bad spot for the alarm, for the censor. It's going to have to be moved,"* so they came out and moved it. Now, if I don't ever fix it, I know why it's going off, so if I don't fix that problem, then -- and I the keep getting the 911 calls and they have to show up. You know, somebody in the area may have a heart attacks, or you know as a doctor, a serious emergency, and now they have to respond to my false alarm because I'm being irresponsible in fixing my system. So I don't want to take away police resources --

LEG. SPENCER:

I agree with that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- for something like this. So that's the hard --

LEG. SPENCER:

I totally agree with you there, I do.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So there has to be a responsibility on the part of the owner of the system. So anyway, I'm sorry. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, so that kind of reminds me, I have a personal experience with this because I grew up with -- as you've all heard, I grew up with a volunteer firefighter father in Stony Brook. We had the Stony Brook school, it was called The Boy School at the time, and they have dormitories and their smoke detectors were going off every night. In my mind it felt like it was months, I'm sure, because I was probably six or seven, it probably didn't last that long. But every night, several times a night, my Dad would respond to Stony Brook University automatic alarm at the dormitory and, you know, you had to go, there are kids in there. And they fixed it, they figured it out, there was some glitch in the system.

But in the case of smoke detectors and volunteer firefighters getting out of bed in the middle of the night and police officers, you know, there has to be -- my colleague, Legislator Spencer, talked about public safety. When you're telling me one out of six calls is a false alarm, there is a public safety issue here. And it's got -- we are going to -- you know, by instituting this, it will be fixed automatically. There will be, you know -- a couple of people will pay some fines, the first, you know, the third call, hopefully not; hopefully people who get those warning notices will know, *I've got to fix it*, and then they'll have to pay a fine and then it'll stop. I imagine it will just -- you'll have a chart, John Ortiz, next year that will go like this as soon as the fines get instituted, because people will say, *I can't keep paying this* and they'll fix -- they'll take the responsibility they should have taken.

And not everybody, you know, is like Kate or like I who understand the ramifications of when the fire department knocks on your door in response to a false alarm,, and you and I are thinking, *Oh, my gosh, I'm so sorry you left your house and you came down here*; not everybody recognizes that. And not everybody recognizes when the police officer spends 15, 20 minutes looking around their house and searching for that broken window, how much time that is, how much resources are expended. Not every individual with an alarm system has the understanding that we all have here about the drain on resources when there are false alarms that could be rectified.

So I really think the fees -- you know, this is one of those instances of, you know, we may get fines in one-year and the next year we won't get as many, and clearly we can't rely on that. And that will be the goal, it will be just take care of the problem, the same way, I feel, with red light cameras. You know, they decline and people know it happens at an intersection, they start behaving at that intersection, you move it to another intersection and they start behaving at that intersection, too, and that was the initial intent. And that's -- you know, you have to have that fine, that stick to make it happen, but it's going to -- people are going to fix their systems where they can be fixed. It's going to increase public safety because we will have resources available. So I think that's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Kara. And just to clarify, Suzanne did say that the 911 calls, when they come in, they come into the 852-COPS number; however, it's a 911 operator who answers that also. So either way, you're still pulling away from a 911 operator to respond to real emergencies. So I believe, Legislator Trotta, you're next.

LEG. TROTТА:

Kara, I hate to burst your bubble, but these dispatchers will tell you, they will hold alarms for any public safety emergency.

LEG. HAHN:

Oh, yeah. No, no, no.

LEG. TROTТА:

They're not going to be -- you know, a baby not breathing or something is not even going to be considered. It's going to be, you know, dispatched immediately. So the fact that these alarms, while it's a problem, it's not affecting public safety per se.

And my next question is what if you -- like I have an alarm in my house, I have central station and now I have to register it and I say, *Forget it. I'm just going the cancel central station, I'm just going to have the buzzer buzz for five minutes;* you know, the alarm will go off for five minutes if there's a break or if there's a false alarm or something. Now, the neighbor calls the police; what's the process then?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

It's the same whether you have central alarm or the alarm goes off, because either way we're we're responding.

LEG. TROTТА:

Well, if the neighbor -- if no one calls you don't respond, obviously.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

If no one calls, we wouldn't respond.

LEG. TROTТА:

Now, the neighbor calls. Now, I didn't call the police at my house; what are you billing me for? What -- is there -- do you fine the person then?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Again, we always have the two free calls and there is an appeals process.

LEG. TROTТА:

No, no. You don't even know who the house -- let's say it's my house and my alarm goes off. I don't have a central station. My neighbor says, *Hey, my alarm's -- my neighbor's alarm, I hear this thing going off.* Now you send a sector car there, he walks around the house, nobody's home; what do you do?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

We use the national model on this. It's presumed that an officer responds to the location, whether it be residential or commercial, reviews and it does not fit the criteria -- it was not an entry, attempted entry, a holdup alarm, an emergency alarm or whatever the case might be that the alarm was designed for, then it's a false alarm and, yes, you would get charged under the current --

LEG. TROTТА:

But you don't even know who I am. I'm not registered, I'm just a house. I'm not registered to anything. I put my alarm in my house, I don't hook it up to central station, nothing. There's no -- house B on Smith Street, house C calls up and says there's an alarm going off; do you leave a bill there with them? What's the process?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

We would have an address and we can look up the address, the owner reverse listing and find out. We also have an alarm -- very seldom do you come in anonymously, you'll usually say, *My neighbor so and so is the one who's house alarm is going off.*

LEG. CALARCO:

An example is if it's a car.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's my point. I'm leading down the point of everyone is going to say, *You know something? I'm going to disconnect my central station. My neighbor will call the police..*

LEG. CALARCO:

They're not going to do that.

LEG. TROTTA:

Believe me they do it, I know they do it. There's a lot of people who do it.

LEG. HAHN:

(Inaudible)

LEG. TROTTA:

I mean, is there a process? Do you have --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

One at a time. One at a time.

LEG. TROTTA:

I want to know the process.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

The process is yet to -- the regulation, this is the law, the regulations haven't been adopted yet, but I would suggest that we would -- it's a false alarm, we would attempt to find the owner of the house and we would -- if it was exceeded at three, we would send you a notification that you had three, more than two false alarms and are subject to penalty.

LEG. TROTTA:

So it's going to be officer's ability to track down who the owner of the house is, write the address and say, *Dear occupant, your alarm went off.* Now, are you going to charge them for not having the permit?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, we're 15 minutes away from the next committee --

LEG. TROTTA:

Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- so just so you're aware -- and I do have a couple of more, and I know Legislator Calarco has not had an opportunity to even say anything. So do you want to speak? I know you asked to say

something, or a question.

LEG. CALARCO:

I did. And actually, Legislator Hahn covered a lot of the points that I wanted to make. You know, this is a public safety issue. And I know that this -- you know, maybe when the alarm company calls up it's not a top priority, depending on what they're indicating is the issue. But at the end of time, it's going to cost us our resources. It's costing the resources of our 911 operators to still take that call and the dispatchers to still dispatch somebody and the police officer to still respond to the location. And if it's a repeat offender, then that is something that we're spending resources on, time in and time out, that we more often than not know it's going to be a false alarm. And then you get into the whole situation of, well, you know, we're poo-pooing these alarms because they're always false, and so we're not really giving credit and due diligence to them because they're not all false and some of them are going to be real. And maybe if we have somebody who it's, you know, the boy who cried wolf type of syndrome that starts happening as well.

So this is an opportunity for us to hold some accountability to get your system corrected or fixed if you have a continual problem, and that's what we're asking to do with this. It's really not that onerous to say, *You know what? If you can't get your alarm working properly after three tries, then we're going to hold you accountable for the cost to us to do that, to respond to it,* is not being overly onerous, I don't think. And the reality is is the company should fix the alarm. And you as the person who purchased -- was purchasing it and spending 30 or 40 or \$50 a month, or whatever the cost of that alarm is to you, to have a system that doesn't work properly, I would say if the company can't get it fixed, go get a new company. What are you spending that money on if you can't get a company that is going to actually provide proper service?

So, you know, this is not that onerous to ask. It's not that uncommon, there are police departments across the country doing this, including every other police department on this Island, at least every other major one, the five East End towns, the Nassau County, they're all doing this now and it has substantially reduced the number of false alarms that they have to deal with, which substantially increases the amount of public safety that they have because it frees up more resources. You know, when an officer is standing waiting for somebody to show up because the business owner or the homeowner has to show up for them to be able to verify that the alarm is false, that officer could be out doing other things. And even if he's not responding to another call, you know what? He could be out patrolling the streets. I know people haven't noticed, you know, the number of fatalities because of roadway deaths because people are speeding and people are flying around our County is not exactly dwindling, they're going up. So it's all about providing those resources.

And I understand that people don't want to make this a budgetary issue, but we affirmatively put the fee in the budget. We affirmatively said this is something that was proposed as part of the budget, the money was put in the budget, but the idea was proposed as part of the budget. And we could have then said at that point in time, *We don't like this idea. We aren't going to pursue this idea of having a false alarm fee because we don't think it's an appropriate thing to do,* and we could have not booked the money in the budget, and that's what we should have done then instead of doing it now after we booked the money in the budget. You know, to say that you don't want to make it a budgetary issue, the problem is we already said we were going to put it there.

LEG. SPENCER:

Well, we still --

LEG. CALARCO:

For a good reason. And you know, we should have at least had some of that policy debate then whether or not we wanted to do it.

LEG. HAHN:

We did.

LEG. CALARCO:

Actually, we did. I know we did it in the Work Group anyway; the Work Group decided to put it in the budget.

So, you know, at the end of the day, this is just bringing us in line with all the other municipalities in the County. This is holding a little level of accountability. We like to talk about personal responsibility an awful lot and this is a personal responsibility issue, in my opinion. If you can't get your act together after three tries, then it's time for us to at least make you pay for the resources that you're receiving.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You know, I'd like to clarify, because this was something that was in the County Exec's budget.

LEG. CALARCO:

It was.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And we could not find an offset. So while I know that I did not agree with some of the numbers in there, we couldn't find an offset, so we kind of got stuck. So it's not -- it didn't originate from us, it originated from the Executive. And again, there was too many other issues that we could not find offsets for. So I want to make sure that we're clear on that.

LEG. CALARCO:

(Inaudible)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

However, are we done?

LEG. SPENCER:

No, we're not done.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. SPENCER:

And I demand to be heard. I want to be heard.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Dammit, I want to be heard *(laughter)*.

LEG. SPENCER:

We're not done, no.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, we're not done. Doc, go ahead.

LEG. SPENCER:

We still can make a policy right. I'm not saying that I'm against the idea, I'm not against personal responsibility. I strongly disagree that two is enough. I also strongly disagree that when you

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

disincentivize, there's a big difference between what you can police and what you can prevent. And when people stop signing up for alarms or they start disconnecting from central monitoring, I think there's going to be a public safety issue. There's not enough officers to be able to overcome what is prevention, and we know this. We've seen insurance companies base -- they lower your premiums based on whether or not you have an alarm in place.

I think we can put this in the budget, I agree with that. I don't like it, I don't think it should be a budgetary issue, but I do think that when we talk about fining people hundreds of dollars after two warnings, I think it should be five. I think that we should take the time, I think there should be a trial period. I think we should look at what we're getting into. And not every municipality has it, there are some municipalities that have it.

So I really feel very strongly. And I disagree that if someone hears an alarm coming from your house, it could be your car alarm, it could be not an alarm at all. You're going to be really hard-pressed because someone reportedly heard an alarm, you send an officer there; well, what if the alarm didn't come from your house? You cannot bill people. That, to me -- well, that's what the testimony was, is that you could be billed if there's an inspection and it reveals that it's false, because it's hearsay from your neighbor. You can't go to someone's house --

LEG. HAHN:

No, the police officer shows up.

LEG. SPENCER:

If a police officer shows up and the alarm is not going on, then is it reported as a false alarm?

LEG. HAHN:

But what if it's going on?

LEG. SPENCER:

If it's going on, that's a different story, but by then it's usually not going on. But I just wanted to clarify that, that we can take this policy and make it better, there should be some sort of trial. But I don't think that it's two strikes when you're talking about something with an alarm that every door, every smoke detector, everything that it takes to install an alarm and you're saying two strikes and you're getting fined \$100. So yes, I understand. I support public safety, I support our police, but we can make this policy better. And so I feel very strongly about that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Leslie?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm amazed to say I agree with Dr. Spencer. A motion to table for slight revision. We can do this and we can make it work for public safety and for the Police Department.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

LEG. CALARCO:

I just have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Rob.

LEG. CALARCO:

I'm not buying the argument that people are going to disconnect from their systems. Nassau County's program is not that old; they've only been in existence for a few years. Do you guys know if Nassau County experienced a large number of people who decided to disconnect their alarms because they rolled out a system, a false alarm fine program?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

I'm not aware of that, but I can tell you they have told us that over 50% of the alarms, the false alarms were eliminated.

LEG. CALARCO:

So they have greatly decreased the number of false alarms. But do we know whether or not they had this large number of people who just decided that they were no longer going to have an actual active alarm?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

No, I don't have that information.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah. I just don't think people are going to go out there and wholesale eliminate their alarm. If you are currently paying somebody for an alarm system in your house, chances are you're not going to just disconnect this alarm system because you're being told that you have to not have too many false alarms. I'm just not buying that argument. It doesn't even compute with me that people who are paying \$30 a month would disconnect their alarm because they have to pay a \$50, you know, registration fee with the County. I'm not --

LEG. SPENCER:

They're not going (*Inaudible*)

LEG. CALARCO:

But they're paying \$30 a month for what? It just doesn't --

LEG. SPENCER:

(*Inaudible*).

LEG. CALARCO:

It doesn't add up. And at the same time you're seeing a great reduction in the number of people who are getting the false alarms. It just doesn't compute to me. I'm not thinking people are going to disconnect all of a sudden because they're being told they can't have too many false alarms.

LEG. SPENCER:

(*Inaudible*).

LEG. CALARCO:

But if they -- if you're saying they're not going to turn the alarm on and then they're not going to pay for their service, that's what I don't -- I just don't buy that. I don't buy that argument that people are going to stop paying an alarm service because they're being told they have to pay a \$50 registration fee to the County, and then on their third alarm they're going to get a fine because they can't get their alarm system working properly; I'm not buying that argument. If people are having an alarm system, they care and they're not going to just go and disconnect for no reason.

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

And in the instance that you mentioned, the terms of the neighbor calling, I would hope that when a neighbor calls about someone's house and they think that there's something going on over there, whether it's because there's an alarm system going off or the smoke alarm's going off in the house, I don't have an alarm system but if my smoke alarms are going off, I hope my neighbors, if they hear it and I'm not home, call 911 so that the fire department can respond. But I don't think that warrants even mention of a violation of an alarm. You didn't have a registered alarm that's gone through one of these companies that has somebody calling us up to say there's an alarm; there's no activation other than by neighbor. You can't get a false alarms because the neighbor called.

LEG. TROTТА:

Well, that was my question. I mean, my whole court of people have alarms, they don't have alarm companies because I told them, there's no sense. You know, I'll walk around --

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah, it's like the car alarm that goes off. And you know what? Most people probably just ignore it, but if somebody calls, that can't be the responsibility of the homeowner that has the alarm that's just making the noise because their neighbor called.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm for this, but there's just too few. I mean, you've got to give the guy five times or something, otherwise you're going to have that consequence of people just not doing alarms.

LEG. SPENCER:

I agree with that.

LEG. TROTТА:

I would say increase it to five or six or something reasonable, we'll talk to Nassau County. I mean, I know a guy over there, we'll find out what the number is.

LEG. CALARCO:

Commissioner, what is Nassau County's law, do you know off the top -- do you know how many alarms before they trigger?

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

We mirror theirs at the moment.

LEG. CALARCO:

So we, by having it at three, is the same as theirs.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

They have determined nationally that two is a good trip to make people become aware and responsible for their actions.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. So it mirrors what other municipalities in the region have for their laws.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Both in the region and nationally.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. I mean, me personally -- actually, the registration fee is the one that I have more of an issue with than the fine. I think, you know, three strikes you're out, works for me. But, you know, the registration, the annual registration, I -- I'm just curious, John; what would the impact be if we did not pass this before the end of the year and we were to have them revisit it? What would the impact be?

MR. ORTIZ:

Well, the registration fee wouldn't matter either way, that's a one-time payment. So at any time during the year --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, it's not, it's an annual payment.

MR. ORTIZ:

No, I know, but if we do it any time during 2016, that number stays constant.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah.

MR. ORTIZ:

It would just be the fines; if we don't pass it till February, you would lose January and February's, you know, fines.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We can't estimate what that could be.

MR. ORTIZ:

I can probably figure that out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So there was, I believe, a motion to table and I think a second; was there? Yes, okay. What I'll do is I think we had a motion to approve and a second.

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I was going to -- okay, leave it at that.

LEG. CALARCO:

You can discharge it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I was thinking about that. So I was thinking about making a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. CALARCO:

And I'll withdraw my second on the motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And there's a withdrawal on the motion to approve. Kara, what about you?

LEG. HAHN:

Sure

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we do have a motion to discharge without recommendation. Second, Legislator Calarco. The tabling goes first. So there was a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed.

LEG. CALARCO:

Opposed to tabling.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm opposed to tabling.

MR. NOLAN:

Who's in favor?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Two in favor. Jason, you got the two in favor of the tabling? Legislator Kennedy and Spencer were the tabling motion, the rest of us are opposed to tabling. Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We're both opposed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, we got that. ***So the motion to table fails (VOTE: 2-4-0-0 -In Favor: Legislators Kennedy & Spencer).***

There was a motion to discharge without recommendation, I made that motion. Legislator Calarco seconded that. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Was there an oppose --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Legislator Kennedy opposed the discharge. Okay, so it has been ***discharged without recommendation (VOTE: 5-1-0-0 - Opposed: Legislator Kennedy).***

Mr. Clampett, you can't vote

MR. CLAMPETT:

No, no, it's not about --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, I'm sorry, you can't talk from the audience.

Okay. So thank you, Commissioner and Lieutenant. It's good to see you, Mr. Webber.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Actually, Commissioner, I would -- we're not done yet. Can everybody keep it down? Commissioner, I would recommend that maybe it's going to be an issue that maybe we have

someone here to respond from the Police Department.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And thank you again always for your years of service, but I know we'll see you on Tuesday.

LEG. CALARCO:

Oh, he's coming on Tuesday?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, he's coming on Tuesday.

LEG. CALARCO:

We're not letting him off too easy.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, he's not getting away too easy.

So I don't want to go on -- I want to apologize; Patrice, again, you were here. Was there any anything on the agenda of issue?

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

(Shook head no).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I know that Commissioner Williams from FRES is a little under the weather, so he is not able to be here. And I do want to ask, I did forget; Mr. Sharkey, you have an update on the Correction Officers test list and how many applicants? Can you kind of give us a background? I know this is -- I know I've been asking you to kind of keep us up-to-date on post the contract and how things are going.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yeah, you had asked me to inform you as things moved along of --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

-- any impacts perceived of the new contract deal. I did let you know at an earlier meeting that we had many less than usual sign up for the test, somewhere in the 2800 range, whereas the last test we had closer to 9,000 sign up for the test. I also have just checked with Civil Service after the test, because there's generally a certain percentage, between 10 and 15% of the signed up candidates, that won't appear for the test. Well, in this case we approached 30%, so we had in the neighborhood of 800 people not show up for the test that had signed up for it. So our list at best will be 2,000, but then again there is also a projection from Civil Service that generally between -- you know, roughly 15% won't pass the test.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

You know, we'll be down with a list of around 1600 people, which won't be adequate.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right. So it reduces the number of qualified and the best qualified people. Do you know when there's another class coming up or when you plan to start another class?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Well, we would plan based on when the list is established. Our list is expired, so we don't have a list to hire from right now.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

This list will be established shortly and then we'll go through the investigation process, so probably the earliest we'd be able to even be ready to do a class would be September, October.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So you anticipate maybe 2,000 people will take the test, and then how many are --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

No, the test already occurred.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, sorry.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

There were 2800, approximately, that signed up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Only approximately 2,000 showed up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

And then we have yet to know how many passed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You don't have the scores yet. So, and plus then you have to go through the investigative process and all of that, so now you're going to whittle down how many are actually going to graduate. So, you know, that has been a concern of mine, is that who wants to take the test anymore, so you're losing the best candidates that you possibly could have. And I think, too, when you have other tests, like the New York City Police test, when you have the Suffolk Police test, you have any other law enforcement test that comes up, clearly, because of that salary, they are most likely to want to move on if they can get a job elsewhere.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Well, it used to be that we recruited from NYPD, and clearly it's going to be a reverse now. I do just want to share with you some disturbing news that was shared with me, at least I find it disturbing; that one of our brand new Correction Officers qualifies and is receiving food stamps.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That's not good, not good at all.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

This is not something that can be addressed in the near term, it's a long-term contract, it doesn't expire until 2018. But it's something I told you I would keep you informed on.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Uh-huh.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

It may be something you may want to pay attention to in regard to our other bargaining unit that has not settled their contract yet, the Deputy Sheriffs, they're still without a contract and it may be something that may come into play with that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, then we could wind up with the same problem. That Corrections Officer, is he married, children; do you know?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I don't feel comfortable discussing that personal information on the record.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right, okay. No, I'm just curious, you know, because obviously -- I'll check with Social Services on the criteria. I can't remember exactly what it is to be eligible.

LEG. CALARCO:

He definitely has kids

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

He must be married with kids, or at least have children to be qualified.

LEG. HAHN:

(Inaudible)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, I think I said that.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I think I had mentioned to you at an earlier --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But I appreciate --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I think I had mentioned to you earlier that the net hourly pay that they're receiving is roughly \$11 an hour.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right, right, yet we have a commission looking to raise the minimum wage to 15 for someone who works at McDonald's, which I think is great, but we're not doing our Corrections Officers any favors. So I appreciate your updates, and please continue to keep me updated and this committee, because I think that at some point, if it doesn't get any better, this is something that I think the Administration really should be readdressing.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. So we'll get back to the agenda, and we're just about five minutes late for the next committee.

Introductory Resolutions

So **1950-15 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$17,548 from the United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the DEA Long Island Task Force with 79.14% support (County Executive).**

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

1951-15 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$17,548 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force with 79.14% support (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Approved - VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

1952-15 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$45,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Ice El Dorado Task Force with 79.14% support (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Approved - VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

1953-15 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$60,000 from the United States Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the IRS STEPP (Suffolk-Treasury Enhanced Prosecution Program) with 82% support (County Executive). I'll make a motion to approve, and second Legislator Martinez for a change. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

Public Safety Committee - 12/10/15

1954-15 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$17,548 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Long Island Cyber Crime Task Force (LICCTF) with 79.14% support (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Martinez. Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

1995-15 - Accepting and appropriating \$1,500,000 in grant funding from the New York State Department of Transportation for provision of dedicated traffic enforcement in the vicinity of certain highway construction projects with 100% support (County Executive). Motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. And second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (and placed on the consent calendar – VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

2018-15 - Accepting and appropriating grant funds in the amount of \$384,177 from the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, for a dedicated Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Enforcement Project with 80% support (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Spencer. Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

So with that, we have nothing more on the agenda. Motion to adjourn. We're all in favor?
We are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned 12:40 PM*)