

STATE OF NEW YORK  
Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor



# 2011 ANNUAL REPORT

## New York State Law Enforcement Accreditation Program



**Michael C. Green**  
Executive Deputy Commissioner  
Division of Criminal Justice Services

**Tony Perez**  
Acting Deputy Commissioner  
Office of Public Safety

---

NEW YORK STATE DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
4 TOWER PLACE  
ALBANY, NY 12203  
(518)485-1417

# **2011 LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY ACCREDITATION COUNCIL**

**Chief H. Lloyd Perkins, *Chairman***

Skaneateles Police Department

**Chief Michael Biasotti<sup>1</sup>**

New Windsor Police Department

**Chief Louis Corsi<sup>2</sup>**

Bethlehem Police Department

**Superintendent Joseph D'Amico**

New York State Police

**Deputy Erin Fuller<sup>3</sup>**

Orleans County Sheriff's Office

**Commissioner Raymond Kelly**

New York City Police Department

**Chief Charles Koenig**

Ballston Spa Police Department

**Sheriff Gary Maha**

Genesee County Sheriff's Office

**Sergeant Timothy Morris<sup>4</sup>**

Suffolk County Police Department

**Sheriff Philip Povero**

Ontario County Sheriff's Office

**Chief Michael Ranalli**

Glenville Police Department

**Deputy Deborah Snyder<sup>5</sup>**

Genesee County Sheriff's Office

**Sheriff Kevin Walsh**

Onondaga County Sheriff's Office

**Mr. Richard Wells**

Police Conference of New York (PCNY)

**Dr. Robert Worden**

Associate Professor, University at Albany

---

<sup>1</sup> Appointed on 12/8/2011 to represent the NYS Association of Chiefs of Police (NYSACOP).

<sup>2</sup> Term representing NYSACOP expired on 12/7/2011.

<sup>3</sup> Appointed on 11/1/2011 to represent the Deputy Sheriff's Association.

<sup>4</sup> Resigned on June 27, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> Term representing the Deputy Sheriff's Association expired on 10/31/2011.

## INTRODUCTION

The New York State Law Enforcement Accreditation Program (LEAP) has been providing law enforcement professionals with a mechanism with which to evaluate and improve the overall effectiveness of the policies and practices of their agency and the performance of their staff for more than two decades. The program was established in 1988 through the enactment of Executive Law Article 36, §846-h, which created the Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council, responsible for overseeing the direction of and setting policy for the program. The accompanying Rules and Regulations (Part 6035) tasked the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) with administering the day-to-day program activities.

Through LEAP, law enforcement professionals can receive formal recognition that their agency meets or exceeds standards of professionalism and excellence in the field of law enforcement. These standards - in the areas of **administration, training, and operations** - have been established over the years by the Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council with input from experienced law enforcement professionals. In 2011, accredited law enforcement agencies had in place policies and procedures that complied with a total of **132<sup>6</sup>** standards.

Administrators that oversee accredited law enforcement agencies cite many benefits of the program. To begin with, preparing their agency for accreditation entails strengthening existing policies and procedures and adding new ones to make sure all standards are met. Maintaining accreditation means being vigilant in routinely reviewing those policies and procedures and updating them when necessary. The Accreditation Program ensures that the agency's directives and practices are always current and consistent with law; that staff members remain adequately trained and informed with regard to agency practices; and that gaps in agency practices are identified and addressed in a timely manner. Increased public confidence in the agency and heightened staff morale are almost always indirect benefits of the program.

Agencies are accredited for a period of five years. During that time, they are expected to maintain compliance with all program standards, reporting on their progress through an Annual Compliance Survey, which ensures that minor lapses in compliance are immediately identified and remedied.

### **The Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council**

The Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council (council), the governing body for the program, establishes the program standards and the policies that determine how the program will be administered, and generally sets the direction for the program. The council has the exclusive authority to award accreditation to an agency.

---

<sup>6</sup> During the year, an additional standard was added, making it 133 standards. However, agencies will not be assessed for compliance on the new standard until January 1, 2012.

According to Executive Law §846-h, subsection 2 (a) (i) through (xii), the council shall consist of:

- (i.) Three incumbent sheriffs of the state;
- (ii.) Three incumbent chiefs of police;
- (iii.) One incumbent deputy sheriff;
- (iv.) One incumbent police officer;
- (v.) The superintendent of state police;
- (vi.) The commissioner of police of the city of New York;
- (vii.) One incumbent chief executive officer of a county of the state;
- (viii.) One incumbent mayor of a city or village of the state;
- (ix.) One incumbent chief executive officer of a town of the state;
- (x.) One member of a statewide labor organization representing police officers as that term is defined in subdivision thirty-four of section 1.20 of the criminal procedure law;
- (xi.) One full-time faculty member of a college or university who teaches in the area of criminal justice or police science; and
- (xii.) Two members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (ix) of paragraph (c) of this subdivision.

All council appointments are made by the governor based on nominations as noted in Executive Law §846-h, subsection 2 (c) (i) through (ix). Vacancies on the council currently exist for the seats nominated by the **New York State Association of Counties; New York State Conference of Mayors; New York State Association of Towns; and the New York State Assembly**. Efforts are underway to obtain nominations that will fill these vacancies to ensure that the 17-member council is adequately represented by all appropriate stakeholders and that quorum issues do not arise.

## **The Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) Office of Public Safety**

The DCJS Office of Public Safety (OPS) is tasked with administering the day-to-day activities of the program and providing support to the Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council.

### **Support for the Council**

OPS program staff members provide all professional, administrative, and clerical assistance to the council as agreed upon by the council chair and the DCJS Deputy Commissioner who oversees OPS. OPS staff members oversee the necessary preparations for the quarterly accreditation council meetings, including preparing the agenda and other materials such as assessment reports, policy proposals, responses to issues discussed at prior meetings, and this annual report. OPS program staff members provide the council with the pertinent information necessary to assist them in making their decisions on voting matters. The agency is responsible for ensuring that the council meetings follow all open meetings laws

including publicizing notice of the meetings; videotaping the meetings and making them available to the public; and preparing and distributing minutes of the meetings.

### **Support for Agencies**

Members of the OPS Accreditation Unit are committed to providing technical assistance and support to participating agencies in their pursuit of accreditation and maintaining accreditation. OPS program staff members offer many types of assistance, such as providing general information about the accreditation program; helping interpret the intent of standards; providing assistance to agencies as they are developing their program, and; offering feedback on whether the policies and/or program files developed by an agency comply with accreditation program standards. OPS program staff members also work with agency staff to assist in overcoming obstacles and issues specific to a particular agency. Finally, OPS program staff work with already accredited agencies to ensure ongoing compliance with program standards.

One of the main roles of the OPS program staff is to coordinate the on-site assessment required to become accredited. OPS staff members oversee the selection of the assessors and provide the information necessary for them to prepare for the assessment. OPS staff also work with agency program staff to determine their readiness for the assessment. This coordination continues throughout the duration of the assessment.

In addition to this day-to-day support, OPS staff members provide two separate training courses: one for agency program managers and command staff; and one for program assessors.

## **PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

The Law Enforcement Accreditation Program is entirely voluntary. Of the 571 eligible law enforcement agencies<sup>7</sup> in the State, 136 are currently accredited, or approximately 24%. An additional 62 agencies are actively pursuing accreditation. The size of accredited agencies ranges from departments with as few as 10 full- and part-time officers to a department employing approximately 4,900 officers. This fact illustrates that accreditation can be accomplished in any department, regardless of size or available resources, provided the command staff within an agency is committed to making the program a priority. By the end of 2011, approximately 59% of all New York State law enforcement officers outside of New York City were employed by an accredited agency.

As per Executive Law, there are no fees imposed on law enforcement agencies that participate in the program. All direct costs are supported by DCJS. Indirect costs to

---

<sup>7</sup> As of December 14, 2011.

agencies include office supplies and an “in-kind” dedication of staff time to implement and maintain the program. The DCJS Office of Public Safety (OPS) provides training to staff involved in preparing their agency for accreditation that can help focus the staff tasked with program implementation. OPS staff members also provide all program materials and technical assistance to agencies at no cost.

## **Accredited Agency Activity in 2011**

The following agencies were accredited in 2011. Included is the date their accreditation expires and, for reaccreditations, the year they were originally accredited.

### **INITIAL ACCREDITATION**

**Poughkeepsie Town Police Department** – *through March 1, 2016*

**Riverhead Town Police Department** – *through June 7, 2016*

**Seneca County Sheriff’s Office** - *through March 1, 2016*

**SUNY Cortland University Police Department** - *through March 1, 2016*

**University at Albany Police Department**– *through June 7, 2016*

### **REACCREDITATION**

**Brighton Town Police Department** – *through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 1991)*

**Broome County Sheriff’s Office** - *through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**Elmira City Police Department** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**Evans Town Police Department** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 1991)*

**Fairport Village Police Department** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 1996)*

**Geddes Town Police Department** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**Geneva City Police Department** – *through March 1, 2016 (accredited since 2006)*

**Hornell City Police Department** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 2006)*

**Liverpool Village Police Department** – *through June 7, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**Manlius Town Police Department** - *through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 1996)*

**Monroe Village Police Department** - *through June 7, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**New Windsor Town Police Department** - *through June 7, 2016 (accredited since 1996)*

**Niagara County Sheriff’s Office** - *through March 1, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**Ogden Town Police Department** - *through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 1991)*

**Oneida County Sheriff’s Office** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 2006)*

**Rotterdam Town Police Department** - *through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 2001)*

**Skaneateles Village Police Department** - *through March 1, 2016 (accredited since 2006)*

**St. Lawrence County Sheriff's Office** - through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 1991)

**Tonawanda City Police Department** - through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 1991)

**Wayne County Sheriff's Office** - through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 2006)

**Wellsville Village Police Department** - through December 6, 2016 (accredited since 1991)

**Yorktown Town Police Department** - through September 13, 2016 (accredited since 1991)

## **Applicant Agencies**

Additional law enforcement agencies have submitted applications since January 2007 and have indicated they are working toward becoming accredited. These agencies are in various stages of preparation to undergo an assessment for initial accreditation. To date, six of the applicant agencies are already scheduled to undergo assessments in 2012.

**Attachment A** of this report details all currently accredited agencies and current applicant agencies<sup>8</sup>. There are a total of 198 agencies throughout the state that are either accredited or actively working toward accreditation.

## **FISCAL IMPACT OF PROGRAM**

Agencies that are newly accredited are asked to complete an Implementation Survey, in part to determine what kind of an impact the program had on the department financially. This year, of the five agencies that received initial accreditation, two completed and submitted the survey and the information provided is summarized below.

### **Personnel Costs**

One agency noted that 50 percent of the undersheriff's time over a period of 20 months was devoted to preparing for the program, at an estimated cost of \$50,000. The other noted only 10 percent of the assistant chief's time had been spent preparing for 22 months, at an estimated cost of \$5,900. (Please note that variations in the salaries of employees from agency to agency can also account for fluctuations in estimated cost.)

### **Non-Personnel Costs**

Both agencies reported similar non-personal services costs, with one spending \$980 and the other \$1,400.

### **Agencies Withdrawn**

Several police departments voluntarily forfeited their accredited status by withdrawing from the program in 2011. Most chief law enforcement officers of withdrawn agencies

---

<sup>8</sup> See the section entitled "Participating Agency Status Redefined" for more information about this list.

explained that dwindling resources made it difficult to stay current with the administrative requirements of the program. The agencies that withdrew from the program in 2011 were:

**Baldwinsville Village Police Department** (*accredited since 1996*)

**Hamburg Town Police Department** (*accredited since 1991*)

**Marcellus Village Police Department** (*accredited since 2001*)

**Orchard Park Town Police Department** (*accredited since 1991*)

**Owego Village Police Department** (*accredited since 2001*)

**Potsdam Village Police Department** (*accredited since 2007*)

Despite these withdrawals during tough fiscal times, the accreditation program continues to be highly valued by the 198 agencies that are either currently accredited or actively pursuing accreditation. In fact, about forty percent (or 25) of the applicant agencies submitted their application within the last 18 months. Six have already set dates in 2012 to be assessed for their initial accreditation.

## **2011 PROGRAM UPDATES**

### **Revamping of the Accreditation Program**

Significant changes were made to the Accreditation Program in 2011 through the efforts of the OPS Accreditation Program Manager and the Chairman of the Accreditation Council. The most significant change to the program in 2011 involves the procedures used to reaccredit agencies.

The impetus for these changes was the need to reduce the Law Enforcement Accreditation Program budget which, through the years, has increased as agency participation in the program has grown. The program could not be sustained and support additional agencies seeking to be accredited for the first time without implementing some cost-saving measures. Reducing the budget was necessary in order to ensure the continued success and longevity of the program, something which is especially important to the council and members of participating agencies.

In January 2011, a focus group was convened to explore ways in which the program could be adapted to the fiscal climate but still maintain its substance and integrity. The group analyzed all of the different components of the program and decided upon several recommendations that were made to the council. After much discussion and several adjustments, the council voted unanimously to adopt the recommended changes at their June meeting. Some of the more significant changes to the Accreditation Program are highlighted in this section.



## **Revised Procedures for Reaccrediting Agencies: Compliance Audits**

Both initial assessments and reassessments are currently conducted by a team of two to three assessors over the course of three full days at an average cost of approximately \$3,500 per assessment. The council approved changes to their *Reaccreditation* policy that will substitute many of the current reassessments with a “compliance audit.”

Agencies undergoing reassessment for the first time will continue under the currently established procedure. These “full” reassessments will be structured as they currently are, with two to three assessors conducting the three-day on-site assessment.

Agencies facing reassessment for the second time or more will now be subject to a “compliance audit.” Under normal circumstances, one assessor will spend on average one to two days off-site and one day on-site reviewing approximately one-third of the agency’s program files, including files for the “critical standards” and a minimum of 20 additional standards that will be chosen for review by the assessor.

### **Critical Standards Identified**

To ensure that the standards with the highest potential for liability are reviewed during every compliance audit, the council has identified 21 critical standards. In addition, the assessor must review a minimum of 20 additional program files which will be selected by the assigned assessor and unknown in advance to the agency being assessed), for a total of at least 41 files being reviewed for every compliance` audit.

The critical standards have been made available to all of the participating law enforcement agencies so the program staff can become familiar with them. However, there will be no advance notice of which additional standards will be selected for review until the actual audit begins. This procedure was designed to ensure that accredited agency staff members continue to maintain compliance with all program standards and not just the standards that will be reviewed in an audit.

The Critical Standards can be found in **Attachment B** of this report.

### **Exceptions to the Compliance Audit Procedure**

The total savings realized in instances where a one-person compliance audit can be conducted will be significant. However, the council wants to ensure that this procedural change does not lead to relaxed efforts on the part of the accredited agencies in terms of compliance with program standards. As such, the revised *Reaccreditation* policy allows for some discretion to adjust the compliance audit procedure when necessary. For instance, an additional assessor and/or additional days on-site may be approved if the council or OPS program staff find that it’s necessary for the agency to more fully demonstrate compliance with the program

standards; or if an agency is particularly large and it's not realistic for one assessor to conduct the review.

The policy also provides discretion to require that a full reassessment be conducted when necessary, regardless of how many times an agency has been reaccredited in the past. Situations that may warrant a full reassessment include a previous difficult reassessment or if the agency has reported, or is suspected of having, major lapses in compliance. A chief law enforcement officer may also request a full reassessment for a variety of reasons (for instance, a newly appointed chief law enforcement officer may want verification that all standards are fully complied with.) These exceptions will ensure that the integrity of the program is maintained.

Because of the scope of the changes to the program, the responsibilities of the assessors will change, necessitating the release of a new Request for Applications (RFA) for program assessors. The RFA was released in December 2011 and all currently active assessors who respond to the RFA will be required to undergo refresher training on the program changes. (Brand new assessors will be required to attend the full assessor training prior to being given an assignment.) The new procedure for reassessing agencies is expected to be implemented no later than early summer, 2012.

## **Hate Crimes Standard Adopted**

In June 2011, the council adopted a new standard. Standard 44.2, Hate Crimes, requires that accredited agencies have a written directive that outlines their response to Hate Crimes. Agencies that are currently accredited and those seeking to become accredited must be able to demonstrate compliance with this new standard by January 1, 2012. The Hate Crimes Standard can be found in **Attachment C** of this report.

## **“Participating Agency” Status Redefined**

The first step agencies take to become accredited is to submit the *LEAP Application Form*. Since the program is entirely voluntary, the application does not in any way bind the agency to the pursuit of accreditation. Rather, it simply provides a mechanism for the chief law enforcement officer of the applicant agency to certify that his or her agency is eligible to become accredited; and certifies that the chief elected official of the municipality served by the law enforcement agency approves of the submission of the application. The *Agency Participation Agreement* that accompanies the application outlines the responsibilities of both the applicant agency and the council throughout the accreditation process should the agency's efforts eventually result in accreditation.

Historically, the receipt of an application and agreement meant that the applicant agency was considered a “participating agency.” The council determined that referring to those agencies as “participating” was an inaccurate description of their standing in the program and, in fact, could be misconstrued as the agency having met the standard of accreditation

in some way. With the council's approval, all applications that were submitted more than five (5) years ago were archived, and the chief law enforcement officers were notified of the need to resubmit another application if they wished to pursue accreditation. The communication step seems to have reignited the desire to work toward accreditation for several agencies, as OPS program staff received phone calls in response to those letters asking for more current information on the program.

As noted earlier, **Attachment A** contains a list of all of the currently active accredited agencies and applicant agencies. This list will have fewer agencies on it than has been reported in the past because of this program change.

## **Training Provided**

The Division of Criminal Justice Services entered into a successful partnership with the State University of New York (SUNY) Administration and SUNY Police Chief's Association to provide Program Manager training in four locations throughout the state during the year. The administration that oversees all SUNY law enforcement agencies is encouraging those eligible police departments to become accredited in the coming years. SUNY's offer to host these workshops allowed DCJS to train 186 officers from 100 different law enforcement agencies during 2011: 64 sworn members from 24 different SUNY police departments received the training, as did 122 sworn officers representing 74 municipal police departments and two other college police departments not affiliated with SUNY.

The SUNY administration and SUNY police chief's association has demonstrated a commitment to the accreditation program that is commendable. In addition, this collaboration allowed DCJS to provide training that otherwise might not have been possible due to budgetary constraints.

## **PLANS FOR 2012**

The OPS accreditation program staff will coordinate reassessments for 24 agencies due to expire in 2012, as well as assessments for at least six agencies already scheduled for initial accreditation. In addition, staff is increasing the level of technical assistance to applicant agencies with the hope of assisting them in more efficiently preparing for the assessment process.

Because of the program changes approved by the council in 2011, assessor training will be held for both veteran assessors to familiarize them with the new compliance audit procedure, and full assessor training will be provided to at least a dozen new assessors so they can become actively involved in the program.

In early 2012, plans will be made to create a focus group of DCJS staff, program assessors and accredited agency command staff and program managers in an to attempt to hone the assessment process. Matters for discussion will include the amount of proof that is

necessary to demonstrate compliance with program standards and developing methods for standardizing the type of documentation kept by agencies.

Staff also has been researching ways to improve the efficiency of the accreditation program through the utilization of technology. In 2010, the Beacon Police Department became the first in the state to become accredited with 100 percent electronic program files, and since then many other law enforcement agencies have explored different methods for doing the same. It is anticipated that in the coming years, more and more accreditation programs will become electronic, perhaps even allowing assessments to be conducted remotely, further reducing the program budget. DCJS program staff will continue to research this.

Finally, in late 2011, OPS program staff began the process of updating all of the council policies that had not been recently updated. The council has already been provided with six revised policies for action at the March 2012 meeting, and the remaining council policies will be reviewed and re-approved in the coming year.

## **CONCLUSION**

The New York State Law Enforcement Accreditation Program continues to be a major source of pride for many law enforcement agencies in the state, as it is one of the few tangible measures of excellence in law enforcement. The accreditation program enhances the effectiveness and promotes accountability of staff; increases professionalism; and ensures that the policies and practices in use within accredited agencies are current and valid. The Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council will continue to ensure that the program is valuable and that it meets the ever-changing needs of law enforcement professionals.

**ATTACHMENT A**

NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation Program  
Accredited and Applicant Agencies Through December 31, 2011

<b>AGENCY NAME</b>	<b>F/T</b>	<b>P/T</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>DATE SUBMITTED</b>	<b>DATE RESUBMITTED</b>	<b>DATE ACCREDITED</b>	<b>DATE REACCREDITED</b>	<b>DATE EXPIRES</b>
ALBANY CITY PD	339	1	340	10/25/1996		12/9/1999	12/2/2009	12/2/2014
ALBANY COUNTY SO	108	1	109	10/15/2002		3/4/2003	3/4/2008	3/4/2013
ALBION VILLAGE PD	12	1	13	12/17/1993	6/14/2007			
AMHERST TOWN PD	158	0	158	1/19/1990		3/12/1992	6/6/2007	6/6/2012
AMITYVILLE VILLAGE PD	27	1	28	3/30/1998	9/17/2009			
BEACON CITY PD	35	0	35	10/27/1993	11/27/2007	9/2/2010		9/2/2015
BEDFORD TOWN PD	43	0	43	4/6/1990		9/15/1999	9/2/2009	9/2/2014
BETHLEHEM TOWN PD	43	0	43	2/12/1990		9/20/1990	9/2/2010	9/2/2015
BINGHAMTON CITY PD	126	0	126	5/14/1990		6/3/1993	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
BRIGHTON TOWN PD	41	0	41	1/16/1990		9/5/1991	9/13/2011	9/13/2016
BROCKPORT VILLAGE PD	11	2	13	8/21/1990	5/12/2002	12/2/2004	12/3/2009	12/3/2014
BROOME COUNTY SO	56	0	56	3/6/1997		10/23/2001	9/13/2011	9/13/2016
CAMILLUS TOWN PD	29	0	29	12/29/1993		3/12/1998	3/12/2008	3/12/2013
CANANDAIGUA PD	25	0	25	8/3/2009		3/4/2010		3/4/2015
CANTON VILLAGE PD	10	0	10	7/1/1991		12/16/1993	12/3/2009	12/3/2014
CATSKILL VILLAGE PD	15	8	23	7/16/1990	5/10/2006	3/5/2009		3/5/2014
CATTARAUGUS COUNTY SO	62	57	119	4/21/1992	7/11/2008	12/4/2008		12/4/2013
CAYUGA COUNTY SO	38	0	38			12/2/2010		12/2/2015
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY SO	274	0	274	4/26/2002		9/12/2002	9/12/2007	9/12/2012
CHEEKTOWAGA TOWN PD	128	0	128	12/18/1989		6/2/1994	6/11/2009	6/11/2014
CHEMUNG COUNTY SO	46	0	46	2/16/1990	2/7/2007	3/4/2010		3/4/2015
CHENANGO COUNTY SO	26	2	28	10/15/1992		12/1/2004	12/2/2009	12/2/2014
CHESTER VILLAGE PD	13	4	17	8/22/2011				
CICERO TOWN PD	9	15	24	2/21/1995		6/5/2003	6/6/2008	6/6/2013
CLARKSTOWN TOWN PD	159	0	159	5/10/1991		6/4/1998	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
COEYMANS TOWN PD	10	10	20	1/15/2009				
COLONIE TOWN PD	101	0	101	1/18/1990		12/8/1994	12/3/2009	12/3/2014
COLUMBIA COUNTY SO	172	0	172	5/29/1992	4/3/2006	9/13/2007		9/13/2012
CORNWALL TOWN PD	11	6	17	12/18/1989	5/30/2003	9/8/2005	9/2/2010	9/8/2015
CORTLAND CITY PD	44	0	44	9/29/1999	2/17/2009			

**ATTACHMENT A**

**NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation Program**  
**Accredited and Applicant Agencies Through December 31, 2011**

CRAWFORD TOWN PD	12	8	20	2/2/2009				
CROTON-ON-HUDSON VILLAGE PD	23	0	23	5/12/2008				
DELAWARE COUNTY SO	13	12	25	12/11/2008		3/4/2010		3/4/2015
DELHI VILLAGE PD	4	10	14	12/20/2011				
DEWITT TOWN PD	38	0	38	1/12/1990		6/3/2003	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
DOBBS FERRY VILLAGE PD	24	0	24	6/10/1993		3/24/1994	3/5/2009	3/5/2014
DRYDEN VILLAGE PD	4	10	14	1/30/1997		3/11/1999	3/5/2009	3/5/2014
DUTCHESS COUNTY SO	105	70	175	1/10/1991		12/2/2002	12/4/2007	12/4/2012
E. ROCHESTER VILLAGE PD	7	6	13	5/17/1990	1/23/2001	6/10/2004	6/11/2009	6/11/2014
E. SYRACUSE VILLAGE PD	11	4	15	12/18/1989		6/11/2002	6/6/2007	6/6/2012
EAST FISHKILL TOWN PD	32	0	32	1/22/1991		9/18/1992	3/6/2007	3/6/2012
EAST HAMPTON TOWN PD	67	0	67	12/20/1989		3/12/1992	6/3/2007	6/3/2012
EAST HAMPTON VILLAGE PD	26	5	31	11/16/1998		3/5/2009		3/5/2014
ELMIRA CITY PD	79	3	82	12/26/1998		12/6/2001	12/14/2006	12/6/2016
ENDICOTT VILLAGE PD	35	0	35	12/7/1989		12/6/1990	12/2/2010	12/2/2015
EVANS TOWN PD	24	5	29	2/12/1990		12/5/1991	12/14/2006	12/6/2016
FAIRPORT VILLAGE PD	10	2	12	6/13/1990		12/5/1996	12/4/2006	12/6/2016
FULTON CITY PD	35	0	35	5/20/1993		9/24/1998	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
FULTON COUNTY SO	33	21	54	8/22/2007				
GATES TOWN PD	32	0	32	9/14/1990		3/12/1992	3/12/2007	3/12/2012
GEDDES TOWN PD	14	0	14	1/11/1990		9/12/2001	9/14/2006	12/6/2016
GENESEE COUNTY SO	50	0	50	3/4/1998		12/7/2000	12/7/2005	12/7/2015
GENESEO VILLAGE PD	8	4	12	6/11/2010				
GENEVA CITY PD	35	0	35	7/10/2003		3/9/2006	3/2/2011	3/2/2016
GLENS FALLS CITY PD	31	0	31	1/12/2011				
GLOVERSVILLE CITY PD	32	0	32	4/27/1990		6/2/1997	6/3/2007	6/3/2012
GOSHEN TOWN PD	11	10	21	3/13/2008				
GOSHEN VILLAGE PD	13	3	16	3/20/1995	12/8/2009			
GREECE TOWN PD	91	1	92	10/29/1990		3/24/1994	3/5/2009	3/5/2014
GREENBURGH TOWN PD	119	0	119	12/2/1990		3/6/2008		3/6/2013
GUILDERLAND TOWN PD	34	0	34	1/26/1993		9/3/2009		9/3/2014
HARRIMAN VILLAGE PD	7	3	10	10/4/2010				
HARRISON TOWN PD	73	0	73	4/4/1991	2/13/2009	6/11/2009		6/11/2014
HAVERSTRAW TOWN PD	73	0	73	10/19/2010				

**ATTACHMENT A**

**NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation Program**  
**Accredited and Applicant Agencies Through December 31, 2011**

HEMPSTEAD VILLAGE PD	120	0	120	4/10/1991	6/22/2007			
HORNELL CITY PD	22	0	22	1/11/1999		12/14/2006		12/6/2016
HUDSON CITY PD	26	0	26	1/25/1990		6/10/1999	6/11/2009	6/11/2014
HUDSON FALLS VILLAGE PD	12	3	15	12/13/1989		3/24/1994	3/5/2009	3/5/2014
HUNTINGTON BAY VILLAGE PD	6	5	11	8/16/2006		6/5/2008		6/5/2013
HYDE PARK TOWN PD	12	5	17	3/7/2011				
IRONDEQUOIT TOWN PD	57	0	57	1/18/1990		12/5/1991	12/5/2006	12/6/2016
ITHACA CITY PD	76	0	76	4/9/2008				
JAMESTOWN CITY PD	64	0	64	12/6/1989		9/20/1990	9/2/2010	9/2/2015
JOHNSON CITY VILLAGE PD	30	0	30	1/2/1990		9/14/2006		9/14/2011
JOHNSTOWN CITY PD	26	0	26	12/23/1994		9/11/1997	9/13/2007	9/13/2012
KINGSTON CITY PD	80	2	82	2/13/1990		12/8/1990	12/2/2010	12/2/2015
LAKE PLACID VILLAGE PD	14	2	16	2/12/2009				
LIVERPOOL VILLAGE PD	4	6	10	8/5/1998		6/14/2001	6/7/2011	6/7/2016
LIVINGSTON COUNTY SO	46	12	58	3/2/1990		12/4/1997	12/6/2007	12/4/2012
LLOYD TOWN PD	9	12	21	5/16/2006	9/30/2011			
LOCKPORT CITY PD	52	0	52	1/21/2010				
LONG ISLAND RR PD	700	0	700	10/24/2008				
LYNBROOK VILLAGE PD	47	0	47	10/28/2011				
MAMARONECK VILLAGE PD	52	0	52	2/26/2009				
MANLIUS TOWN PD	38	0	38	2/12/1996		9/12/1996	9/13/2011	9/13/2016
METRO TRANSIT AUTHORITY (MTA) PD	700	0	700	10/8/2008				
MIDDLETOWN CITY PD	70	0	70	4/6/1990	1/13/2004	12/13/2007		12/13/2012
MONROE COUNTY SO	249	52	301	6/12/1991		3/12/1992	3/6/2007	3/6/2012
MONROE VILLAGE PD	18	0	18	9/19/1991		6/13/2001	6/7/2011	6/7/2016
MT KISCO VILLAGE PD	35	0	35	2/12/2009				
MT PLEASANT TOWN PD	44	0	44	11/21/1990		9/24/1998	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
MT VERNON CITY PD	191	0	191	1/17/1990		3/9/1995	3/4/2010	3/4/2015
NEW CASTLE TOWN PD	35	0	35	1/8/2010		3/15/2005	3/4/2010	3/4/2015
NEW ROCHELLE CITY PD	174	0	174	12/8/1989		6/3/1993	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
NEW WINDSOR TOWN PD	39	0	39	1/6/1991		6/12/1996	6/7/2011	6/7/2016
NEW YORK STATE POLICE	4922	0	4,922	12/26/1989		2/21/1990	3/4/2010	3/4/2015
NEWARK VILLAGE PD	16	0	16	7/17/2008				
NEWBURGH CITY PD	80	0	80	10/5/2000	3/2/2007	12/4/2008		12/4/2013

**ATTACHMENT A**

**NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation Program**  
**Accredited and Applicant Agencies Through December 31, 2011**

NEWBURGH TOWN PD	56	0	56	12/10/2010				
NIAGARA COUNTY SO	132	4	136	9/28/1999		3/8/2001	3/2/2011	3/2/2016
NIAGARA FALLS CITY PD	158	0	158	2/12/1996		9/4/2003	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
NORTH CASTLE TOWN PD	37	0	37	12/17/1993		12/7/2000	12/2/2010	12/2/2015
NORTH GREENBUSH TOWN PD	18	0	18	3/3/1997	7/26/2006	12/13/2007		12/24/2012
NORTHPORT VILLAGE PD	15	4	19	7/10/1995	1/15/2009			
OCEAN BEACH VILLAGE PD	5	22	27	1/28/2008				
OGDEN TOWN PD	13	0	13	6/21/1990		9/5/1991	9/13/2011	9/13/2016
OLD WESTBURY VILLAGE PD	26	0	26	8/24/1992	1/23/2008			
ONEIDA COUNTY SO	79	0	79	1/22/1990		12/7/2006		12/6/2016
ONEONTA CITY PD	28	0	28	10/24/2011				
ONONDAGA COUNTY SO	224	3	227	12/16/1991		9/24/1998	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
ONTARIO COUNTY SO	65	24	89	7/17/1991		6/3/1993	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
ORANGE COUNTY SO	98	29	127	5/28/1991	4/11/2005	12/8/2005	12/2/2010	12/2/2015
ORANGETOWN TOWN PD	87	0	87	7/31/1998		3/13/2007		3/19/2012
OSSINING TOWN PD	15	0	15	12/21/1989	2/18/2010			
OSSINING VILLAGE PD	59	0	59	4/6/1990	12/11/2003	9/2/2004	9/3/2009	9/3/2014
OSWEGO CITY PD	47	0	47	7/19/1990		9/4/2003	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
OSWEGO COUNTY SO	61	0	61	4/1/1991		12/10/1992	3/6/2008	3/6/2013
OTSEGO COUNTY SO	19	5	24	2/12/1990	9/27/2007			
PEEKSKILL CITY PD	61	0	61	12/14/1989	8/8/2008	9/3/2009		9/3/2014
PELHAM VILLAGE PD	28	0	28	7/2/2008				
PORT JERVIS CITY PD	32	0	32	2/26/2008				
POUGHKEEPSIE TOWN PD	87	0	87	1/25/2010		3/2/2011		3/2/2016
PUTNAM COUNTY SO	83	0	83	12/22/1989	5/9/2007			
QUOGUE VILLAGE PD	14	4	18	12/20/1989	9/17/2007	6/11/2009		6/11/2014
RAMAPO TOWN PD	114	1	115	1/23/2001	1/21/2003	6/10/2004	6/11/2009	6/11/2014
RENSSELAER CITY PD	24	0	24	3/12/1990		6/3/1993	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
RIVERHEAD TOWN PD	85	2	87	10/19/2010		6/7/2011		6/7/2016
ROCHESTER CITY PD	740	0	740	12/28/1989		2/21/1990	3/4/2010	3/4/2015
ROCKLAND COUNTY SO	72	55	127	1/15/1991	10/6/2006	3/6/2008		3/6/2013
ROCKVILLE CENTRE VILLAGE PD	54	0	54	6/6/1991		3/4/1997	3/6/2008	3/6/2013
ROME CITY PD	74	6	80	1/29/1990		12/4/2003	12/4/2008	12/4/2013
ROTTERDAM TOWN PD	42	0	42	6/21/1990		12/6/2001	12/14/2006	12/6/2016



**ATTACHMENT A**

**NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation Program**  
**Accredited and Applicant Agencies Through December 31, 2011**

RYE BROOK VILLAGE PD	28	0	28	7/13/2009				
RYE CITY PD	39	0	39	7/19/1990		9/24/1998	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
SARATOGA COUNTY SO	81	0	81	3/15/1992		12/13/1993	12/4/2008	12/4/2013
SARATOGA SPRINGS CITY PD	65	0	65	8/24/1990	3/3/2010			
SCARSDALE VILLAGE PD	45	0	45	12/18/1989		9/20/1990	9/2/2010	9/2/2015
SCHENECTADY CITY PD	151	0	151	1/16/1991	9/11/2009			
SENECA COUNTY SO	31	13	44	1/17/1995	2/2/2009	3/2/2011		3/2/2016
SHELTER ISLAND TOWN PD	9	0	9	2/26/2009		6/11/2009		6/11/2014
SHERRILL CITY PD	4	6	10	1/21/2010				
SKANEATELES VILLAGE PD	5	7	12	11/2/2002		3/9/2006	3/2/2011	3/2/2016
SOLVAY VILLAGE PD	22	0	22	7/25/2001		3/4/2003	3/6/2008	3/6/2013
SOUTHAMPTON TOWN PD	101	20	121	1/4/1990		9/24/1998	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
SOUTHAMPTON VILLAGE PD	37	0	37	12/18/1989		9/9/1993	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
SPRING VALLEY VILLAGE PD	66	6	72	3/5/1990	10/14/2011			
ST LAWRENCE COUNTY SO	34	4	38	1/31/1990		9/5/1991	9/13/2011	9/13/2016
STONY POINT TOWN PD	29	3	32	12/23/2002		6/5/2003	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
SUC ALFRED UNIVERSITY PD	12	0	12	1/22/2009				
SUC BUFFALO STATE COLLEGE PD	34	0	34	6/1/2010	10/17/2011			
SUC CANTON UNIVERSITY PD	9	0	9	8/20/2010				
SUC ESF UNIVERSITY PD	9	0	9	6/22/2011				
SUC FARMINGDALE UNIVERSITY PD	17	0	17	6/14/2010				
SUC OLD WESTBURY UNIVERSITY PD	20	0	20	10/8/2010				
SUC ONEONTA UNIVERSITY PD	17	0	17	5/5/2010				
SUC OSWEGO UNIVERSITY PD	20	0	20	6/9/2008				
SUFFERN VILLAGE PD	27	3	30	9/15/1999	2/7/2007	12/3/2009		12/3/2014
SUFFOLK CO PD	2697	2	2,699	9/7/2004		6/2/2005	9/2/2010	6/2/2015
SUFFOLK CO SO	271	1	272	1/30/2008				
SUNY ALBANY UNIVERSITY PD	39	0	39	11/15/2010		6/7/2011		6/7/2016
SUNY BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY PD	32	0	32	7/30/2008				
SUNY BUFFALO UNIVERSITY PD	61	0	61	11/3/2006		12/13/2007		12/13/2012
SUNY COBLESKILL UNIVERSITY PD	10	0	10	5/12/2011				
SUNY CORTLAND UNIVERSITY PD	19	0	19	7/29/2008		3/2/2011		3/2/2016
SUNY IT UNIVERSITY PD	11	0	11	1/27/2011				
SUNY NEW PALTZ UNIVERSITY PD	23	0	23	9/16/2011				

**ATTACHMENT A**

**NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation Program**  
**Accredited and Applicant Agencies Through December 31, 2011**

SUNY PLATTSBURGH UNIVERSITY PD	13	0	13	9/23/2010				
SUNY PURCHASE UNIVERSITY PD	24	0	24	11/19/2010				
SUNY STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY PD	70	0	70	4/21/2009		12/2/2010		12/2/2015
SYRACUSE CITY PD	465	0	465	2/16/1990		9/17/1992	12/5/2007	12/5/2012
TIOGA COUNTY SO	38	7	45	6/15/1996		6/3/2003	6/5/2008	6/5/2013
TOMPKINS COUNTY SO	40	0	40	12/27/2011				
TONAWANDA CITY PD	28	0	28	12/1/1989		12/5/1991	12/5/2006	12/6/2016
TONAWANDA TOWN PD	106	0	106	11/14/1990		9/9/1993	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
TROY CITY PD	114	1	115	2/8/1990		12/7/2000	12/2/2010	12/7/2015
TUCKAHOE VILLAGE PD	26	0	26	5/10/2002		9/12/2002	9/13/2007	9/13/2012
ULSTER COUNTY SO	60	25	85	3/1/1991		12/10/1992	12/4/2007	12/4/2012
ULSTER TOWN PD	37	0	37	2/25/1997		6/6/2002	6/14/2007	6/14/2012
UTICA CITY PD	187	0	187	11/15/1995	2/15/2010	9/2/2010		9/2/2015
VESTAL TOWN PD	35	0	35	8/2/1990		3/12/1992	12/7/2006	12/7/2011
WALDEN VILLAGE PD								
WARREN COUNTY SO	70	2	72	4/3/1990		9/20/1990	9/2/2010	9/2/2015
WASHINGTON COUNTY SO	122	0	122	1/16/1990	11/30/2006	3/8/2007		3/19/2012
WASHINGTONVILLE VILLAGE PD	16	2	18	9/22/1997	2/2/2007			
WATERFORD TOWN AND VILLAGE PD	10	3	13	3/6/2006		9/2/2010		9/2/2015
WATERFRONT COMMISSIONER HARBOR PD	38	0	38	6/23/2011				
WATERTOWN CITY PD	65	0	65	8/19/1993		12/10/1998	12/4/2008	12/4/2013
WAYNE COUNTY SO	49	20	69	2/3/1992	3/26/2006	9/14/2006	9/13/2011	9/13/2016
WEBSTER TOWN PD	32	0	32	10/11/1990		3/11/1999	3/5/2009	3/5/2014
WELLSVILLE VILLAGE PD	10	8	18	1/22/1990		12/5/1991	12/7/2006	12/6/2016
WEST SENECA TOWN PD	66	0	66	11/14/1990		9/9/1993	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
WESTCHESTER CO DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY	249	9	258	12/14/1989		12/10/1992	12/4/2007	12/4/2012
WESTHAMPTON BEACH VILLAGE PD	15	5	20	4/28/2009				
WHITE PLAINS DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY	215	20	235	2/21/1990		2/21/1990	3/4/2010	3/4/2015
WOODBURY TOWN PD	22	1	23	1/26/1990		6/2/1994	6/11/2009	6/11/2014
WYOMING COUNTY SO	30	12	42	12/8/2009				
YATES COUNTY SO	26	2	28	2/3/1992		12/8/2005	12/2/2010	12/2/2015
YONKERS CITY PD	544	0	544	4/3/1995		9/4/2003	9/4/2008	9/4/2013
YORKTOWN TOWN PD	49	0	49	12/15/1989		9/5/1991	9/13/2011	9/13/2016

# **New York State Law Enforcement Accreditation Program**

## **Critical Standards**

The following Critical Standards are to be used in conjunction with the LEAC Reaccreditation Policy as a guide for determining which of the 133 Accreditation program standards are required to be reviewed as part of all reaccreditation compliance audits. The list represents the standards that have historically held the highest potential for liability to a law enforcement agency.

***PLEASE NOTE - accredited agencies must establish and maintain compliance with all 133 Program Standards in order to maintain their accredited status.***

### **ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS**

- 2.3 - Written Directives**
- 2.7 - Officer Responsibility and Authority**
- 2.9 - Accountability of Supervisory Personnel**
- 5.3 - Safeguarding Cash**
- 6.2 - Safeguarding Agency Weapons**
- 7.1 - Storage of Evidence**
- 7.3 - Inventory Control**
- 8.7 - Records Management System**
- 12.5 - Background Investigation**
- 13.1 - Performance Evaluation System**
- 14.1 - Rules of Conduct**
- 14.4 - Disciplinary System**
- 14.7 - Sexual Harassment**
- 20.1 - Necessary Force**
- 20.7 - Reporting Requirements**
- 25.1 - Internal Affairs Function**

### **TRAINING STANDARDS**

- 33.1 - In-service Training - Length and Content**

### **OPERATIONAL STANDARDS**

- 43.4 - Vehicle Pursuits**
- 44.1 - Domestic Incidents**
- 51.4 - Labeling Evidence (Scenes of Incidents section)**
- 58.2 - Disaster Plans**

## ATTACHMENT C

### New York State Law Enforcement Accreditation Program **HATE CRIMES STANDARD**

#### OPERATIONS

**STANDARD 44.2**      **The agency has a written directive that outlines the response to hate crimes in accordance with the Hate Crimes Act of 2000. The directive should address the unique factors to consider when establishing motive and the proper crime classification for Hate Crimes that will lead to an elevation of the charge(s).**

*Commentary: New York State Penal Law §485.05 designates certain crimes or attempts to commit those crimes as Hate Crimes when the primary motive for the crime is based on the victim's race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, religion, religious practice, age, disability or sexual orientation. Hate crime investigations pose a challenge for many agencies since they require establishment of a motive. Early identification and supervisory notification is crucial. Agencies should have a directive in place that outlines the law, and are strongly encouraged to adapt other standards (e.g. 40.2; 50.1) to strengthen the critical components of responding to a Hate Crime.*

#### Compliance Verification Strategies

Assessors may seek to verify compliance with this standard by using one or more of the strategies listed below. There may be other strategies identified by the agency which could also be acceptable.

1. A copy of the directive should be available for review;
2. Interviews with agency personnel to verify their knowledge of and understanding of the directive; and
3. Review of hate crime reports.