

**Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010**

**Approved 4-5-10**

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Nathan Shinagawa	Chair	Present	
James Dennis	Member	Present	
Leslyn McBean-Clairborne	Member	Present	3:45 PM
Brian Robison	Member	Present	
Peter Stein	Member	Present	3:33 PM

Legislator(s): M. Robertson

Staff: G. Potter, K. Moore, Information Technology Services; L. Shurtleff, Department of Emergency Response; S. Cook, Criminal Justice Advisory/Alternatives-to-Incarceration Board; D. Bodnar, P. Carey, DSS; J. Mareane, M. Lynch, County Administration; P Buechel, Department of Probation and Community Service; P. Meskill, R. Tubbs, Sheriff's Office; M. Pottorff, Legislature Office

Guests: D. Dietrich, OAR; S. Shackford, Ithaca, Journal, D. Wright, Ithaca Police Department; J. Carey, WHCU

**Call to Order**

Mr. Shinagawa called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Changes to Agenda**

Mr. Shinagawa moved a discussion of gas impacts on public safety to the Chair's report.

**Chair's Report**

Mr. Shinagawa said a Legislator has expressed interest in discussing text messaging while driving, specifically a proposal by the Governor to make it a primary offense as opposed to a secondary offense.

Mr. Shinagawa said he works at Robert Packer Hospital in Sayre, PA, and said there is a lot of public safety issues related to natural gas drilling. He said in that area there have been significant issues that have arisen since gas drilling first began. He said he will be inviting a public safety professional from that area to attend a meeting of this Committee to provide information. He also asked those in attendance to let him know of others who could provide information to the Committee.

**Sheriff's Office**

Sheriff Meskill reported statistics for January were distributed with the agenda. The Office has been very busy.

**OAR (Opportunities, Alternatives, and Resources)**

Ms. Dietrich distributed a services brochure and said services are basically broken down into two areas – client services and bail services. OAR current has three employees; however, one position is currently vacant. In December there were 4.3 fte's and she expects after filling the current opening there will be 3.7 fte's. In 2009, there were 6,347 service units.

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010

Client Services – These are services provided to those who are incarcerated and include Bail Fund intake applications, Assigned Counsel Program intakes, applications for DSS, Social Security, and advocacy with other agencies and County departments. In addition, OAR provides writing utensils and phone access to OAR and family members. The Friends Society of Ithaca also provides rides for family members of inmates to the Jail on Tuesdays and Saturday for visiting hours. Last year over 430 volunteer rides were provided. Upon release, individuals also receive assistance with finding housing, the food pantry, and linkage to other emergency services.

Bail Fund – The Bail Fund is a revolving fund that OAR administers and “evens the playing field” with those who cannot afford bail and those who can. There is a criteria to qualify for the Bail Fund and a maximum bail amount of \$2,500. There needs to be a co-signor for the bail, and the individual is required to maintain contact with OAR after release. Ms. Dietrich said the forfeiture rate is very low (5-10%). She explained that the court charges a 3% fee on every bail and in addition to that OAR charges a 3% fee that comes back to Client Services Fund. However, there are circumstances when the OAR fee is waived. Ms. Dietrich said the other area she believes OAR saves a significant amount of County dollars is through the intakes for the Assigned Counsel Program; last year 251 intakes were done in the Jail and by phone.

### **Report or Discussion Item (DOC ID: 1842): ATI Evaluation (Part 1 Program Outcomes)**

Ms. Bodnar said last Fall the Public Safety Committee requested a program evaluation be done on the three ATI programs. She is a Program Development Specialist at DSS and was asked to do this for a couple of reasons. The previous evaluation was produced by the individual who held her position at that time, Kathy Schlather. In addition, she explained some of her qualifications, all of which are contained in the report.

Ms. Bodnar said what she had planned to do originally had to be scaled back for a number of reasons. She said there is no available data on recidivism and it is unclear whether it can be obtained. She said the Office of Court Administration does not carry that kind of data and although she is working with the Probation Department, it is not known yet whether it will be made available. Ms. Bodnar said there are several reasons why it is so difficult to obtain this information; participant data is kept confidential and it is in two different State systems. The drug courts are operated by the Office of Court Administration but obtaining individual ID numbers for any kind of arrest that happened after drug court would come from Probation and Probation would have to be tracking their identification through its system. There have been State budget cuts to the State Probation Department and this has impacted the way information is provided and has created additional hurdles in receiving information. Ms. Bodnar said the only potential the County has to receive the information is if the State would consider Tompkins County a bonafide research institute and provide the raw data for the County to work through itself. She said part of the issue is confidentiality and the other is a systems issue with two different State systems having the information.

Mr. Robison said CID numbers are used all the time in identifying convicted offenders and said recidivism information is a big component of the evaluation. Ms. Bodnar did not disagree and said she wishes the information was available as well.

Ms. Bodnar said the first drug court was established in Dade County, Florida in the late 1980's in response to the fact that addiction is a brain disease. An approach was developed that rather than sending people to jail, to mandate them to treatment and do more intensive supervision and treatment with judicial oversight. This model of getting people who have addiction into treatment has been proven to work, even in situations where it was mandated.

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010

At this time Ms. Bodnar presented an abbreviated report on the following information; a copy of the full report is on file in the Legislature Office. The cost analysis will be presented at the April meeting.

## **OVERVIEW**

Over the past two decades, the criminal justice system has undergone significant philosophical and subsequent programmatic shifts in working with low-level offenders. In particular, a primary focus has been the development of alternatives to incarceration (ATI) in which offenders are connected with services that help address risk factors such as lack of employment and substance use with the goal of reducing future recidivism. The implementation of the drug court model beginning in 1989 represents one of the most significant areas of ATI development. Drug courts were developed with the key understanding and evidence from scientific research that addiction is a disease. Specifically, addiction is a complex condition with genetic heredity that drives compulsive use of substances and affects multiple brain circuits including those related to reward-motivation, executive function, learning and memory and impulse control.

Effective substance abuse treatment requires helping individuals develop skills that enable them to stop using drugs, develop sound relationships, gain employment and make other supportive social connections. Hence, simply incarcerating offenders with addictions does not address any of these issues and hence, leaves them at high risk for continued substance use and re-offending upon release. Therefore, drug courts developed the model of mandating participants to engage in substance abuse treatment as well as other services to reduce their substance use and stabilize their functioning in the community as an alternative to incarceration.

In the past decade, a large number of program evaluations have been performed for drug courts across New York State and the United States to assess the effectiveness drug courts in reducing recidivism and substance use. In 2003, New York Center for Court Innovation conducted an evaluation of 11 drug courts throughout the state. In 2005, the General Accounting Office of the United States Government conducted a review of program evaluations for 23 drug courts across the United States including 6 within New York State. The consistent finding across these and other evaluation studies is that drug courts reduce recidivism rates for participants compared to individuals who receive other treatment and court processing approaches. Because of their success, drug courts have been implemented throughout the country and in 2005 Judge Judith Kaye mandated the implementation of drug court throughout New York State.

The present report represents a program evaluation of three ATI programs in Tompkins County: Ithaca Community Treatment Court, Tompkins County Felony Treatment Court and Tompkins County Day Reporting. This report covers the period from January 2004 to end of September 2009 for the two drug courts and from 2006 to 2009 for Day Reporting. Data was gathered from existing databases utilized by these programs. A previous program evaluation covering the period from 1998 to 2002 was conducted by Kathy Schlather in 2003.

In order to perform a rigorous program evaluation on par with evaluation studies mentioned above, one must have a control group against which to compare program participants. However, due to the size of Tompkins County, the structure of our drug court system and limited staff resources, gaining access to a valid comparison group and doing such an analysis is not possible. Hence, this program evaluation aims to report on measures in various program areas in order to identify program strengths and program challenges with the goal of making adjustments in program approaches and services that will likely improve achievement of program goals.

## **Program Outcome Measures**

Over the past decade a standard set of program measures have emerged as the primary source for ATI program review. These measures are connected with the primary goals of ATI programs in general and drug courts in particular: namely factors related to reduced recidivism and reduced substance use. Below is an outline and short description of each area of program evaluation measurement. Following this a summary of results for these program evaluation area is presented for each ATI program (Felony Treatment Court, Ithaca Community Treatment Court and Day Reporting).

Program Entry, Retention and Exits: Program entries, retention rates and exits reflect a program's overall capacity, general timeframe of participant progress in the program and rates of successful completion of the program. Drug Court Evaluation studies have often shown that the length of time participants are retained in the program and their successful completion are most often associated with positive program outcomes such as reduced recidivism, reduced substance use and increased education and employment. Comparisons of demographic data between graduates and unsuccessful exits can help identify populations that need additional supports or different interventions in order to be more successful in a program.

Substance Use and Treatment: One of the primary goals of treatment courts is to help participants gain abstinence and recovery from their substance use. Hence, during their time in treatment court participants are required to participate in substance abuse treatment and their drug use is monitored through regular testing. In order to successfully graduate participants must have 8-12 consecutive months (depending on the program) without a positive drug screen. Whenever a participant has a positive screen their current treatment is reviewed and increased in either intensity (inpatient vs. outpatient) or frequency of treatment sessions. As relapse is most often a part of the recovery process, participants often have more than one treatment episode during their tenure in the program.

Program Compliance: In addition to attendance to substance abuse treatment, participation in drug court programs also requires compliance with a number of other requirements including regular reporting to probation officer, attendance to court sessions and engagement in other services identified for individual participants. Failure to meet these requirements results in some type of program sanction. Generally, the court uses graduated sanctions in which the severity and duration of the sanction is increased with the level and frequency of infraction. Sanctions can range from verbal warning by the judge to time spent in jail.

Program Achievements: In addition to completing substance abuse treatment and maintaining abstinence from drug use, program participants also engage in a number of services that provide benefits to themselves and the community. These include gaining education, vocational training, employment, community service and re-connection with family. Below are program achievement outcomes for graduates at the time of completion (note: database does not track these outcomes for unsuccessful exits).

### **ITHACA COMMUNITY TREATMENT COURT (ICTC)**

ICTC began in January 1998 and serves individuals with misdemeanor level crimes. To advance to graduation, participants must have at least a total of eight months sobriety and have resolved all criminal cases, fines and restitution.

#### **Program Entries, Retention Rates and Exits**

Program Entries and Active Cases: From 2004 to 2009 ICTC had a total of 171 participants enter the program with an average of 29.7 new participants entering each year. The average of active cases each year was 64.

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010

#### Retention Rates:

- 6 months: 76% of the cases remained open with 16% unsuccessful exits
- 1 year: 28% open cases, 29% graduated and 32% unsuccessful
- 2 years: 3% of cases remained open, 42% had graduated and 44% were unsuccessful.

Program Exits: From 2004 to 2009 a total of 177 participants exited the program with an average length of time of the program of 13.2 months. Of all exits 51% were successful (graduated), 45% were unsuccessful and 4% exited the program with unknown outcomes.

Comparisons of demographic data of graduates and unsuccessful exits:

- Gender: significant difference with females graduating at a higher rate than males
- Age: significant difference with older participants graduating at a higher rate than younger participants
- Race and Ethnicity: no significant difference
- Education Level: no significant difference
- Primary Drug Use: no significant differences

#### **Substance Use and Treatment**

Substance Use: Overall approximately 20% of all participants had NO positive drug screen during their time in drug court, with the remaining 80% have at least one positive screen. Graduates had an average of 6.5 positive drug screens during their participation while unsuccessful participants had an average of 7.23 positive drug screens (Mann Whitney U-Test  $p=0.023$ ).

Inpatient Treatment: 40% of all participants did not have any inpatient treatment episodes. The average number of inpatient episodes for graduates was 0.79 and for unsuccessful exits was 1.07 (Mann Whitney U-Test  $p<0.0001$ ).

Outpatient Treatment: 48% of all participants had only one outpatient treatment episode. The average number of outpatient treatment episodes for graduates was 1.7 and for unsuccessful exits was 1.63 (no significant difference).

#### **Program Compliance**

Summary of Sanctions:

- 35% participants exiting the program between 2004-2007 were sanctioned to day reporting program at least once (data for 2008 & 2009 are not available).
- 29% participants exiting the program between 2004-2007, engaged in community service as a sanction for an infraction (data for 2008 & 2009 are not available).
- 50% of all participants exiting the program from 2004-2009 had at least one jail sanction during their participation in the program.
- The mean number of jail sanctions for graduates was 0.69, while the mean number of sanctions for unsuccessful exits was 1.25 (Mann Whitney U-Test  $p=0.003$ ).
- The estimated total number of days of jail sanction for all Ithaca Community Treatment Court participants exiting the program between 2004-2009 was 864 days with an average of 150 jail sanction days per year.

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010

## **Program Achievements**

Education: Five graduates obtained their GED while in the program. This represents 15% of graduates who entered the program with less than high school education.

Vocational Training: A total of 7 graduates completed vocational training during their time in the program.

Employment: Upon graduation 23 graduates (28%) had full-time employment, this represents a net increase of 6 individuals gaining employment during their time in the program. Overall another 14 graduates improved their employment status compared to entry, e.g. gained part-time employment, entered the labor force.

Government Assistance: A total of 5 (13%) graduates who were on Temporary Assistance at program entry were able to discontinue Temporary Assistance by the time they completed the program. A total for 7 individuals went on Temporary Assistance during their time in the program. Hence, there was a net increase of 2 persons on Temporary Assistance.

## **FELONY TREATMENT COURT (FTC)**

Tompkins County Felony Treatment Court began in April 2000 and serves individuals with nonviolent felony level crimes. To advance to graduation, participants must have at least a total of twelve months sobriety and have resolved all criminal cases, fines and restitution.

## **Program Entries, Retention Rates and Exits**

Program Entries and Active Cases: From 2004 to 2009 FTC had a total of 143 participants enter the program with an average of approximately 25 new participants entering each year. The average of active cases each year was 55.

### Retention Rates:

- 6 months: 83% of the cases remained open with 13% unsuccessful exits
- 1 year: 59% open cases, 14% graduated and 22% unsuccessful
- 2 years: 15% of cases remained open, 44% had graduated and 36% were unsuccessful.

Program Exits: From 2004 to 2009 a total of 145 participants exited the program with an average length of time of the program of 16.8 months. Of all exits 51% were successful (graduated), 45% were unsuccessful and 4% exited the program with unknown outcomes.

Comparisons of demographic data of graduates and unsuccessful exits:

- Gender: no significant differences
- Age: significant difference with older participants graduating at a higher rate than younger participants
- Race and Ethnicity: no significant difference however statistical test show a trend in the effect of race and ethnicity on success in the program
- Education Level: significant difference, participants with higher education level graduate at a higher rate than those with lower education level
- Primary Drug Use: significant difference, participants whose primary drug was alcohol graduate at a higher rate than those who have other primary drug (e.g. marijuana)

### **Substance Use and Treatment**

Substance Use: Approximately 40% of all participants had NO positive drug screen during their time in drug court. Graduates had an average of 1.13 positive drug screen during their participation while unsuccessful participants had an average of 1.81 positive drug screens (Mann Whitney U-test =0.072).

Inpatient Treatment: 38% of all participants did not have an inpatient treatment episode. The average number of inpatient episodes for graduates was 0.62 and for unsuccessful exits 1.13 (Mann Whitney U-test p=0.002).

Outpatient Treatment: 36% of all participants had only one outpatient treatment episode. The average number of outpatient treatment episodes for graduates was 1.89 and for unsuccessful exits was 2.16 (no significant difference).

### **Program Compliance**

Summary of Program Sanctions:

- 19% participants exiting the program between 2004-2009 were sanctioned to day reporting program at least once.
- 32% participants exiting the program between 2004-2009, engaged in community service at least once as a sanction for an infraction.
- 70% of all participants exiting the program from 2004-2009 had at least one jail sanction during their participation in the program.
- The mean number of jail sanctions for graduates was 0.8, while the mean number of sanctions for unsuccessful exits was 2.25 (p0<0001).
- The estimated total number of days of jail sanction for all Felony Treatment Court participants who exited the program between 2004-2009 was 1150 days with an average of 200 jail sanction days per year.

### **Program Achievements**

Education: Five graduates obtained their GED while in the program. This represents 50% of graduates who entered the program with less than high school education.

Vocational Training: A total of 25 graduates completed vocational training during their time in the program.

Employment: Upon graduation 57 graduates (77%) had full-time employment, 25 of these individuals gained this employment during their time in the program. Overall another 13 graduates improved their employment status compared to entry, e.g. gained part-time employment, entered the labor force.

Government Assistance: A total of 20 (62%) graduates who were on Temporary Assistance at program entry were able to discontinue Temporary Assistance by the time they completed the program. A total for

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010

5 individuals went on Temporary Assistance during their time in the program. Hence, there was a net reduction of 15 persons on Temporary Assistance.

## **DAY REPORTING**

### **Program Entries and Exits**

Program Entries: From 2006 to 2009 a total of 525 unduplicated individuals participated in day reporting for a total of 759 entries in day reporting. A total of 118 persons (22%) had repeated participation in day reporting during a designated year.

Referral Source: Approximately half of the persons in day reporting (51%) were participants in one of the treatment courts, with the majority of referrals coming from ICITC (29%). There remaining 49% of day reporting participants had some type of involvement with probation or parole, e.g. pre-trial release, release under supervision.

Program Exits: Over half of day reporting participants either successfully completed (42%) or were released by their referral (16%). The remaining 35% were removed from the program. The most common reason for removal was Non-Attendance.

Comparison of demographics of individuals who completed or were released and those removed:

- Gender: no significant difference
- Race: no significant difference, however statistical test suggest a potential trend in the effect of race
- Age: no significant difference
- Education: significant difference with more educated participants likely to complete, however, this difference was largely due to high percentage of individuals with post-high school education completing. Comparison of individual with GED or High School diploma with those with less than high school showed no significant difference.

### **Program Achievements**

Education: From 2007 to 2009 (data not available for 2006) Day Reporting provided a total of 545 service units in relation to education to 87 unduplicated clients. Education services included literacy services, GED services and GED tests. A total of 42 persons (48%) with less than high school education obtained their GED. Another 22 persons passed a GED subject.

Employment: From 2007 to 2009 (data not available for 2006) Day Reporting provided a total of 1320 service units in relation to employment for 374 unduplicated individuals. Employment services included assistance with job search, career counseling and resume and cover letters. A total of 200 (53%) unduplicated persons obtained employment while participating in day reporting.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. Cook said the CJA/ATI Board will be discussing this information at it's March meeting.

### **Department of Emergency Response – Presentation on Computer Aided Dispatch**

Mr. Shurtleff, Director of Emergency Response, distributed a list of commonly used acronyms to assist members of the Committee in following the presentation.

Mr. Shurtleff said from 2003 to 2005 the Communications system upgrade began and coincided with building the Emergency Communications Center as well as tying the Legacy Radio Systems to that new building and starting the process of preparing for the overall radio communications upgrade. From 2006 to 2008 they entered into the construction phase and implemented the Simulcast Trunked Radio system, as well as the microwave backbone. That is a key part of this because the microwave backbone that transports the voice communications systems (the radios) was also intended to support electronic data needs over a period of time. Mr. Shurtleff said over the last couple of years they have moved into phase three, which is getting the system implemented and operational, getting the training done, and distributing subscriber equipment throughout the County. He said the first year of full operation has gone extraordinarily well and they are now at phase four.

Phase IV includes re-establishing the Mobile Data system, getting computers into the cars and the ability to transmit data, and to address the long-standing Computer Aided Dispatch and records management needs. Mr. Shurtleff said he and Mr. Potter, Director of Information Technology Services (ITS), are working to bring together a number of long-standing ITS and emergency response needs. Jack Crance of the Department of Emergency Response, and Kim Moore of ITS are project leaders. There are a number of end-user groups that they consistently work and communicate with to bring together a number of goals and objectives: Dispatch, LETSS (Law Enforcement Technology Shared Services group), New York State Police, local colleges, District Attorney, and ECROC (Emergency Communications Review and Oversight Committee).

Mr. Shurtleff spoke of how the CAD system and Mobile Data system relates to the day-to-day operations of the Dispatch Center and said it is the overall software and hardware system that allows them to process the volume of dispatch activity that is handled on a regular basis. In 2009 the annual telephone volume was 193,758 (531 calls per day). The following is a breakdown of calls to the Center:

**911 Calls**

<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2009</u>
15,836	43,836	55,081

**Dispatched Incidents**

<u>2000</u>	<u>2009</u>
52,617	58,339 (Average 160/day)

**Radio Transmissions**

2009: 2,145,631

**Monitored or Initiated by Dispatch**

2009: 1,475,631

Mr. Shurtleff noted that although there has been an increase in the call volume it does not mean there has been an increase in the number of incidents. Due to the increasing access and use of cell phones, in many cases there is tremendous duplication of calls made about a single incident. He said although it is currently a manageable volume of calls it can be very difficult. In addition to all of these calls there has been a steady increase in the number of alarms that the Center dispatches to over 40 public safety agencies. At this time Mr. Shurtleff conducted a PowerPoint Presentation showing the route calls are taken as they relate to the CAD system, the Mobile Data system, and the Integrated Records Management system. The presentation was coded in color, showing components that are existing, proposed, partially functional, and to be restored.

Mr. Potter, Director of Information Technology Services, provided an overview of existing records management systems that are currently being used by public safety agencies. Right now all users are accessing the applications through the Tompkins County hosted Citrix Farm, a secure manner in which agencies have access to applications on the County's network through a browser interface. The applications include:

- Spectrum Justice Systems – New York State Department of Criminal Justice Services application used for basic records management functions for incidents and arrests; it does not interface with the Dispatch Center and is used by villages and the City;
- CRIMES by HTE Sunguard – used by Sheriff's Office; the CAD data that is developed at the Dispatch Center flows automatically into CRIMES and is picked up by a records management process;
- Run Sheets/Shift Reports – ITS has developed a custom application that hits the back-end of the data that is stored in the CAD in order to allow all of the police agencies to query all the details of incidents; those run sheets are used to determine what reports are required to be handed into sergeants or supervisors at each shift and then goes into CRIMES;
- TraCS application – a collaborative effort was done under the LETSS Group and funding received to purchase 40 mobile data terminals and software. This software is used to issue traffic tickets and accident information. The flow of the data goes directly to NYS DMV and the Office of Court Administration; some of the data also flows back into the SJS through another interface for the villages; and
- Livescan – Digital fingerprinting. Everything in New York State is now required to be digital. The project was coordinated with the Sheriff's Department and the Ithaca Police Department where the two locations are and agreements have been entered into with all of the villages to use those locations.

#### Present Situation

Mr. Shurtleff said the CAD system has reached its end-of-life cycle and the vendor is no longer able to provide any upgrades or software packages.

He also reported the following:

- Mobile data cannot be restored with the current CAD platform and in order to do mobile data they either need to upgrade with the H.T.E. Sunguard system which has some severe limitations or do a replacement;
- The records management system (CRIMES) has served the County well but is outdated and incompatible with current operations;
- The Spectrum system and the CAD system's two-way integration can't be done and wouldn't meet long-term requirements for a multi-agency records management system;
- Any potential upgrade with H.T.E. does not and will not integrate with New York State or any other local records systems; other solutions can and do; and
- Current CAD hardware is over six years old and must be replaced.

#### Recommendations

Mr. Shurtleff presented the following recommendations:

- Authorization to release an RFP for: Replacement of the CAD system; implementation of Mobile Data Applications, and implementation of a Fully-Integrated and standardized

multi-agency records management system for the public safety/emergency responders in Tompkins County

To finalize options and costs for the Mobile data network infrastructure as defined in Phase IV: activation of integrated voice and data (IV&D) radio component, and restoration of AVL and mobile data communications.

#### Benefits of Completing Phase IV

- Maintain comprehensive ALI data functions (Dispatch);
- Re-establish mobile data in vehicles;
- Safety: AVL and closest car assignment, reduction of radio and telephone traffic, NYSPIN access and other criminal justice resources;
- Quality Assurance: Improve response times, focus dispatch on call management and monitoring;
- Unified data repository – standardization;
- Comprehensive database and reporting capabilities;
- Solution for Sheriff's records management needs; and
- Establish platform to extend data to criminal justice and public safety partners (future), achieving ultimate LETSS goals.

#### Consequences of Deferring Phase IV

- Annual operation and support expenses likely to increase with time;
- Irreparable systems failures;
- Fragmentation of duplication of efforts;
- Need to invest in separate records management system for the sheriff's Office; and
- Operational costs for staffing.

Mr. Shurtleff said they are nearing a point where without sound technology there will be a need for more employees in the Dispatch Center, Sheriff's Office, and Information Technology Services Department just to manage the amount of data that is required.

#### Project Budget and Available Financial Resources

- 2005 – Reserved \$1,000,000 in Public Safety Communications System Capital Project for eventual restoration of mobile data and CAD upgrade;
- 2010 – Capital account balance approximately \$700,000 with additional project bonding authority of up to \$500,000; and
- Additional Homeland Security Funds identified by Sheriff and Department of Emergency Response: \$150,000-\$200,000.

#### Authorization to Proceed with Request for Proposals

Mr. Shurtleff said the purpose of this presentation today is to seek Committee approval to move forward with a bidding proposal process so that vendors can be identified and negotiated with. He said he will come back once that process is complete and present the Committee with an update. It was MOVED by Mr. Robison, seconded by Mr. Dennis, and unanimously adopted by voice vote, to authorize Mr. Shurtleff to proceed with preparing a Request for Proposals for Computer Aided Dispatch, Records Management, and Mobile Data system. MOTION CARRIED.

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, March 1, 2010

Mr. Shurtleff said Cornell has gone through a similar process and has awarded a similar system. He said he is impressed with what he has seen and if the County ends up with a compatible vendor there may be an opportunity to use Cornell as a backup and share long-term maintenance.

Ms. Robertson said a resolution was passed by the New York State Association of Counties on 911 funds that requested counties receive a portion of the funds that were originally designated for counties. She asked if this project would be appropriate for those funds. Mr. Shurtleff said the County currently receives some funding through the surcharge and that would apply towards this type of system. The funding, however, is hinged on the Governor's budget bill that Mr. Shurtleff assisted in drafting. He doesn't necessarily think there would be funding for this in that bill but it may provide reimbursement of some of the capital expenses the County has outlaid on the system.

#### **Approval of Minutes of February 1, 2010**

It was MOVED by Mr. Stein, seconded by Mr. Robison, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to approve the minutes of February 1, 2010 as submitted. MINUTES APPROVED.

#### **Appointment(s)**

It was MOVED by Mr. Dennis, seconded by Mr. Robison, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to approve the following appointment(s):

#### **Emergency Planning Committee**

Brian Robison

#### **Traffic Safety Committee**

Peter Meskill, Sheriff; term expires December 31, 2012

#### **Adjournment**

On motion the meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Michelle Pottorff, TC Legislature Office