

From: "Davidson, Gary" <GDavidson@vcso.us>
To: VolusiaExposed <volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com>
Subject: RE: Question - Clark 911 arrest
Date: Fri, 5 Oct 2012 09:16:56 -0400

It's correct that the same telecommunicators answer the calls, whether they come in on a non-emergency or E-911 line. So tying up a telecommunicator isn't the issue. Tying up a 911 line that's specifically dedicated for actual emergencies is the issue. There are plenty of appropriate ways to complain about a deputy's performance or handling of a call for service. Using an emergency E-911 line isn't one of them.

-----Original Message-----

From: VolusiaExposed [<mailto:volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 05, 2012 8:50 AM
To: Davidson, Gary
Subject: Question - Clark 911 arrest

Gary:

VX is working on it's article covering the Desarea Clark arrest, regarding her alleged misuse of the 911 system.

QUESTION: As detailed in the below attached VCSO phone list (see PDF doc) - it is true, that had Ms. Desarea called the NON-emergency number (386-736-5999) AND pressed #1 as verbally instructed - she would have in fact spoken to a 911 operator?

Obviously, if true, VX would like to expose this ironic twist - that regardless whether Mr. Clark would had dialed "911" or the listed NON-emergency number of 736-5999 plus # 1, she would have spoken to a 911 operator regarding her concerns about the deputy.

Thank for any guidance you can provide.

VX