

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

A regular meeting of the Public Safety Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Friday, March 18, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson
Legislator Robert Calarco - Vice-Chair
Legislator Bridget Fleming
Legislator Kara Hahn
Legislator Monica Martinez
Legislator Tom Cilmi
Legislator Leslie Kennedy

Member Not Present:

Legislator William Spencer

Also In Attendance:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
Robert Lipp - Director/Legislative Budget Review Office
Craig Freas - Legislative Budget Review Office
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory
Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning
Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy
Elizabeth Sutton - Aide to Legislator Fleming
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn
Lisa Santeramo - Assistant Deputy County Executive
Katie Horst - Director - Intergovernmental Relations/CE's Office
Jason Hann - County Executive's Office.
Stuart Cameron - Chief of Department/Suffolk County Police Dept.
Richard O'Carroll - Deputy Inspector/Suffolk County Police Dept.
Patrice Dlhopsky - Director/Suffolk County Probation Department
Linda Lagnese - Suffolk County Probation Officers Association
Michael Sharkey - Chief Deputy Sheriff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Joseph Williams - Commissioner of FRES
Ed Johnston - Deputy Director of Suffolk County Fire Academy
John Becker - DSPBA/President
Artie Sanchez - DSPBA
Lou Tutone - 1st Vice-President/Suffolk County PBA
Jim Hughes - 1st Vice-President/SOA
Jim Rodden - SOA
Suzanne McBride - AME Representative/Police Emergency Unit
Dawn Ruggiero - Police Emergency Unit
All Other Interested Parties

Taken By:

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer

*(*The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m.*)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Good morning. We will start the Public Safety meeting. If everyone would please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, and will be led by Legislator Cilmi.

*(*Salutation*)*

And a moment of silence for those who defend our country at home and abroad.

*(*Moment of Silence*)*

Thank you. It's so good to see you, Legislator Cilmi. I hope you're feeling better.

LEG. CILMI:

I am. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And we did have to change our committee meeting to this morning. So due to that change, Legislator Spencer was unable to be here, so he does have an excused absence. So I don't think -- there are no cards? Wow.

MS. ELLIS:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I believe Chief Cameron will be here shortly. If anyone has any questions about the alarm bill, we can hold off on that. However, I am tabling it today.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

So we will start with tabled resolutions, and that's ***1026 - Adopting a Local Law to amend Resolution No. 1123-2015 and improve Alarm System Registration Requirements (Browning)***. I'm making a motion to table.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. ***(Vote: Tabled 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)***.

1042 - Adopting a Local Law, 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:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled. ***(Vote: Tabled 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)***

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

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second. Who said second?

LEG. FLEMING:

Leslie.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1148 - Adopting a Local Law to establish a Child Fatality Review Team (Hahn). Is that public hearing still --

MR. NOLAN:

It's closed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, it's closed? Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve --

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- Legislator Hahn; second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor?

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

On the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

Just, Legislator Hahn, could you just explain? I mean, I read the bill, but just explain what the concept is here.

LEG. HAHN:

So this is basically to pull a team together to review cases of child fatality, where, really, I think under Section 2, Definitions, No. 3, the circumstances of the death are suspicious, obscure or otherwise unexplained. Not to point blame, but to try to, you know, find gaps in the system that we can correct.

LEG. CILMI:

And who is on the team?

LEG. HAHN:

It is a 13-member team. Director of the Department of Health Services, Director of Child Protective Services, a representative from the New York State Office of Children and Family Services, the Director of the Department of Social Services, Chief Medical Examiner, District Attorney, County Attorney. You know, anyone I've mentioned here also could assign a designee.

LEG. CILMI:

And so do you envision this team getting sort of a list of child fatalities, you know, for the period prior to -- I mean, I just got deja vu. Do we have something else like this that we did a year or two ago?

LEG. HAHN:

Well, I did introduce a Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team. That didn't pass because of some laws about confidentiality. There is an exception for child fatality in the State Law, and our Medical Examiner recommended that we do this. You know, he thought that Suffolk County needed this. I think where he had come from in Maryland, wherever he -- I can't remember where he came from, but they had one, and he thought it was needed here, so --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So this is the Medical Examiner's suggestion that we do this?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, that's correct.

LEG. CILMI:

And so I guess the Medical Examiner, then, would report to this team in the months leading up to their next meeting what the -- what the number of child fatalities and the circumstances are, and then the team would review those cases?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, would review the cases, you know, for the purposes of trying to find loopholes in the system in areas where improvements can be made.

LEG. CILMI:

In what system exactly?

LEG. HAHN:

Well, depending on -- you know, each circumstance will be different.

LEG. CILMI:

So, in other words, a hospital might be negligent in some way, or there might be a law enforcement issue that wasn't addressed by somebody or --

LEG. HAHN:

All that is potentially possible. It could -- you know, it could be Social Services, it could be school districts. You know, there were signs and were never addressed, and what can we do to make sure that doesn't happen again. You know, we don't want to -- it's not about placing blame, it's about preventing future occurrences.

LEG. CILMI:

And there'll be a reporting requirement to the Legislature? How does that work, or there's no reporting requirement?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes. Hold on. I do believe we did do a report.

LEG. CILMI:

There's something in here that says the team may prepare fatality reports in accordance with the requirements of New York Social Services Law, which shall be provided to the New York State Office of Children and Family Services. Based on my summary, I don't see anything about reporting to the Legislature, not that it's necessary. You know, not that it's absolutely necessary, but I was wondering.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, I guess we didn't add that.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, we do have language in the bill that states that they're going to aggregate that or relating to child fatalities and formulate recommendations regarding methods of improving the protection of children. It doesn't state expressly that it's going to be made to the Legislature or to the Executive, but I think that's, you know, certainly implied, those type of reports.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. All right.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So there was a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Introductory Resolutions: ***I.R. 1165 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$20,500 in Federal pass-through funding from New York State's Governor's Traffic Safety Committee, for the Suffolk County Police Department's Motorcycle Safety Enforcement and Education Program with 79.55% support (Co. Exec.)***. Motion to approve --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- Legislator Martinez; second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer).**

1166 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$135,425 in Federal pass-through funding from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee to provide Enhanced Enforcement of Motor Vehicle and Traffic Laws and Regulations with 79.33% support (Co. Exec.). I guess we can do same motion, same second.

LEG. CILMI:

And on the motion, if I can.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure, on the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

Maybe either Budget Review or Counsel can explain. We said this is roughly 79% support, which means the County funds the 21% or so balance, correct? And I have a note in here, which, I guess, comes from our Fiscal Impact Statement, that there's roughly a \$35,000 cost incurred through September 30th of this year for nonreimbursable employee benefits. Where does that money come from? Is that something that we budgeted for or --

MR. NOLAN:

Yes. And according to the resolution, it's included in the budget already.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So that was, I believe, same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1167 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$133,233 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Suffolk County Police Department's 2016 Motor Vehicle Theft and Insurance Fraud (MVTIF) Prevention Program with 79.77% support (Co. Exec.). So we'll do same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

1180 - Adopting a Local Law to prohibit the sale of Kratom -- is that how you pronounce it -- **in Suffolk County (Stern).**

Is that Still in public hearing?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So I'll make a motion to table for public hearing.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled for public hearing.
(Vote: Tabled for Public Hearing 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer).

1185 - Appropriating funds in connection with renovations at the Yaphank Correctional Facility (CP 3009) (Co. Exec.). I'll make that motion, and second, Legislator Martinez?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

(Nodded yes).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I see Mr. Sharkey is here. Can you kind of give us an update on that?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

This is Riverhead, I'm assuming.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

This is Yaphank.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, Yaphank. Okay, I forgot.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yaphank previously was covered by two separate --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, that's right.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

-- capital projects, 3008 and 3009. 3009 is now the remaining project that will cover the entire campus for ongoing maintenance. This resolution originally had a half a million for construction and the 350,000 for FF&E. The -- we earlier in the year, in concert with DPW, made an agreement with them that we could defer the half a million in construction, because they had a priority project that they needed to use that money as an offset. So the remaining money is for the FF&E for the renovated dorms that will be completed in the near future.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That's the old dorms that --

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yeah, the eight dorms in the original portion of Yaphank.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Are you using them or are they closed up completely? I know I've been over there, but I haven't been in that section.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The renovation of the first four dorms is nearing completion, and when they're finished, we'll repopulate those and close the other four and we'll do the renovation on those.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Now the sprung is still open and running.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The sprung is still open.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So are you going to be able to take them out of the sprung and once all of those renovations are done?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The sprung is considered -- you know, for us, it's permanent housing space. We have no immediate plans to close the sprung.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

What was the life span on that, because then it's been a while.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

The think the original life span was approximately 20 years.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

But those type of structures have been in use in New York City for a much longer than that time frame.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Well, hopefully, you can eliminate it. Maybe we can reduce that population. So thank you. Is there anything else, Mike, while you're here?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No? Okay, thanks.

LEG. CILMI:

Can I ask the Chief a question?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, sure.

LEG. CILMI:

Chief, how are you? How is -- how are things going with our Youth Tier? What's the population, you know, the numbers like in the Youth Tier? Is anything going on there?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I would be glad to make a report to you on that, but I am not prepared to do that now.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, that's fine.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

So I have to get back to you.

LEG. CILMI:

All right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I could probably tell you it's going pretty well. They have a good success rate with the kids in there.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah. I've been there a couple of times and -- but it's been probably a year or so since I've been there, so I just was curious.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, the Youth Reentry Task Force, we can send that. Maybe Kristin can send an email to Legislator Cilmi when the next one is, because they usually -- there's good updates in what they're doing there. Okay? Thanks, Mike. Oh, Leslie. I'm sorry. Mike, come back.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good morning. I just want to ask a question. You're doing the roof repairs, or you've already completed the roof repairs?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

I'm sorry. The repairs in Yaphank?

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the roof, the roofs.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Specifically, the roofs, I'd have to check back with DPW, but the major project going on there now is the renovation of the dorms, which would include any repairs to the roofs over those dorms.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Waterproofing.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just if -- when you speak with DPW, we are repairing a lot of roof structures in all of our County buildings as of late. Are we shoring them up with enough -- I'm not a construction person -- enough whatever it is, so that they can hold solar panels themselves? Because that was one of our original intents, and now that the lives of most of our roofs are coming due, I think we should do whatever is necessary so they would hold the weight of solar panels.

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yeah. I know that there was some discussion about the solar panels in the Yaphank facility area, and trying to conserve some of the open space around it by potentially using roof space. I'm sure that the new facility is probably designed. But portions of old Yaphank go back to 1959, so that would be an engineering question for DPW.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right. And when you speak with him, could you ask?

CHIEF SHARKEY:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So, next -- did we --

MR. NOLAN:

We didn't vote.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Did we vote on that? We didn't. We did -- we had a motion and a second, correct?

MS. ELLIS:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1186 - Accepting and appropriating grant funds from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Aid to Laboratories Grant Program for the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner, Crime Lab (Co. Exec.). Sorry. I'll make a motion to approve. I can't get away from that one as long I've lived here.

(*Laughter*)

I made the motion.

LEG. FLEMING:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1188 - Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an agreement with Suffolk County Community College to provide indoor facilities for human and pet sheltering during times of emergency (Co. Exec.).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion and a second. Motion by Legislator Martinez; second, Legislator Hahn. I'm assuming Legislator Martinez wants to cosponsor this.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I guess this is, okay, pretty self-explanatory. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Anybody else want to cosponsor while we're at it?

LEG. FLEMING:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure, okay. Go ahead, just put everybody on it.

LEG. CILMI:

No, don't put me on, I don't need to be on.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No? How did I know Monica was going to want that on? **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**.

1196 - Appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to the Suffolk County Fire Rescue C.A.D. (CP 3416) (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. HAHN:

I think it's about time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And does anybody have any questions?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Oh, no.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Was that a no? Yes, no? Everybody's good? Okay. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1197 - Appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to the Suffolk County Fire Training Center (CP 3405) (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And second, Legislator Kennedy. Can we maybe get a little more information for the record on what exactly we're doing here? Because I know that there were some -- I do remember getting pictures and seeing the condition of the building, and just so it would be nice to get an update on that.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Good morning. This morning I have with me is my Chief of Operations, Joel Vetter, and the Deputy Director of the Fire Academy, Ed Johnston, who is prepared to answer any questions and explain what this important program is.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. This is renovations to the Academy that --

MR. VETTER:

You are correct.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I know that have been sorely needed.

MR. VETTER:

You are correct. So over the last 18 months, 2 years, we've been putting an extensive amount of money back into the Academy. The projects are all currently on time and within the budget. The next phase that was appropriated and written into the budget for this year was the million dollars to renovate the aged gas props and the computer technology in both the taxpayer and the tower building. Those will be converted over to a smarter technology that allows us to regulate the gas and/or the combustibles that are used in the building. It will also fortify the block and brick construction building, prolonging the life of the structure that's being used. That's pretty much it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Mr. Johnston, anything? No? Everybody's good? Okay. Thank you for that. And you have a ways -- say again.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm sorry, Madam Chair. Before they leave, could I ask --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Go ahead.

LEG. CILMI:

-- an related question? This is really going to be out of left field, but do we maintain a stock of generators in your department?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes, we do. A number of years ago, a couple of years ago, through Federal funds, we purchased generators, large ones on -- we can pull on wheels. We had small ones. But we do keep them in stock and we use them during emergencies.

LEG. CILMI:

Do you have enough of them?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Right now, we have 19 of them. We always had -- you know, we've not reached a point, even during Sandy, where we got all 19 of them out. Like anything else, we always can use more. We look through Federal funds to purchase that type of stuff. We're just coming into some funds now and we'll take a look at them. But the ones we have right now are still in perfect working order. From time to time there, we loaned them out to municipalities that needed them for an emergency basis. But we can always use more, but we prefer to use grant fund money to get that.

LEG. CILMI:

Because the reason I ask is that a message came across our desks recently, I think through the Clerk's Office, if I'm not mistaken, and appropriately so, that the Board of Elections was excessing a number of generators that I found out were new in the box, never used. They had similarly gotten them from grant funds in anticipation of potentially needing them in the event of a storm and they need to carry on an election, etcetera. And, of course, you know, the first thing that we do is we think of different organizations that might need them, because that's really why the message comes to us. And after I -- after I actually reached out to an organization to say, "Hey, we're excessing generators," before I inquired as to why we were excessing the generators, or what condition they were in.

It occurred to me that I should really -- you know, why are we excessing generators, because they normally have a fairly long life span. And, you know, what I was told was that Board of Elections was excessing them, but that they hoped that we would see if there was a need within the County for those generators. Apparently, that never happened. I don't know why -- I don't what the process is by which, you know, a department would excess something and then, you know, see if some other -- some other department would need it, but it occurred to me that either Department of Public Works or FRES might be able to use these generators. I don't know that there are any left at this point that haven't been committed to other organizations, but I figured I'd ask the question.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

We will reach out to them to see if there's anymore left. You know, it's something we can always use. We understand if it goes to those organizations, mostly nonprofits, that does help us. That type of stuff, it does go out or go to someplace that it can help them --

LEG. CILMI:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

-- then maybe they won't be looking for us, so -- but we will definitely reach out to them. If there's anymore left, we would gladly take them or store them with DPW.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. All right. Thanks, Joe.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

If you could also let us know how many you would actually need, that would be useful.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yeah, absolutely. Right now, the current stock that we have right now we've -- we have not run out in a situation even during Sandy. During Sandy, what we did, we actually even contracted to bring some more in. There's no -- there's no such hard, fast line, but we will be looking to replace them.

The good thing about a generator, like you had mentioned before, it goes by the number of hours on it, not the age of it. So what we exercise, and which we have to do just keep them going, and some of them have very low hours, but we will be looking forward to put -- again, they are an item that can be purchased through Federal grants. They're looked on very favorably by the Federal Government when we list them. And I would -- my first area to go to would be a Federal grant on that type of stuff.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And that would be 100% Federal grant?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes. What happens is we get the -- with the Urban Area Work Group, we get a number of dollars a year from that. We submit a budget on what we're going to spend that money on. That's approved by the State of New York and FEMA. It comes back to us, and then we spend that money, and that is 100% grant-funded with the items we do purchase.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Because there was an organization reached out to me and they are currently working on Sandy homes that have no electricity. So they were saying a generator would come in handy for them when they're doing the work. So I thought, you know, it's a valid organization and they could certainly use them, but I think maybe we should talk about, you know, should we be transferring them over. If they can get them on grant money and we have organizations within our community that say, "We need it," and like this one, you know, that's --

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, it's actually a valid question. I was just wondering. It just seemed odd to me that -- or I questioned whether or not there's any mechanism. And maybe, George, maybe this is something that we can look at legislatively, procedurally, whatever, I don't know. But it seems like there ought to be a way that when "Department A" decides that they have equipment that they don't need any longer, that there's a way to share that information with the rest of the County to determine whether or not anybody else in the County needs that equipment before we -- you know, before we -- I mean, I'm sure they will all get the -- you know, be put to good use. But, nevertheless --

MR. NOLAN:

Generally, you know, I can't speak to the Board of Elections equipment, but the Department of Public Works is responsible for surplus personal property, and I -- but I don't know the process they use and whether or not they touch base with every department to see if they can use some equipment that one department cannot use, but that's a question we could put to DPW.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah. If you could help me with that, George, I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

If I could just add on that, we work very closely with DPW and they do a fantastic job on vehicles. We just received lately a pickup truck that we mostly use around our facility that was reaching its end of life as a frontline vehicle for another department. We were looking for something, and, actually, we wound up with two vehicles in the last year like that, that it's good enough for around our property, short runs, but not everyday use. And I think DPW does a good job of contacting us and other departments on that.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes. And this may be just an anomaly with the Board of Elections, ironically, right across the street from DPW, but nevertheless, we'll look into. Thanks, Joe.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And, again, some of our nonprofits, you know, they just don't have that kind of money. So if we're helping them and it's a good use, too, that's also good.

LEG. CILMI:

Yup.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So how did we do on that? Did we have a motion and a second?

MS. ELLIS:

We had a motion and a second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

Okay. **1200 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal funds awarded by the U.S. Marshals Service to the Suffolk County Department of Probation and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements (Co. Exec.).** I make a motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1206 - To establish eligibility by the Village of Amityville for Public Safety Revenue-Sharing funds (Co. Exec.). I guess I'll make -- nobody's from Amityville here. Okay. Motion to approve --

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- Legislator Kennedy; second, Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**.

Okay. **1217 - Accepting and appropriating additional Federal pass-through funding in the amount of \$263,678 from the New York City Police Department in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Sponsored Securing the Cities Program with 93.6% support (Co. Exec.).** Motion to approve, second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1218 - Accepting the transfer of a surplus New York State MTA Police Vehicle to the Department of Public Works and approving a temporary increase to the fleet of the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (Co. Exec.). So you're getting another vehicle. Good to hear. Motion to approve --

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- Legislator Hahn.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1230 - Adopting a Local Law to ban the manufacture of synthetic cannabinoids and synthetic cocaine in Suffolk County (Spencer). The sponsor has actually reached out and asked that we table it, so I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I don't know specifically why, but --

LEG. CILMI:

It's in public hearing anyway.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Is it still in public hearing?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, I thought he closed it. Okay, so table for public hearing. So there was a motion and second, yes?

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Did I have a second?

MS. ELLIS:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled for public hearing. **(Vote: Tabled for Public Hearing 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1234 - Declaring April As "Distracted Driving Awareness Month" In Suffolk County (Spencer). That would be a motion by Legislator Calarco; second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1239 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$67,260 in Federal pass-through funding from the New York State Division of Homeland Security with Emergency Support Services for the 2015 Tactical Team Grant Program with 100% support (Co. Exec.). I make a motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar; second, Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's approved. **(Vote: Approved and Placed on Consent Calendar 7-0-0-1/Absent: Leg. Spencer)**

1240 - Approving a temporary increase in fleet for the newly formed Long Island Heroin Task Force Unit at no cost to the County through the use of Asset Forfeiture Funds (Co. Exec.).

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve by Legislator Calarco. Did I hear a second?

LEG. FLEMING:

(Nodded yes).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Fleming.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

On the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

That was me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah. I don't know. Would the Police Department or who --

LEG. CILMI:

That was really the question. I wanted --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

I think we have two asset forfeiture accounts in the County, right? One is with the P.D. -- we have three?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Three.

LEG. CILMI:

P.D., D.A --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sheriff.

LEG. CILMI:

Oh, and the Sheriff.

LEG. CALARCO:

And, actually, I think Probation gets some, too.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Does Probation get asset forfeiture.

DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:

We do sometimes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Patrice said yes, they do sometimes. That's our Director of Probation.

LEG. CILMI:

So which account is this coming from or going to?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Does anyone know? County Exec's Office know?

MR. LIPP:

Asset forfeiture accounts are off-budget items. There are multiple asset forfeiture accounts in the County.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

LEG. CILMI:

More than four?

MR. LIPP:

Yes. I'm not sure, you know, if there are four departments, which is what you're implying, but what I remember seeing in the past, there's not a lot of information out there, but there are multiple asset forfeiture accounts.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I am sorry.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR CARROLL:

Yes. Richard O'Carroll, Deputy Inspector with Chief Cameron's Office. This is with the Suffolk County Police. It's going to be a Joint Task Force with Nassau County Police for the Heroin Task Force, and it would be for five vehicles that we would be leasing through Enterprise for temporary use for the Heroine Task Force.

LEG. CILMI:

So from the P.D.'s asset forfeiture account?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR CARROLL:

P.D. asset forfeiture, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Very good. Thank you.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR CARROLL:

You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It doesn't say how much. Just curious. Anybody have any idea how much? Robert know?

MR. LIPP:

(Shook head no).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No. You don't have it right now?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR CARROLL:

I'll have to get back to you on that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah. If you can just email the committee members and give us that number, that would be great.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR CARROLL:

I will.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I appreciate it. So there was a motion to approve, and a second, was there? Did we have --

MS. ELLIS:

Yes, there was a second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(Vote: *Approved*
7-0-0-1/Absent: *Leg. Spencer*)**

So we actually -- I see Chief Cameron did come in. So, just so you know, we tabled the alarm bill that I introduced. There were some concerns. I don't know if there's any -- does anyone have any questions about the alarm bill? I think that would be a good idea.

Also, I would be remiss to recognize that we do have representatives from our Police Department and from the Sheriff's Department, the unions, and I know that the Deputy Sheriffs are still pending a contract. Any way close?

MR. BECKER:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No way close.

MR. BECKER:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That's not good to hear.

LEG. HAHN:

Probation.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And Probation, I was going to say the same thing. No one -- can we speak on the Probation Officers' contract?

MS. LAGNESE:

We don't have one right now, six years.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Are we close or not close? Can we get somebody on the mic? Can anybody speak or no? They prefer not to. Yes, no? Is that a -- I don't want to -- okay. No comment at this time. But if you could, please, you know, we -- I know that we come here all the time and we see you guys in the audience, and it would be nice to get an update on how things are going. It's what, six years for each of them right now?

LEG. HAHN:

Well, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Maybe close to seven.

LEG. HAHN:

Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah.

LEG. HAHN:

You know, maybe we should have Director of Labor Relations come in and tell us.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

That would be a good idea. Can we -- I guess Lisa, Katie.

LEG. HAHN:

You know, just the status of --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Maybe the next committee meeting, it would be -- if we could have the Director of Labor Relations come to the next meeting and let us know how things are going.

MS. SANTERAMO:

We will pass that request along to the Director of Labor Relations.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, we would -- so we'll put that on the agenda that she'll be here at next committee meeting.

Okay. Chief Cameron, we do have some questions regarding the alarm bill.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Good morning, everyone. A belated Happy Saint Patrick's Day to all of you.

LEG. HAHN:

Good morning. So just I -- thank you for all your hard work on this. It's a complete waste of time to have one out of every six calls be a false alarm. And we really want to get this right so that we are not wasting our resources, our very precious police resources. However, I did get a call yesterday from someone who was trying to register on the website and it wasn't working, and I just --

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yeah. The website is not going to be up and running until April 1st. That's what we've been telling people. We're in the process. We're very close to having it up and running. We may have it up and ready a few days beforehand, and we have been getting calls at the Police Department from people expressing that they want to register, but we're not quite ready. So April 1st is --

LEG. HAHN:

April 1st. Thank you. I should have known that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Any other questions? Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good morning, Chief.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Good morning. How are you?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I know we all worked very hard on getting the fees down. I just have a couple of questions.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:

How did the initial --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Can you talk in the mic more? We can't really hear you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

How did the initial -- how was the initial fee, the cost of the initial fee, how did you come up with that?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I believe it was modeled after the fees in Nassau County, the existing fees in Nassau County.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. With an average of the present police salary, about how much would it cost per false alarm? How much would it cost in police salary?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I'd have to do the calculations. We're estimating that it's about a half an hour of time for a police officer to respond to an alarm. So I would have to take the salary and the, you know, vehicle usage, but they would be working anyway. The intent of the law is to redeploy that half hour for each alarm to more urgent police matters such as the heroin issue that we're dealing with right now. That was -- that's my concern. I want to try and use the police resources as efficiently as possible. And, you know, in my mind, 97,000 false alarms is a waste of our time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It would free up what, 35,000 hours?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Approximately, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

If every false alarm went away. Obviously, we're not going to have that. There's not perfection, but the agencies and municipalities we've spoken to that have similar programs, similar models say that it should free up 50 to 70% of our false alarms, which is a significant amount of time. And I really don't know if there's anything else that I could change that would free up that much patrol time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

My district is very non-pro this bill. I've been hearing a lot of information back about the pamphlet that was sent out. I'm trying to come up with answers to some of their questions, so if you would send me the calculation of an average salary.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Sure, sure. I don't want to give you, you know, numbers off the top of my head. I'd have to sit and calculate the hourly rate versus --

LEG. KENNEDY:

That's fine.

CHIEF CAMERON:

And that's -- again, that's going to be an estimate.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I know. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think you have a point, because I know the first and second are, you know, just warnings, but the third one -- so, you know, that is a good question, is how the fine structure was determined. Was it based on what it costs a police officer to respond? And, obviously, increasing it because it's a, you know, fourth and fifth time. So was that how that was calculated?

CHIEF CAMERON:

We looked at a bunch of alarm programs that are similar, and they all operate in a similar fashion. They all require a permit, you know, with a varying fee for it, and then there are fines. Some vary with -- if you get a permit, how many, you know, quote, unquote, free instances you get. For example, there's an agency on the East End of Long Island that it doesn't reset. So if -- once you get a permit, you get your two, you know, quote, unquote, free alarms, and then you get into the fine structure and it continues to escalate. And even though you renew your permit, it never drops it back down again.

So, you know, we did meet with some of the Alarm Associations, and I went to an Alarm Association meeting, and I did hear comments from them that they would prefer our program over that program. And they think -- you know, some of them said it's more fair the way that we've structured it. You know, our goal is, from the Police Department's perspective, is to reduce false alarms. That's the primary goal. We're just looking at a program that will do that. And I mentioned it when I was here earlier. This is a Department of Justice recommended best practice, a program of this nature to target false alarms, that's why we adopted it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And I know that, you know, I did table the bill, because I'm starting to hear from, you know, people. As the fliers are being dropped off at each home, we're starting to get the complaints about the idea of even doing it when we have a resident who says, you know, "I have an alarm and it's never gone off, it's never accidentally gone off, and now you're telling me that I have to pay a registration fee for something that never happens." And while some of them have been somewhat receptive and understanding for the registration, and, you know, we have been directing people, if they want to know about the implementation of the program and why they're paying that registration fee, we're telling them, you know, it's best answered at the Police Department. But the renewal, it seems to me that that's the one that is most egregious to people, saying, "I don't use it that much. I know I'm not going to get the fines, but I'm now being told I have to continue to register." So they're saying, "Okay, I'm willing to register once, but I'm not willing to do it again, and I have to pay for it." Or they're willing to register, but they don't want to pay for it. So that's one of the reasons why I've tabled the bill.

I know that a few of my colleagues have felt, you know, this seems to be a constant message from the constituents as the fliers are coming in. So, you know, again, it's -- is it really that complicated for someone to register that we'd need to have to charge them, or reregister?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Well, the main reason we want people to reregister annually is we're going to capture information from them when they register. And, obviously, that information will become stale if they register one time and they don't re-up their information. That includes contact information, and, if they want to supply it to us, alternative contact information. So if their alarm goes off and we're unable to contact them, and, for example, there's an open door in a house or break in a house, or even more significant, and I've experienced this myself, there's a broken window on a store, and it's on a midnight tour and we're unable to contact them to secure their establishment, we either have to leave an officer there to secure that business until they come and open it, or we have to leave it unattended, which is not something we would certainly want to do.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

It subjects that business to further criminal activity if we leave it that way.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well --

CHIEF CAMERON:

So the reregistration is an opportunity for us to keep updated information on those businesses on a regular basis.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well, like I said, I did table it because I want to hear from everyone. I know it doesn't really apply -- well, you do have some in Brookhaven. Have you, Bridget?

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes, definitely that. But I we also are -- I'm from the Town of Southampton, which has -- I think the Chief might have been referring to. I know there was a movement to reset the alarms, and I don't know if it passed. Were you talking about Southampton or East Hampton?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I was talking about Southampton.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yeah, that's is. There was -- you know, there has been an effort by homeowners to have that reset so that they don't get really banged by these high fines.

What our issues are, and I think it's really telling for the County as a whole, well, because of our second homeowners, we have an inordinate amount of false alarms, and it's considering the fact that we have such a small police force, really. We have seven sector cars and 140 square miles. Backup for one officer can be as long as eight minutes away. We just can't afford to have people chasing false alarms.

So the fees -- the fine structure is designed to incentivize people to be responsible about how they install these alarm systems. And, you know, folks I think oftentimes don't realize the enormous cost to the Police Department of these false alarms, and especially when they're not around, if it's a second home. So, you know, if I can share any of that information with you, I'm happy to. I don't know if you could build in exemptions, perhaps, for folks who don't -- you know, where it's not the scenario that you've described, Chief, of a commercial establishment, or if it isn't a second home, or one of the -- you know, where it's not in that high risk category for these repeated alarms, false alarms. Maybe that's a way to craft it so that you don't hurt, you know, ordinary homeowners, but, at the same time, we really need to recognize those costs, because they're very real.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I've met -- you know I've met with you. We're receptive to changes in the Police Department, but really substantive changes would change it from the model that I know has been successful, and I'm not sure, you know, that would alter the path of success that I hope we're going to achieve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And I know that one of the conversations we had was senior citizens. A lot of, you know, senior citizens who have alarms, but they are on a limited income, and I know that is something that's been talked about. However, come April 1st, we've already got that set in place what the registration fee is, you know. And I know that some of the people that have called are saying they're paying 60, \$70 a month for their alarm system. But, again, the senior citizen, you know, they have the alarm, they're paying for it, but they're saying, you know, "Now this is going to cost me more money," and that's -- you know, it's difficult for them. You know, are you receptive? And I don't know if it's something you can do before April 1st when people have to register to consider senior citizens, and, you know, if they really can afford to pay that. I don't want to say they can't afford it. I know they're paying for the alarm system, but is there a thought to consider a senior discount?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I'm certainly empathetic to what you're saying, but the law is the way it is and I can't -- I can't change it, unilaterally change it. I have to impose it the way it is. I mean, it would be -- it would have to be changed legally.

LEG. FLEMING:

I was just wondering if we could consider Enhanced Star, you know, eligibility for Enhanced Star triggering an exemption and sort of streamline it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, but that's the issue, is the bill that the County Executive introduced last year doesn't consider that. We'd have to amend it. But if we're going to amend it with no reregistration, possibly, then it kind of kills it.

LEG. FLEMING:

Is there an appeal process?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, there is.

LEG. FLEMING:

So maybe eligibility for Enhanced Star could expedite an appeal or serve as some kind of a baseline for a determination of an appeal.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The bill really doesn't allow for that, right?

MR. NOLAN:

No, the existing law doesn't allow for that. It doesn't exempt people from fees who are senior citizens. You know, that's a policy judgment that people have to make whether that's a good idea. I think it might be administratively a bit to ask for in administering the program, but -- and then, you know, we would have to look at the legal issue about whether you're treating somebody different for the same conduct. You know, I don't know. I don't know if you can make it, you know, income-based, you know, whether or not you pay a fee.

LEG. FLEMING:

I mean, maybe it's because I'm a lawyer, but I think you could probably formulate a rationale for senior citizens, especially those who are vulnerable and need an alarm, at the same time, can't afford an alarm. It might be able -- there may be some way that, you know, this works well for law enforcement to allow these folks to -- you know, you don't want to disincentivize people from having an alarm if they live by themselves and they don't have a family or, you know, caretaker, they can't afford caretakers to help them. So I think you could probably --

MR. NOLAN:

Well, I think -- while the question is are we talking about the registration fee or are we talking about the false alarm fees or penalties? Are we going to treat them different for the registration fee or for, you know, the false alarms? That's another question, you know, that has to be addressed.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay?

LEG. FLEMING:

(Nodded yes).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And no more questions? Okay. Chief Cameron, thank you.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And it was good seeing you yesterday leading the -- leading the Police Officers. It was certainly a very, very great day yesterday.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, it was. Thanks for marching with us, we appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Have a nice day.

LEG. FLEMING:

Was he wearing a kilt?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And -- say again.

LEG. FLEMING:

Was he wearing a kilt?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, he was not wearing a kilt. She wants to know if you were wearing a kilt. He was in uniform.

*(*Laughter*)*

And I do apologize. I know that, you know, being this is a Public Safety Committee, and asking about the union contracts for our public safety members. But Suffolk County Community College, I was reminded, too, the AME members at the Community College are also four years without a contract. So that would be Mr. Tempera we'd have to reach out to. So I would -- Government Ops is still you, Rob.

LEG. CALARCO:

(Nodded yes).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Right. But if we could maybe kind of find out through the Community College and Mr. Tempera where they are with the Community College employees, that would be nice to know. Okay?

LEG. CILMI:

Madam Chair, I might suggest as well, I had gotten an email a few months ago after some remarks with respect to the Deputy Sheriffs contract. I received an email from Chief Deputy County Executive Dennis Cohen, which seemed to indicate to me that he was the one that was responsible for doing the negotiating. So rather than have Jennifer McNamara come, maybe it's -- maybe you should have the Chief Deputy County Executive come and --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

-- talk about those things.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I mean, I'm just used to -- previously, Jeff Tempera was Labor Relations, so, generally, it's Labor Relations. So I would have assumed that's the person, but --

LEG. CILMI:

I would have assumed as well.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, but --

LEG. CILMI:

May not be the case.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

-- if that is needed, then we will certainly request that. So, okay, sorry. I just caught what he said. Okay. So I guess if Mr. Cohen will come with our Labor Relations and let us know how things are progressing. If not -- there was another issue I was going to bring up, but I forgot, so we will --

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I can talk a little bit more and maybe you'll remember.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Ah, it's okay.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I do actually -- I actually do have to do one more bit of business, if I may through the Chair. We at an earlier meeting, we had tabled subject to call a Procedural Motion 02-16, establishing a special committee to review law enforcement operations in Suffolk County. I'd like to make a motion to consider that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

LEG. CILMI:

If that's the proper motion to make. I'm not exactly sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

George?

MR. NOLAN:

That will work. It's basically to take it from its current status as being tabled subject to call, so they're asking to bring the resolution -- the resolution before the committee for a vote. So that's the proper motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I was going to say on the motion, too, because what has been occurring, and I know that you're aware, is we have members of the Minority Caucus and members of the Majority Caucus, we have been -- have had conversations, and actually in addressing that particular bill, and we've kind of -- I know Legislator Hahn has come forward with some thoughts and initiated legislation. And I think we're kind of coming where we're taking the two pieces of legislation and trying to combine them. So I think we should hold off and see how that one goes.

I'm happy to see that it's a bipartisan work group, because that's -- I know we all are concerned about the recent events and what's still currently going on, that we need to address that issue for the future. It's a shame that it takes an occurrence to make -- you know, for us to realize something needs to be done or to know that we need to do something, but I think that we could hold off. I don't want to support bringing it forward at this point in time until, you know, both representatives from each caucus are prepared to present something. And if you feel that that's not acceptable enough, then maybe we can consider it again. So, Rob, did you want to say anything, or is --

LEG. CALARCO:

No. You said what I was going to say.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Anybody else?

LEG. CILMI:

Is the -- Counsel, is the bill -- when a bill is tabled subject to call, is it subject to the same -- you know, the sixth-month rule, the expiration dates that a bill would be subject to if it were just tabled?

MR. NOLAN:

In terms of it lapsing after six months --

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

MR. NOLAN:

-- being in committee? Yes, it would lapse after six months, it would be treated the same.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And we're in month three.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

So I think we're going to see the other piece of legislation definitely within the next month, couple of weeks.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay?

LEG. CILMI:

All right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Would I be right to say that?

LEG. CILMI:

I'll withdraw my motion in that case.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

The plan is within the next couple of weeks, and maybe have it laid on the table for Tuesday. So who am I to -- I don't know.

MR. NOLAN:

I'll say no more.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I don't know that it's not being ambitious. So anyway, with that, we will -- I'll make a motion to adjourn. All in favor? Opposed? We're adjourned. Thank you.

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.*)*