

## **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 Maxine S. Postal Legislative Auditorium of the Evans K. Griffing Building, 300 Center Drive, Riverhead, New York on Thursday, September 1st, 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

#### **Members Not Present:**

Legislator Monica Martinez - *Excused*

#### **Also In Attendance:**

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature

Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature

Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

John Ortiz - Senior Budget Analyst/Legislative Budget Review Office

Janice Lawlor - Budget Review Office

Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning

Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory

Ray Donnelly - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory

Alysa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn

Liz Alexander - Aide to Legislator Spencer

Elizabeth Sutton - Aide to Legislator Fleming

Chris DeLuca - Aide to Legislator Cilmi

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

Kerri Suoto - County Executive Assistant

Jason Hann - County Executive Assistant

Stuart Cameron - Chief of Department/Suffolk County Police Department

James Cerone - Sergeant/Chief of Department's Office - SCPD

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

Dr. Michael Caplan - Suffolk County Medical Examiner

Robert Holley - Director/Suffolk County Fire Academy

Ed Johnston - Deputy Director/Suffolk County Fire Academy

Joel Vetter - Coordinator of Emergency Medical Services/FRES

John Becker - President/Deputy Sheriffs Police Benevolent Association

Artie Sanchez - 1st Vice-President/Deputy Sheriffs PBA

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

Jim Roddin - Trustee/Superior Officer's Association

Patrice Dishopolsky - Director/Suffolk County Probation Department

Matt Porter - President/Probation Officer's Association

Peter Dykeman - Suffolk County Probation Officer

Stan Humin - Executive Vice-President/AME

Jamie Ryan Atkinson - Nominee/Suffolk County Child Fatality Review Team  
Thomas McAbee - Resident/Village of Southampton - tip411  
Terry Halsch - President/tip411 (*Present via teleconference*)  
Dan Zell - National Program Manager/tip411 (*Present via teleconference*)  
Stephen Ruth - Resident of Ridge/Red Light Camera Program  
Stephen Ruth Jr. - Resident of Centereach/Red Light Camera Program  
Robert Rockelein - Huntington Matters/Greenlawn Civic Association  
Sydney Marshall - Resident of Wheatley Heights/Red Light Camera Program  
James McGoldrick - Resident of Huntington Station  
Robert Spetta - Resident of Setauket  
All Other Interested Parties

**Minutes Taken By:**

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer

**Transcript Prepared By:**

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

**(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:41 A.M. \*)**

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good morning. We will start the Public Safety meeting. If everyone could please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Kennedy.

**(\*Salutation\*)**

And a moment of silence for those who defend our country at home and abroad. And this is Labor Day Weekend, so keep in mind not everybody gets to enjoy the weekend. We have many of our public service employees have to -- in the medical field, law enforcement who have to continue to work, and also in our military. And also keep in our prayers Officer Cummings and we hope a speedy recovery.

***Moment of Silence Observed***

Thank you. So we do have a presentation. I do have a few cards. Is -- okay. Mr. Halsch, I believe you're on-line? Is he -- do we have him on the phone? This is a little unusual, but if you don't mind, we do have a Public Portion, so we generally have that first. I just want to make sure he's aware of our process. So this is a little unusual. Is he on the phone?

**MR. HALSCH:**

We're here.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So if you don't mind, we do have a few speakers. We have a Public Portion generally first, so I do want to let them go. So our first speaker is Robert Rockelein. And before we go, I do apologize, Legislator Martinez has an excused absence, she's attending a funeral. Go ahead, Mr. Rockelein.

**MR. ROCKELEIN:**

Good morning, Chairwoman. Good morning, Members of the committee. Robert Rockelein, 893 Park Avenue, Huntington, New York, representing the civic group Huntington Matters which I'm a board member of and the Greenlawn Civic Association, which I'm the Safety and Traffic Chairperson for their committees.

First of all, I want to thank all of you for your service. Suffolk County I moved to several years ago, very great place, a lot to keep up with. I thank you for your service. I've been in public service for over 33 years, retired from the New York City Police Department and was involved in community affairs and that was my bridge to civics over 25 years ago.

As far as the recent violence and homicides in Huntington Station and Greenlawn, we realize the Police Department has a fixed amount of assets and resources, and we're here to ask for you to bump that up, because it's apparent now that we're dealing with a more urban environment than suburban environment. And I know the Police Department, I used to be a spokesperson myself, cannot really admit to the fact that they're insufficiently staffed or insufficiently funded, but it's the truth, I'm not going to pull any punches here. Prevention and detection is the real P and D of Police Department. You don't have to report, detect, investigate, arrest or testify for crimes and offenses that don't occur. Generally the theme of patrolling is omnipresence, for you to worry about there being a police officer almost everywhere and, therefore, go to another county, go to another state to find your wears and commit your crimes. But we really need a more proactive and not reactive approach to policing due to the increased density and the quantity of offenses. I know a lot of times statistically driven policing 911 calls and such generate, you know, the need for resources. A lot of people don't want to call 911. I can't tell you how many times, and I work in Nassau County for some villages in the auspices of North Hempstead, they don't want to bother the police, and I tell them *bother us*. I never minded being bothered, never minded steering people in the right direction or referring the complainant instead of the complaint, but that's not the -- that's not the mindset generally here. They feel 911 is for life or death, which of course it's not due to the system allocation and prioritization. But we're not in Kansas anymore, we really need to step up things.

Public safety is not an option, and the necessary resources must be allocated on a regular basis, not just temporarily in a reactive approach which has happened here and there in Huntington Station over the years. We know we have the quality in our officers on patrol, but in cases like this we need quantity, too. Just like one professional cook in the kitchen can't serve 100 people simultaneously, even if he's a five-star Michelin Chef, the same thing with insufficient allocation and manpower. We're being a little too reactive and we need more proactive boots-on-the-ground approach where people are dissuaded from even thinking about committing a crime.

A lot of people that we talk to, and we talk to hundreds on a monthly basis and we have our other civic representatives here, they've constantly stated they don't see the police. And I look for things, I see things people don't see, I'm a trained observer and I don't see all that many police. You see them here and there, and part of it is because I'm actually looking for them. But so many people have stated that blatant traffic violations, blatant quality of life violations just go -- pass by, possibly due to the call volume that officers don't really have the time to proactively patrol, but it's a lot of the same things in the same locations and people are complaining on a regular basis. We're going to have them start to complain to the Legislature and to the County, as well as the Town of Huntington.

So there's already a reduction in manpower in Greenlawn. Each night one of the sector cars is knocked out and there's a combination and an overlap of sectors. A lot of things are going on in downtown Greenlawn, both property crimes, we've had a shooting, we've had a homicide. So restoring that car to the full sector width; like I said, we need -- you know, you really need the maximum manning, not the minimum manning. There's a lot of contractual things what the PBA might say, and I was a union delegate for 12 years and I was on the Contract Committee as well as the Political Activism Committee. So that reduction of manpower, everybody's starting to know it now and I think they're going to make their dissatisfaction with that known.

It also puts officer safety at risk. You want to have the necessary people out there to back up. A lot of Suffolk -- with the exception of the last couple of months with the national climate, you have single person patrol cars. I've worked by myself in the city, I've worked with a partner, there's a

big difference and officer safety is paramount, obviously. But we don't want minimum staffing levels, we want maximum staffing levels. And if you have to get that money --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Mr. Rockelein?

**MR. ROCKELEIN:**

Yes?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I apologize, we didn't start that timer, but your three minutes are up.

**MR. ROCKELEIN:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

If you would like to kind of wrap up.

**MR. ROCKELEIN:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And just so you know, our -- the Chief of Police is here today --

**MR. ROCKELEIN:**

I saw him in the back.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- which is nice that he's getting to hear what you've got to say.

**MR. ROCKELEIN:**

Right. And Commissioner Sini we've met with several times, his proactive outreach to the community has been phenomenal. And he is trying to do what he can do, but it's like a Vegas shuffler; if you have one deck in the shoe, you can only go so far. That's why they have many decks in the shoes at a lot of the tables.

But the Town of Huntington, the tax contribution to the County doesn't seem to be coming back in a fair share allocation, and that's something we'd like to change in the future. If we're paying out X amount of million, we'd like to get 95% of that back at a minimum. So I thank you all for your time.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. Next speaker is James McGoldrick.

**MR. McGOLDRICK:**

Good morning. My name's James McGoldrick, I live in Huntington Station. Thank you for having me. I'm here to thank Doc Spencer, Commissioner Sini and Chief of Patrols, Officer Brown. They have sent -- yesterday -- as you know, Huntington Station and Greenlawn is under tremendous amount of pressure with crime and everything over there, so they're sending in more police, and we need that and you have to give them every resource that's possible. I don't want to repeat what Rob -- Rob said a lot of the things that I was going to say. But when it comes to the budgeting of the money to the 2nd Precinct, you have to look at those numbers very closely. It's out of proportion. It's actually so bad that it actually -- it might be worth going privatized, that's what people are thinking. They're paying out \$115 million on a \$493 million budget, that's almost 23% of the police budget that the Town of Huntington is paying. And with all of these things going on

over in that town, I think we're entitled to more. They are sending in more police, I was told last night from Doc Spencer, and Commissioner Sini's been very proactive over there in helping us, but it's up to you also. You're holding the purse strings. And if there is any, any emergency funding for more police, they need it immediately. We don't even know how many are retiring this year, and what's going on is you keep going down in the numbers but the crime keeps going up.

So please, you have to look into this budgeting. You have to look into the police contracts. I mean, some of the things in the contracts. I was a union worker for 37 years; I compliment their negotiators, I wish we had them. But you know what? It's getting to the proportion now where it's getting a little crazy on salaries, and now you're paying overtime. It's cheaper to hire somebody. Thirty million dollars in a budget for overtime? That's a lot of money. You can hire a lot more officers and maybe cut it down to ten. If you go with 20 million at \$150,000 a year, that's approximately 138 Police Officers. And when they divide up the classes, the classes should be divided up proportionately. Huntington, you had 104 graduates last year out of that class, we only got 13 officers, we were actually entitled to 14, 15 officers. We were shorted, and this is not fair to the Town of Huntington. And, you know, these are some of the issues that we're dealing with over there and if you, you know, look into this and what I'm saying, it's all there. I've got the paperwork from you, I FOILED it.

So, you know, I understand it can't be done overnight, and I'm fully aware, Huntington Station has taken 50 years to get here, I understand the Police Department cannot fix it overnight. They are doing everything they can, but you hold the purse strings and they need more money. I know this isn't the Budget Committee, I understand that, that's next month, I'll be there, but thank you. But please help them because they need it. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, you don't have any arguments from me about their staffing levels. I thank you. The next speaker is Stephen Ruth.

**MR. RUTH JR:**

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. I want to thank you all for being here and thank God for allowing us to be here. And I want to discuss another victim I came across that's in a wheelchair for life due to a red light camera incident where he was hit and ran in front of two cameras on Boyle Road and Middle Country Road and he was never allowed to see any video of his accident, nor were the detectives even able to access the video to try and find the perpetrator who left him in the street to die; he fortunately lived and his name is Billy Ventora. And I met him the other day and when he explained the accident to me and how he was never able to see the footage from the cameras, I thought that I would bring this before you. And maybe we could find out also not just his accident, but what happened with the girl in Miller Place on Route 25A and Miller Place Road, there was a young girl that was injured in a crash and my eye witness testimony, which I placed on Facebook, stated that the two vehicles were trying to beat a short yellow light, and it's the short yellow lights causing these accidents.

So I've been telling you guys this for a long time. I know Mr. Cilmi has been trying to get the lights lengthened and other Councilmen and Legislators want the same. I think that if we don't have everybody on board, more lives are going to be lost. Not to mention what good are these cameras if they're causing more accidents? And then the accidents that they do cause, you can't even access the videos from the cameras on hit and run accidents. If there's a hit and run and somebody's in a wheelchair for life because of it, that's a serious concern. But when the County won't even find a way to release the videos, that's really an injustice on society. If the cameras are only good to extort money from us and they're not able to prevent or they're not able to expose who committed a crime, what good are the cameras? They're just a revenue generator, that's it, just revenue generating. And everybody knows the lights were shortened, it's not a coincidence that these accidents are occurring in front of cameras where lights are terribly short, like Miller Place Road and Route 25A. That same intersection is where John Luke got killed. His family was never

able to see the video of his death. When we got a subpoena for that video, they just showed the boy laying dead in the street. That's not fair because before that accident they showed continuous video, but then when his accident takes place they only show him laying dead in the street. That's not fair to the family, to the officers that want to investigate what really happened.

The same thing with the boy named -- he was actually a young man named Billy Ventora who got hit and ran at Boyle Road and Middle Country Road right in front of two cameras. If they're never able to access the video to try and find the perpetrator, then what good are the cameras other than from revenue generation? I mean, at that point why don't we just get rid of yellow lights all together and put cameras everywhere? I mean, if that's all it's about, if it's all about money, just do away with yellow lights. I mean, what's the point at that point? If we know what it's all about, it's just about revenue generation and it doesn't have anything to do with safety or preventing or solving crime, then just get rid of yellow lights all together. I think that's a great idea. What do you guys think? *(Laughter)*.

*(Timer Sounded)*

That's the way the County wants us to feel, so. Please guys, get together and work with us. Lengthen the yellow lights, and maybe some solid, red turning arrows at like Miller Place Road and also Old Town Road and County Road 83. If we had solid red turning arrows, it will prevent these crimes, these fatal accidents and horrible accidents. Thank you and much respect.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Next speaker, Sydney Marshall.

**MS. MARSHALL:**

Good morning, Suffolk County. I'm a New York State EMTB, I do have a duty to act in all situations where there are accidents. I'm not stopping for every accident, but I am stopping for the ones that I deem worthy of medical attention, or the possibility of medical attention. I have many issues with the red light cameras. There is no proof of improving highway safety, reducing overall accidents or improving traffic flow. There's no certifiable witness for the infraction; a machine took the photo, not a person, there is no one to say that this actually happened. The driver is not positively identified. The owner of the vehicle is mailed a ticket. Who else is driving the vehicle? Not necessarily the owner.

My personal biggest issue with the red light cameras is that this County has been choosing money over safety. There have been proven methods to improve traffic safety, including designing the intersections better without negative effects. For those that say red light cameras have caused a decrease in accidents, you're not really correct. Right angle or T-bone accidents have decreased slightly, but it's not significantly notable. The Federal Highway Administration says that there has been a 15% decrease, but all accidents have increased by 25%. People are not crashing less, they're just dying less. An institute -- a current institute -- Insurance Institute for Highway Safety Study shows fatal crashes have been reduced by 14%, but injury severity has increased by 22% and cost of damages are up by 34%.

Rear-end accidents have, in fact, increased significantly. The Federal Highway Administration Study showed an overall 18% increase. The Texas Transportation Institute found that multiple cities rear-end crashes have increased by 20 to 40%; the same study found increases from two to 60% at intersections across America. Our problem is the yellow light timing. In the City of Chandler, Arizona, they increased yellow light times by just one second. They have no red light cameras installed at the following intersections, but an overall decrease in rear-end accidents by approximately 50%. A study conducted in California by Safer Streets LA increased yellow light times by .3 seconds, not even an entire second for the number of violations at a single light within one month to decrease by 92. They went from 194 infractions to 102 infractions. A different intersection increased the timeframe from 4.3 seconds to five seconds flat. Average infractions

decreased by 38%, from 180 infractions to 70 infractions a month. With my background in EMS, I'm disappointed in our government for choosing money over safety. This Legislature is choosing revenue over public safety. And it's not just my safety and my other citizens safety, it's your safety as well.

The Federal Highway Administration found a positive economic effect of more than 18.5 million in seven cities it studied, but our priorities are wrong and this is corruption. This really isn't fair for anyone. And as a citizen who serves as our country -- as an EMT, anyway -- serves our County, I really want to see public safety increase. This isn't fair to us and this isn't fair to anyone who drives on our streets, whether they're visiting, whether they're a Legislator, whether they're another citizen, whether they're me as an emergency responder. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. The next speaker is Stephen Ruth Sr.

**MR. RUTH SR:**

Good morning. My name is Stephen Ruth Sr, I represent numerous groups, Social Security pension recipient, business owner in Suffolk County for 38 years, and both residential and commercial property owner. The first premise in business is that it makes a profit; it cannot operate in the red. Government is the same, it must be able to support itself. Fiscal responsibility is a must. Excuse me, fiscal responsibility must be the way to run any business. When responsibility leaves, so do values, morals and legality. There are many areas of over spending, from overtime to duplication of effort to false billing and costs. Suffolk County is operating like it has an unending supply of money obtained from OTB, sales tax, property taxes, fees and now red light cameras. We are still in the red. There is something very wrong. The costs that we pay are exorbitant and not all that much in return.

After attending several Suffolk County meetings, I observed no response from Legislators, little interest in the residents' concerns, and no interest in fixing a problem that is both illegal and immoral. Red light cameras are killing people, injuring residents that don't want them in the first place. Why must lawsuits be filed? Listen to what I'm saying; take down the cameras, or make them uniform in timing. Change traffic signals to show timing of turning lanes and put a stop -- put in stop and go lines for speed. Do the right thing.

You cannot continue to run our government with no concern for the life and safety of your constituents. We as a County can get down in flames or change our government to operate on a fiscally sound platform. Without change, life gets worse. I think a New York State audit is necessary. John Kennedy needs the help of New York State auditors. Bring in the State auditors. OTB is missing the boat. Locate a casino in the Grumman incubation area, or on the surrounding 10,000 unused acres. Accept the fact that casino gambling is a viable source of income and not a detriment to the area. Use revenue to replace those cameras. The public has had it. We cannot continue to accept any more taxes, fees, penalties or excuses. The government must be responsive. Think of why you were elected. The end does not justify the means. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. Next speaker is Peter Dykeman.

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

Day 2,071; today, September 1st, 2016, is day 2,071 of the Suffolk County Probation Officers working without the consideration of a fair Collective Bargaining Agreement. In just four days we will observe Labor Day, defined by the U.S. Department of Labor as a day, "*Dedicated to the social and economic achievements of American workers. A yearly national tribute to the contributions workers have made to the strength, prosperity and well-being of our country.*"

As we move into this Labor Day Weekend, culminating with the observation on Monday of Labor Day, we'll no doubt hear quotes on our; local news channels or read statements on social media from our local officials. Some, like this committee and our friends in the Legislature, have regularly shown their support for the American worker and the Suffolk County worker, including Suffolk County Probation Officers. On the other hand, there will be those who pay little more than lip service to that cause. A true champion of labor would not, in this day and age, decimate the budget and staff of a law enforcement agency by approximately 20% while permitting their own budget to increase by 13%, the Law Department by 12%, the Labor Department by 24%, and the economic development and Planning Department by an apparent 60%.

An employer who "*appreciates the achievements of their workers*" would not fail to negotiate or even communicate with that group of workers. An executive who recognizes the contributions that workers, like Suffolk County Probation Officers, have made to the strength, prosperity and well-being of our County would look to use a portion of the funds from that 20% departmental budget erosion to negotiate a contract that has been outstanding for six years. As we await the 2017 recommended budget, we can't help but wonder if the Probation Department will see even deeper cuts and if, at the same time, there will be increases in other select departmental budgets. One could only imagine that the justification that will be offered regarding the significant budget increases of those departments would include the idea that such investments would produce returns that would more than amply cover the cost of the initial investment. Why does that rationale not apply to Probation Officers? We are the most cost effective -- cost efficient, excuse me, alternative to incarceration. And I draw a firm distinction between *cost efficient* and simply *cost*.

In the same manner of speaking, an investment in our unique ability to effect change and reduce recidivism could drive down criminal justice costs in this County. It does become an increasingly difficult task, however, to comply with State mandates and otherwise, as the saying goes, *get the job done* with the constant erosion and decimation of our resources and the lack of a fair contract. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you, Peter. Did I hear somebody had a question? No? Okay. When was the expiration of your contract? I'm sorry.

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

December 31st, 2010.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So this December will be six years.

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

It will be our six-year anniversary.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. You monitor sex offenders, people who wear ankle bracelets, you monitor the DWI program, among many other individuals. And do you know what the average cost is for a Probation Officer?

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

If you're asking our average salary?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yeah, a day.

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

I could tell you our top salary for a Probation Officer is \$76,285 a year with relatively minimal overtime.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And the average cost per day I believe is less than the cost of a jail cell per day.

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

Very much so.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So you are definitely more cost effective. So, you know, I know that we have talked about this for many, many months, and it really is a shame. Do you know the last time that your union has actually sat at the table with the Administration to negotiate the contract?

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

I believe there are individuals here more qualified to answer that question than me.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, we might -- if they're willing to give us and speak with us, I'd certainly appreciate that updated information, and I'm probably going to ask the same question of our Deputy Sheriffs. But thank you, Peter.

**MR. DYKEMAN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

The last speaker is Robert Spetta.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Good morning. My name is Robert Spetta and I am here speaking to you as a concerned citizen and not as an alarm professional as in the past. The question is where do my Suffolk County false alarm permit fees go? Recently the Suffolk County Legislators voted to approve legislation to permit and fine homeowners for life safety devices. The permit fees are \$50 for residential citizens, and \$100 for commercial businesses. The permit fees are also combined with false alarm fines that can be up to \$750. Here's what I know about the legislation. I already pay sales tax to Suffolk County on all alarm monitoring fees I pay for. I already pay property taxes to Suffolk County for police services. For me to pay an additional \$50 to Suffolk County would amount to another tax for services I'm already paying for.

The Suffolk County Police are one of the highest paid police forces in the nation. When a Suffolk County Police Officer gets ready to retire, sometimes after 20 years of service, they wrack up overtime in their last three years of service so that their pensions increase to an inordinate amount, all with a wink and a nod from the Legislators. The Suffolk County Police had a corrupt Police Chief who was criminally prosecuted and convicted and still receives a half a million dollars in pension and benefits. These fees, all the fees and fines are slated to go directly into the Police 115 Fund.

In the Suffolk County's 2016 Recommended Operating Budget, an estimated \$7.3 million was expected to be raised from this program to offset salaries and benefits for the Police Fund. False alarms had nothing to do with this. If I have an alarm and the police respond, my fine is up to the discretion of the responding officer. And it's next to impossible for me to appeal the fine, which makes a mockery of my right of due process which is assured to me under the United States Constitution; see the 14th Amendment. The Suffolk County Legislators voted to approve this law on the sole recommendation of the Suffolk County Police Chief Cameron, without any input from the tens of thousands of life safety homeowners residing in Suffolk County.

You can see the transcripts from 12/15/15 concerning now.

Here's the real question. Is this how Suffolk County Legislators conduct business? Do they vote legislation into law based on the sole discretion of special interests rather than the citizens they have vowed to represent? The voters and the taxpayers of Suffolk County are already one of the most highly taxed counties in the nation, but we can do something about this injustice and let it start here, because the Legislators work for us and not for special interests. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Don't go anywhere, Robert. Legislator Krupski has a question.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Good morning.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Good morning.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Do you do any business in the five East End towns or Nassau where they already have a fee for false alarms?

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Has that affected your business at all?

**MR. SPETTA:**

Well, again, I didn't really come up here to speak -- and I know people have seen me in the past speaking in reference to the alarm business, but I didn't come up here to speak as a business owner of alarms. I came up here because, quite frankly, this infuriated me as a person, as a citizen. This law infuriated me and it infuriated me on how it was voted in. It just seemed a real injustice. So I'm not here to talk about business, I'm here as a citizen of Suffolk County speaking about how this --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No, I appreciate you coming in to give us input and that's important to get input from people. But as a businessman, that's my question to you. You operate in areas that historically have had a false alarm fee for the same reason that the Legislature adopted it last year, because of the amount of false alarms, so.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Ninety-six thousand of them.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yeah, 96,000 false alarms in the Police District.

**MR. SPETTA:**

That data I would love to see.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

But you operate under -- so you're saying as a businessman you do operate in the East End towns that already have that.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

But how -- so has that affected -- my question to you as a businessman, how has that affected your business?

**MR. SPETTA:**

Well, it's hurt it, absolutely. I mean, that hurts business, it doesn't help it. It doesn't help to have, you know, fines for things that you already pay taxes for in the first place. A lot of people find that to be an injustice.

**AUDIENCE MEMBER:**

It's abuse.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. I'm not sure how it hurts your business.

**MR. SPETTA:**

What do you mean?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Well, the homeowner would pay the fine. If you're a homeowner and you have a --

**MR. SPETTA:**

Because a homeowner says, *"I don't want the alarm anymore. I don't want the life safety system anymore. I don't want"* -- and again, these life safety systems are not just burglar alarms, they're all-in-one. They're smoke detectors, carbon monoxide, flood sensors; all these things are integrated into one system. So they cut out everything.

They say, *"I don't want to pay for this fine. I don't want this service anymore,"* and that's already happened. It's happened quite a bit because of this legislation, and because of the way it's handled by the police, quite frankly.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Mr. Spetta, I know that you're coming as an individual, but we have had several meetings --

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- with regards to this alarm bill. And I think that, you know, many of us were not happy with what -- what had developed. Now, the County Executive making that decision to put \$7 million in the budget as revenue; again, as far as the Police Department is concerned, they weren't the ones who determined what the costs were. As you know, this bill is an amendment to what the County Executive originally proposed, and rather than being a third time -- on the third time a fine it's the fourth time, so you actually get three free false alarms.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

As you know, 96,000 people -- sorry, false alarms is a significant impact on the Police Department. We know that Nassau County, we know that the city does it. One of the things that is being done elsewhere is that after a third false alarm, the Police Department doesn't show up on a false alarm; we don't want to do that here in Suffolk County. But there has been a reduction in false alarm calls; I have asked for a bit more specific information on that. The registration fee is a one-time registration on a resident. There is no additional registration fees. They will be required to register. And I think it's important that the Police Department does know who has -- who has an alarm system. They feel it's important for them to know when they respond and to capture additional information, and I know Chief Cameron is here to respond to that. So I know that we have met.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I know that in a perfect world you would like to see it gone completely, but it's been going on in Nassau County for years. And for some reason I've been trying to find out how many times have, you know, has the businesses gone. I reached out to the businesses to come up with a common ground on this and, you know, I haven't heard of too much going to Nassau County or going on in the city like here, opposing this program. So I think if Nassau -- and what we're doing, Nassau County is much more -- more strict on their program than we will be if this bill passes.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Correct. But has that really helped in the reduction of false alarms? That would be the real question.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, according to Chief Cameron right now, to date there has been a reduction in false alarms and I'm hoping technology will make a difference.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Okay. How many people have just cancelled their service to relate to that number of going down of false alarms?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And that is a possibility. And as you know, this is only to do with police calls, it's got nothing to do with the fire departments. The fire departments will still respond, so they are exempt on this. So, you know, again, we've met several times, we have worked on this.

**MR. SPETTA:**

I just thought it was important.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. And I think it's important to be clear that everyone knows we participated in discussions with this.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And from your last meeting, my understanding was is that yes we came to common ground and that it is more acceptable to the industry when we left that table than what it was before.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Okay. Thank you.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Kate?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Legislator Fleming has a question.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you. Yes, I do. Good morning.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Good morning.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you for coming in. I'm unclear on what your position is. I know you've met with Kate. I hear that you don't like the original bill. I applaud Legislator Browning's attempts to get this right and to include the industry in the discussions. So we have -- we're considering a bill that would amend the bill that you find so offensive. So I'm not clear on what your position is on the bill that we're actually considering.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Well, my position is to get rid of it entirely. I mean, that would be my position, my ideal position. But, you know, I have to be realistic.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I appreciate that. I don't think I agree with you, but I appreciate it. I come from a district where we have an alarm bill that's very effective. A very small Police Department, they can't waste time, and I think -- I appreciate the Police Department's need to reduce false alarms. So I guess the other question I have for you is you say that you're losing business because of false alarms. Rather than looking for the cause of that --

**MR. SPETTA:**

I'm not losing business because of false alarms, I'm losing business because of the alarm permits and fines.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay, so let's back that up. The alarm permits are generated -- the alarm fines are generated by false alarms, and then folks are upset about fines and so cancel their systems, or get rid of their system; that means they're getting rid of their systems because of false alarms. So my question is can you -- isn't there pressure on the industry, based on the fact that false alarms are wasting Police Department time, to improve the technology and get it right so that we don't have so many false alarms? I mean, that's -- from a public safety perspective, that's what we're trying to do here.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Absolutely. But wouldn't it be better to work with industry professionals?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Right. That's what I'm confused about because I thought you were working with -- I thought that's why you came and met with Legislator Browning.

**MR. SPETTA:**

I am now, but this law wasn't voted in originally that way. This law was voted in without any input from anyone.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

All right. But now we're at a place where we've had quite -- I don't know if that's true or false, I wasn't involved. I know the Police Department was involved. And as a former Assistant District Attorney, I support that and I understand it and I know that we can't waste time when it comes to public safety. So I appreciate your points. I think I understand your position now. So even the changes that you've been, you know, part of the conversation for are still not acceptable to you; is that right?

**MR. SPETTA:**

No. Again, I'm just bringing this to light in how this was done. I mean, naturally, I would like not to have this, but I understand, you know, compromise is important. But it would be -- but many people that I deal with -- and again, I was speaking as a citizen, not as a -- you know, I'm speaking as a resident of Suffolk County, not as an alarm business owner here. You know, that has been expressed to me by many, many people that they wished this was never even here, and that's how I'm speaking to you folks today. Not --

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay, you've clarified my question. Thank you.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Any other questions? No? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Spetta.

**MR. SPETTA:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Have a good day.

Okay. We do have a presentation. Are we ready? We have Terry Halsch, President of tip411, who will present the public safety tool via the web. Hopefully this will -- (*laughter*) hopefully our technology is going to work. This is an anonymous tip system used by over 1400 communities across the U.S. to engage residents by a smart phone app and text messaging system to share information with police to help fight crime. So -- okay. Now, you're not Mr. Halsch,

**MR. McABEE:**

I am not. My name is Thomas McAbee, I am a resident of the Village of Southampton in Suffolk County and I am going to introduce Mr. Halsch.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So if you'd like to go ahead and begin, we're getting the screens coming down. Whoops; maybe it's not coming down. Okay, it's working.

**MR. McABEE:**

Start?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think. What's going on here? Okay. If you'd like to go ahead.

**MR. McABEE:**

Madam Chair and members of the Public Safety Committee, I thank you for your dedication to public safety and for your work on the Public Safety Committee which has jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the Suffolk County Police Department, the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department, the

District Attorney's Office, forfeiture and seizure laws and all law enforcement related business and activities.

I also thank you for the opportunity to make a short introduction to the presentation you're about to see. Three years ago, a local pharmacist and I formed a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit which is concerned with prescription drug abuse which, as you probably know, often results in heroin use and related crimes such as robbery, larceny and even homicide. Therefore, we are dealing with a matter that is both a public health issue and a public safety issue.

To educate myself about these issues, I frequently visited the website of the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration. About one year ago, the DEA website posted a press release which announced to the public that the DEA in Phoenix, Arizona had begun using a new technology to help fight crime including crime that is associated with prescription drug and heroin abuse, and the new technology is called tip411. I wondered why tip411 was not available in Suffolk County. So to learn about tip411, I contacted the organization which operates tip411 and I spoke with the organization's President, Mr. Terry Halsch, who will now explain to you how tip411 is used by more than 1,400 law enforcement agencies across the United States. I would like to introduce Mr. Terry Halsch from tip411's headquarters in Minnesota. Mr. Halsch, the floor is all yours.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Thank you, Tom. I really appreciate the introduction and we really appreciate the opportunity to make this presentation to the committee today and to everyone present. Just to give a little bit more background, our corporation has been around for about 15 years and we do have a pretty good size footprint in the State of New York. We're approaching about 100 public safety agencies, both local, State and Federal agencies that are using tip411 to gather anonymous tips from the public. One of the people on our staff who has been most influential in getting that going in the State of New York is Dan Zell. I've asked Dan to do the presentation today to explain a little bit more how tip411 is being used in New York and around the country. Dan?

**MR. ZELL:**

Thanks, Terry. First of all, Tom, can I confirm you can see my screen, or everybody can see the screen there?

**MR. McABEE:**

Yeah, if you could move your cursor.

**MR. ZELL:**

Yes.

**MR. McABEE:**

There we go.

**MR. ZELL:**

Okay. So as Terry said, we have a large footprint across the country, especially out in the northeast and especially in New York, so quite a few agencies around the area you guys are in are using tip411. So let me log in. What we have is a web-based technology that law enforcement uses to connect with citizens, so it's really about citizen engagement through community notification anonymous tips, social media published and mobile apps. So what I'm going to do is walk through a little bit of the functionality of how that happens.

Really it's about transparency and engagement. So when you look at how do you connect with the public, it's about using tools that they use every day as well and things that are easy for them to use. So the notification part is really leveraging off text and email notification out to citizens that, you know, opt in to receive information from law enforcement. So what I wanted to show you here is some of that initial functionality of the alerting capability.

So how this works, if an agency is using tip411, within their community they can set up public and private groups that they can communicate directly with, so that might be things like neighborhood watch groups or business groups, things like that that folks can opt into. This technology can also be used for pride alerting, so commonly the pride alerting is used to communicate with internal agency groups or external folks such as school superintendents, school administrators, things like that. So if there happens to be a lockdown or anything like that that's happening in the community, they can quickly use tip411 to reach out to those folks privately. So that capability is really reaching, you know, their target audience immediately through that text and email functionality.

So the purpose of this presentation, a lot of times I'll go into detail a little bit more about how it works. I think more what I'd like to do here is show you what the public sees, so. But just to give you a little understanding of the functional aspect of this; as I said, I'm not going to go through detail here. But for an agency that uses this, it's very easy for them to come in and start to create content and target alerts off to groups that they can create. So we have some agencies around the country with several hundred groups that they're communicating with that folks are opting into. And so as I said, you go through, you create your content and then you send it. So rather than showing you all the functionality, I wanted to show you kind of a live -- I'm going to use Yonkers as kind of a live example for some of the functionality. You know, they're fairly close there, plus they are using this in a very effective way across multiple channels of communication. So I'll just really hold up here some examples of what they're communicating out to their citizens; it's kind of a roll-up of the alerts that they're sending out. So you can see there's different things that they're communicating out to the public. Some are crime related, some are school related, there's press releases they're putting out over this. So those are just some real brief examples -- I want to see if I can scroll over here -- of what those content alerts look like.

The next piece is getting that information out to social media.

So part of the capability of what tip411 does is it takes the notifications and will feed them out to social media that, for example, an agency has. So if they have a Twitter account, Facebook page or, you know, other venues that they have that they're leveraging to communicate with the public, tip411 can kind of save a lot of time and effort internally at an agency but yet leverage those resources that the public is wanting to go to to get information. Obviously, you know, Facebook is a huge component of how the public is communicating with not only each other but with organizations.

So here I pulled up Yonkers PD, this is their Facebook page. So what I wanted to point out with social media and publishing is it enables an agency to leverage tip411 to get information out to Facebook or Twitter quickly without having to spend a lot of time jumping around in two different accounts and publishing that information. So some of these alerts were created directly out of tip411, just the brief picture I showed you there of creating content, for example, this one here. So it's a nice way to really get the law enforcement agency involved in being able to leverage the Facebook and Twitter connection with the public. You see these other components out here, too, on Facebook.

So another component to tip411 is anonymous tips. And as Tom said, that's really how we got involved here through his research. Anonymous tips is a huge part of a connection in a community to create that kind of open communication without fear of reprisal. So it's overcoming the snitches get stitches thing that's been around forever. And through use at Federal level, through DEA, through U.S. Marshals, your post office all the way down to the smallest agencies in the country, we've seen this make a huge impact.

So functional-wise I want to jump back over here, and I'll show you that. So anonymous tips, it's a two-way real-time communication for citizens to connect with law enforcement. They can do that, again, through multiple ways that they're used to, however they want. They can text tips, they can get access to agency-graded apps that we provide through our subscriptions, they can submit tips through Facebook, through a website. So there's really no way they can't communicate and it's 100% anonymous. So when those tips do come into agencies, the folks that are administrators on

the system, whether it's Chief or Detectives or whoever it might be, have access real-time to that information coming in, and it ends up being a two-way chat with the tipster, and I'll just show you a brief example of what that looks like and the simplicity of how that works.

So when those tips come into the system, the agency sees no identifying information, there's no way to get access to it. The key to all of this is communicating to the citizen that it's 100% anonymous. We've got some examples. For example, Atlantic City they -- and we partner with Crime Stoppers in many cases, but in some communities there's a distrust of different things that have been used over the years regarding phone calls. So what this does is it kind of opens up a whole new channel so you can appeal to those folks that it might not otherwise come forward. So when they do communicate it's a real-time chat, think instant chat and the officer or whoever's involved in this can communicate back and forth with the tipster in real-time.

And then this information, in the case of, for example, Westchester County, every agency has access there, so they can actually all share tips across all agencies if they get information related to another community or sharing investigation information. So there's some delegation and some command and control aspect to tip411 that allows an agency to really leverage the intelligence that's coming in from the community, and a lot of times these conversations in the community go on for a long time. I've seen -- heard examples where there's a chat that goes on two or three years, it's that concern citizen that's tired of something happening in their neighborhood. So they all have something that they can do about it by providing anonymous tips. So that's a quick touch on anonymous tips.

Another component that -- I just want to explain, and I guess your folks have questions -- is we also have a component here that publishes crime data to the public. So an agency can choose to connect to the crime there, it's a back-end records management system. It's a simple connection we can make and then folks can go up to the public crime map and view, you know, the current information that's in their city on a map and they can submit tips via that map as well.

So I kind of want to get to the last piece, though, which really ties it all together. So the last piece here is the mobile app. I'm going to share my mobile screen here. So I've got an i-Phone that I want to share. Okay. So Tom or Janice, can you just confirm, you should see on your screen my i-Phone, it says *airplay* on it.

**MS. LAWLOR:**

Yes.

**MR. ZELL:**

Okay. So what the mobile app component of tip411 is is it really ties the notification, the pop-up notification, tips, crime map and custom flexibility for an agency to promote other resources that they're, you know, using to reach out to citizens. So kind of along my theme here, I'm going to go to Yonkers. So the way this works, part of our mantra is to encourage communities, agencies to make it their own. You know, really it's kind of a hyper local thing. You want to -- although local levels you can build that brand in connection with your citizens. So everything we do is really pointed at branding to the agency, and their relationship with the community, so the mobile apps are branded to an agency so it looks like their app.

The components of the app integrate in the notification. So again, folks can upload these for free once the agency subscribes, so they're automatically getting pushed information out to their phones that the agency is creating using Tips411. So you can see, you know, these are just different examples of some of these we saw on Facebook, actually, when I clicked on there. So I can submit tips to citizens directly related to something by clicking on that tip. I can submit tips unrelated to alert, so if I simply just have information on something I can send a tip to the agency. And I could also view other things that the agency wants to share with me. So this is just an example of what Yonkers puts out there. So these are completely -- they're not really related to what the functionality of what we provide through tip411. So this is where you get into -- we're working to

leverage other resources that you already have and make them more valuable in terms of how that communication happens with citizens.

So those are some examples of what one agency wants to put for citizens, so it's completely custom. This is all managed by us as far as the technology goes. So the good news is is for, you know, as most law enforcement agencies in our communities, very limited resources to one technically managed software; go out and buy new hardware and software. So everything we have is if you want to call it cloud-based, is managed from our end so we manage the technology. So the agencies that use it really are just using it to get benefit out of what the goal is which is, you know, that citizen engagement and transparency.

**MR. McABEE:**

Hey, Dan?

**MR. ZELL:**

So I know you have a very short time, so I'll stop there, Tom, and give it back to you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. You want to hit the lights, Josh?

**MR. McABEE:**

Dan, thank you very much. I just want to conclude by saying this. I have downloaded on my cell phone the Yonkers, New York, tip411 app. And as an example, I wanted to show you that if I witnessed what I thought was a crime, I would just open up the app and then I would dictate on my cell phone something like this; *Hey, I just saw a guy run out of a pharmacy, he had had a gun and a bag. He was a white male about 6-foot 2, 200 pounds. He got into a car, a black car, the license plate numbers started with GAX and that's all I saw.* And then the cell phone app would transcribe what I said and send it to the police immediately, and they would then take action.

So Terry Halsch, I'm going to conclude this, if you're ready for me to do that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I think -- do we have some questions before I ask any questions?

**MR. McABEE:**

Before I have a question, could I just ask to say what I would like the committee to do? Mr. Terry Halsch will repeat a presentation on September the 15th, and the target audience for that presentation will be all of the law enforcement agencies in Suffolk County. Now, to maximize the attendance for the September 15th presentation, I ask you, the Public Safety Committee, to do three things. Number one, contact the Suffolk County District Attorney, Mr. Thomas Spota, and ask that the District Attorney participate for 30 minutes on September the 15th. Number two, contact your Legislative colleagues and ask that they be sure to contact all law enforcement agencies in their district to participate for 30 minutes on September the 15th. And three, contact the Suffolk County Police Commissioner Tim Sini and Sheriff Vincent DeMarco and ask that someone from those law enforcement agencies participate for 30 minutes on September the 15th.

Now, as far as disclosure, I have no business relationship with tip411. I'm just a private, concerned citizen who has a not-for-profit organization. And I will pledge that if tip411 comes to Suffolk County, that our not-for-profit will actively promote tip411 to the general public so that Suffolk County will receive the benefits of less crime, fewer criminals and more public safety. And I thank you for this opportunity to address the committee. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Can you repeat again, September 15th, where and -- where and what time?

**MR. McABEE:**

Okay. In front of you should be a handout with mostly an orange color. No, it hasn't been handed out yet. It gives the date and time. But I'm also asking to include the members of the Public Safety Committee as the inviters. At the bottom of this handout, you will see your names being given recognition as the inviters encouraging law enforcement agencies throughout Suffolk County to at least take a look at tip411 and then they can assess whether or not tip411 creates the benefits for their local communities.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I can tell you September 15th might be an issue for me. I wasn't aware that you haven't actually invited any of the law enforcement, so that's a further conversation we're going to have to have.

**MR. McABEE:**

Yeah, we have not invited any law enforcement agencies at this point, but we have proposed September the 15th as the date for this.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And what's the location for this?

**MR. McABEE:**

It will be the same type of arrangement where law enforcement personnel, at their desk in their office, can log in and view the demonstration on-line.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I'm happy to share the information, but I don't know that September 15th is going to be an easy date to make this a reality. You're talking two weeks away. So I think they may -- some of them need a bit more time, because I know my schedule already for the entire month is pretty much jam-packed. So I'll have that conversation. I will reach out to all of our law enforcement. I know that there's a representative here for the Sheriff's Department. And also our Chief is here, so obviously they're aware of it. We'll see what they can do. I think it's important for them to have further discussion. I know --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can we ask some questions?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, right. I'm going to let you talk (*laughter*). We have -- You know, our Police Commissioner is definitely very interested in any new technology that can help the Police Department, as I'm sure our Sheriff is, to help them enhance tips to fight crime. And certainly, we have our residents from Huntington here with the issues that are going on in their community that anything can help them to improve the safety of their community, I'm sure that is something they'll certainly have an interest in. But I think we'll move this to our Police Department. There are a couple of questions. Legislator Hahn has a question.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Well, I was just wondering, back in 2014 we passed legislation that I authored and Rob Calarco co-authored directing the Police Department to study the feasibility of using Next Generation 911 technology. You know, so I was kind of -- I know that the Police Department has been studying this. I know that the Police Department has been working towards instituting smart Next Generation 911 where folks can text in video and photographs, and etcetera. So I kind of want to have a representative from the police -- there was a report that was supposed to be produced and I -- I don't have a handle on that at the moment. So I was hoping someone from the Police Department could come forward and just -- we usually have a rep from P.D. here that can talk about these things. Is anyone from P.D. here?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Why don't we let the P.D. -- we have a couple of more questions.  
So I'd prefer to let --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Well, I passed legislation two years ago directing them to study this.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, but we'll --

**LEG. HAHN:**

So I'd like to know if there was a result of that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Chief, we'll let the Legislators ask the questions and if you want to save your answers so that the Legislators can finish the questions, and then we'll get to yours. Okay? So do you have any more questions? Do you have any questions?

**LEG. HAHN:**

*(Shook head no.)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No? Okay. Leslie, you have a question?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

When you dictate into your phone that you're witnessing a robbery with a man with a gun, prior to it going out as a Tweet, is there any vetting by the Police Department?

**MR. McABEE:**

Well, when it --

**MR. HALSCH:**

Yes. I can explain that. So --

**MR. McABEE:**

Terry? Hey, Terry, can you hold on? Because the audio here is -- go ahead, try now.

**MR. HALSCH:**

How is that; can you hear me okay?

**MR. McABEE:**

Try it, go ahead.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Is it okay? How's that?

**MR. McABEE:**

Yes, go forward.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Is it a little bit better? Okay. So, yeah, just to clarify. So kind of the functionality that I was walking through there composes both outgoing communication that's generated by the law enforcement agency, so it's a text/e-mail alert that goes out to folks that, you know, want to be made aware of what the Police Department is trying to communicate. There's absolutely no connection between the anonymity of a tip or how that function works, it's a completely separate

thing.

What we're talking about when we say -- when we start talking about social media, it's really more about promoting both the notifications that are being sent out, as well as promoting the fact that the public can send anonymous tips. When someone sends an anonymous tip, it's completely encrypted, 100% anonymous, no one sees it or who they are. The only people that see the actual tip content itself are authorized law enforcement agency personnel that have access to the tip411 System that can log in and kind of view the screen that you're seeing here.

**MR. McABEE:**

Terry, let me jump in here. Legislator Kennedy, the tip that I sent or could have sent on my cell phone was sent not as a Tweet but a tip directly to the law enforcement agency anonymously, they received it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. McABEE:**

And they will handle it from there.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's excellent. I was fearful that we would be encouraging on Tweets, people would be taking pictures.

**MR. McABEE:**

It's not a public Tweet.

**MR. HALSCH:**

There's no public Tweet at all involved with that, no.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Any more questions? Okay. Bridget?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Yes. Hi, Tom.

**MR. McABEE:**

Hi.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So I know we worked together on pharmaceutical disposal. You know, we -- in the Town of Southampton, when I was a Councilwoman we expanded the pharmaceutical give-back program, Operation Medicine Cabinet that the County started, and I appreciate your input with all that and the pharmacies bringing back the pharmaceuticals. You mentioned at the beginning of your presentation something about pharmaceuticals, but I don't see how it ties in.

**MR. McABEE:**

Well, prescription drug abuse is a crime, and whether the prescription drug abuse actually is perpetrated by a patient, a pharmacist, a doctor or a street criminal, these tips can be reported to law enforcement and acted upon.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Oh, I see. Okay, so just like any other crime.

**MR. McABEE:**

Just like any other crime.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay.

**MR. McABEE:**

But with my interest being in prescription drug abuse leading to heroin abuse.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Gotcha. Thanks. And then two other questions. How much does this system cost?

**MR. McABEE:**

Well --

**MR. HALSCH:**

Tom, I can answer that.

**MR. McABEE:**

Go ahead, Terry.

**MR. HALSCH:**

The price of the system is based on two things; one is the size of the agency, and the other piece is the subscription that people decide to use. We have a variety of different product offerings, if you will, but it ranges between \$200 and \$1200 per month/per agency. Our largest agency would pay at the top end and then the smaller ones that Dan alluded to would just be paying \$200 which includes all of our system, all of the training, all of the upgrades. So it's a very cost effective way of connecting with the public, developing additional trust and transparency with the public, and agencies continue to renew their subscription at a very, very high rate year over year with tip411.

**MR. McABEE:**

And Terry, I think the closest law enforcement agencies here to Long Island would be Westchester County and Yonkers. But also, I understand that the entire San Francisco Police Department, and of course there's 1400 other agencies throughout the United States including, by the way, the Department of Fish & Wildlife in California which has over 380 uniformed conservation officers.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Yeah, we actually have agencies that range in size from four sworn officers to over 4,000 sworn officers using this system effectively.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

That's great to know. And just so you know, our Chief of Police is here in the audience and hearing this. I think this is very valuable in terms of letting us know that there is this product available. I think there are a number of products that serve similar purposes, and I know that Legislator Hahn had directed a look into that.

We currently have a new Police Commissioner who is extremely focused on social media and IT and, you know, sort of modernizing communications within the Police Department and, you know, with the community. So I think this is very valuable to know that this exists and I would suggest that, you know, dealing directly with IT, you know conversations with the IT, you know, folks in the Police Department might be helpful, because I know they're very focused on this area already and moving

in that direction. But thank you very much for your presentation, Tom.

**MR. McABEE:**

Thank you.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Thank you. We really appreciate it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Kara?

**LEG. HAHN:**

So, quick question. In the PowerPoint, it did talk about having a police officer actually respond in real-time via chat. So I guess part -- two things, two things to this. You know, you were very knowledgeable when you created the scenario where you were reporting a crime and you talked about the weight of the individual, the hair color of the individual, what they were wearing. The average -- you know the average citizen who calls 911 I believe often needs to be prompted for the valuable information -- you know, to report the valuable information in those kinds of scenarios. And what I wouldn't want to -- you know, I think this is obviously the wave of where things are going, is through social media and we have to be on top of that. But we also have to recognize the value of the 911 operator, the value of all that training and everything else there is that goes into taking and receiving a 911 type of call and not only being able to help in scenarios, but being able to prompt potential witnesses to what they're seeing, you know, to report what they're seeing and the very important details of what they're seeing. So I would -- you know, so I'm just kind of --

**MR. HALSCH:**

If I could interrupt quickly.

**LEG. HAHN:**

-- wondering how --

**MR. McABEE:**

Hold on, Terry.

**MR. HALSCH:**

We have calm centers all across America that are on the back end of --

**MR. HALSCH:**

Terry, hold on.

**MR. HALSCH:**

-- responding to these --

**MS. LAWLOR:**

Terry? Terry?

**MR. HALSCH:**

Yes?

**MS. LAWLOR:**

Hold on one moment.

**LEG. HAHN:**

He can go ahead.

**MS. LAWLOR:**

Legislator Hahn had a question.

**MR. HALSCH:**

About how the tipster could be prompted, and I just thought that that was an excellent question of how she's telling -- the key ingredient is who's on the receiving end of these tips. And we actually have 911 calm center operators across America that are responding to these tips when, in fact, the investigative people aren't on duty. And so the training that we do is going right into those calm centers who already have the training of interacting with the public and all we're doing is training them how to use our system.

Typically, during the day the investigators will be on duty and they've been trained of how to draw information out of tipsters, and so they do an outstanding job at most occasions of being able to do that. And then the calm center takes over when maybe the investigators aren't on duty for -- especially for these small agencies that we're working with around America, around the U.S., the 911 Center is involved a lot.

**MR. McABEE:**

Legislator Hahn, I'd like to also add this. I think that tip411 is not meant to replace 911, but it is --

**MR. HALSCH:**

No.

**MR. McABEE:**

It is definitely an add-on. Especially when the tipster really wants to remain anonymous. You know, I have the 631-852-NARC, which is a telephone number that goes into Suffolk County. I called that number and the phone was answered by a live person. Now, if I were a tipster who wanted to remain anonymous, I might hang up the phone right then and there.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Well, we have a text-a-tip line where you can text in tips as well. So, you know, there's certainly --

**MR. McABEE:**

I understand.

**LEG. HAHN:**

But no, I'm not suggesting in any way it's duplicated. It's obviously adding extra features and there's many things that, you know, I know our department is thinking about. I know they had said that they would have infrastructure in place by the end of this summer. There was something about the wireless carriers that was a problem. But certainly, we have to move in the direction of social media; it's clearly where everything is moving and we should move in that direction. But I think at some point we should hear from the Police Department as to how far along they are already.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Tom, can I add just one more thing to that? It's obvious that you all have been thinking about this. The infrastructure question, just to go all the way back to Dan's introduction, we deliver our software as a service, so there's no infrastructure, there's no IT support needed. We have database managers on our team 24/7 backing up the software and the connection to the Police Department. We have been able to turn this on for nationwide orders in 48-hours from the time that we've got the purchase order in the system as being used.

In the case of the U.S. Marshals, I got a phone call on a Saturday morning, they wanted the system to be live in 45 minutes, we trained one of their people in 45 minutes and they went to the media with a child abduction case in 45 minutes. So the software, because of the fact that it's being

delivered software as a service, is very, very easy to turn on and get started. There's no computer speed, space or support needed, so it's a really excellent system for all sides of agencies, and that's one of the things we're proudest of.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I think we have one or two more questions. And I think in all reality there's a lot of questions that need to be answered, but I think more by our Police Department, by our law enforcement that they probably have more questions than we could even think of. But Doc Spencer, you have a question?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I did. It was related to the cost and also how the tips are handled, so they were asked and answered. I think it seems like there's a lot of potential here, and I look forward to hearing more about it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And Legislator Cilmi?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you. Just a couple of -- couple of things. Quickly, my opinion here, not that you necessarily asked for it, but I really don't see anything here that's different than what we already do. I mean, this may be more evolved in some aspects than where we are. We're certainly trying to get there. But in this learn-how section on your *You're Invited* flier, each of those items we're doing in various ways. Our use of Facebook has increased tremendously; we have real-time community notifications through our code red system; we encourage anonymous tips. In fact, on one of our -- one or more of our lines, maybe the 852-NARC line, when you speak with a person, if you don't want to be identified, they give you an actual number that you can use and call. And so for future calls, you just call and you give the number and they can add to the case file based on the number, you don't have to give your name.

So I really don't see the value here, myself personally. But I'm just one person, obviously, of 18 members of the Legislature. I think those that have said you would be more -- it would be more appropriate for you to, you know, have an audience with the public safety departments in our County, I think that's accurate.

I did notice here on your *Your Invited* flier that it says you've been invited by, and it lists ten different folks here, among whom are some of us Legislators, my name is included. I hope this flier has not been distributed in any way yet. Because I think if you want to have a meeting with the Police Commissioner or the Sheriff, I think that's fine and appropriate and, you know, certainly you have the ability to reach out to those folks and ask for a meeting. And if you're having a problem with access, I'm sure the Chair of this committee can try and negotiate that. But I don't think it's appropriate to have -- and I'm not sure if any of you noticed that or agree with me, but I would appreciate if you took my name off this list.

**MR. McABEE:**

Legislator Cilmi, that flier is a draft, it has not been sent out. It was presented to you for your concurrence and approval.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I appreciate that. Thank you.

**MR. McABEE:**

We'll remove your name.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yep, I appreciate that. If I can privately or personally help you try and set up a meeting, I'd be happy to do that if you're not successful, but I don't want to do it in this way.

**MR. McABEE:**

Right.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**

Yeah, I agree with that.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Me, too.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Ditto, okay. Legislator Kennedy?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Are you at liberty to tell us what the cost component of this program is?

**MR. McABEE:**

Well, it was mentioned that each agency, depending on its size and also the type of -- the level of the tip411 product that is subscribed to, it could be anywhere from \$200 per month to \$1,200 per month. I think that -- those were the numbers that were mentioned.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

What is the difference between the \$200 a month product and the \$1,200 a month product?

**MR. McABEE:**

Well, there are three different levels called different bundles and I cannot -- Terry, I don't know if you're still there, maybe you could --

**MR. HALSCH:**

Yes, I am, Tom.

**MR. McABEE:**

Okay.

**MR. HIRSCH:**

I think the thing that distinguishes the price level is primarily based on the number of sworn officers. Because as we work with an agency that has 4,000 sworn officers, there's a lot more support involved as far as training the officers as duties are changed and everything else like that. And also, there's a lot more cost in relationship to the volume of text messaging that is going on. In a community that has 4,000 sworn officers, that's generally a very large community, and the number of tips that they get is, as you could imagine, significantly larger than the one that has four or 40 or 400.

**MR. ZELL:**

Dan here, too; I'd like to add something to that, Terry. There's a delineation between really two primary products we have. One product is primarily focused on tip technology only and it does not involve community notification or any connections to social media or anything like that. And the other product includes tips, but it also includes all of the other functionality related to reaching out.

So as the gentleman said earlier -- I didn't catch the name, so I apologize for that -- but we certainly understand some communities have -- they have some of these capabilities. So what we're trying to do is plug in what we can provide that's best fit. So that's a delineation, not only by

dollar amount so you can understand when you're talking about just tip functionality, you're going to be talking about the lower end of that scale, especially for smaller agencies, and on the higher end if you're using all the functionality in your large.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Oh, sorry, Leslie.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's okay. I still need more explanation. Is there any material that you have with you or can send to us to give us -- and to the Police Department?

**MR. McABEE:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Can I jump in? I mean, I think at this stage of the game, obviously they need to meet with their law enforcement.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Correct.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I think that if there is any further -- if the Police Department decides they want to move forward with this or the Sheriff's Department, then I think then we could move further with having -- certainly Mr. Halsch will need to come out here and meet with us at a later date. So, if that works for you.

**MR. HALSCH:**

That's fine. Tom and I have already talked about that possibility and we would be very open and welcoming to the idea of being there in person.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Doc Spencer, you have a question?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I do. I think that one concern that I have is that when we're dealing with the financial challenges that we are facing as a municipality and you bring something like this as a not-for-profit representative, and we have extensive resources within the County itself, my initial impulse is to say, *Hey, thank you very much. This is something we should be doing.* There's nothing proprietary really that's going on, it's like a great idea. We take our existing system that we have and we make it a lot more user friendly to be able to do that and really applaud you for this type of awareness. So I think that that would be one of the things I'll be looking for. You know, whether or not you look at this as Shark Tank and say, *What are you doing here that's proprietary?* It's great ideas. Thank you for doing your job as a concerned citizen, we're going to direct our law enforcement community to look at this and set up our resources to be able to utilize these ideas. So it's kind of -- I think that's where -- you know, that's kind of where the challenge is.

**MR. McABEE:**

Legislator Spencer, I would like to add that it's my understanding -- and Terry, correct me if I'm wrong -- is that in Westchester County and in Onondaga County where Syracuse is located, that the entire cost of tip411 was paid for by the District Attorney's Drug Crime Forfeiture monies.

**MR. HALSCH:**

That's correct.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I don't believe there are any more questions. And certainly, I will provide your information with all of our law enforcement. I can't force them to meet with you, but I'm sure they may have some other questions. Like again, I said the 15th, I'm sure there's some research and some things that they might want to do before the 15th, and I don't know if that's an adequate time for them. So we'll get back to you and let you know how things are going with them --

**MR. McABEE:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

-- for a presentation. Thank you.

**MS. LAWLOR:**

Terry? Dan?

**MR. HALSCH:**

Yep?

**MS. LAWLOR:**

That concludes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think we lost Mr. Halsch.

**MS. LAWLOR:**

That concludes; correct?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That concludes it.

**MS. LAWLOR:**

Okay. Have a great day in Minnesota.

**MR. HALSCH:**

Thank you.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. We have a couple of items. And I want to say, Patrice, are there any issues; Probation, anything you'd like to bring forward to us?

**DIRECTOR DLHOPOLSKY:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I see Dr. Caplan here. Is there anything specific, Dr. Caplan, that you are here for and would like to speak on?

**DR. CAPLAN:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

No? Commissioner Williams regrets his attendance, but they are paying attention to the weather, so he's a little busy right now. But there is someone -- Joel Vetter is here to represent him.

And we do have our Chief is here. I know he's here on a specific issue. Question for -- Matt, would you like to speak on a Probation update again, contract? Close, not close, last time you met? You're free to tell me whatever you've got to say, if anything. Whichever one makes you comfortable.

**MR. PORTER:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Good morning.

**MR. PORTER:**

Obviously I'm not smiling, so I don't have good news. But I'll answer any question you have for me.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

When was the last time you had face-to-face sit down with the Administration to negotiate your contract?

**MR. PORTER:**

What are you quantifying as Administration?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, I know that Mr. Cohen is the one who generally is -- has been meeting. But curiosity; has the County Executive ever participated either?

**MR. PORTER:**

To my knowledge, no.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And when was the last time that there was a face-to-face with Mr. Cohen?

**MR. PORTER:**

Within, I believe, the last month. But is there anything significant? No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So there's no offers, no counter offers, nothing like that's been going on.

**MR. PORTER:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So why bother meeting?

**MR. PORTER:**

That's a valid point.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You kind of went thinking there might be something, is that what I'm --

**MR. PORTER:**

There's always hope. We have to have hope or else what do we have?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

He's right. He's right, yeah.

**MR. PORTER:**

I mean, there has to be something. We -- anything and everything that we could do, if we need to mobilize, if we need to be somewhere, you've seen what we can do in 24-hours for a cause, and anything for a contract and the attention we deserve. In the two years that I've been unit president of the SCPOA, I have not seen the County move in any -- the first step they take towards us with a contract, I'd like to see it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So you guys have presented an offer.

**MR. PORTER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And again, I heard there was one in November, that supposedly an agreement was -- they came to an agreement in November, but nothing has been signed.

**MR. PORTER:**

Nothing has been signed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Because they've decided they didn't like that agreement; is that right?

**MR. PORTER:**

No. They haven't said whether or not they liked, disliked. They haven't pointed out, *Hey, you know, A through P is fine, but we have a problem with W, X, Y and Z and let's just figure this out and go*; no, nothing like that.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, that really is a shame.

**MR. PORTER:**

It is.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It really is a shame.

**MR. PORTER:**

It is. It's at the point of befuddlement as to how long can this keep going on?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. PORTER:**

We are concerned. You know, the budget is coming up for next year.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**MR. PORTER:**

And if there isn't a budget for our unions that haven't settled their contracts, what's going to happen?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**MR. PORTER:**

And that's what we're pressing upon our Legislators, is if there's not money allocated in the budget next year to settle contracts, then what?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, right. Well, there used to be a contingency fund. I don't know. John, do you know if there's money or how much money there is in the salary, the contingency fund?

**MR. ORTIZ:**

There are no contingency funds.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

There used to be.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

Yes, appropriation 19.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So we could only hope that there would be an attempt to put something in the budget for potential salary changes.

**MR. ORTIZ:**

We'll see when the recommended budget comes out in a couple of weeks.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

In a couple of weeks, okay. I'm sorry, Matt. I wish there was better news. So now you're getting close to six years, and I know AME is coming up at the end of the year, and that's going to be interesting to see how that's going to be. So I guess maybe the Public Safety Committee should continue to send letters and ask questions about why it's taking so long.

**MR. PORTER:**

I can't answer that. Our fundamental message from, you know, all of our members to the County Exec's Office is you can run but you can't hide. Eventually we need a contract.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right, right.

**MR. PORTER:**

It's six years. My membership is at their wits end. They are frustrated, they feel disrespected. And as a County workforce who -- you know, we don't make the money in law enforcement, other agencies do. And they have their contracts, we don't begrudge anybody of what they have or what they do, but we have to live here, too.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Well, I guess we will be sending a letter to the County Executive asking him when he anticipates a contract for you guys, as for the Deputy Sheriffs. And when they propose, I'm just curious, you know, if they've reached out to AME yet to even attempt to start having some discussions before the expiration of their contract. So -- but thank you, Matt, and we'll be in touch.

And I think John Becker was in the room. Is he still here?

**MR. PORTER:**

As always, though, we'd like to thank the Legislature for their support on behalf of the whole SCPOA. You guys have been great. And hopefully sometime soon I can come up here smiling with a piece of paper.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I hope so, too. And thank you for what you do to keep our residents safe.

John? I guess same question; when was the last time you had a discussion?

**MR. BECKER:**

Well, a lot of the sentiments that were just echoed by Matt are unfortunately very familiar. We have not had any informal negotiations or any conversations since we presented an offer back in March. As far as formal negotiations, that has not gone on for over a year. And I just had a couple of talking points that I just wanted to update the committee on.

I had spoken previously that we had requested costings from the Police contracts and the Corrections contracts. I received an email on August the 9th from Chief Deputy Executive Dennis Cohen. In that email it contains spreadsheets and tables for the Police and Corrections contracts. My disappointment in this email really was two-fold.

The first was the amount of time that it took to receive this email. And what was finally sent out -- again, our disappointment was in not only the content, but in the presentation. The information was very haphazard. It made it very difficult to even understand what it was that they sent, and other sections were just completely illegible.

I actually met with the Budget Director, Dr. Lipp, just to get his assistance in trying to understand what was sent out, not only to me, but to the Presiding Officer of this Legislature. What we were able to figure out was it seems that the savings for these contracts were achieved through this new pay scale.

In regards to our membership, I feel this is problematic. Our Deputy Sheriffs are already at a starting salary of \$30,000. Now, a lot of the other bargaining units brought their starting salaries down. I think it's already a problem for us to now enter into a new pay scale with such a low starting salary. I think it's going to create -- and I believe Chief Sharkey is here, he would echo this sentiment -- this is going to create a recruitment and a retention issue for Deputy Sheriffs. I believe each bargaining unit is unique, and when it comes to negotiations, you can't be so rigid and not allow that there are circumstances that are unique to your bargaining unit. The things that Deputy Sheriffs need may not be the same things that Correction Officers need or AME needs, and I think as part of those negotiations you need to look at that. But unfortunately, negotiations really haven't taken place, and we haven't been able to make any strides towards getting closer to that goal.

Again, I want to echo the frustration that Matt Porter just talked about. I have Deputy Sheriffs that are here, their job is to provide the safety here at this committee. They are six years without a contract and they are just so disillusioned as to how this has been able to go on for so long. It's beyond unfair.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. And I got a copy of that so-called cost out, and when I looked at it, I thought, *What am I looking at?* I don't know if you guys received a copy.

**LEG. CILMI:**

*(Shook head no.)*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Oh; I'll be happy to share. But when I looked at it, I thought, well, you know, this is -- it was more assumed or anticipated, but wasn't realized. And from what I understand is what was in there was not realized. So my assumption is is that you could do a contract with an assumed or anticipated savings, but may not be realized, or should not be -- and I think Probation should be able to do the same thing. If they want -- if they want consistency in negotiations, then that's what you could do.

And I think it's unrealistic to ask you to go below \$30,000. You know, we have other County workers who don't have to wear a gun and put on a bulletproof vest to go to work that are making \$30,000 and coming in at a start salary of 30,000. So I think it's unfair and unrealistic to ask people, members of law enforcement to do that much more less.

So again, I apologize that you're not hearing anything. I know that the Presiding Officer, you know, I spoke with him yesterday, and I think he's equally disappointed that you are not getting the answers. And that the amount of time the letter he sent out requesting the information and not getting the answer, and then when they do get a response back, it's a bunch of hogwash, if you ask me. So, again, we will continue to ask that question. How many times have you met with County Executive since you've started negotiations?

**MR. BECKER:**

That's easy to answer, zero.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. I can't imagine why he wouldn't. I know that the former County Executive I know has participated in contract negotiations, or at least been somewhat engaged, so that really is a shame. Again, thank you, John. And I would hate to ask AME if there's been any initial conversations. I know when I've been involved in contract negotiations myself, before the contract expires you generally have some meetings beforehand to hope that you'll get to an agreement before the contract expires. Can you guys speak to that, or would you prefer that your President respond to that?

**MR. HUMIN:**

We're still trying to come to an agreement with the College right now, so that's basically our effort at this point and we're hoping that at the conclusion of what we have going with the College, we could move directly into our negotiation.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

State your name on the record.

**MR. HUMIN:**

Forgive me, please. Stan Humin, Executive Vice-President of AME.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, thank you. And the College contract, I mean, what -- is there -- are you getting close to your contract?

**MR. HUMIN:**

I believe we're making progress, absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. However, the college is separate, now a separate entity than you guys, the Suffolk County workers.

**MR. HUMIN:**

Correct.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And so -- but you had no preliminary meetings?

**MR. HUMIN:**

We've had no preliminary talks regarding AME's contracts.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Nothing? And have you made requests?

**MR. HUMIN:**

Yes, we have.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, that I need to know. Well, I appreciate it. And hopefully you won't have to sit for six years without a contract.

**MR. HUMIN:**

I hope not. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Thank you. I'm sorry, does any of my colleagues have any questions? No? Okay.

I know, Kara, you had a question with regards to the tip411 and the Next Generation. I guess, Chief Cameron, if you would like to -- if you could please come forward? You might want to have a seat and make yourself comfortable, because I know that there's another issue. We might as well get on them all.

So you kind of -- you know, the presentation was somewhat helpful. I mean, I think there was some positive things about that presentation and the Tips411. Obviously, you guys would want to have a meeting, conversation to see if it is something that would be of interest to you. It is an enhancement of what you currently do, but I know the Next Generation Program did -- Kara, do you want to reiterate or do you need to --

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

No. Of course we're always willing to look at new technology. I don't know why this group thinks there's any difficulty in getting the tip411 people in to see the Commissioner or I. I think it probably would be better if they met with our IT staff, because I think Legislator Cilmi really hit the ball -- hit the nail on the head; a lot of what they offer we already have. You know, we already have Nixel which was free, we signed up with Nixel to send out information that also feeds social media. At some point we paid for a block for Nixel to be able to create private groups. We created private groups, for example, the schools, we send messages out for the schools exactly like the presenter said, if there's a lockdown at school, we'll notify of course that school, but we also notify other schools because they're very interconnected and may have students in the school that's involved, so we notify everyone. So we do have that.

The Crime Stoppers can take tips via telephone which is the ideal situation, because I think someone mentioned that. Because the person that's calling in the tip can be interrogated and we can get additional information, potentially, that's anonymous. You can report Crime Stoppers through our web page, that's anonymous. And you can also report Crime Stoppers via texting in, so we have all of that.

With respect to texting in and sending photos in for crimes in progress that was demonstrated, but clearly it would have to be something in order to be monitored 24/7 and that would be best accomplished through the Next Generation 911, because that would be incorporated into our 911 system and that would go to the ECOs, just as a phone call would go in. So that is in progress, some of the hardware has been installed. I wasn't aware that we owed you a report on the status, but that's certainly something that we can get to you right away. That is in progress and in the near future, within maybe a year, we should be able to take text tips and receive photographs.

The one thing that I would like to point out with that, and if you've ever had a conversation with somebody via SMS as opposed to a voice conversation on the phone, widespread use of texting in to our ECOs is going to take additional time, it's going to tie them up. So, you know, in special circumstances, that is certainly something that would be advantageous, but widespread use of texting into 911 could result in additional need for resources in our 911 Center.

**LEG. HAHN:**

And just to clarify. I have our Clerk staff checking to make sure that you never -- because it's, you know, two years overdue, a report, if it is overdue; it's possible one was done two years ago and maybe never circulated, but certainly an update. We appreciate the update.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Sure, absolutely. There's no problem with that whatsoever. I can get that over to you rather quickly. If you didn't get the report that you required, I apologize for that.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah. We're double-checking.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**

They weren't able to find it immediately, but Ann Marie back in Hauppauge is doing the search.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

It's under way and it's going well. Thank you.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So I think what I will do is -- say again? (*Brief pause*). Yeah, okay. So first resolution, you might as well stick around.

The ***Tabled Resolutions, 1493(-16) - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to improve alarm system registration requirements (Browning)***. I'm making a motion to approve.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Kennedy. Any question?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Just on the motion, if I may. I just -- I appreciate, Kate, your work on this to include the industry and to try to get it right. As I mentioned to you, I think that two strikes and you're out is a better way to go than allowing that third, so I would love to see that adjustment. But I certainly want to

support sending it to the General Meeting so that you get a vote after all the hard work you've done.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I can tell you, it's been -- we're now in September. And since this information went out with regards to the alarm system and the alarm program, I have to tell you, my office, as I'm sure many others, have been flooded with phone calls with very angry constituents. And I have to tell you, the majority of the phone calls were not necessarily about the fine but about the registration.

And I did meet with the industry and I think we did come to a common ground with the industry. Of course they're never going to like it, but it's going on in Nassau, it's going on in the city and, you know, they've been living with it. They haven't been kicking up a stink in those other counties. And I'm again having the conversations with the Police Department and the 96,000 false alarms that they've been receiving. We continually want to say, this about public safety, about freeing up our police officers. I don't believe a \$50 registration is going to free up a police officer. I think fining for false alarms is going to force people to do the right thing and make sure their alarm system is working properly, and also the company that they have hired to install it and the central alarm -- whatever they're called, call center, that they're going to do a better job to reduce the number of false alarms.

So the registration fee, I understand that, you know, the Police Department still wanted that registration and a registration fee. But when you have residents who said *I've had an alarm system for five years, ten years, I've never had a false alarm. Now you're going to make me pay \$50. Why? What is your reason? You have no reason, and I don't think that's fair.* I understand the Police Department wants to capture the information on all of the alarm systems that exist, and I think we're giving them that opportunity. And that one-time registration fee I see as an administrative cost, but once you get it, you shouldn't need to continue to get it. So I don't know if Chief Cameron wants to explain, with the 911 system and the registration, what is the Police Department providing and if you want to provide us with. Now that people are registering, what is -- what's the service you're providing?

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Well, I would like to just point out, as you know we started the program because we wanted to spend some time notifying people because it passed in December, so we didn't actually stand up the system and start taking registrations until April. We received registrations in April and May and we didn't start imposing the alarm fee for false alarms until June. And the largest number of false alarms that we receive in the County is from residences. And just the process of having the residences obtain permits, in April and May you had a significant impact on false alarm. We saw a 23% reduction of false alarms in April and an almost 34% reduction in May, just from requiring people to obtain permits. Because basically it focused their attention on something that they've never really had to pay attention to before.

Now as we moved into June and July, we're up, just last month in July, to seeing a 34% reduction in false alarms, and that was the problem that we took a look at. And I heard a couple of the people during the public portion speak about the fact that the Police Department should have additional resources. And of course I think any Police Chief that's sitting in front of you that says they wouldn't like additional resources is lying to you, but I don't have control over that. What I do have control over is making the resources I have as efficient as possible, and in my mind responding to 97, 96,000 false alarms is a complete waste of time. And whenever I ask -- whenever I have discussions with our officers about doing additional things, spending more time working on the Opiate crisis or spending more time working on traffic, one of the reactions I often hear is *I don't have the time, I'm running from call to call.* So pulling out 96,000 false alarms is having a significant impact on that, which is 17% of our calls or one-sixth of our dispatched 911 calls. So if I was sitting behind the table where you are, I would be asking me what are you doing about eliminating this waste of police resources? It's expensive, it's a waste of time and there's a lot of things that you would rather have the Police Department doing and responding to 911 calls.

And the gentleman from the Alarm Bureau that spoke before as a citizen talked about how expensive the Police Department is, but I can tell you I think you get what you pay for and our police officers are very talented. In order for them to really use their talents, they have to have some free time. So by eliminating some of these false alarm calls, and the agencies and municipalities that have put in place programs that are virtually identical to this program have been able to reduce false alarms 50 to 70%, which would be about a 10% reduction in our dispatched 911 calls. And I don't know that there's anything I can do that would have that kind of impact on freeing up patrol time that this would.

And when we identified this as a problem, we didn't pull this program out of the air. We looked at other municipalities and we basically modeled our program after theirs. Again, as you pointed out before, I didn't actually determine the fees that would be applied to this, but if you look at other programs, our fees are kind of in the middle. There's programs, there's places where they charge a lot more fees and there's a few programs that charge less. For example, the Cincinnati, Ohio, link that you sent me to their program, if you apply for an appeal, you send an appeal letter, they won't even look at it unless you send a check for \$25. So, I mean, that clearly does -- there's some motivation to make money here.

But, I mean, taking a look at the results on the residential alarms, just from getting people to sign up for permits, we had high double-digit reductions in false alarms just from getting the permits. So I think it focuses their attention on it. And when we met, I know you've met with me several times with people from the Alarm Bureau, I think the last meeting we had one of the alarm -- central station folks summed it up very well when he said, *"If I get a concert ticket and it's free and I miss the concert, I'm not that upset about it. If I bought the concert tickets and I miss a concert, I'm going to be upset about it."* So it vests you in the program if you pay a small permit fee, I believe that. I believe changing the program from the model that's been successful all across the country could have very negative impacts on where we want to go. I want to see false alarms reduced 50 to 70% so where my talented police officers can work on far more important things that are a problem for Suffolk County.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right. Let me ask you. So when someone registers, what are they getting today because they're registered with the Police Department versus before the program?

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

We're collecting information, so if we respond to their home -- for example, some of you have spoken about snowbirds; we will have alternative means to contact them. We may have their cell phone number, so if we respond to an alarm at their house and we find a break, we can get a hold of them. I was just reviewing the communication section log this morning and I saw that we responded in one of the precincts to an alarm at a church and there was a break and they were unable to contact the representative of the church to determine if someone had actually entered and stolen something. That's a problem for us because that wastes resources. And in residences and commercial establishments, it requires that the law enforcement, the police officers linger there longer than they would if we can just basically go into our database that we've received from people registering and getting permits and being able to reach out to them and contact them and have -- respond to the scene in a more expeditious manner.

We also, as you know, when they acquire a permit, they get two false alarms, which I think is an appropriate number for them to have. I think people do make mistakes and there hasn't been allowance for that in the program, and having had an alarm in my house for over 30 years, I think two false alarms is more than fair.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And -- because what you're saying is you're getting the contact information; however, central station has that same information, or may already have that information. So when the

alarm goes off and it goes to central station, they have the contact information for the individuals who own that alarm system are responsible to oversee it.

So where -- so it kind of looks like it's an overlap, a duplication.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

I'm more confident in our efforts to collect the information would be more successful and have greater success in contacting people when necessary. Because, you know, I do know that very often we are unsuccessful to contact the rep by going back to the alarm company.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I mean, yeah, that can happen. But I -- and again, when you say a 35% reduction, 34%?

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Thirty-five percent reduction in residential false alarms last month.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So, you know, obviously I know -- I've spoken to police officers who have had incidents -- you know, one in the 5th Precinct -- and he told me that, you know, he got a false alarm and he was on his way to the false alarm and then there was a call for an overdose. Where is he going to go? He's got to go to the overdose.

But what I'd like to get more information is when you say a 35% reduction and, you know, the gentleman who was representing himself but he works for central station is, you know, we need -- I think I need more information on the 35%. Like was that 35% because there are some people who have cancelled their alarm system because they don't want to pay that fee anymore? You know, so I think that it's just -- it's a number that I can't say that, yeah, that's because why; because people are registered? I don't know that that's necessarily the answer.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

I have no way of knowing how many alarm systems there are in Suffolk County, so I would have no way of knowing what percentage the reduction is a result of people cancelling their central station service. But I do know their central station service is at least, in most cases, \$30 a month, so the \$50 permit fee is not that much compared to -- it's a small percentage of what people pay to have central station. So if the \$50 is pushing people over the edge that they're cancelling an alarm system, they were probably on the fence anyway and they were probably considering it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

That's possible.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

And we're in a situation now where due to technological advances, there's other things available to people. For example, people can put WI-FI webcams in their homes that will push alerts to their smart phone if it detects motion and then they can go and look to see who's in their house and call us if necessary. So that's a technology that's available to people now, if they want to abandon central station, that may not have been available years before. And to the Police Department, that would be advantageous for someone to call us and say, *I see a stranger in my house that does not belong there*. That's going to be a much higher priority call for us and it gives us a much greater chance of success of catching a burglar than it coming in as a burglar alarm --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

-- because it would get a much priority.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I have that. I have the camera in my house that I get the push notifications, yes, and it works. But again, you know, I supported this initially, but, again, I know a few of us, we're not real excited about the fees and that's why I said I would address this moving forward. Because, again, we look at the revenue and it was speculative revenue. And I support this for the Police Department to reduce the number of calls, false alarms that they have to respond to. I'm not going to support this system as a revenue generator, it's wrong. People pay for the alarm systems because of crime that has occurred and the heroin problems. And, you know, I see all the PIOs for Huntington and the things that go on there, and the home break-ins, and I have to say, people are putting alarms in because of their concern. The house next door to me got broken into. But I can support the fine structure that's been put in place and support that when people have false alarms they have to be responsible for their alarm system, as does the central station, as does the alarm company. But to just continue to charge the registration fee year after year, I don't think that's fair.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Again, this is not something we pulled out of the air. This is a model that's been applied on municipalities all across the country and on Long Island and it's a successful model. And most of the models require some permit fee, whether it's annual or biannual.

For the folks that have alarm systems, the Police Department, in some cases our response time is not optimal to their alarm because the alarms are not -- with 97,000 false alarms, in less than 3% of the alarms received being actual crimes in progress, they're not given the highest priority. And very often, as you pointed out with the overdose, there are other higher priority things that we need to go to. So as we shrink the number of alarms and false alarms, our response time to alarms will decrease. And we will also see a percentage of increase of alarms that are real crimes in progress as the number of false alarms decreases, so they could potentially become a higher priority. So for the folks that have alarm systems, they will receive better service as the number of false alarms shrink.

And again, just by people paying attention to their alarm systems because they have to get a permit and pay a fee, we've already seem dramatic reductions that exceeded my expectation of initial alarm reductions. I thought it would take far longer than this for us to see a one-third reduction in false alarms at residences in Suffolk County. So I'm very pleased with the way the program is working. And my sole motivation is to see a reduction in false alarms and I'm very pleased, and I'm just afraid that making dramatic changes to the program would derail that and we won't get to the level that we want to achieve.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think the fine to -- basically I think the fine that is being put in place is going to be the one that's going to -- that's the thing that's going to drive people to make sure their system works better, and I think that's what's important. And I think because of the fact that a lot of people are not aware of it and still not aware of it, even about a week ago we're getting phone calls from people who are snowbirds didn't even know that this existed and didn't register.

So I think we need time to see how well it works. Clearly -- you know, as people register we'll have a better idea of how many people actually have alarms, because right now we don't have actual information yet. So I think it's going to take us a good year or two years before we have all the real information and, you know, if there's a need to force people to reregister every year moving down the road because they're not being responsible, I don't know. But I just think right now the fine structure that's put in place is sufficient, and to tell people they have to register the first time. I don't think that's -- I'm not going to disagree with the \$50 first-time registration. I know that you have to -- you have administrative costs. But to continue for somebody to repay every year when

their alarm never goes off and hasn't gone off in years, I think that's a little tough.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

I would respectfully suggest, if you want to see how the program works, I wouldn't change it eight months in, I would let it run for a while as it is to see how successful it is before a change is made.

**LEG. HAHN:**

But it's not even eight months in.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It's okay. Hold on a minute, we have a couple of other people. I'm going to stop. Legislator Cilmi has a question. Kara, you're next.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I just wanted to make a statement for the record here. You know, Chief Cameron knows how much respect I have for him and appreciation for the work that he is doing in our Police Department and for the work that our Police Department is doing, by and large, throughout the County, throughout the Police District at least.

And additionally, my opposition to this program and disdain for this program is well documented, so I won't go too much into that. Simply to say that I don't mind so much a fine for a number of false alarms, whatever that number may be, whether it's two or more, three or more. But like the Chair, I think the registration fee at all is nothing more than a public safety tax.

And while you can certainly compare, Chief, the cost of that fee to what folks pay in their alarm for their central station monitoring, we can also compare it to our General Fund property taxes in this County and if you do that comparison, it's like a 40% increase in most people's General Fund property taxes. So there are many ways you can look at this.

I will be supporting this bill today, but I do so very, very, very hesitantly because I am opposed to any registration fee at all. The only reason I will support this today is because it's better for our residents than where we are now. So I just wanted to make that point for the record. I really think that while you can point to a success in reduction of false alarms, that may be an anomaly, it may not be an anomaly, it may be the result of people cancelling their central station monitoring, it may not be, we don't know, we just don't know. And having fewer false alarms is great, but having fewer people protected by alarm systems is not so great. And having people basically taxed additionally for public safety in this County is certainly not great.

So I just wanted to register my opposition to this program in its current form, say that I'll support this bill but, again, stipulating that I disagree with any registration fee at all. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Kara?

**LEG. HAHN:**

So clearly, Chief, you have put a lot of time and effort into researching and studying, you know, programs from around the country that reduce false alarms. This program really, from what you said, has only been truly in effect since you started instituting fines for those alarms in June.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Correct, that's correct. Three months.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Three months. We're not really eight months into this, we're three months into this. I myself would like to get to a place we're at the 70% reduction. I don't think we should take a step

backwards here. I think my constituents have been clamoring for more services to fight the heroin epidemic, to fight gangs, to fight speeders, to fight people running stop signs and running red lights. We do not need the time spent, officers going to false alarms.

This is an industry that is outdated technology, as you said. They certainly could begin selling cameras, as you described; that would be, you know, helpful to their customers in a way to increase their revenue. But it's outdated technology that operates on the back of a government service. I cannot think of another service where someone is charging residents to get response from the government. And homes and businesses without alarms are subsidizing extra services to those with it. And I really strongly feel that we need to give this program the opportunity to work to the fullest extent. We need our officers on the streets fighting the crime that is in our neighborhoods like Huntington, that is in neighborhoods like Port Jefferson Station, many others, in everyone's district.

And I commend Legislator Browning, you know, for trying to work on something to fix here. A, I think it's too early; and B, I don't think we found the right balance, and I think that we need more work. I don't think -- I think we should wait and get to a place where you've been in operation for a year and it can maybe have some tweaks. You know, we all agreed that that was something, but we needed to wait and see how it works. And that is why I offered a motion to table earlier, and I just wanted to remind everyone that that motion is on the floor.

But thank you for all your hard work on this. It's incred -- you are doing what we ask all of our Commissioners to do; find efficiencies with what we have, find wasted time and wasted effort by our employees in the system. Find ways to make sure that we're fighting crime, not chasing false alarms. So thank you very much for all your work on this. I for one, you know, believe in following what happens. It works really well elsewhere and trying to bring it here. And I believe that we owe Chief Cameron, who is asking for us to give a little more time to the current system so we can get to the 50 to 70, hopefully closer to 70%, reduction space.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Doc?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you. And thank you, Chief. I don't know if you remember, but when this bill first came out, I was adamantly against it and --

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

I recall.

(\*Laughter\*)

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And I was rock solid, no one could move me on my position. And my position was based on the concern of the inequity towards people that may need public safety the most because of maybe where they live and their socioeconomic status and that this could be a tipping point that would prevent them from getting safety. And I'm wrong on a lot of different things, but in my mind I almost predicted the public outcry and the outcry was there. The only thing that changed my vote, and it wasn't even getting calls from different advocates within the Administration, even up to the Executive, but, you know, it was you. And I saw a man that came in to a new position that had the stature, the reputation, the background that looked me in the eye, shook my hand and said, *Doc, I need these tools*, and that's what changed my vote.

And one of the things that I did state on the record at the time was that I needed, you know, this to be tweaked, and the commitment that I had at the time was that, *Hey, Doc, if you pass this now* -- and that's what Legislator Browning, she made that commitment to make the tweaks, so she's doing exactly what I asked for. And the letters have been coming in and I'm hearing two

different things. I don't disagree that I was wrong; the program is working. I believe it's working. And I think what is at debate here is not so much that we -- you know, if this resolution was to eliminate the program, then we could talk about why we're going to take that away. When I listened to the point of once you register and you incur that cost of gathering that data and that one-time \$50 fee, if nothing has changed, I strongly believe that giving another registration fee may not be necessary and I do support that.

I also have a fundamental concern with regards to the idea of false alarms, and I'm hoping that we can really objectify what constitutes a false alarm. Because when we get our ShotSpotter reports we see false alarms, but we see unsubstantiated. And my concern is that the fines, when we say false alarm, an officer goes out and they don't see any evidence of anything happening, but there is a situation. And I do believe the vast majorities of these issues -- majority of these issues are related to maybe not maintaining the system properly, and there should be fines for that. But I also believe that there can be unsubstantiated issues, and it's almost guilty until proven innocent, unless you have a camera to show that there was someone that came around and rattled your window and realized that there was an alarm in place, left the premises, the officer gets there, he walks around, there was no evidence of any forced entry or anything, no fingerprints, so that goes as a false alarm. And so that resident or that constituent, they're faced with that strike or that fine. And I do think that there should be a way where when we talk about something that is unsubstantiated, that the resident gets the benefit of the doubt.

But what Kate is proposing here is as far as -- you know, it's not taking away the program. The program's still in place. You're going to still see I think the gains that we're making here. But we're -- you know, my -- who I hold in highest esteem, my Majority Leader who makes the comment that it's too soon, I passed this with the contingency that we would address this issue right away, because I'm getting letters from my constituents. I have a community, Huntington Station, and thank you really for all of the resources that you're putting in there, but I have a community right now that is scared. There's homicides, there's robberies, there's things that are going on, and the alarm issue is real there. And I think that if they sign up and they pay that 50 bucks, why do you need to come to them again for another 50 bucks two years later? And I get that you're saying this is based on well-established models, Chief, but I don't know if that's the aspect of the model, that makes it work or not. So I have very strong feelings. I do -- you know, I don't necessarily -- I don't regret my vote because I believe in you.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Thank you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

You've done a hell of a job, and I'm going to continue to back you and support you, but I do have a difficult time reconciling how if I support this, that I'm taking away -- you know, I just wonder where did the fine structure come in place? Was that something that you looked at the model and you sat down and put the fine structure in place, or who decided on the fines? Because I know we're having a shortage of money and we've got to be creative, but that's really where the problem is. I think the money keeps people from public safety, and I believe that in my heart and that's why I'm having a difficult time.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

I appreciate your support, Sir. One of the things that -- you know, the bill in its current format is not just eliminating the residential fee for a permit, after their initial apartment, there's other aspects to it. For example, if it's still in the current format that I saw, people that have an initial alarm can get -- obtain their permit, if they're not permitted, in lieu of paying the initial fine. Which in my mind will damage the program, because why would you get a permit if you wait until you have a false alarm to get the permit? So there's aspects in that bill. I don't know if you're completely familiar with every part of what's in that bill. We have not -- I've met with many of you and I think, Legislator, you weren't there, but I think there was somebody representing you from your office

when we met in Police Headquarters and we came up with Legislator Browning's first bill to amend the alarm law and we were all fine with that; that was a fair compromise and I don't believe that that would adversely impact the alarm law. There's aspects to this bill that I believe will adversely impact the success of this program, and my true goal here is solely to reduce false alarms. I don't think any of you want a Police Chief whose goal is to raise revenue for the County; that obviously would be probably a bad thing and things could go very poorly if that was my ambition.

My ambition is to make the department more efficient because there's a lot of things that I'm concerned about. One of the ways that I can do that is reducing false alarms and it's working. So my concern is if this bill passes, it will have detrimental effects on our program and we won't achieve the 50 to 70% false alarm reduction. And I very much appreciate your support and your willingness to hear me out for the initial vote. So thank you, Sir.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We have Bridget.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you, Kate. I'm torn about this, and I have to say initially that it doesn't directly impact my district, except in that when Suffolk County Police resources are directed somewhere other than, for instance, joint efforts with the local police departments, then, you know, we lose. But I don't think that should be a major consideration on the bill.

And I do appreciate Legislator Browning's efforts, you know, to be responsive to our constituents and to find compromise. The one aspect of the bill that hasn't been discussed here that I'm confused about, Kate, is -- the one aspect that I'm confused about, Kate, that is both -- not only about the registration, but the sort of three strikes and you're out aspect of it. So maybe I'm wrong, it appears that this bill is amending it to give folks one more shot at not getting a fine.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

*(Nodded head yes).*

**LEG. FLEMING:**

And that I can't support. I appreciate -- I disagree with Legislator Cilmi that there isn't any proof that this program is working. I think a 35% reduction after a program is put in place when you know that the program's been successful in other jurisdictions is absolutely -- you know, I think it's absolutely fair and responsible to draw a conclusion from that. So I think it's obvious that the program is working.

In Southampton Town, we have the program and you don't get anywhere near as many shots, you know, bites at the apple. Our second -- second false alarm is \$100, third is 150, I think 200 and then fourth is 250. So if you get -- if you are in Southampton Town, when you get this fourth -- you know, fourth shot at it and you finally have to pay a fine, you'd already be paying \$250 there, because we only give you one false alarm. And I just -- you know, as a former law enforcement person, I just get it. You know, you just don't want this. I think that the video is a fabulous solution and I would like to see an incentive built into it.

As I said, this doesn't affect my district directly, but I appreciate the efforts that you've made. I don't think I can support it with the -- you know, when we continue to give people a pass after three times. But I certainly appreciate it. So I'm going to be voting to allow it to go to the General Meeting, but I really would ask you that you revisit it. We haven't heard any discussion of that. I don't know why it serves a good purpose to give people another shot at it. I would rather go in the other direction.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. And the one thing that I continue to say is just because they do it somewhere else doesn't

always make it right. And I think --

**LEG. FLEMING:**

But I think it's been successful, really successful, in a smaller Police Department where personnel time is more dear.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It can be successful, but we can't judge whether ours is successful yet based on -- you know, if in time they say, *Oh. Well, the way this is drafted now that it's not working*, or there's something wrong with it. Then let law enforcement come to us and say it's not working or there's a negative impact based on what I did. But I think that just because Southampton charges a ridiculously high fee, and I understand why, you have a lot of summer homes, and generally those people aren't home. So yeah, they are responding to a lot of summer homes where nobody's there, especially in the winter, so it is -- it certainly has a very negative impact. You know, I don't want to say that there's more money out there, but I had an 80-year old senior citizen who is a snow bird and was not aware of the program, and she got a false alarm. Now she has to go through the fair hearing process.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

But that doesn't respond to the concern I have. She got a false alarm; good, now she's aware of it, she's doing something. Now under this new version, she can do that again and then she can do it again, and it's not until she does it again that there are any repercussions.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And I don't think that the average citizen wants to have their alarm go off. And to be honest with you, anybody I've talked to that has an alarm, it's embarrassing, especially when the Fire Department shows up and you really don't have a fire, and it's your smoke alarm because your chicken cutlet's are getting burned, you know. That's something that people don't want police officers to show up, or the fire department, or the ambulance company to show up when it's really a false alarm, they don't want that. So people are generally responsible. So the person who's letting their alarm go off several times and never fixing it, they're the ones who are going to be the ones who are going to pay.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I appreciate that, thanks. But my question is why are you making the change there?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But I think -- because I think I'm trying to be fair to our citizens.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I think you're taking a lot of the umpf out of the bill by doing it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Personally, I didn't want the registration at all. But at the same time -- at the same time, we are going to have people register. I think out of fairness, if you don't know about the program and you don't pay the \$50 and you get an an alarm, a false alarm, you know, you have an opportunity to register or pay the fine. So if you register within 30 days, then you don't pay that fine, that's waived, and I think that's fair. Because how do we --

**LEG. FLEMING:**

My concern is about adding in one more free pass. I don't understand why it's there, and I think it really does --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think it's fair.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

-- hurt the problem.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think it's fair.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

But why?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think it's fair to the resident. So, again, I spoke about it when we first voted for it. I kind of held my nose and said I really don't like it, but I wanted to support the fact that, you know, our Police Department and our police officers are responding to way too many of these. And I committed that I was going to change it. The Administration stood there and said if there was anything we didn't like, that they would find an offset.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I appreciate that. I don't understand why there's anything you don't like in the three -- you know, that third opportunity. Can we just ask the Chief, do you mind? There's another change in the bill which is that you now have three free passes as opposed to two free passions, instead of third strike and you're out, it's fourth strike and you're out. So is that -- could you just comment on what you think the effect of that is?

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Yes. Like I said, there's elements of this bill that I think will be directly detrimental to the program, that's one of them. There's also a reduction of the escalating fines which I think benefits the most egregious offenders. It's unlikely that anybody will get up into those levels unless they're completely negligent and careless with their alarm system, and those are the exact people that we're trying to target. Because we did have people that have had hundreds of alarms and they're wasting everyone's police resources that should be used for more important things that's benefitting them.

There's also a clause in the bill that if it's proven that it's the alarm company's fault, that we're going to waive the fault. Now, I don't even know how -- I don't understand what that means, how we would apply that or exactly who the onus is to resolve that type of issue. So I have some concerns. The initial bill that we all sat and negotiated I was fine with, and I wouldn't have even been here because I don't think any element of that would be directly detrimental to the program. I'm concerned about going backwards instead of forwards in reducing false alarms and that's why I'm here, because I care about using our valuable police resources where they need to be used.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I'm sorry. When you say the initial bill wouldn't be detrimental; were there changes that you had thought were okay that are different from these?

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Yeah, there were changes in the initial bill that I really have no objection to. We sat and spoke about it, I believe Legislator Browning was there, Legislator Kennedy, I believe Legislator Spencer had a representative, I think, Legislator Hahn, you may have been there, and we kind of came to a consensus. Everybody wanted to make some changes and we did make some changes and I don't think those changes would have been directly detrimental to the program. These, I do think there's elements to this that will harm the effectiveness of the program and achieving the Police Department's objectives of reducing false alarms.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Kate, just -- I'm really having a problem with this because it's so many times you get away with it. When the Chief says it's unlikely that anyone will be subject to a fine under this, unless they're -- I think you said negligent, reckless? I'm sorry, I don't remember. But unless you were an egregious offender, you're not going to be paying any fine because you have three opportunities to have cops come out to your house when there was no need for it. Is there -- I just -- I'm trying to wrap my head around why you're making that change.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

There is no guarantee that -- and again, it's not about the revenue, so let's be honest.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

No, no, that's just the direct question.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I mean, part of it is that I can tell you when my alarm went off twice, it took two times for that alarm to go off twice, for two false alarms, to figure out what was wrong with the alarm, and we had that fixed, and we have it fixed.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

You had it fixed; that's the point.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So like I said before, I think the average citizen doesn't want them to come once. So the first time it goes off, you want to figure out what's wrong with it. It may take a second time, but I can guarantee you that the general -- that the average citizen, responsible citizen who has an alarm will make sure that they will not get another one.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I just don't hear an answer to the specific question of why you're making that specific change.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Well, I think that was the answer, because you're not going to allow your alarm to go off unless you're really going to be negligent.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So fines will never come into play.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Even if it's twice; okay, so if it's twice your alarm goes off and we had it where it was a third time, so after a second time you're going to fix your alarm, so you're still not going to get the fine. So does it matter whether it's three or four times? Really? No, it's not.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

But if it ain't broke don't fix it. I hear the Chief saying this is a very effective program and that's a critically important part of it. I just don't see a direct reason for making that specific change.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I think we'll just have to continue to agree to disagree. And George, there was an item that I did want you to respond to.

**MR. NOLAN:**

This bill went through a lot of revisions, there were a lot of meetings. The provision, Chief, you spoke about that said if it's the alarm company's fault, that would be a defense; that particular provision was removed.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

So it's not in the current version.

**CHIEF CAMERON:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

But easy mistake to make because it went through a lot of different permutations.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Isn't there a version the Chiefs agreed to? *(Said off the microphone)*.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think at a certain point --

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Can we put that question on the record?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah, the Legislator is asking was there a version that the Chief was okay with, and there was an early version that preserved the registration fee, the annual registration fee, but Legislator Browning later changed that to eliminate the annual registration fee. I think that's the version that the Chief was referring to that he was supportive of.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Again, the businesses, it still exists for an annual registration, because I think in our initial presentation --

**MR. NOLAN:**

They don't pay a fee.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

They pay a registration fee, the businesses, the first time.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Everybody pays the registration fee the first time.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Right.

**MR. NOLAN:**

The annual registration requirement is still there, but there is no fee for either businesses or residences to pay a fee after the initial registration.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So anyway --

**LEG. FLEMING:**

My concern is not so much the registration free, I just don't understand why you would make a change if it's not broken.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And you know, that's entirely up to you guys. You know, if you feel the need to change this and you think that after one year that what we have in place here in this bill is negatively impacting the Police Department, then have fun with that. But I'm telling you, in my opinion -- yeah. In my opinion, I think this is fair. You know, with many conversations with local businesses, many conversations with residents, they don't disagree with having to pay that fine. Most responsible alarm owners will not allow their alarm to go off three and four times; after two times they're going to have it fixed. So the revenue is still not going to be realized, whether it be three false alarms or four false alarms. After the second, I guarantee you people are going to fix it.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Well, I'm -- you know, I'm with the Chief, the revenue is the not the key here. The key here is freeing up police time and this seems to me to be kind of eliminating the program, you have so many shots at the apple. But I don't want to beat a dead horse, it's just that's an aspect of it that I just can't -- I don't understand.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So there was a motion to approve and a second, and there was a motion to table. Is there a second on the table? There is no second on the table?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I'll second the motion to table. I'd like to see that changed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So there's a second on the table. Table takes precedent. So all in favor?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Tabling, let's see hands.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**

Tabling?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Show hands to table.

*(\*Legislators Hahn, Fleming & Calarco  
Raised their hands in favor of tabling\*)*

All in favor? Opposed? Opposed to tabling?

*(\*Legislators Browning, Cilmi & Kennedy  
Raised their hands in opposition\*)*

**MR. NOLAN:**

What are you, Doc? Yes or not to table?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yes or no to table or --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Let's keep working on it.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Abstentions? I don't know.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Abstain.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Tabling fails.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

*Tabling fails, okay. (VOTE: 3-3-1-1 Abstention: Legislator Spencer - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).*

Okay. So now there was a motion to approve. And the second to approve was Legislator Kennedy?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

*(Nodded yes).*

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Opposed.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Two opposed.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

*(Laughter).*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I don't support the tabling.

**MR. NOLAN:**

What's your vote?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Can I ask a question? Why are we allowing this -- the vote is the vote.

**LEG. HAHN:**

It needs five.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Oh, he voted to approve.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, but we need five.

**MR. NOLAN:**

You need five to discharge.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. So we had a motion to approve and a second, right? All in favor of the approve?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I want to make a motion to discharge.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

I wanted to know -- well, I don't know what the numbers are. Do we have the numbers?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Check with the Clerk.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Do you guys have the number?

**MS. ELLIS:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

How many on the approved?

**MS. ELLIS:**

We have four on the approve.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Four for the approval. So the *approval fails (VOTE: 4-2-1-1 Opposed: Legislators Hahn & Fleming - Abstention: Legislator Calarco - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Four for the approval?

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We need five votes to approve.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'll make a motion to discharge.

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's too late.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Too late, Doc.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

We needed five to approve it, so I will get a discharge petition and pass it around. Okay?

So, next; we're done with that. 1692. It's the number of people in the committee. We need five to vote, even though one is absent.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**

Monica is not here.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

It doesn't matter; even though she's absent, we still need the five. Okay, so thank you for that.

**Introductory Resolutions**

So **1692(-16) - Appoint member to the Child Fatality Review Team (Jamie Ryan Atkinson))(Lindsay)**. Oooh, is she here?

**LEG. HAHN:**

He.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

He, sorry. Jamie, sorry. I apologize, I just realized. Have a seat. I hope you had fun this morning.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, we probably shouldn't have made you sit through all that.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

It was interesting.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Somebody should have reminded me. Good morning, or good afternoon.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Good afternoon.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And if you would like to introduce yourself and tell us why you want to serve.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Sure. My name is Jamie Atkinson. I'm sorry if this is making noise. Fourteen years with the MTA Police Department, currently a Detective. I investigate fatalities dealing with children and adults. I started off my career in patrol working in Manhattan, then moved into Suffolk County in a patrol car, and then to Queens. Currently in the squad I've worked in Suffolk County, Nassau County, Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens. I work on a day-to-day basis with the Medical Examiner's Office, both in the Chief Medical Examiner's Office in Manhattan and Queens, and also the Nassau County and the Suffolk County Medical Examiner's Office.

I volunteer with the Community Ambulance Company, I've been with them for 17 years. I've held virtually every position in the Ambulance Company, from Lieutenant, Captain, 2nd Assistant Chief, 1st Assistant Chief, Chief of Department for four years, Board of Directors and currently Vice-President. I'm also the Safety Officer for Northwell Health for Southside Hospital where I deal with intergovernmental relations, regulatory committees, JACHO and liaison with EMS Fire and First Responders. I'm on the Board of Directors for the Youth Enrichment Services for Islip Town, through the Islip Town Youth Bureau, and also with the South Bay Coalition.

Why I want to serve? I want the opportunity to be an advocate for our population of children who can't speak for themselves, and to be a voice and an advocate.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay. Anyone have any questions? I certainly think you have a very impressive resume.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And certainly your background and your expertise will certainly help with this review team.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

So I don't think there are any questions, so I'll make a motion to approve. And was there a second?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).*** And congratulations.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You don't have to come to the General Meeting.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

But we don't anticipate any issues. Again, you have a very impressive resume.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And we thank you for your service.

**MR. ATKINSON:**

Thank you. Have a good day.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Okay, 1694. I hope there's no more -- Oh. No, he's not here.

***1694-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% State grant funds from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services in the amount of \$90,000 for the Aid to Crime Laboratories Grant Program for the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner, Toxicology Laboratory and to execute grant related agreements (County Executive).***

So I'll make a motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Is there a second?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

And no questions on the -- okay, no questions, excellent. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
***It is approved (and placed on the Consent Calendar - VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

And I do apologize, I'm just realizing I did not recognize, Mr. Sharkey is in the room from the Sheriff's Department. I'm assuming no particular issues? Okay.

1695-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% State grant funds -- did we have a motion and a second?

**MS. ELLIS:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Who was the second on that one?

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**

Tom Cilmi.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Legislator Cilmi was the second on the last one, and place on the Consent Calendar.

**MS. ELLIS:**

We're good with that one.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

You got that. Okay, I'm just double-checking.

So ***1695-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% State grant funds from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services in the amount of \$455,880 for the Aid to Crime Laboratories Grant Program for the Suffolk County Office of the Medical Examiner, Crime Laboratory and to execute grant related agreements (County Executive).*** Can we just do same motion, same second?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yup.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Yup. Same vote. ***(Approved & placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

***1701-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% federal pass-through grant funds from the NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services in the amount of \$900,000 for the "State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) FY2016" administered by the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services (County Executive).*** We'll do same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Approved & placed on the Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

***1702-16 - Accepting and appropriating 100% federal pass-through grant funds from the NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services in the amount of \$2,647,775 for the "Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) FY2016" administered by the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (County Executive).*** Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Approved & Placed on the Consent Calendar. (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

**1710-16 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$6,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the ICE El Dorado Task Force with 79.4% support (County Executive).** Motion by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
(Raised hand.)

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved.***  
**(VOTE: 7-0-0-1 Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).**

**1748-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$66,745 in federal pass-through funding from the State of New York Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Suffolk County Police Department's Stop Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program with 75% support (County Executive).** Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

**1755-16 - Appointing Edmund Densieski** -- I hope I didn't crucify his name -- ***as a member of the Suffolk County Vocational, Education, and Extension Board (Krupski).*** The sponsor has asked that it be tabled, so I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
Second.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Second, Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

**1758-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to prohibit unregulated synthetic opioids in Suffolk County (Stern).** That's good to go?

**MR. NOLAN:**  
Nope, has to be tabled.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Oh, okay. So I'll make a motion to table for public hearing. And second, Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled for public hearing (VOTE: 7-0-0-1 - Excused Absence: Legislator Martinez).***

With that, there is nothing more on the agenda, so I'll make a motion to adjourn.

**(\*The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 P.M. \*)**