

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, February 25th, 2016 at 9:30 am.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson

Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair

Legislator Kara Hahn

Legislator Bridget Fleming

Legislator Tom Cilmi

Legislator Leslie Kennedy

Legislator William Spencer

Legislator Monica Martinez

Also In Attendance:

Legislator Robert Trotta - Legislative District #13

Legislator Kevin McCaffrey - Legislative District #14

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature

Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature

Jason Richberg - Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

Robert Lipp - Director/Legislative Budget Review Office

Craig Freas - Budget Analyst/Legislative Budget Review Office.

Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory

Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning

Alysa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn

Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy

Zach Viola - Aide to Legislator Kennedy

Elizabeth Alexander - Aide to Legislator Spencer

Liz Sutton - Aide to Legislator Fleming

Maria Barbara - Aide to Legislator Cilmi

Brian Sapp - Aide to Legislator Lindsay.

Greg Atherton - Aide to Legislator McCaffrey

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

Kerry Suoto - County Executive Assistant

Jason Hahn - County Executive Assistant

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

Patrice Dishopolsky - Director/Suffolk County Probation Department

Richard O'Carroll - Deputy Inspector-Chief of Department's Office/SCPD

Mark Fisher - Deputy Inspector-Communications Records Bureau/SCPD

Anthony Bocchimuzzo - Communications/Suffolk County Police Department

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

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

Dr. Michael Caplan - Chief Medical Examiner of Suffolk County

Liza Wright - Senior Budget Analyst/Medical Examiner's Office
Joe Williams - Commissioner/Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services
John Jordan - Deputy Commissioner/Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services
Bob Holley - Director/Suffolk County Fire Academy
Eddie Johnston - Deputy Director/Suffolk County Fire Academy
Noel DiGerolamo - President/Suffolk County Police Benevolent Assoc
Jim Roddin - Trustee/Superior Officer's Association
Suzanne McBride - AME Representative/Police Emergency Unit
Jennifer Nuns - 911 Dispatcher/Suffolk County Police Department
Joe Hawkins - Senior Vice-President of Operations/ShotSpotter
Jack Pontius - Northeast Director/ShotSpotter
Mark Jones - Senior Director of Customer Success/ShotSpotter
Nancy Marr - Suffolk County League of Women Voters
Anthony LaFarrera - Vice-Chairman/Fire Chiefs Council of Suffolk County
Gerry Turza - Nominee/SC Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services Commission
Frank Vorventre-Nominee/SC Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services Commission
John Coughlin - Nominee/SC Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services Commission
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 9:48 A.M. *)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, good morning. Sorry for the delay. We will start the Public Safety meeting. If everyone could please rise for the pledge of allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

Salutation

There's always a moment of silence for those who defend our country, at home and abroad, and a special moment for a young man, 29 years old from the National Guard, our National Guard at the 106th, who passed away suddenly, so we'll keep him in our prayers. Sorry, the name is Joseph Tandy.

Moment of Silence Observed

Thank you. Okay. And for the record, Legislator Cilmi will not be here today. He has an excused absence, and we wish him well. He did have some surgery, so we hope we can see him on Tuesday. So Maria, please give him our best and we hope he feels better.

We do have one card. Suzanne McBride?

MS. McBRIDE:

Good morning, Madam Chair, Legislators. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak. I'd like to start by thanking you guys again for your continued support in trying to fix the staffing issues up at 911. I understand we do have some SCINS signed for dispatchers. While we are very grateful for those SCINS, unfortunately I have to say it is kind of like sticking bubble gum into the dam that has a big huge crack.

Since 2014, we have lost 21 personnel. Eight of those dispatchers have left recently. We have two dispatchers who are currently out long-term leave of absence, we have two more projected to leave within the next six to eight weeks. We are lower than the level we were in 2012 when I first came

here. And while those four SCINS will help us on the dispatch side, and I understand there are seven SCINS on the ECO side that, once filled, will extremely help us, people keep flooding out the doors. Until we find a way to stop the continued exits, we are going to continue to be in a very bad position, and unfortunately you'll probably continue to see me here every month.

We appreciate anything that can be done by this body, by the Police Commissioner, we are very grateful for his support. He's been tremendous already in just the few short weeks he's been here, we appreciate that. We hope that the County Executive can help out, get us some more SCINS. We know money is tight, but this is a crucial function for the County. Without the 911 operators, without those dispatchers, your families do not have anybody to call and the police do not have anybody on the other side of that radio when they need help. They do a tremendous job out there on the street every day. They need to know that they have dispatchers on those radios who are sharp and who are prepared to do that job, and being mandated for 12 to 16 hours is not going to give them the best person on that radio during the summer. We do not want to put their lives in jeopardy, so we're asking for your help. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Suzanne. I know that we have had conversation with the Commissioner and I think he has come up with a long-term plan to ensure that you are adequately and properly staffed. So thank you always for coming for your members.

MS. McBRIDE:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No one has any questions for Suzanne, right? Okay, good. We'll go -- actually, we do have ShotSpotter here. But what I will do is I know we have a few appointments and I'd like to give them the courtesy, I don't want to have to make them stay, I know that some of them have other things that they need to get to. So I will suggest that we take some of them out of order; I know there's quite a few of them.

MR. NOLAN:

There's also a few reappointments.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, there's a couple of reappointments. We'll just do the appointments.

Okay. So I will -- okay, the first one we have is 1127. So I'd like to make a motion to take out of order 1127. Do I have a second?

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is out of order.

So **1127-16 - Approving the appointment of Frank Bonventra -- Bonventre**, I'm sorry -- **as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services Commission (County Executive)**. Mr. Bonventre, I hope I'm saying your name correctly. If you'd like to come up and say hello and let us know a little bit about yourself.

MR. BONVENTRE:

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good morning.

MR. BONVENTRE:

My name is Frank Bonventre, I'm representing the Islip Town Fire Chiefs Council. And I've been a firemen since 1977 and I'd like to continue to serve my community and extend the community outside the Town of Islip. That's why I'd like to be part of the FRES commission.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Any questions? No? Okay. So I didn't actually get to meet you. I was at the FRES meeting last night, so I didn't get to meet you last night, but I'm sure we will meet up again at the next meeting. So thank you again for your service.

MR. BONVENTRE:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So I will make a motion to approve. Actually, what fire department are you with?

MR. BONVENTRE:

I'm with the East Islip Fire Department.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

East Islip. So I believe your Legislator is not here today. But I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, ***it is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)***. Congratulations and thank you for your service.

MR. BONVENTRE:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And no one needs to come on Tuesday.

The next one that we will take out of order is 1128, approving the appointment of John Coughlin as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is out of order -- taken out of order.

Okay, ***1128-16 - Approving the appointment of John Coughlin as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services Comission (County Executive)***. Mr. Coughlin, how are you?

MR. COUGHLIN:

Good morning, Madam Chairman. How are you?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good.

MR. COUGHLIN:

I'm John Coughlin, I'm a 38-year member of the Deer Park Volunteer Fire Department, presently the Town of Babylon Fire Chiefs President and appointed to the Suffolk County Fire Chiefs representative to the FRES Commission.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. And it was a pleasure meeting you last night.

MR. COUGHLIN:

The pleasure was all mine.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

My husband remembers you (*laughter*). Former NYPD.

MR. COUGHLIN:

Correct.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So he says to say hello.

MR. COUGHLIN:

Say hello back for me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I will. But anyway, so I will make a motion to approve. We have a second, Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? And congratulations. **(Approved - VOTE: 7-0-0-1 – Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).**

MR. COUGHLIN:

Thank you very much. I look forward to working with the committee.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you. See you next month.

We did have -- I kind of want to ask this one. There's an appointment for Jay Egan. He was not able to come today, but we all know him, it's just a different position, so.

MR. NOLAN:

(Inaudible)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, that's what I want to know. Well, he's not here today anyway, but that was my question.

We have one more, it's -- I'll make a motion to take out of order **1134(-16)** and that's **approving the appointment of Gerard Turza Jr as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services Commission (County Executive)**. Second?

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It has been taken out of order.

So 1134, I'll make a motion. And we have a second, Legislator Hahn. And good morning again.

MR. TURZA:

Good morning. How are you today?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We're good.

MR. TURZA:

My name is George Turza Jr, I'm the Assistant Chief with the East Hampton Fire Department. I am the representative for the East Hampton Town Fire Chiefs Council to the FRES Commission.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. TURZA:

I have 25 years in the fire service.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, and thank you for your service. It was a pleasure again meeting you last night.

MR. TURZA:

The pleasure was mine.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I will apologize. I'll withdraw my motion. I'm assuming that -- you're on this committee, right?

LEG. FLEMING:

(Nodded head yes).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So -- yeah, Legislator Fleming I'm sure will want to make that motion, and that second by Legislator Hahn. So thank you again for your service and --

MR. TURZA:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- we'll see you next month. So, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved***
(VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).

LEG. FLEMING:

Cosponsor.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And cosponsor, Legislator Fleming.

Okay. So all the others, there is no one else here for appointments, or reappointments, correct?

MR. NOLAN:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So with that --

LEG. HAHN:

I would like to thank all the volunteers for their service and their willingness to serve on the FRES Commission.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, thank you.

So with that, we have ShotSpotter and Mr. Jack Pontius that we all know well, who is the Northeast Region Director for ShotSpotter. Jack, if you'd like to introduce everyone who's with you. I know you've been through this before, you've done it before. Go ahead. Good morning.

MR. PONTIUS:

Good morning, Madam Chair and Legislators. It's great to be back. My name is Jack Pontius, I'm the Northeast Director for ShotSpotter. And we are very excited to be bringing the team in today, at least part of the team. We have some new introductions, so I'll go ahead and introduce the team. Next to me on my right is Joe Hawkins, he's our Operations Chief for ShotSpotter. He'll be conducting a short presentation today, kind of going over some of the data and the results that we've seen over the past year. And on his right is Mark Jones, relatively new with the company. As we continue to grow and expand, we're bringing in new resources, and Mark will be leading and is leading our training and customer success programs. And on his right is Anthony Nunley who is our Director of Operations for the Northeast Region here, primarily focused in on the New York region as we continue to expand our operations in New York City, Nassau County. We've had an expansion here in Suffolk County, as you know, so we need additional resources to help with the operations and certainly the driving customer success and best practices.

With that said, I'm going to go ahead and turn the presentation over to Joe Hawkins, our Operations Chief. Thank you.

MR. HAWKINS:

Thank you, Jack. Madam Chair, Legislators, my name again, Joe Hawkins, Senior Vice President of Operations for ShotSpotter. What we're going to go through today is just some data we prepared looking back at the ShotSpotter data from actually the last two years, and with a focus on looking at the service performance in terms of what we've delivered and what we can see from our side.

Typically what we do when we have these reviews with our customers directly is then talk about the successes that they've had and things that we might be able to export, largely through Mark and his strategic focus, to other agencies so that they can benefit from things that are going on in places like Suffolk County, and then see where we can improve going forward.

Just by way of recap, again, I apologize for the long distance 20,000-foot eye chart, but you'll recognize the five cities that we have been operating in Suffolk County for the past four years, and we'll get a closer look at this. As Jack mentioned, starting late in 2014 and early last year, we worked closely with the Suffolk County PD directly to identify opportunities where we can improve where the coverage areas actually existed so that we're actually focusing on where they were concerned about gun violence and could better focus their resources. We made those adjustments to the physical infrastructure in Suffolk County and turned up service in an expanded area going from seven square miles to eight square miles in August of last year. I should note that this expansion of one mile was something we did for Suffolk County at no charge as a show of our commitment to improving what we bring to the table here in our partnership with Suffolk County PD.

A closer look at these coverage areas, and I won't dwell on them too long. Huntington Station was more of an adjustment or a movement of where ShotSpotter coverage is as opposed to an expansion; it expanded very, very slightly. Brentwood, you did see a little bit of an expansion around the periphery, so we've added between those two about a third of a square mile. In the other cities, again, we saw about equal expansions each in Wyandanch, Amityville and North Bellport, totaling two-thirds of a square mile; so between the five cities, a one mile addition.

In terms of actual gunfire detected over the last two years, and what we focus on is really the change year-over-year. Really good news, at least from our perspective, and that is very large reductions in gunfire in Brentwood and in Huntington Station, also good reduction in Wyandanch. A little bit of an uptick in North Bellport and Amityville looking year-over-year. When you take all of the eight square miles of Suffolk County in total on a per square mile basis, that nets out to a 24% reduction in overall gunfire. So by any measure, we look at that as a very, very healthy improvement in terms of reduced gunfire detected. And again, all we do on our end is deliver the data about where gunfire is happening, the actual reduction is a reflection of what Suffolk County PD has been able to do to reduce that gunfire. So very, very promising.

Looking -- again, I apologize for the eye chart we're looking at, it's a little bit closer how gunfire looks geographically from city to city. Part of the point we make here is the heat map that you see with green representing relatively cool areas, red representing relatively hot areas, is a traditional law enforcement tool that almost any agency is familiar with. What they lack, though, and I think Suffolk County is a good example of this, is the precision to show exactly where things are happening. The red dots represent the locations, the precise locations of gunfire incidents that occurred. And you can see, looking at 2014 versus 2015, exactly where gunfire has moved, where it's been reduced entirely, Huntington Station is a great example of that. Whereas if you only had the heat map itself and not the precise dots, with this small amount of gunfire activity, you can see how the heat map itself is not a particularly useful tool from an investigative response or predicted policing perspective. So, again, good reductions, very, very strong reductions. I mean, these are way beyond any sort of numbers we see in most cities, even with the overall pretty low numbers.

Wyandanch as well, you see reductions there, even though the heat map doesn't change at all. It's pretty clear where concentrated gunfire activity is down. The slight increases in Amityville and North Bellport again are you're able to hone in pretty specifically as to where to apply resources and where activity is changing.

I'm not going to go through the following charts in detail, but what we've got for Suffolk County PD is a breakdown of month-to-month activity. And again, this is not side-by-side year-to-year, but you can see where things do trend. Across the board, in most cases we're down in almost all months, and I'll let you take a look at this at your convenience later on going through the numbers. Otherwise, it's not particularly instructive, at least from our perspective. But the data at a month-to-month breakdown is there.

One of the things that we always do with all of our customers in Suffolk County is no different. As a reminder to everybody, ShotSpotter, as proud as we are of the technology and our people, it is not a perfect system. It is not designed to detect all gunfire, and certainly there are going to be gunfire incidents that we do not detect from time to time. Now, rather than simply accept that and say, *Well, that's just the way it is*, we have a protocol, a standard operating procedure for responding to any reports of missed gunfire that we do learn about, because there are things that we can do and we have done them in Suffolk County. So we actually have a great partnership with Suffolk County PD where they're extremely good about telling us when they've got incidents of confirmed gunfire that ShotSpotter did not create an alert on so that we've got an opportunity to take some action on those things. And we keep a record in our database of every such report; we know exactly when they happened and where they happened. We have records of what sort of ground truth or physical

evidence the Police Department was able to accumulate that, in fact, confirms it was gunfire. We know who was telling us about those incidents.

We also keep track of any reports of gunfire incidents that we've misclassified. Because, again, as good as our humans are, and they -- each one of our people in our 24/7 review center will hear more gunfire in a month than virtually any law enforcement officer will in their entire career, unless they've done active military duty in a hot war zone. All we do is listen to gunfire. But occasionally you'll see twelve cases over two years where we misclassified gunshots, and we use those as learning opportunities as well.

A little bit about -- actually, I'm going to back up a little bit, and rather than talk about the standard operating procedure, I'll voice over. When we learn of a missed gunfire incident, as a reminder, in order to detect and put a dot on the map, we have to have at least three sensors that detect the gunfire incident at a slightly different time, that allows us to do the math to try and get the location of the gunshot origin. When we don't have three gunshots, perhaps it was a small caliber weapon, perhaps the gunfire was slightly concealed in a closed space or a point black where the acoustic energy of the gunshot can be absorbed by other materials, sometimes even a person, sadly. There may still be audio evidence on a single sensor, possibly two sensors; not enough to locate a dot, but enough that our forensic experts can remotely access that audio. And when we do find traces of audio, we'll package that up and deliver it to the Suffolk County PD on the presumption that that can be helpful in their investigation. Perhaps it will tell them, in fact, there were five shots fired at exactly 14 seconds after 1:15 in the afternoon, so they've got a time. Oftentimes that data is used to corroborate a witness or help back refute a witness who may be less than truthful. You'll see here on each one of our cases that in just over half the times we were, in fact, able to find some audio and send that to the Police Department. So our goal is even when we're not detecting gunfire realtime from a response perspective, we can help out an investigative perspective after the fact, and that's what we endeavor to do in every case.

The last thing that we do is we use the aggregation or collection of those missed gunshot reports almost the way a doctor would use testing your blood pressure or cholesterol to look for hidden signs that may not be as apparent on the surface to see if there are any areas of our service that we can shore up or need to improve. In many cities, and I don't know if it's necessarily true in Suffolk County, the topography or the geography or building layouts can change over the course of years, and the way sound propagates through the air can change as well at the time. So we take a proactive look at evolving our service and making adjustments to match the geography, to match the cities that we're in based on those missed gunshot reports. The good news here is we've not seen any such trends in Suffolk County that indicate a problem, service is actually quite strong, as evidenced by the gunfire numbers and the reductions there.

The last thing I wanted to share with you is while most people are familiar with ShotSpotter as a real-time alerting service, we also provide a number of things after the fact to help with investigation, crime analysis and ultimately prosecution of gun crime. We do that through a number of forensic data services that are delivered by our technical support staff. There's a couple of different flavors of reports, the granddaddy of which is the detailed forensic report. In its best use case -- and I'll give you an example. Typically when a multiple gunshot incident occurs, what we deliver to the Police Department real-time is a single dot on the map that says "M" for multiple, and it may say there were 25 shots fired, and this is the center of all those gunshots. With a detailed forensic report, we are able to, using our post processing tools, tear apart that incident into each individual shot and place them precisely in both time and space to recreate a crime scene from an acoustic perspective. This being an example of that with many, many gunshots fired, you can see dots all over the place that indicate where the shooting occurred and we can replay that in time. These reports were designed for courtroom testimony and they are accepted as evidence in courts across the country, both at a State and a Federal level. And when

we testify in court, it is with a mind to demonstrate the technical proficiency and efficacy of the service to accurately locating the gunfire, and we will show things like this and explain with our chief scientists how math and physics played into locating gunshots accurately.

In fact, Suffolk County PD has made great use of our forensic services over the last two years. Seventeen times they requested what we call an enhanced incident report that can be very useful in quickly propagating out evidence of a shooting to investigators and detectives and six detailed forensic reports. And we're very pleased to say that, in fact, twice we've been asked to testify in court or work with a District Attorney to help explain ShotSpotter data in the prosecution of a case against a perpetrator of gun violence. Again, we keep detailed records on all of this. As we sit here today, we're working with the District Attorney right now on preparing for trial that is tentatively scheduled to go to court the first week of March, and we're very, very pleased to support the PD and the District Attorney in that effort.

Lastly -- and again, this is just a snapshot -- we have a close relationship with Suffolk County PD. We view this as a partnership where we're helping them in a long-term, strategic focus on reducing gunfire in Suffolk County. One hundred and thirteen times over the past two years we've had a contact beyond the gunshot alert themselves or the many real-time chats that they will have with our incident review center to either ask for assistance with a case or to give us feedback about how we're performing and about the ground truth associated with gunshot incidents. This is a sign of a very healthy relationship, we're very proud of the Suffolk County PD. And that said, we're looking forward to continuing to work and grow the relationship, particularly through Mark and his efforts, as we evolve our best practices and customer success program.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. Mark, next.

MR. JONES:

Good morning, Legislators. It's an honor to be here to present to you. My role in the company is to help one customer learn from other customers and bring the best practices from potentially one side of the country to another.

I've been with the company for just a little more than a year. Since I've started we've begun a process called -- what we call executive account reviews where we visit with our customers at least once a year to do exactly what you're seeing that Joe Hawkins has put up for you, and that's essentially to go over our data and our service and find out how we might be a better service to the Suffolk County Police Department. I come to this job with a 30-year law enforcement background; I'm a retired Federal agent, municipal police officer. I've got a great deal of investigative background and so I've been putting that to work. My passion is investigations, and so we're spending a great deal of time revamping things like our training program so that we agree to bring a lot more web-based training.

We're creating an on-line user community for our users that Suffolk County will be able to participate in and get answers to their own questions. But largely what we really are doing is connecting one agency to another. We have many, many customers, Suffolk County included, that are doing really great work using the service, and we want to make sure that all of our customers know that, you know, what one agency is doing all agencies can do if it fits their protocol.

What our service does is provide a tool for agencies to recognize where their crime -- their gun crime is occurring and be able to focus resources on that -- on that place or those places. And so in pursuit of that, we're creating new programs within the company to bring these training programs in and analytical efforts to the Suffolk County Police department, and we're working in very close partnership with them to get that done.

MR. PONTIUS:

So Madam Chair, that concludes our formal presentation, and we certainly would be open to any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, yes, we do.

(*Laughter*)

MR. PONTIUS:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I know that our Presiding Officer isn't here today, but notably Amityville and Bellport. The -- I'm not sure if that increase is just an increase in what you're detecting or an increase -- just an increase in gunshot that's being detected, or just that the crime is going up as far as gunfire; is it one or the other or both?

MR. HAWKINS:

I understand the question, Madam Chair. The gunshot data that we reported are simply those gunshot incidents that we have detected --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. HAWKINS:

-- in real-time using ShotSpotter technology.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Because I'm kind of -- you know, we do have that issue with gun crime. And I'm curious if -- are there other locations throughout the United States where you've seen this kind of uptick? And what have they done to try and -- because obviously when ShotSpotter first came, you know, the criminals are saying, *Well, I'm not going to shoot off a gun where ShotSpotter exists*, but maybe now they're getting very cocky and could care less. So I'm just curious what other places are doing to try and reduce that.

MR. HAWKINS:

I'm going to let Mark answer part of that question. I can tell you that certainly there are cities that are not as fortunate as Suffolk County that have got much, much, much higher rates of gun violence. It's extremely disturbing, really, from our perspective, unacceptable, as any kind of new normal. And there are cities that have, in fact, seen dramatic rises in gunfire activity from 2014 to 2015, and even starting into this year. I forgot to mention, just looking at this January compared to last January, there's another 10% reduction so far. That's not necessarily a predictor of what will happen for the rest of the year, but again, there are other cities; I'd rather not name names, but they're usually larger cities that get plenty of news and are struggling with a terrible increase in gun violence. As to the causes, there are many complex factors, but I'll let Mark who is much more of an expert than I am, talk to that.

MR. JONES:

Madam Chair, the reasons why gunfire might go up in a particular coverage area or down are -- I mean, we understand generally why they go down. But I think on the uptick there are many cities around the country -- I think you'll all recognize that there's been a national trend in crime going down, it's been going on for a few years now.

In some places it's intractable and stubborn, and in many instances agencies have to sort of dial in their efforts. In the coverage areas here in Suffolk County, you've seen dramatic reductions in three and slight increases in gunfire. And this is, mind you, gunfire that we are detecting, it's not necessarily indicative of an overall rise in crime in that coverage area.

What I would suggest is that the Suffolk County Police are also aware of this. Our service gives them the tool to say, *Look, there's a 12% increase in this particular coverage area.* So they can then start using the tool as it's meant to be used in that way to focus their efforts on those two places where they've had increases, even though slight increases, I'm sure the Commissioner is not happy with that and is going to want to reduce them. With the new Commissioner, we're going to have a meeting with him at some point, I think, in the very near future to discuss additional strategies and things that others are doing that may be helpful to them -- to him.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But what are the other locations doing? Have they modified anything? Have they done anything different to try and use ShotSpotter to reduce that activity?

MR. JONES:

Yes, ma'am. The agencies that we're working with are doing things like creating specialized units whose only job really is they don't take regular calls for service, they respond only to gunfire alerts, they do follow-up. They're tied to a robust effort to enter ballistic evidence into the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network that's run by ATF. They are doing things like looking at their processes for collecting evidence to see how long it takes for them to get evidence back once they've entered it into the system. It's a fairly complex bit of things that they can do. There aren't any real, simple answers, like just throw a whole bunch more cops into a district and hope that that works. We're in an age of data-driven policing, so that --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Are they doing any -- no, but, I mean, as far as ShotSpotter's concerned, have they used the ShotSpotter technology or enhanced the ShotSpotter technology? Do they all have cameras or do they not? I mean, that --

MR. JONES:

I'm going to actually pass that idea of the cameras to Joe and Jack.

MR. PONTIUS:

So, yes, there's a number of agencies throughout the country that are integrating the ShotSpotter acoustic surveillance system with the video assets. We're not doing that here in Suffolk County as of yet, it's certainly something that we could do to enhance not only the investment that you have made in video assets, cameras, but also to provide a more robust solution for deterring and interdicting gun crime.

The thing is, you know, it's not that there's a whole like plethora of shooters out there in these neighborhoods, it's really a few bad people that are serial shooters. And when you get the two or three or four or five or six, whatever, these guys off the street, it tends to send a message to the other serial shooters that, *Hey, you know, maybe this isn't a good idea, (laughter)*, and their risk calculation changes quite rapidly. So that's why we're seeing on the national scale gun violence reduction in ShotSpotter zones of about 35%. In some cities where they're really putting resources, like Mark was talking about, in counties that are using ShotSpotter in more disruptive ways, we're seeing as much as 60, 70, 80% reductions in gunfire in the zones. I think Nassau County would be proof of that. We are expanding dramatically in Nassau County, as we continue to operate there.

Certainly, there are things we can do better and we will, as Mark said, endeavor to sit down with the new Commissioner and the command staff to talk about strategies and tactics to make sure that we continue to disrupt and deter gun crime.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, thank you for that. Doc, you have a question?

LEG. SPENCER:

I do. Good morning. Thank you very much for your presentation and the updated information. I have been a fan of ShotSpotter, and as I became a Legislature -- Legislator, that was one of the things that was very important for me as far as in Huntington Station. And over the past four years, I've had some kind of conflicting reports as far as constituents in my community, wondering if the value is there, and I wanted to ask a few questions along those lines.

So, I guess the first question is when I look -- when I get the reports from the Police Department, they do like a year-to-date activations and dispositions by precinct. And in the past, when I look at the end of year from 2014, my concern is that the unsubstantiated and the false claims are 80% compared to the confirmed; the confirmed, I guess, activations are in the low 20s, and in some precincts have been as low as 10%. And I'm just looking at the activations from 2014 that see by precinct -- in the 1st Precinct there were 70% unsubstantiated, 14% false, 14.6 confirmed.

So my question is I know that there is a learning curve, but is there a standard protocol within the Police Department that is consistent throughout all the precincts of how they address an activation when it occurs?

MR. HAWKINS:

Thank you, Dr. Spencer. I'll also ask Mark to chime in on this one. I do not know what Suffolk County Police Department's specific protocols for response are. I do know, as we had this similar conversation a couple of years ago, that unfounded -- I believe, if I recall correctly -- means the officers were unable to find evidence in those cases of gunfire. It does not mean that gunfire did not exist, the audio evidence that we've got is pretty clear in all those cases.

I would simply say it is not easy to find physical evidence or cooperative witnesses in many cases. That's one of the most difficult parts of police work. It's something we would like to understand more deeply with the Suffolk County Police Department. That said, again, I'll ask my colleague Mark Jones to comment further.

MR. JONES:

Legislator Spencer, I would only say that I have not had the opportunity yet to meet with the Suffolk County Police one-on-one to determine what their procedures are, and offer only that that's coming in the very near future, that we'll have that conversation.

That said, Joe's right. It's very difficult to find shell casings, particularly on Is and IIs, they're small. As a prior law enforcement officer, I can tell you just picking up brass at the range after regular qualification where there's nothing but brass, you miss brass. So on a dark street in the middle of the night, no excuses, but it's difficult sometimes to find that. So it's confirming actual gunfire. We're very convinced that the science is correct; when we say that there's gunfire there, we're right 90% of the time, maybe more.

MR. HAWKINS:

More.

MR. JONES:

More, definitely more.

LEG. SPENCER:

And, you know, I would imagine that if there was -- I'm sure that there would be some difficulties in terms of substantiating gunfire. But, you know, if I see out of one precinct unsubstantiated 44%, false 25%, confirmed 30%, and then I see in another precinct confirmed 8%, that's a significant difference there. So I would imagine -- is there any thoughts of why there would be -- you know, that's definitely statistically significant, almost a 25% difference in confirmed findings. And when you look at the number of rounds fired, they're pretty similar; so about 50 rounds over the course of the year. So unfortunately when I see that, I don't know if -- you know, to me the 8% doesn't give me the value, the 30% gives me the value. And I just can't come up with a reason of why there would be that substantial variation. And this is just the latest report looking at year-to-date from the October numbers.

And so I don't know if there's someone from -- you know, I guess what I'm saying is that if this administration and this Legislature is going to invest, and I want our police officers to -- I want to make sure that our police force is either satisfied with the technology that they feel, you know, I want to arm them with what they need, but if in one precinct they're saying ShotSpotter, it's really like a false alarm; it's going off in a business and it's not being taken seriously.

So, all right, you don't know how the PD is handling it, I understand that. Maybe I can ask someone from the Police Department if they would address that, if there's one of the Chiefs here. But what would it count -- you've got five geographic areas. Why would there be that vast a difference in terms of confirmed confirmations from one precinct to another.

MR. JONES:

Legislator, I would say that there's none of our customers, not one would say that they're doing things perfectly all the time.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure.

MR. JONES:

We can't let perfection be the enemy of the good; I think it's an old chestnut, but it's true in this case. I think that if they're differences district-to-district and precinct-to-precinct, that the commanders in those precincts are held accountable for them, for those differences and for the performance of their officers in their districts. You know, when we meet with the Commissioner, we'll certainly talk about standardization of procedure across the County. And as I've previously said, I have not yet had the opportunity to review in-depth Suffolk County's procedures and, frankly, what they -- we do need to have that conversation and I'm sure they're going to be open to suggestion on things. And they have -- they're the experts on Suffolk County and what they need to do in one district versus another.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure. And I'm not criticizing any of the commanders. In fact, I'm trying to reach out to ask, *Is this what you need? Is the value there?*

MR. JONES:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

When I vote for a bill to re-up ShotSpotter, should I take that money and use it for more police officers? You know, is the value there. And, you know, maybe through the Chair, at the conclusion of this, or at some point if there is one of the Chiefs that could talk to me about their thoughts, it would be important. But I think that's really where, you know, you being here, thank you with -- you know, I appreciate what you're saying here, but I want to hear that our Police Department is coming to this Legislature and saying, *Hey, this is good. The learning curve is there, it is helping us and this is a valuable tool*, and that would mean a lot as far as my support is concerned for the project. But through the Chair, at the conclusion, I'm hoping if there's a minute that I could ask one of the Chiefs, I'd appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure.

LEG. SPENCER:

But I'll yield.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm going to make a really bad mistake; Mark, Inspector Fisher?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes? Thank God I got it right (*laughter*). And I have to say, I don't know if you remember, when I asked our new Police Commissioner about the ShotSpotter, it was a question I had asked of him at the last Public Safety meeting, was did he think that we were utilizing ShotSpotter to the best of our ability, and he agrees we are not really using it, he did not think that we're using it as much as we should be.

So with that, I will hope that there will be a meeting set up shortly. And I -- I do believe that with our new Police Commissioner that there will definitely be maybe a bit more communication, and whatever needs to be done to enhance the system to make it work better between the Police Department and yourselves, I think he will definitely do that.

So Mark?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I guess if you can respond to Doc Spencer's questions, or if you need him to repeat anything?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Well, I think the -- if I got the question correct, how do we respond or is there a consistency or standardization in response amongst precincts, and the answer to that is yes. We handle -- when we get a call of gunshots, whether it's ShotSpotter or coming from an anonymous citizen, we go to the area, we look around. And again, where it may not be always consistent, it depends on the area. If it's a wooded area with no people around, the officer will get out, take a look, put his flashlight down on the ground, see if he sees any evidence, and depending on the topography, he may go into the woods. If it's a residential area, he may knock on some doors and start doing interviews; if there are people out on the street, he's going to stop and talk to those people. But we respond the same way. And again, whether it's ShotSpotter or whether it's an anonymous call, if we have a complainant on a call, we naturally go to that complainant and interview them and try

to figure out what's going on.

A little bit more on the shell casings. And I know it's going out of vogue, and maybe I'll show my age here, but in the days of the revolver, shell casings weren't ejected, so sometimes there are no shell casings with certain weapons also. So sometimes it's very, very difficult to recover or make a determination that way, but we respond pretty much consistently in all precincts.

LEG. SPENCER:

And the purpose of my inquiry is really not as far as looking at how you are responding, but really more addressing my support of the program. And so from your perspective, you know, I guess that what I'm interested in finding out is that is this something that the Police Department says, *We want this. Give this to us, Doc.*

And then I'll ask you, the other question was if there is that consistent sort of program or response over the course -- and I'm not talking about one month; I get it in a month. I'm talking about two precincts, about 50 rounds fired over the course of the year, and in one precinct seeing over a 30% confirmation rate, and in another precinct seeing an 8% confirmation rate. So it seems that, you know, one month to month you may get some fluctuations, but when we're talking about similar rounds fired, similar Police Departments, similar procedures, what could possibly account for such a disproportionate amount of confirmations? And I think that that's where I'm scratching my head. You know, maybe -- I don't know if it -- internally what's happening there, but that is to me kind of -- that's very concerning.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

I see your point on the numbers and the numbers are disparate. But again, without an analysis and taking a look into it, really digging in deep as to what's happening here, how the officers responded to topography and the overall situation, I wouldn't be able to give you an answer right now on why those numbers are so different. But I understand your concerns.

LEG. SPENCER:

And maybe I could just, you know, work with the police internally to just try to get, you know, some -- a sense of why that might be. Because to me, that's everything. If I'm looking at -- you know, I'm following it from year to year. If I see the number of confirmations going up I'm saying, *Ah ha! This is great.* If I see convictions, if I see gunfire going down, then I'm saying, *Okay.* And I've got a lot of pressure from Huntington Station. I've got groups that have organized, Huntington Matters, that are holding me accountable to make sure that I'm spending their tax dollars with our public safety in the best way possible, you know. And if this is something that, with all due respect, if we should have more license plate readers or if we should have more cameras, you know, I want to know. This is great technology, but it's not cheap, and if we're expanding it and we're looking to re-up it, I need to get some sense to a question like that. You could understand where I'm coming from.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

No, I understand completely and, you know, it makes total sense to me. And what I'll do is I'll bring back your concerns, we'll have to open dialogue and take a look at it, and I'll bring it back to my Chiefs and I'm sure somebody will be contacting you. We will be in comunicada (*sic*).

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Communication.

LEG. SPENCER:

That really means a lot to me. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll yield.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Calarco?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you. Inspector, you said something that kind of got me a little upset, and it's not, probably, your fault. But we had this discussion with ShotSpotter at least two or three years ago regarding how -- what protocols are in place and how officers respond to an incident of ShotSpotter.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Uh-huh.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And I appreciate and understand our officers are under a great deal, amount of pressure and just in their time constraints alone, in order to respond to calls and get people serviced and make sure that they're taking care of our public. But there is a difference between somebody calling in a gunshot who lives on a street and ShotSpotter calling in a gunshot to you. That difference is that ShotSpotter is telling you a very specific location that they believe a gunshot went off, that gives you a very specific radius to search, where there could possibly be shell casings. And to say that you respond to both instances in the exact same fashion means that you don't actually give any regard to what ShotSpotter is sending you, which then means that ShotSpotter -- we either are wasting our money with them, or our Police Department doesn't have any buy-in into this technology.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Well, no. If I gave you that impression, that's maybe not what I wanted to come across with. What I'm trying to say is that we take shot -- calls, whether it's from the public or whether it's from ShotSpotter, very seriously of gunshots.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I am sure you do, but they are different types of calls that regard -- require different protocols. Because when you are given a very specific location that has a longitude and a latitude and says, *This is the point at which there was a gunshot that went off*, and you are going to -- we are guaranteeing that point with technology that's proven in the courts, so we know it's a proven technology, within a certain radius, I think it's 25 meters, if I'm not mistaken?

MR. HAWKINS:

That's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Then we know exactly where to go search. Now, there are hindrances to that. Like if that shot came from a backyard, you may not be able to get into that area to look. Or if it came from within a house, which I know is not as easily detected, that may put a hindrance to where to look, but there should be a protocol there. Whereas, if I was to be a resident on a street and call in that I think gunshots went off on my street, and I may say I think they went off down the block from me, it's really not a very precise place for you to look. You could be searching the whole neighborhood to find that shell casing.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Right. And but the officers do search in the ShotSpotter within that radius; again, assuming it's reasonable, they're not climbing trees necessarily or anything like that, and they do search an area also when the public calls up. So again, depending on the variances occurred, topography area

location, circumstances, but the response is all the same, it's taken very seriously. And what I'm trying to say is the officers do the best they can with the information that they have to try to make a determination.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I'm saying the response isn't the same, there are two different protocols that need to be put in place. And I would hope that there is conversations with the Police Department and ShotSpotter about best practices and how to respond to their instances, because this is technology being used all across the country and there are a lot of other departments who I'm sure develop their best practices. And I'm no expert in policing, but I know Police Departments are para military, and there's pretty much a protocol on how you do just about everything you do in the Police Department. So there should be a protocol on how you respond in these instances that are individual to this particular technology.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

And what I will do is I'll bring your concerns back to my bosses and we'll see if we can't come to a successful conclusion on this.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you, Inspector.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Any other questions? No. And again, when you mentioned topography and if it's a wooded lot, and I -- you know, I'm pretty sure that a police officer, if he shows up and sees nothing, there's no shell casings, then pretty much it's unsubstantiated; correct, is that what you would consider it to be?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. But now ShotSpotter is picking something up. Say it's at night and maybe somebody shows up at the hospital that was shot, and would it force you to now go back to a location? Say the incident occurs at night, does it force you to go back and do you go back?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

Well, again, that's connecting the dots, as we say, in police work. If we're getting ShotSpotter activations which we can't substantiate, and like you said, all of a sudden somebody turns up at the hospital ten minutes later, then we're going to be taking a look at that. Generally the investigation is going to start at the hospital. And if you have a trail of blood that comes up the street from that area, we're going to backtrack it. But again, that's a connecting the dot situation, so we may go back and look into that --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FISHER:

-- and do a more, you know, in-depth, thorough type of situation if that -- because there's very few times when there's a coincidence in that sort of thing, as we know. Most of the time there is a connecting of the dots there, as we call it in police work.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Well, I appreciate it. And I --

LEG. SPENCER:

I have one more quick question.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Doc Spencer, one more.

LEG. SPENCER:

This to ShotSpotter folks, too. I mean, I'm looking at the police and the difference from the confirmation perspective. Also when you drill down on those numbers, in that one precinct where there's only 8% confirmation, the unsubstantiated is 40% and it compares to 40% as the other precinct. But the difference is that one has a 25% false rate and the other one has a 47% false activation rate. So maybe that doesn't completely lie with the Police Department as far as I don't know if there's any differences between the two areas in terms of -- you know, if they're saying there's a 47% false activation rate, like you said, it doesn't mean that there wasn't gunfire. But again, I'm just looking at when I see things that stick out. You know, why in one place we can see 25% and why would you see 50% as far as the false rates are concerned? Could there be a difference in the transponders? Are the sensitivity settings maybe in one area to see that?

And so, you know, I'm taking into account what you said, that false doesn't necessarily mean that there wasn't gunfire; I take you at your word there. But what I'm doing is now we've got data, so when you come and you present this, you've got a track record, you know, and you're looking and you're saying, *Hey, buy into this*. So what I'm just looking, I'm just looking at the information that I'm given. Why would you see double the amount of false activations. Unsubstantiated, we're saying, all right, it could have been gunfire, we just can't prove it. But when we're saying false, then they're determining that there was not gunfire, is what I understand false to mean versus unsubstantiated. So 50% of the time in one precinct we're saying it was false, and the other precinct we're saying 25% of the time. What could account for that? Is there more adjustments that needs to be done on the transponder field? Do we need to address the sensitivities? But there's got to be an answer somewhere in between. Are these being miscategorized as false and maybe they should be unsubstantiated? What is making a false claim.

So I've got to put a lot of pressure on you guys to kind of, you know, give me some help there. But do you have any thoughts?

MR. HAWKINS:

Yes. Thank you, Doc Spencer, for the question. And again, it's a very good one.

What we provide -- what we can provide is the what, where and when something happened but not the why. My understanding of the definition of false, according to the report, is the police officer responded and found some evidence that something else occurred that made a loud noise that we misrepresented or mistook for gunfire.

As I mentioned earlier, we do take and rely on reports of not only missed gunshots, but where we detect an impulsive noise, identify it as gunfire and learn that it is not, in fact, gunfire, we take those reports and we have a procedure that you can see where we analyze what could have caused that false classification. In the past two years, I think we received only one report of a false positive for a gunshot alert that the Police Department conclusively determined was not, in fact, gunfire. What this tells me is here's a great opportunity where we need to sit down at the table with our sleeves rolled up with the Police Department and look at each one of those cases of reportedly false reports. At present we don't have any of evidence of what those false reports are, we only have the audio

data and the forensic audio trail that we've got that tells us it was gunfire. So we've got to look at each one of those cases side by side with the Police Department and understand what was the physical evidence they found. To the degree that we all agree, in fact, *Yep, there clearly was a case where we were wrong on that*, how do we learn what that points to in terms of opportunities to make adjustments.

One thing it does not necessarily point to is whether or not we're short sensors, for example, because the sensors themselves do not make the classification. Their responsibility is to hear a sound, say that was an explosive noise, a very loud, impulsive sound, and be able to try and get its location. The classification of whether it was a gunshot versus a firecracker versus some other explosive noise is the job of back end software and human reviewers, not the sensors themselves.

So one thing I can assure you is it's not a sensor issue or opportunity but, again, one where we need to sit down with the Police Department and say, *Let's take a look at what you found which we don't know about yet and look at each one case-by-case*, see if there are individual cases where we would make adjustments, certainly at least in reporting the data, because we can change those classifications after the fact for historical reporting and an analysis perspective. But more importantly, if there are trends that point out anything that we need to do differently or anything that the Police Department can do differently in terms of how they make those evaluations. It's an opportunity, but we don't know yet.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good? I believe we have one last speaker and a question is Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Fireworks set this thing off all the time, correct?

MR. HAWKINS:

We do detect fireworks when fireworks are present, absolutely. They have a -- they meet the characteristic of an explosive, impulsive noise that we can locate. Their audio signature is usually quite different and we're pretty good at weeding those out, even on 4th of July.

LEG. TROTТА:

So who -- the computer weeds them out so it doesn't notify the police, or doesn't trigger a SpotShotter alert?

MR. HAWKINS:

It's a two-step process. First we, ShotSpotter, receive an alert with an initial classification that's done by the software. It may come in as a fireworks, usually they do. Sometimes a firework like an M-80, not an aerial firework, but something that's just a loud, you know, piece of dynamite can sometimes masquerade as a fireworks. We have a -- so a two point review; first is software classification, the second is human reviewers. These are our experts that work 24/7 that can tell both by audio signature and the sound itself whether it's gunfire or something else. We do all that classification typically 30 to 40 seconds before the gunshot alert alone goes to the Suffolk County PD. So we hear and detect fireworks and then in many cases they are captured in the database so they can be inspected by either ourselves or Suffolk County PD after the fact. For example, if there is a report of a missed gunshot, either the PD or we can go back and look and say, *Huh, I wonder if there were any other non-gunshot alerts we detected at that same time and location*, in which case we learn of a mistake we've made in the classification. But to answer your question directly, we do detect fireworks, we classify them as fireworks, they are not alerted to the PD in real-time.

LEG. TROTTA:

I see some of these -- on this report where it says it's false and it was determined to be fireworks. So is that not true?

MR. HAWKINS:

I have not seen the report, sir. But that's where we would want to sit with the Suffolk County PD and say, *Exactly which evidence did you find that indicated it was fireworks?* I will say as well, and I'm recalling back a couple of years ago when we -- when I met with you last. This is not entirely uncommon, it's not necessarily commonplace either, that you can have fireworks and gunfire happening in the same place. I know that we had looked at one particular address where there had been a great deal of fireworks activity and there had been, in fact, a gunshot that happened 45 minutes later. So sometimes physical evidence of fireworks --

LEG. TROTTA:

So are you saying that fireworks -- when fireworks are set off in an area, ShotSpotter is not sending the police there; is that what you're saying?

MR. HAWKINS:

That is correct. We do not send alerts on fireworks, we're in the gunshot business.

LEG. TROTTA:

Now, like firecrackers sound similar to a small caliber gun, I would think.

MR. HAWKINS:

They can do a center that's very, very close. But one -- they have one marked difference, and that is the sound of gunfire will travel very far, often a mile or further. The sound of a fireworks, even a loud -- like an M-80 typically will not fire near -- travel nearly that far through the air. So one of the techniques our reviewers use is to look at the pattern of which sensor is activated on any particular explosive noise. Fireworks tend to have a very symmetrical radial outburst, gunfire is often directional and often is triggering sensors very far away, much further than fireworks were. So again, there's more than just the sound. When our reviewers listen to those incidents, they're listening not to a single sensor but to all the sensors.

LEG. TROTTA:

It was odd, I had never heard of the fireworks one. I saw fireworks as a reason here, a couple of places, actually. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Just a quick question. Looking at here where it says source and you have the one individual's name very often there; is that one of your people from ShotSpotter, or is that a --

MR. HAWKINS:

No, Mr. Bocchimuzzo is with Suffolk County PD's dispatch center. He's our main point of contact --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay.

MR. HAWKINS:

-- and main conduit for learning about incidents of this sort.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, that explains it. Okay, thank you. So I do not believe there are any other questions. And I'm hoping that shortly Inspector will get the message to the Commissioner that we should set up a

meeting for you, Mark and Jack, to discuss ShotSpotter and how can we improve what we're doing in Suffolk County. I know everything can always be improved, there's always room for improvement for everything. So I appreciate you coming in. I know it's not a hop, skip and a jump for some of you to get here, but I appreciate everything that you've been doing and hopefully our lines of communication will be better. I apologize. I mean, you've been around for a year and it certainly seems that the communication's not been as agreeable as it should be. But anyway, thank you for coming and we will be in touch.

MR. JONES:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

MR. PONTIUS:

Thank you.

MR. HAWKINS:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Inspector.

Okay. So we have our Commissioner from FRES is here, Mr. Williams. Is there anything you'd like to update us on or do you have any -- or are you more just here for specific resolutions?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I'm actually here for resolutions, any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And I see Patrice is here. Thank you for always being here. Any specific issues for you guys?

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Here for the resolutions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Actually, there is a question I have for you.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If you wouldn't mind coming up. I don't need an answer today, but I think it would be good to get an update on the GPS monitoring, because we contracted with someone, a company to do the GPS monitoring, correct? It would be good if we could get an update at some point on how that's working.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

You're referring to GPS monitoring as a whole or specifically as it regards the domestic violence resolutions.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I know we contracted with a company, because outside of -- we used to have Probation Officers doing the monitoring 24/7 and now we have a company that's been contracted to do some of that monitoring. And I know that quite some time ago there were some concerns because, you know,

nights and weekends and what kind of responses and how we're responding.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Certainly I could give you a response on that. But in general what I can say to you is we have a company that provides the initial monitoring between eleven o'clock at night on weeknights and six in the morning, and from eleven o'clock on Friday night through 6 AM on Monday morning, but we also have officers on duty, stand-by duty and they are informed. The company makes the first attempt to resolve a situation, but the officers are informed of any violations and they respond by phone or by going out. If necessary, they go to the person's house.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I think -- you know, obviously I think it's something that's been going on for a while.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And, you know, we'd kind of like to see how responses are, how they're calling, kind of give us a little bit of data on how that's been working.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Okay. We can give you that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You know, it's good to compare.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay?

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

Very good.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Patrice. And Mike Sharkey is here from the Sheriff's Department; anything from you?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

(Shook head no).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Nope. And our Medical Examiner is here. I know we have a couple of resolutions for the Medical Examiner, so do you have anything you need to report? How things are going? You can come on up.

DR. CAPLAN:

Thank you very much, Legislator Browning. Thank you, everybody. Yeah, no, things are going well. We have a new Deputy Chief now who's been here for about three weeks, Gerard Catanese. We worked together in fellowship, actually, and so that's been a real nice -- he's, you know, stepped right in and been very active there. So I'm glad to have him aboard.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good.

DR. CAPLAN:

So I would say yeah, overall things have been going well.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Anyone have any questions? I know the Doctor would probably have more than any of us?
No; not today? (*Laughter*).

LEG. SPENCER:

Not today.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, we appreciate it. Thank you. We'll be in touch. And I know we have a couple of resolutions here; if there's any questions, we'll check with you.

DR. CAPLAN:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. **Tabled Resolutions:**

1026-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to amend Resolution No. 1123-2015 and improve Alarm System Registration Requirements (Browning). I'll make a motion to table for a public hearing.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy. It is -- did you say something, Kara?

MR. NOLAN:

She seconded it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, sorry. So it is still being worked on and hopefully we'll close it on Tuesday. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1042-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Charter Law to establish minimum qualifications and screening process for appointment of Police Commissioner (McCaffrey). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think it's pretty much a moot point at this point.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second by Legislator Kara -- Kara Hahn, sorry.

LEG. FLEMING:

Is it tabled subject to call or --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I'm fine to table.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

Introductory Resolutions

1096-16 - Amending Resolution No. 119-2015, establishing a School Traffic Zone Safety Commission (Anker).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion -- who said that? Motion to approve, Legislator Fleming. Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1105-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds received from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office STOP DWI Prosecution Program (County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Hahn. Second, Legislator Martinez.

LEG. HAHN:

Oh, motion to put it on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Place on the Consent Calendar. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (and placed on the Consent Calendar - VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1106-16 - Establishing a reporting requirement for the Police Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (Calarco).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I was approached by the Minority Leader this morning regarding this resolution. He was asking us to hold off on this for a cycle, which I agreed to do because we are working collaboratively, some of the members of this committee are working with him and a couple of other members of the

minority, to come up with some comprehensive reforms that we can all support in our Police Department and in the County as a whole. So I am going to make a motion to table this for one cycle with a full expectation that in three weeks we will move this forward.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So there was a motion to table by Legislator Calarco. Second, Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1108-16 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of communications equipment for Sheriff's Office (CP 3060)(County Executive). I'll make a motion to approve. Second, Legislator Kennedy. Mike, could you give us an update on what that is? You might want to stick around for the other ones.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Good morning. As each of these three resolutions, they're all appropriations for Capital Programs that were approved during the Capital Budget process last year. This particular one is in this year's cycle, it is primarily for up-fitting and usage of our existing mobile data terminals into the newer vehicles. They stopped making the Crown Victorias. Their new vehicles are smaller and there's some adaptation needed to use existing equipment.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. So we did have a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

I don't know if anybody's going to have any questions about the other ones, but hang on.

1109-16 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Replacement of the Jail Time and Accrual System (CP 3065)(County Executive). I'll make that motion. Second, Legislator Kennedy. Explain?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

This actually is regarding the jail -- Sheriff's Office Time and Accrual System, and also the Jail Management System. Both are programs that we currently operate that are written in really antiquated computer language that's really not supported anymore, so we have to start to look for options that are, you know, off-the-shelf options from, you know, a software company. This is just planning money; this is a small amount of money, this year it's planning money.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Did you want to ask, Monica?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Could you just be a little more specific in terms of what you're actually collecting? What data are you collecting with this program?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Are we talking about the time and accrual or we're talking about the jail management?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Both.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The time and accrual is kind of self-explanatory. We have, you know, 1300 employees between Deputy Sheriffs, Correction Officers and civilian employees, so obviously it's important to track

everyone's time, make sure it was paid correctly, etcetera, and port that over into the County's payroll system. So that's what that would be for.

We currently have a Jail Management System that tracks all of the inmates that we have in-house, their visitation records, their health records, their court dates. Anything to do with the management of the inmates that we take care of is in that system, and the system is getting old and non-supportable.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Thank you. And it may be self-explanatory, I just needed for it to be explained. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you, Mike. So there was a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1110-16 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Heavy Duty Equipment for the Sheriff's Office (CP 3047) (County Executive). Motion to approve. Second, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes. Hello, Chief. I just have to ask, in reading this bill, it's a refrigerator truck, so I understand you transport food back and forth, but it says "*other large supplies*"? We need a refrigerator truck for the large supplies, or --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I mean, obviously the primary use for this vehicle is to transfer food back and forth between the two facilities. Recently, in one of our Capital Projects, we invested in a large freezer at the Yaphank facility that enables us to buy most specifically meat in bulk quantities, which is a savings to the County. In order for us to officially use that, we have to be able to move large quantities between the two facilities, so that's really what this is for. But in order to cover ourselves, you know, if we need to move dry goods between the two facilities, we're not going to limit ourselves to say, *Oh, we can't use that truck because it's only for meat.*

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Everything's good? Okay. So there was a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

I think that's it for the Sheriff's Office, right?

1111-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal funds awarded as pass-thru funding by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements (County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to approve and put on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve by Legislator Hahn and place on the Consent Calendar.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is approved*
(VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).

1116-15 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal grant funds from the US Department of Justice passed through the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Program to the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner, Crime Laboratory (County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve by Legislator Hahn and place on the Consent Calendar. Second, Legislator Martinez. Dr. Caplan, what is this? I'm assuming -- oh, no. It's a grant.

DR. CAPLAN:

With your permission, Legislator Browning, I'd like to --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure.

DR. CAPLAN:

I'd like to introduce Liza Wright, who is going to be our Senior Budget Analyst starting next week, and she was kind enough to come with us. So what this is is this is a grant, the aim of which is to basically --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Can you maybe speak into the mic? Can you hear?

DR. CAPLAN:

I'm sorry. I apologize. This is basically a grant to improve the quality and timeliness of Forensic Science and Medical Examiner services and to try to, you know, if not eliminate, at least minimize the backlog in providing these services. And this is specifically through -- you know, this part, this grant is in the Crime Laboratory and that would include forensic sciences, you know, such as trace evidence, DNA, firearms analysis, criminalistics, basically all of the Crime Laboratory forensic sciences.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Any other questions? You have a question?

LEG. SPENCER:

Not related.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Not related?

LEG. SPENCER:

You know what? I'll do it off the record.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. You might want to -- I think there's a couple more for you, if you want to just hang out.

DR. CAPLAN:

Yep, sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So we did have a motion to approve the Concept Calendar and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (and placed on the Consent Calendar. VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1117-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% federal grant funds from the US Department of Justice passed through the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Program (to the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner, Toxicology Laboratory (County Executive)). Isn't this the same thing?

DR. CAPLAN:

It's the same thing, except this applies to the Toxicology Lab.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, yeah. Okay, Toxicology.

DR. CAPLAN:

I had the same reaction, I thought it was a duplicate, but no.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we'll do same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar - VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1118-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% federal grant funds from the US Department of Justice for the DNA Forensic Backlog Reduction Program to the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner, Crime Laboratory (County Executive). Motion by Doc Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:

On the motion.

LEG. HAHN:

I'll make the motion.

LEG. SPENCER:

I'll second for purposes of discussion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion by Legislator Hahn to place on the Consent Calendar. Second by Doc Spencer. Go ahead, Doc Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

Now I'll ask my question. Thank you. I guess -- and again, I try to make sure that I keep information in perspective. There is an article today, you know, that indicates that *Judge Irate in Trial Delay*, and one of the things it says, you know, it's in this particular case, and the reason it's important is because obviously it's a murder case in my district, so that's why I have some interest here. And it says the Supreme Court did not hide his irritation leading to the delay because I guess he found that there was forensic evidence had not had a chance to be processed, you know, and I don't know if this relates to that. What's going on? Are you aware of this story? And, you know, I just have to ask you, you know, obviously as a representative, you know, if we can't get crucial evidence for a trial and we have an irate judge and they're saying because of our crime lab, can you -- what can we do to make this go away? How can we support you?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Before you start, Dr. Caplan, I would like that you speak in general terms and not specifically to this case.

LEG. SPENCER:

Fair enough.

DR. CAPLAN:

Okay.

LEG. SPENCER:

Fair enough. But I do think that -- I do think it's kind of appropriate, especially with this resolution that's talking about backlog, that I should ask what's happening here.

DR. CAPLAN:

Yes. Thank you, Legislator Spencer. I will -- and I will try to answer this in as general terms as possible.

Let me start by saying that DNA evidence, you know, I think one of our -- I feel that one of my jobs as a Medical Examiner is to try to show what really happens as opposed to, you know, what you see on TV. Obviously, you know, we talk about the CSI effect where, you know, evidence is analyzed, you know, within an hour with commercials and people impeccably dressed do just a terrific job. Well, that would be wonderful, but that's not reality. The reality of the situation is that we process DNA evidence of all different kinds. We may be as lucky enough as to have liquid blood, which is the best evidence.

We may have, on the other hand, a body that's burned or decomposed or injured where we don't have that luxury of having the best DNA evidence. Then we have to be more creative. Then we have to use other tissues, you know, muscle or bone or things like that, and that takes a substantial amount of time to be done right. And it's not just a matter of doing the analysis, it's the quality assurance, it's making sure that a positive -- a match is indeed a match and that a negative is indeed a negative.

So the -- I'm, again, trying to be as general as possible here. To do an appropriate DNA analysis on a case, especially a homicide, depends on -- you can have anywhere from a few pieces of evidence to over a hundred pieces of evidence. And so when we analyze a case for DNA analysis, we are not analyzing every piece of evidence. We're analyzing that evidence based upon what it's guided by the prosecution and the District Attorney and to what evidence is most critical, you know, to pursue that case. So what I'm saying here is that sometimes we may analyze evidence, but then at a later point, months or years later, we may be asked to analyze additional evidence that we have, you know, in our possession, but that was not asked to analyze originally.

So we're not talking about -- when we're talking about backlog here, we're not talking about in cases like this about stuff that has been sitting for years waiting to be analyzed. We're talking about stuff where the decision has been made by the District Attorney that now, because of the complexity of the case has changed or situations have changed, now we're being asked to analyze that evidence. And if we're being asked to analyze that evidence -- evidence, I'm sorry, a week before the trial, unfortunately that may not be realistic in terms of what we do.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you. I appreciate your answer. I wanted to make sure it wasn't a situation where there was indeed a staff shortage or an equipment shortage or something of that sort. And I take your remarks, you know, again, from a supportive point of view, but I'm sure that judges know this. So when I see that there's a situation where there particularly might be a judge that's irate and I don't know how -- what's realistic or not. And again, I know we're limited in terms of having to be very general, but I'm sure that a court would already understand this. So if I'm seeing there's some agitation there, I don't know if there's something that is unique or specific to the proceedings in the Crime Lab that would cause an actual court to be concerned. You know, we're not -- look, obviously a judge is not going to look at this like CSI. So if there's something unique, if there's something we need to be aware of as Legislators, we just want to be aware of it so that we can address the issue. But I understand what you're saying.

DR. CAPLAN:

I appreciate that, Legislator Spencer. Let me -- if I could just make one quick comment. I think part of it is about communication and expectations, meaning that, you know, we have -- in order to address this, I've actually, you know, been to one of the proceedings with a different judge to explain what was going on, and we also have a meeting scheduled regarding the latest situation just to try to communicate and say, *Okay, this -- these are the facts, this is what's going on.* And then if we need more support at a later time, we can. But I think part of it just has to do with actual -- you know, what information does everybody have.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Everybody's happy? Okay. So there was a motion -- was there -- there was a motion to approve that?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That was 1118, and to place on the Consent Calendar. And a second -- do we remember who did that?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Do we have that?

MS. ELLIS:

Yes, we have a motion and a second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (and placed on the Consent Calendar VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).***

1119-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant providing 50% support, in the amount of \$150,000, from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, and amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program in connection with the purchase of Livescan Equipment Replacement (CP 3508)(County Executive). Where is that going? Do we have any information on that? What is Livescan?

MR. FREAS:

Madam Chair, yeah, it's fingerprinting and mug shot work stations.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. We actually have somebody here who's going to tell us about that. Since you're here, you're going to -- I'm sorry, I do not --

DEPUTY INSPECTOR O'CARROLL:

Richard O'Carroll, I'm the Deputy Inspector assigned to the Office of the Chief of the Department.

Livescan is equipment we use to fingerprint and for photographing arrestees. The current equipment is aging, it's constantly in need of repair now. The vendor has told us that they're no longer going to support the equipment. So with the grant we would get about a 50% savings than if we tried to replace it without a grant.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, thank you. I did not know what that was, but I appreciate it. Thank you.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR O'CARROLL:

You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So there was a motion.

MR. NOLAN:

No motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No motions yet, sorry. I'm really confusing you today, Amy. So there was a motion by Legislator Martinez. Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer).***

Okay, and the next two, 17 -- 1127, 1128 are done.

1129-16 - Approving the appointment of Jay Egan as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive). This is a slightly different title, but I think we know Jay only too well. So there was a motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? And it is approved (***VOTE: 6-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer.***)

1130-16 - Approving the re-appointment of Nicholas Luparella III as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive). We'll do same motion, same second, same vote. ***Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer).***

1131-16 - Approving the re-appointment of Norman Reilly, Jr. As a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive). We'll do same motion, same second, same vote; is that good? **(Approved - VOTE: 6-0-0-2 – Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer).**

1132-16 - Approving the re-appointment of Drew Silverman as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved - VOTE: 6-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer).**

1133-16 - Approving the re-appointment of Edward Tully, Jr. As a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive). We'll do same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved - VOTE: 6-0-0-2 - Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer).**

1148-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to establish a Child Fatality Review Team (Hahn). Motion to table by Legislator Hahn for public hearing.

LEG. FLEMING:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Second is Legislator Fleming; am I correct?

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled for public hearing. (VOTE: 6-0-0-2 – Not Present: Legislators Cilmi & Spencer).***

So I'm making a motion -- oh, you can leave. But I just want to check, Bob Holly.

CHIEF HOLLEY:
Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
How are we doing with the academy? Do we have a class going? How's your numbers? I was just curious. And I should have asked you last night, I'm sorry.

CHIEF HOLLEY:
I'm sorry, what was the question?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
The Fire Academy. How are you doing with recruits and number of students in the academy?

CHIEF HOLLEY:
We're doing fine at the moment. Our numbers are up.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Good.

CHIEF HOLLEY:

And I know with the SAFER Grant coming in, we are expecting more recruits coming in, so we are ready for them.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Say again?

LEG. HAHN:

On-line training?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

On-line training? Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Anything you -- any updates on the on-line training and how we're doing?

CHIEF HOLLEY:

We are expanding that program. We have the HazMat refresher on-line, we have the Firefighter I class on-line and we just added Into to Fire Officer and Fire Officer I classes. So it's expanding tremendously right now.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Well, thank you, Bob.

CHIEF HOLLEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So with that, motion to adjourn. Second, Legislator Calarco.
We're adjourned.

*(*The meeting was adjourned an 11:22 A.M. *)*