1 BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE FINANCE AND ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEES 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 JOINT LEGISLATIVE HEARING 4 In the Matter of the 2016-2017 EXECUTIVE BUDGET ON 5 PUBLIC PROTECTION 6 \_\_\_\_\_ 7 Hearing Room B Legislative Office Building 8 Albany, New York 9 February 4, 2016 9:40 a.m. 10 11 PRESIDING: 12 Senator Catharine M. Young Chair, Senate Finance Committee 13 Assemblyman Herman D. Farrell, Jr. 14 Chair, Assembly Ways & Means Committee 15 PRESENT: 16 Senator Liz Krueger Senate Finance Committee (RM) 17 Assemblyman Robert Oaks 18 Assembly Ways & Means Committee (RM) 19 Senator John J. Bonacic Chair, Senate Committee on Judiciary 20 Assemblywoman Helene Weinstein 21 Chair, Assembly Committee on Judiciary 22 Senator Patrick M. Gallivan Chair, Senate Committee on Crime Victims, 23 Crime and Correction 24

1 2016-2017 Executive Budget Public Protection 2 2-4-16 3 PRESENT: (Continued) 4 5 Senator Michael F. Nozzolio Chair, Senate Committee on Codes 6 Assemblyman Joseph Lentol 7 Chair, Assembly Committee on Codes 8 Senator Thomas D. Croci Chair, Senate Committee on Veterans, 9 Homeland Security and Military Affairs 10 Assemblyman Daniel O'Donnell Chair, Assembly Committee on Correction 11 Senator Frederick J. Akshar II 12 Assemblyman Michael Montesano 13 Senator Diane Savino 14 Assemblyman Al Graf 15 Assemblywoman Janet L. Duprey 16 Senator Rich Funke 17 Assemblyman J. Gary Pretlow 18 Senator Velmanette Montgomery 19 Senator Ruth Hassell-Thompson 20 Assemblyman Joseph M. Giglio 21 Senator Martin Golden 22 Senator Joseph P. Addabbo, Jr. 23 Assemblywoman Crystal Peoples-Stokes 24

1	2016-2017 Executive Budget Public Protection	
2	2-4-16	
3	PRESENT:	(Continued)
4		
5		Senator Daniel Squadron
6		Assemblyman John T. McDonald III
7		Assemblyman Joseph S. Saladino
8		Senator Gustavo Rivera
9		Assemblywoman Diana C. Richardson
10		Senator Leroy Comrie
11		Assemblywoman Nicole Malliotakis
12		Senator Phil M. Boyle
13		Assemblywoman Patricia Fahy
14		Assemblyman John T. McDonald III
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

	2016-2017 Executive Budget Public Protection 2-4-16			
3	LIST OF SPEAKERS			
4		STATEMENT	QUESTIONS	
5	Honorable Lawrence K. Marks Chief Administrative Judge			
6	NYS Office of Court Administration	9	20	
7	John P. Melville			
8 9	Commissioner NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services	106	113	
10	Michael C. Green			
11	Executive Deputy Commissioner NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services	180	186	
12	Anthony J. Annucci	100	100	
13 14	Acting Commissioner NYS Department of Corrections and Community Supervision	257	264	
15	Joseph D'Amico			
16	Superintendent NYS Division of State Police	361	370	
17	Margaret Miller NYS Chief Information Officer			
18	Director, NYS Office of Information Technology Services	422	430	
19	William J. Leahy			
20	Director NYS Office of Indigent			
21 22	Legal Services Robert H. Tembeckjian	465	474	
22	Administrator and Counsel New York State Commission on			
24	Judicial Conduct	483	488	

	2016-2017 Executive Budget Public Protection 2-4-16		
3	LIST OF SPEAKERS,	Cont.	
4		STATEMENT	QUESTIONS
5	Thomas H. Mungeer President		
6	New York State Troopers PBA	492	495
7	Christopher M. Quick President		
8	New York State Police Investigators Association	497	502
9	Michael B. Powers		
	President NYS Correctional Officers & Police Benevolent Assn.	504	511
12	Patrick J. Lynch New York City Patrolmen's		
13	Benevolent Association	524	530
14	Steve Drake NYSDOCCS		
	Paul Rigby NYSDOCCS		
	Nikki Brate Vice President		
	NYS Public Employees Federation (PEF)	561	579
18			
19	Executive Director		
20	Art Cody Legal Director, Veterans		
21 22	Defense Programs NYS Defenders Association	611	
22	Mark Williams President-Elect		
23	Chief Defenders Association of New York State	620	625

1 2016-2017 Executive Budget Public Protection 2 2-4-16 3 LIST OF SPEAKERS, Cont. 4 STATEMENT QUESTIONS 5 Patrick Cullen President 6 New York State Supreme Court Officers Association 634 7 Pamela Browne 8 President New York State County 9 Clerks Association 643 10 Billy Imandt President 11 Court Officers Benevolent Assn. of Nassau County 651 12 William Dobbins 13 President Suffolk County Court 664 14 Employees Association 15 Colonel Jack Ozer New York Wing of the 16 Civil Air Patrol 672 17 Charlotte Carter Executive Director 18 NYS Dispute Resolution Assn. -and-19 Julie Loesch Director 20 Center for Resolution and Justice 676 21 Child & Family Services 22 Connie Neal Executive Director 23 NYS Coalition Against Domestic Violence 681 688 24

1 2016-2017 Executive Budget Public Protection 2 2-4-16 3 LIST OF SPEAKERS, Cont. 4 STATEMENT QUESTIONS 5 Soffiyah Elijah Executive Director 6 Correctional Association of New York 690 696 7 Karen L. Murtagh 8 Executive Director Thomas Curran 9 Board Member Prisoners' Legal Services 10 of New York 700 11 Page Pierce Executive Director 707 12 Families Together in NYS 13 Terry O'Neill Director 14 The Constantine Institute 714 15 Anne Erickson President and CEO 16 Empire Justice Center 720 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

1	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Good morning.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Good morning.
3	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Could we have some
4	order, please.
5	Welcome to the Joint Legislative
6	Budget Hearing on Public Protection. I'm
7	Senator Catharine Young, chair of the Senate
8	Finance Committee.
9	Pursuant to the State Constitution and
10	Legislative Law, the fiscal committees of the
11	State Legislature are authorized to hold
12	hearings on the Executive Budget proposal.
13	Today's hearing will be limited to a
14	discussion on the Governor's proposed budget
15	for public protection.
16	Following each presentation, there
17	will be some time allowed for questions from
18	the chairs of the fiscal committees and other
19	legislators.
20	I would like to welcome Judge Lawrence
21	K. Marks, chief administrative judge of the
22	Office of Court Administration; John P.
23	Melville, executive deputy commissioner of
24	the Division of Homeland Security and

1 Emergency Services; Michael C. Green, 2 executive deputy commissioner of the Division 3 of Criminal Justice Services; Anthony J. Annucci, acting commissioner of the 4 5 Department of Corrections and Community Supervision; Joseph A. D'Amico, 6 7 Superintendent of the Division of State Police; and Margaret Miller, director and 8 chief information officer of the Office of 9 10 Information Technology Services. 11 At this time I would like to begin 12 with testimony of Judge Lawrence K. Marks, chief administrative judge of the Office of 13 14 Court Administration. 15 Welcome, and good morning. 16 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Good morning. Good morning. Thank you. 17 18 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Before we begin, 19 though, Assemblyman Farrell, who keeps me in line, reminded me that we need to introduce 20 our members. So if you'd hold on one second. 21 I'd like to introduce Senator Liz 22 Krueger, who is ranking member of the Senate 23 24 Finance Committee; Senator Michael Nozzolio,

1 who is chair of the Senate Codes Committee; 2 Senator Patrick Gallivan, who is chair of the Crime and Corrections Committee; Senator Fred 3 4 Akshar; Senator Rich Funke; Senator Joe 5 Addabbo; Senator John Bonacic; Senator Diane Savino; and Senator Marty Golden. 6 7 Assemblyman? CHAIRMAN FARRELL: We've been joined 8 by Assemblywoman -- and chair -- Weinstein, 9 10 Assemblyman Lentol, Assemblyman O'Donnell, and Assemblywoman Peoples-Stokes. 11 12 We also have Mr. Oaks, who will give us his names. 13 14 ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you, 15 Chairman. We've been joined also by Assemblyman 16 Giglio, Assemblyman Montesano, Assemblyman 17 18 Graf, and Assemblywoman Malliotakis. 19 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Good morning. 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Good morning. 21 So, Judge, we do welcome you once 22 again, and we're ready for your testimony. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 23 24 Okay, thank you very much. I'm Lawrence

1 Marks. I'm the chief administrative judge of 2 the courts. And thank you so much for the 3 opportunity to speak to you today about the 4 Unified Court System's budget request. And 5 I'd just like to take 10 minutes, if I may, to lay out the key issues in our budget 6 7 request. And then of course I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have. 8

But just before I do that, I'd like to 9 10 make note of our new chief judge, Janet DiFiore, just confirmed by the Senate two 11 12 weeks ago. Everyone in the court system is excited about Judge DiFiore assuming the 13 14 leadership of the Judiciary. The Governor 15 certainly made a terrific decision in 16 nominating her. And on behalf of her and the entire court system, I want to say that we 17 18 very much look forward to continuing to work 19 closely and cooperatively with the 20 Legislature in the coming years.

21 So turning to our budget request, I 22 would start by providing some brief context. 23 In fiscal year 2009-2010, the General Fund 24 state operations portion of the court

1

system's budget was approximately

2 \$1.78 billion. Today, six years later, that 3 amount is approximately \$1.85 billion, an increase of only \$64 million, or 3.5 percent, 4 5 which averages out to about six-tenths of 1 percent of an increase each year over that 6 7 six-year period. Yet during that same period of time, 8 9 the Judiciary has absorbed nearly 10 \$400 million in higher costs. These higher 11 costs include mandated employee salary 12 increases, increased contractual expenses, 13 funding for indigent criminal defense to meet 14 statutory caseload standards, and funding for 15 civil legal services. 16 And because our budget is overwhelmingly -- roughly 90 percent --17 18 salaries and fringe benefits, we've managed to do this -- that is, absorb increased costs 19 20 that have been far higher than the very 21 minimal increases in our budget 22 allocations -- we've been able to do this

23 primarily by decreasing our employment

24 levels. Indeed, the number of nonjudicial

employees in the court system has decreased by about 2,000 since 2009, which is a 12 percent reduction in our workforce. That means we have fewer court officers, fewer court clerks, court reporters, court interpreters, court attorneys, back-office staff, and so on.

And although we've worked tirelessly 8 9 to try to minimize the impact of this through 10 innovation and streamlining -- and in our budget submission we highlight steps we've 11 12 taken in that regard -- those efforts have 13 been only partially successful. Without 14 question, we, and more importantly the 15 public, are still suffering consequences from 16 our reduced staffing levels. These consequences include delays on some days in 17 18 opening courtroom parts, delays in entering 19 judgments in the clerk's offices, lines to 20 get into courthouses, lines in the clerk's 21 offices, just to name a few of these 22 consequences.

23 So given that context, this year we 24 are asking for an increase in our budget.

And while you've helped us with additional
 budgetary support in the last two years, this
 year our situation is a little more
 complicated. And I want to take a moment to
 explain that to you.

As I think you know, under the State 6 7 Constitution the Judiciary is required to 8 submit its proposed budget to the Governor on the December 1st preceding the upcoming 9 10 fiscal year. But this year, as we were 11 preparing our budget request, and when we 12 submitted it to the Governor on December 1, 13 the commission on Legislative, Judicial and 14 Executive Compensation had not yet issued its 15 findings and determinations with regard to 16 judicial salary increases.

17 Under the statute creating the Salary 18 Commission, the commission's findings and 19 determinations as to judicial salaries were 20 not due until the end of December. So by the 21 time we were required by law to submit our 22 proposed budget to the Governor, we had no idea what the Salary Commission would be 23 24 doing with regard to judicial salaries. We

were certainly hopeful that the commission would be voting for a judicial salary increase, but we had no idea what the salary levels would be, and therefore we had no idea how much they would cost.

6 Consequently, what we did was note in 7 our budget request that we were awaiting the 8 Salary Commission's determinations and that 9 we might well be seeking additional funding 10 to pay for judicial salary increases, 11 depending on what the Salary Commission ended 12 up doing.

As it happened, later that month in 13 December, the Salary Commission issued its 14 15 report, which called for phased-in salary 16 increases for New York judges, using the Federal District Court judge salary as a 17 18 benchmark, and providing for the largest 19 portion of the phase-in to take effect this 20 April 1st.

Now, I'm not planning on going into
the details of the Salary Commission's
findings now in my prepared remarks, but I'll
certainly answer any questions that you may

have about that this morning. What I will, say, however, is that we are extremely pleased with what the commission did, and I would note that its findings and determinations were fully supported by the Legislature's two representatives on the commission.

By using the federal salary as the 8 benchmark, the Commission followed the 9 10 precedent that was set by the last commission 11 in 2011, which in turn was the precedent the 12 Legislature itself had used throughout much 13 of the history of judicial salaries before the commission process was enacted. Indeed, 14 15 this commission has finally and essentially 16 resolved what has been a decades-long, haphazard, inadequate and frankly unfair 17 process for setting judicial salaries. 18 19 So we're extremely grateful for the 20 commission's findings, and for the support of

21 the Legislature's representatives on the 22 commission, and through them, we are 23 extremely grateful to you for those findings. 24 The problem, though -- and this is the

1 main issue I want to talk to you about and 2 highlight for you this morning -- is that the 3 cost of the first year of the phase-in of the judicial salary increase, beginning on 4 5 April 1st of this year, is \$27 million. That's a cost we were not able to budget for 6 7 when we submitted our proposed budget to the Governor on December 1st, for the reasons 8 that I've explained. Our budget request 9 10 submitted on December 1st sought a 2.4 11 percent increase in our General Funds 12 operating budget, which is an increase of \$44.4 million. An increase is necessary 13 14 because we are again facing significant cost 15 increases, which include mandatory salary 16 increases for court employees, increases in contractual obligations, such as our 17 18 contracts with local governments to provide courthouse security in certain portions of 19 20 the state, annualization of the cost of the 21 five Family Court judgeships that the Legislature created effective January 1, 22 2016, and additional funding for civil legal 23 24 services.

1 But because of the additional cost of 2 judicial salary increases, a cost we could 3 not estimate when we submitted our budget request on December 1st, we now must seek 4 5 additional funding to meet that cost. What we are proposing to you, and what we are 6 7 respectfully urging you to support, is an additional \$19.6 million to help pay for this 8 increased cost. We are proposing that we 9 10 apply the four-tenths of 1 percent part of 11 the 2.4 percent increase we requested in our 12 December 1 submission -- and the four-tenths 13 of 1 percent part of that is about \$7.4 14 million. We're proposing applying that 15 toward the cost of the judicial salary 16 increase, and then we also proposing that the Legislature add to our budget the remaining 17 \$19.6 million of the full cost. That would 18 19 pay for the cost of judicial salary increases 20 in the upcoming fiscal year, and it would 21 leave the courts with an increase of 22 2 percent -- which is the Governor's target, as we know -- or \$37 million in our operating 23 24 budget to cover our increased expenses,

including the mandated court employee salary
 increases, increased contractual expenses,
 and additional funding for civil legal
 services.

5 We firmly believe that what we are seeking is fair and reasonable. The newly 6 7 arising cost of the judicial salary increase has resulted from a statutory process that 8 was designed to inject fairness, objectivity, 9 10 and transparency into the method for determining judicial salaries. That 11 12 statutory process worked, and the Salary Commission's determinations were fully 13 14 supported by the Legislature's two 15 representatives on the commission.

16 We respectfully submit that the fair thing to do now is to provide the funding to 17 18 implement those results. Without that 19 funding, it will be increasingly difficult to 20 replace employees when they leave the court 21 system, further decreasing our employment 22 level and resulting in the consequences that will entail. With that funding, the 23 24 Judiciary will be able to furnish the quality

1	of service that we need to provide to the
2	people of this state, a quality of service
3	that we all agree the public fully deserves.
4	Thank you very much, and I'd be happy
5	to answer any questions.
6	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Chief
7	Administrative Judge Marks.
8	We have been joined by Senator Gustavo
9	Rivera.
10	And our first speaker will be Senator
11	John Bonacic, who is chair of the Senate
12	Judiciary Committee.
13	SENATOR BONACIC: Good morning,
14	Your Honor.
15	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
16	Good morning.
17	SENATOR BONACIC: It's good to see
18	you.
19	Before I ask you some questions, I
20	just would like to say that I always enjoy
21	working with my counterpart, Helene
22	Weinstein, who chairs the Judiciary in the
23	Assembly. We've been having discussions how
24	to work through this Judiciary Budget to try

1 to be fair to all concerned. Your budget, I think, for court 2 administration is between 2.8 and 2.9 3 billion; would I be correct? 4 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 5 That's correct. 6 7 SENATOR BONACIC: Okay. Now, we have a concern, what we see happening in the court 8 system. As you pointed out, a lack of 9 10 staffing, shorter hours. 11 We now see the Hurrell-Harring case, 12 which basically stated that there's not enough district attorneys for first 13 14 appearance for defendants in criminal 15 actions. So for five counties that brought a 16 lawsuit, monies were given to those five counties. So there's a need for more monies 17 18 for criminal representation for mainly upstate. That's another developing future 19 20 cost on the court system. 21 As, you know, you explained, it 22 appears to me that the priorities are to take care of the judicial salaries, which we're 23 24 all supportive of. We think the judges are

deserving of raises. You're struggling with 1 2 the 2 percent cap, how to live with all of 3 this, with a judicial court system with access to justice that is deteriorating 4 5 rather than getting stronger. So when I look at your budget, one of 6 7 the priorities, in addition to the raises, is civil services. Now, that item has jumped 8 from \$70 million to \$85 million this year. 9 So that's free legal services for civilian 10 actions. Civil service; right? As opposed 11 12 to criminal. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 13 Civil cases. 14 15 SENATOR BONACIC: Right. So 16 middle-class families have to pay for legal fees, but there's a movement to have the poor 17 have free legal services. I just point that 18 19 out. 20 I think for this year, that's a wrong 21 priority. I think that part of the budget 22 should be no gain, because last year they got a \$15 million bump, they're up to \$70 million 23 24 now for free legal services for civil

1 actions. And you now want to take it to 85. 2 There's \$15 million. If you kept that level, 3 you would help reach your other priorities of 4 making the court system stronger and/or 5 helping to support the raises. So I throw 6 that out to you. 7 I haven't asked you a question yet. I have not asked you a question. 8 9 (Laughter.) 10 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I'm 11 waiting for the question. 12 SENATOR BONACIC: Right. But things 13 like CASA and the dispute resolution, I think 14 these are very worthwhile services. A lot of 15 them are on a volunteer basis. They help 16 children and families in preventive action before it even gets to the courts. They help 17 18 relieve court congestion. We did the divorce law amendments this 19 past year; that's supposed to clean up 20 21 94 percent of matrimonial actions with court congestion. So we're trying. 22 So I would say to you that those two 23 24 volunteer programs are very helpful. You

1 should look to see what you can do there. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: And 2 3 we are continuing, proposing to continue the funding for those programs in this budget. 4 5 SENATOR BONACIC: So now I'm going to come to the \$64,000 -- more than the \$64,000 6 7 question. If the Governor is insisting on the 8 9 2 percent cap, have you given any thought to 10 how you're going to reconcile making the court stronger, doing the judicial raises, 11 12 and what has to be saved and what has to be 13 cut? 14 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 Well, so you're asking if we don't get 16 additional money and we had to stay within the 2 percent, how would we cope with that? 17 SENATOR BONACIC: Which the Governor's 18 19 kind of indicating that's where he wants to 20 go. I'm not speaking for the Governor, but I just --21 22 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: No, 23 if you read his commentary on our budget 24 submission, that is what he said, that's

1 right.

SENATOR BONACIC: Yes. 2 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 3 So 4 I'll answer that. But let me -- if I could, 5 let me just respond to your comments about 6 civil legal services. 7 SENATOR BONACIC: Could you speak into the mic a little? 8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 9 10 Sure. I was saying if -- and I'll answer 11 your question, but if I may just initially, 12 if I could respond to your question about --13 SENATOR BONACIC: Sure. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: --14 15 your comments about civil legal services. 16 Look, this is a critically important program. I mean, everyone here on this 17 18 panel, every member of the Legislature should 19 really support money for civil legal 20 services. 21 Our program, money goes to every 22 single county in the state, all 62 counties. This is not a New York City program, it's not 23 24 an upstate program, it's a statewide program.

1 And every legislative district in this state 2 has -- every one of you has constituents that 3 benefit from this money. You know, as you all know, there's a legal right in a criminal 4 5 case, if you can't afford an attorney, one will be provided for you free of charge. 6 7 There's no such right, generally speaking, in civil cases. 8

And this is money that goes to provide 9 10 lawyers, again, in every county in this state -- people who are facing potential 11 12 eviction, people who are facing potential foreclosure, victims of domestic violence in 13 14 Family Court proceedings, veterans seeking 15 disability payments. This is money that is 16 very well spent. There have been studies done by economists that have concluded that 17 18 for every dollar spent on civil legal 19 services, government can save as much as \$6. 20 And that's because if someone is evicted or 21 their house is foreclosed on or they don't receive federal benefits, that leads to 22 further problems and further costs imposed on 23 24 government. This is a critically important

program that I really can't emphasize enough
 that everyone here should really be
 supporting.

And this last \$15 million that we're 4 5 seeking in this budget is the last installment in a plan that was announced five 6 7 years ago, five, six years ago, where each year -- and by the way, each year in years 8 that were fiscally much weaker than this 9 10 particular year, where the state economy is relatively strong now -- the Legislature 11 12 provided money for each of the last four or five years. And this would be the last 13 14 installment that would get us to 15 \$100 million, which will meet the goal that we set for funding civil legal services. 16 So again, I really can't emphasize 17 enough how this is a program that benefits 18 19 people throughout the state in all 20 62 counties. And I would urge that you 21 support the additional funding that we're 22 seeking for civil legal services. Having said that, in the doomsday 23

24 scenario where we don't get any additional

1 money -- and this is to answer your question, 2 Senator Bonacic, what would we do. Well, you 3 know, we don't have a lot of choices in the Judiciary budget, since we're roughly 4 5 90 percent salaries and fringe benefits. We don't have a capital budget, we don't have --6 7 other than civil legal services, we don't have a whole lot of programs that we could 8 cut. We're primarily people, and that's what 9 10 makes up the vast percentage of our budget.

So if we had to absorb the full cost 11 12 of this judicial salary increase, the 13 \$27 million, you know, we would have to look 14 at attrition, not replacing people when they 15 leave the court system. Which is how we 16 managed far more difficult budgets going back 17 to 2011, where we sustained a massive budget 18 cut that year which resulted in layoffs that 19 year because the budget cut was so extreme. 20 And that was followed by two years of flat 21 budgets. And the way we managed that --22 because every year our costs go up, they don't go down. Costs go up. 23

24 So the way we managed that those years

1 was through attrition. When people left, we 2 didn't replace them. We had a strict hiring freeze. So if we were not successful in 3 getting this additional money, we would 4 5 inevitably have to look at attrition, not replacing people when they leave, and we 6 7 would have to look at the civil legal services money as well, as you've suggested. 8 SENATOR BONACIC: Thank you. 9 10 My only point is the Legislature has been supportive of monies for civil legal 11 12 services. But times change. And it's a 13 question of priorities this year. And we're 14 suggesting to you that maybe judicial 15 salaries are more important than that area. 16 But I would certainly never like to hear you say that you're going to cut more personnel 17 from the Judiciary Budget for the 18 19 administration of the courts, which are now 20 not up to par where they should be, in terms 21 of the hours, the staffing. That would be 22 really not a good thing to do. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 23 Ι

24 agree with you. We would be loath to do

1 that. We're 2,000 employees fewer, as I 2 mentioned in my remarks, than we were in 3 2009. And that absolutely has consequences on the operation of the courts. And the last 4 5 few years we have finally been able to kind of get our heads above water and replace 6 7 people when they leave and maybe even slightly increase our employment level. 8 But again, it's the last thing we 9 10 would want to do, is to go back to the scenario of a few years ago where we were 11 12 bleeding people and, you know, when they left 13 that we couldn't replace them. 14 Please don't misunderstand me. I'm 15 not suggesting that we would favor further 16 reducing our employment level. It's the last thing we would want to do. But in the end, 17 18 because our budget is overwhelmingly, you 19 know, 90 percent salaries and fringe 20 benefits, when we don't have sufficient 21 money, that's really where we look. And we have no choice. 22

23 SENATOR BONACIC: My only last comment24 is I believe that there's \$15 million there

1 in civil services that you should not give 2 this year to make sure that the judges get 3 their raises, which we all think they're 4 entitled to. 5 And I thank you very much, Your Honor, for coming today. 6 7 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Thank you. 8 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator 9 10 Bonacic. We've been joined by senator Thomas 11 12 Croci, chair of the Veterans, Homeland 13 Security, and Military Affairs Committee, and 14 also Senator Leroy Comrie. Chairman Farrell. 15 16 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Yes. Mr. Oaks. ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Yes, we've been 17 18 also been joined by Assemblyman Saladino. 19 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Next to question, 20 Chairperson Weinstein. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: Thank you, 22 Mr. Chairman. Judge Marks, it's a pleasure to see 23 24 you here today. And as Senator Bonacic said,

1 we work closely together. But in relation to 2 the civil legal services, it's a point where 3 we diverge in terms of this increase. And I just wanted to continue that 4 5 discussion a little bit more. I looked at the task force, permanent commission's last 6 7 report, and I just want to make sure that I 8 read correctly that, based on the commission's finding, that New York State 9 10 realized \$260 million in taxpayer savings in 11 the form of reduced emergency shelter costs 12 alone as a result of legal services. 13 So that was one of their findings? 14 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 That's correct. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: And that the 16 overall -- the finding that the overall 17 18 investment in civil legal services has 19 resulted in an overall economic benefit to 20 New York State of \$2.4 billion through 2014? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 21 22 Yeah, that's -- I think that's correct. And that goes to the point that I made a moment 23 24 ago that investing in civil legal services in

1 the end can save state and local government, 2 you know, significant amounts of money. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: 3 So if we were to cut out of the Judiciary Budget the 4 5 \$15 million for civil legal services and dedicate it to a different purpose, as my 6 7 colleague suggests, it would actually cost 8 New York State money in this next year going forward? 9 10 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Yes. There have been studies by economists 11 that have suggested that, that if -- that 12 13 expenditures on civil legal services is 14 cost-effective. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: And could 15 16 you just maybe go into a tiny bit more detail as to how the funding that's in the Judiciary 17 18 Budget for civil legal services is allocated around the state, and perhaps restate some of 19 20 the services, the kinds of populations that 21 benefit from civil legal services? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 22 23 Yeah, the money is divided up based on a 24 formula, 200 percent -- each county's

population that's less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level -- the formula is based on that. So it's equally divided to the state's 62 counties based on that formula.

And the money goes to really kind of 6 7 the essentials of life. People who find themselves in court without a lawyer, or who 8 would otherwise find themselves in court 9 10 without a lawyer -- in landlord-tenant 11 proceedings, so facing eviction; in 12 foreclosure proceedings, where people are facing the potential loss of their home. 13 14 Victims of domestic violence in family 15 offense proceedings in the Family Court 16 receive lawyers under this program.

I mentioned veterans are a significant
component of the people who benefit from
these services. Veterans who may be facing
eviction, facing foreclosure, seeking
disability benefits.

And so those are some of the examples of the types of people who benefit from this program in every county in the state.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: And I was 1 2 just wondering, from the court's perspective, 3 how do unrepresented litigants impact the functioning of the courts, people who come in 4 5 without an attorney? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 6 7 It's -- actually, I can speak personally for this, because I sit -- in addition to my 8 administrative responsibilities, I sit in 9 10 Supreme Court. And I can tell you, from the court's perspective and the judge's 11 12 perspective, when someone comes in without a 13 lawyer, it's just a -- it's a night-and-day 14 situation.

15 You know, it's very difficult for the 16 judge because judges ethically can't advise litigants on the law. The court staff can't 17 do that. You know, people are basically on 18 19 their own. It's not an equal playing field, 20 obviously, when that happens. It's not -- I 21 mean, my own view, which I know is shared by 22 the new chief judge, is that a justice system just doesn't make sense when you have 23 24 hundreds of thousands of people coming into

court without a lawyer, their opponents often 1 2 represented by lawyers. It's just -- it's 3 not a justice system, you know, that we could all be proud of, you know, when that's as 4 5 serious a problem as it has been in New York. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: And beyond 6 7 just the impact on the individual litigant who's unrepresented, does it also impact the 8 courts? Are there additional delays? You 9 10 mentioned the court staff that are asked questions. Does it actually increase costs 11 12 to the court system and use up resources that 13 would not be needed if those litigants were 14 represented? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 16 Yeah. I mean, I would say that cases in which litigants are self-represented become 17 more labor-intensive for the court -- for the 18 19 judge, for the judge's staff, for the clerk's 20 office, for the court personnel. 21 So yes, I would agree with that very 22 much. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: And to go to 23 24 the defense side, I know and I agree with my

1 colleague that there is a need for increased 2 services for indigent defendants, 3 particularly in first appearances that go 4 beyond the Hurrell decision. And I 5 understand that the Indigent Legal Services Board has asked for increased resources to be 6 7 able to address those needs. And I think that that is something obviously that 8 personally I would support, and I think other 9 10 members also. Can I just -- I just want to ask you a 11 12 question about the staffing. You mentioned that there's been a reduction of 2,000 13 14 nonjudicial employees, and I think you 15 mentioned it was 12 percent; is that correct? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 16 Since 2009, that was the high level mark for 17 us, we have 2,000 fewer employees since that 18 19 year. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: And I 20 21 probably should know the answer, but perhaps 22 do you know how that compares to state agencies? 23 24 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: The 1 executive branch?

2	For us, it's a 12 percent decrease in
3	the court system, the roughly 2,000 fewer
4	employees. In the executive branch,
5	depending on how you define the executive
6	branch but if you include CUNY and SUNY,
7	the executive branch employment level since
8	2009 has dropped between 8 and 8.5 percent.
9	So our employment level has declined
10	more than the executive branch.
11	ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEINSTEIN: Thank you.
12	Thank you on that. And I think for the
13	moment that's all the questions,
14	Mr. Chairman.
15	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very
16	much.
17	Our next speaker is Senator Michael
18	Nozzolio, who is chair of the Codes
19	Committee.
20	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you,
21	Chairwoman Young.
22	Good morning, Judge Marks.
23	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
24	Good morning.

1	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: We're used to
2	seeing Judge Prudenti in that chair. I don't
3	see much of a resemblance
4	(Laughter.)
5	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: at least in
6	outward appearances. But she certainly
7	there's big shoes to fill, and I wish you all
8	the luck in this endeavor.
9	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
10	Thank you.
11	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I want to follow up
12	on the questioning that's already occurred.
13	Senator Bonacic and I have discussed this
14	issue a number of times over the last few
15	weeks.
16	One of the things about Judge Prudenti
17	is that she always looked for creative ways
18	to solve problems, that in large part because
19	of the creativity she exhibited, the CASA
20	program was revived when budgetary axes had
21	to fall. And Senator Bonacic, myself and
22	others worked very closely with her to
23	restore that program.
24	I share your admiration for civil

legal services. I think it's a great
 program. I probably, in the course of my
 service, have had many more requests for
 legal assistance through the Assembly and
 Senate offices that I served in than you as a
 judge would have ever had. Literally
 hundreds of people have asked.

We supported, I have supported, 8 through special grants, civil legal services 9 10 in the Finger Lakes region. I understand its importance. However, Senator Bonacic, I 11 12 think, stated it very clearly. We believe 13 we're your partner in the Legislature as we 14 try to tackle these budget challenges. The 15 Judicial Pay Commission was a commission 16 established by the Legislature because we believed there was a need to have judicial 17 salaries increased. And we look to be a 18 19 partner with you in the court system in 20 meeting the obligations established by the 21 commission. That's public policy. We need to do that. 22

At the same token, a major increase inthe budget from one year to the next,

1 21 percent, for albeit a very noble program, 2 just is not appropriate for this period of 3 time. And that we look to see you develop the creativity that we know you are likely to 4 5 have in solving this problem. And certainly we understand the time 6 7 frame, we understand the budgetary restrictions. I think logically, though, to 8 say it saves money for the state -- yes, it 9 10 does, but if that was the case, then we should raise civil legal services to 11 12 \$100 million, we should increase the budget 13 by 75 percent, 100 percent. Because if we're 14 going to have such a great savings, obviously 15 more would be helpful. 16 But that's not the reality. And it's not a dollar-for-dollar savings. 17 18 I want to hear from you, in your 19 capacity as leader of the court system, what 20 types of creative solutions are here. Judge 21 Lippman spent a lot of time discussing pro 22 bono work, established requirements for pro bono services for attorneys to be admitted, 23 24 for attorneys to continue in other services.

1 To achieve the objectives that this 2 body shares in supporting legal services, 3 yes, an increase could be appropriate. Yes, we need to be partners with you on the salary 4 5 increases that judges are receiving. But what are you doing to make civil legal 6 7 services more effective, efficient and cost-effective for the taxpayer? 8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 9 10 Well, I think your points are well taken, particularly about Judge Prudenti, who was 11 12 very creative, and had to be, when she served 13 as chief administrative judge through some 14 very difficult years. 15 And hopefully things have gotten 16 better. But, you know, I understand necessity can be the mother of invention. 17 And when you're really pressed, you're forced 18 19 to be creative. And I can promise you that I'll do that as well. I mean, I'll continue 20 that trend. 21 22 But, you know, in the end we -- our budget situation has been so challenging, you 23 24 know, for so many years at this point. I

1

mean, we started back in 2011 with a

2 \$170 million budget cut. That was followed 3 by a flat budget the following year. And of 4 course a flat budget is really a negative 5 budget because costs go up, they don't go 6 down.

7 The year after that was another flat 8 budget. And the last two years we've received, you know, very modest increases in 9 10 the range of 2 percent -- which we greatly appreciate, and I'm not being ungrateful 11 12 about that in the least, don't misunderstand 13 me. But at some point where costs have been 14 going up and up and up, which is what they 15 do, you can be creative only so much. And, 16 you know, you run out of ideas at some point.

17 So I can't sit here today and tell you 18 about all the creative ideas that are in my 19 head as to how we'll deal with this if we 20 don't get additional money, because I'm very 21 much hoping that we get additional money. 22 I'm hoping that we can get your support about 23 that.

24

But in the end, frankly, if we don't,

1 we'll have to prepare for that eventuality 2 because that's certainly a possibility. And, 3 you know, we will find a way to manage this 4 in one way or the other. The courts will 5 remain open. I'm not suggesting in any way at all that we won't continue to keep 6 7 courthouses open and we won't be providing justice to the people of this state. But 8 we're going to have to be very, very 9 10 creative, I agree with you. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And again, we are 11 12 not trying to shirk the responsibilities of 13 the Legislature one bit. We believe strongly 14 that the issues of judicial salary increases 15 have to be met, can't totally be absorbed 16 within the traditional court budget, judicial budget. 17 But we look to these other 18 19 expenditures as -- so expect you'll have 20 advocates to help in that endeavor, but we 21 want you to also find ways to help the 22 taxpayers who are paying for these bills, to find creative ways to stretch, to cut, and to 23 24 provide the services in less costly ways.

1 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: And 2 I appreciate that. And I agree with you. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you. 3 And thank you, Madam Chairman. 4 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. But we've been joined by Senator Phil 6 7 Boyle and Senator Daniel Squadron. CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Mr. Montesano. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN MONTESANO: Thank you, 9 10 Mr. Chairman. 11 Good morning, Judge. 12 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Good morning. 13 14 ASSEMBLYMAN MONTESANO: Judge, in your 15 response to the different questions, and in comments you made, you know, what I'm 16 concerned about is -- and I'll address the 17 18 indigent legal services in a moment, for the 19 civil part. 20 But, you know, as a practicing 21 attorney, I get into the courts quite a bit in Nassau County, and I can't begin to tell 22 you the decimation of our court system in 23 24 Nassau County over the last several years.

1 In our surrogate's court alone, we lost 2 approximately 35 operational staff, which resulted in limited cashier hours, limited 3 record room access. And some of those things 4 5 have cured a little bit down the line. In our Supreme Court, many parts are 6 7 down on a daily basis because there's no court officers or clerks to staff them. So 8 while we give this free indigent legal 9 10 services in the civil parts, it's all well 11 and good when the litigant comes in with the 12 free attorney, but there's no courtroom to 13 appear in. 14 We have one clerk covering three 15 parts. So they run from one courtroom to the 16 next, or they're handling three calendars at the same time. 17 18 So when you indicated that a lot of 19 these costs that OCA is incurring over the 20 last several years has to do with personnel 21 and salaries, when many of the -- and I'm not 22 going to put myself in the middle of the contract negotiations. But many of those 23 24 unions that you're talking about, the court

1 officers and clerks specifically, they've 2 gotten zero contracts over the last several years. So I don't understand where there's 3 4 an increase in salaries, because they haven't 5 gotten anything. So -- yet there's a \$15 million bump 6 7 in the free civil legal services. So I'd 8 like to get an idea from you what's driven that uptick --9 10 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I'm sorry, which what? 11 12 ASSEMBLYMAN MONTESANO: What is driving the uptick in the civil legal 13 14 services to warrant another \$15 million? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 16 Well, just -- we don't have a contract with the Nassau court employees union, that's 17 correct. Unfortunately, we don't. We would 18 19 like to have a contract with them. We have 20 12 labor unions in the court system, and at the moment we have contracts with eight of 21 the 12. 22 23 So with respect to the employees in 24 those unions, they've received salary

increases, modest salary increases over the
 last couple of years. And that's the reason
 for our increasing salary costs. It's the - we have contracts with two-thirds of our
 unions, but not in Nassau, unfortunately.
 And hopefully we will reach agreement with
 them shortly.

8 But the -- yes, you know, what you're 9 describing in the courts in Nassau, there 10 have been consequences of our reduced 11 staffing levels. And I'm sure you've 12 accurately described some of those, you know, 13 based on your firsthand experience.

14 And, you know, that's my concern, is 15 that we -- and I think there have been 16 improvements over the last year or two. And I very much want to be able to continue that 17 18 trend and be able to improve from year to 19 year. Which is why I'm very much arguing 20 for, asking you and pleading with you to 21 provide this additional money that I firmly 22 believe we need to continue improvement and to mitigate some of the problems that you're 23 24 describing in the courts in Nassau County,

1 for example.

2	ASSEMBLYMAN MONTESANO: And, Judge,
3	just to go in a different direction for a
4	second.
5	The bail system, I know that a process
6	has been instituted I think it started in
7	the city that when bail is set on a
8	defendant, it can go to another judge of the
9	same court who's going to review the judge's
10	bail. Now, it just seems odd to me that a
11	judge of the same jurisdiction and the same
12	court is acting as an appellate review of a
13	judge's bail.
14	Legally, how did that come about?
15	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Let
16	me explain it to you. It's just in New York
17	City, by the way, not in your district.
18	There's a review if it's requested
19	by the defendant or the defense counsel,
20	there's a review, not to a judge of the same
21	jurisdiction, but to a judge in the Supreme
22	Court. And this is for misdemeanor cases
23	only, only the low-level offense. And it's
24	perfectly authorized under the law. It's

1 Section 530.30 of the Criminal Procedure Law, 2 if you take a look at it, gives the Supreme 3 Court the authority, upon an application by the defendant, to review bail that was set by 4 5 the lower court judge. So it was based on 6 that statutory authority. 7 ASSEMBLYMAN MONTESANO: Thank you, 8 Judge. And just a last follow-up on my 9 10 question before, can you give us just a quick overview of the justification for the 11 12 \$15 million increase on the indigent legal 13 fund? What's driven that uptick and that 14 cost over the last year? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 The 16 justification for it is it's the last installment of a five-, six-year plan to 17 18 reach \$100 million for civil legal services 19 in this state. Which, by the way, doesn't 20 solve the problem of the justice gap. There 21 will still be multitudes of people who do not 22 have lawyers and won't have lawyers. But because of this money, for example, in this 23 24 fiscal year there will be over 450,000 people

1 who have lawyers because of the money that 2 we're providing. 3 And this would be the very last 4 installment that will fulfill the goal that 5 was set five, six years ago to reach 6 \$100 million for civil legal services. 7 And we were able to add money to it in more difficult budget years, more difficult 8 fiscal years than this year. So we feel that 9 10 it's very important, it benefits hundreds of thousands of people who need help throughout 11 12 the state. It levels the playing field in the courts, and we feel it's very important. 13 14 And that's why we're urging the Legislature 15 to provide that funding. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN MONTESANO: Thank you, Judge. Thank you, Chairman. 17 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 18 19 Assemblyman. 20 Our next speaker is Senator Diane 21 Savino. 22 SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you, Senator 23 Young. 24 Good morning, Judge Marks.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:

2 Good morning.

1

3 SENATOR SAVINO: I'm happy to see in your testimony that you guys are actually 4 5 asking for more money. If you recall, at Judge DiFiore's nomination and her 6 7 confirmation on the Senate floor, I mentioned the fact that she's inheriting a court system 8 9 that is overburdened in many ways and has 10 suffered from a shortage of resources. In fact, Sunday's New York Times detailed the 11 12 long slog through the court system that it 13 took one particular young man who was 14 injured, and it took several months for cases to move that should have taken much less 15 time. So we know that our courts are 16 overburdened. 17 18 But I have a question. I know you've 19 had several collective bargaining units in the court system. Are all of them now 20 settled? Have you settled all their 21

22 contracts?

23 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: No.24 I was saying before we have 12 unions in the

1	court system. We have contracts with eight
2	of the 12, and we're eager to reach agreement
3	with the remaining four.
4	SENATOR SAVINO: Do you feel that the
5	proposed budget by the Governor is sufficient
6	to meet the financial settlements of those
7	contracts?
8	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: It
9	would be very difficult.
10	SENATOR SAVINO: It would be very
11	difficult.
12	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
13	Yes. Yes.
14	SENATOR SAVINO: And in addition,
15	there was a lawsuit brought against the
16	courts by the Court Officers Association that
17	triggered a hiring mandate. From what I
18	understand, there was supposed to be 350
19	court officers hired; 150 have been actually
20	accomplished, and there's another 200
21	outstanding. Is there sufficient money in
22	your budget to meet that additional hiring?
23	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
24	Well, court officers you know, we're down,

1 as I was saying before, 12 percent in our workforce since 2009. We have -- court 2 officers have been hit less hard. At least 3 when you look at it today, statewide we're 4 5 about 6.2 percent fewer court officers than we were in 2009, which is proportionally less 6 7 than some of the other titles. And in fact -- because, look, public safety, you 8 know, in the courts, there's really nothing 9 10 more important than that. SENATOR SAVINO: No doubt. 11 12 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 13 People who work in the courts, people who come into the courts have to be secure and 14 15 safe. And we would never compromise that. 16 In fact, we're starting a court officer class in our academy, which when we 17 hire court officers, they have to go through 18 the academy, obviously. There's a class of I 19 20 think it's 150 recruits starting later this 21 month. Once they are deployed in the courts 22 when they graduates from the academy, you know, later this year, we'll be down to maybe 23 24 only 3 percent or so less -- 3 percent fewer

1 court officers than we had in 2009.

2 So frankly, I'm less concerned about 3 the number of court officers. Although it's not perfect, and we do need more court 4 5 officers, particularly in some parts of the state. But I think we're in better shape 6 7 with regard to court officers than we are with some of the other titles. 8 SENATOR SAVINO: I'm glad to see you 9 feel that way. But again, there's certainly 10 a shortage of court officers, court clerks, 11 12 court stenographers, and basically

13 courtrooms.

I spoke previously about the problem 14 15 we have in Richmond County. You know, the 16 state created a separate judicial district for Staten Island, Richmond County, in 2007. 17 18 To date, we have yet to receive the seven judges that we're entitled to. We owe three 19 20 to Brooklyn. You know, we're entitled to 10 21 judges for the County of Richmond. We don't have them. We have a brand-new courthouse 22 that we outgrew already. 23

24 And this is not your problem. I'm

1 just saying this to make the point that while 2 the discussion today seems to be between 3 civil legal services and judges' salaries, I think it goes beyond that. We still have a 4 5 court system that is overburdened, under-resourced, regardless of how we decide 6 7 whether you should get civil legal services or whether judges should get a raise. 8

9 By the way, I think we should do both. 10 But I think we also need to increase funding 11 to the court system because we're not able 12 to, in my opinion, deliver what Judge DeFiore 13 says is most important to her, the speedy and 14 efficient administration of justice.

15 So I would just hope that while we 16 continue to listen to you today, people take into consideration it shouldn't be just civil 17 18 legal services versus judges' salaries, it's how do we appropriately fund a court system 19 20 so that we can meet that mandate of speedy 21 and efficient administration of justice. 22 Thank you, Judge Marks. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 23 24 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Lentol, 2 Chairman Lentol. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you, 4 Mr. Chairman. 5 And congratulations, Mr. Marks, for your ascendency to this very good position --6 7 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Thank you. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: -- chief 9 10 administrative judge. I guess I'm a little bit torn, because 11 12 I know that having appeared in court and 13 knowing judges like I do -- and even 14 legislators like I do -- that none of us 15 would like to see a wounded warrior not have 16 a lawyer in court at the expense of my not getting a raise or a judge not getting a 17 raise. I would not like to see a homeless 18 19 person who lost his home because of a bank 20 who foreclosed on him illegally. 21 And so I guess that I believe that, as 22 Diane Savino said, that we surely have to do both. But I certainly wouldn't advocate for 23 24 taking money away from legal services and

putting additional people out on the streets -- and, since we're going to be in Afghanistan for a while, not having legal representation for the veterans of the United States of America.

Actually, I wanted to ask you about 6 7 raising the age of criminal responsibility, because the chief judge, as you know, has 8 created an adolescent diversion court part in 9 10 the adult criminal court in nine counties dedicated exclusively to handling cases of 11 12 16-and-17-year-olds. And since the Governor has again talked about this in his State of 13 14 the State, and it's in his budget, might you 15 provide us with an update on the status and 16 operation of these new adolescent diversion court parts? 17

18 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 19 Well, they're continuing. This was a program 20 that was started by the prior chief judge, 21 Judge Lippman, at the same time that he 22 called for statutory reform, the Legislature 23 raising the age of criminal responsibility. 24 Which I think, as we all know, we're one of

1 only two states in the country that sets the 2 age of criminal responsibility at 16. And so the adolescent diversion court 3 parts were a complement to the legislative 4 5 proposal. The legislation is the ultimate solution. 6 7 But in the meantime, these are court parts that were set up -- I think we have 11 8 9 of them now throughout the state. They have 10 been successful. They're set up in 11 cooperation with the district attorneys in 12 those jurisdictions, who have been supportive. They're a limited solution to 13 14 the problem, I think it's fair to describe it 15 that way. They're mostly dealing with 16 misdemeanors. I think a few may deal with some -- a modest number of nonviolent 17 18 felonies. But they've been certainly 19 successful. We're continuing them. There's 20 been evaluations done, scholarly evaluations of the results of the adolescent diversion 21 22 parts, and they've been shown to reduce recidivism for the 16-and-17-year-olds 23 24 participating in the program.

1 So it's been a successful program, but 2 it's somewhat of a limited program. And we 3 feel and certainly the new chief judge feels that way, that the ultimate solution is to 4 5 statutorily raise the age of criminal 6 responsibility in New York. 7 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Now, both the 8 Assembly and the Executive proposals talk about a large amount of cases being shifted 9 10 from the criminal part to the Family Court. 11 And since we're talking about the lack of 12 resources for all the court system, I'm 13 wondering if you believe the necessary 14 resources are available to implement that. 15 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:

16 Yeah, the -- we've taken the position we could accommodate the -- there would be more 17 18 cases in Family Court. So there wouldn't be 19 more cases overall in the court system, there 20 would be a shift of some cases that are now 21 in the criminal courts to the Family Court. 22 And Family Court certainly has challenges --I'm not going to suggest otherwise -- but 23 24 Family Court does have 25 new judges. Thanks

1 to the support of the Legislature, we have 25 2 additional judges in Family Court around the 3 state. So the other thing is when Judge 4 5 Lippman --ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Has that helped, 6 7 the 25 additional Family Court judges? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 8 Absolutely. Yeah, it absolutely helps. We 9 10 are very happy that the Legislature approved that two years ago. 11 12 But the number of 16-and-17-year-olds who have been arrested, that number has 13 14 plummeted over the last half dozen years or so. It's a fraction of what it once was. 15 So there might be a need for some 16 additional resources in Family Court, but my 17 sense is that it would not be draconian. 18 So 19 it would be a problem that we would cope 20 with. And if the legislation passed, I think 21 under all the proposals -- I know this about 22 the Governor's proposal -- the effective date would not be for, you know, a year and a half 23 24 down the road, so there would be time to

1 prepare for it. There might be some modest 2 additional expense in costs for the court, but we feel -- and, you know, we've thought 3 about this a great deal over recent years --4 5 that we would be able to handle that. And -it would be a good problem to have, in other 6 7 words. You know, we view it that way. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you very 9 much. 10 SENATOR KRUEGER: Next is Senator Ruth Hassell-Thompson, ranker on Judiciary. We're 11 12 going to make a chair trade. 13 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you, 14 Madam Chair. 15 Good morning, Judge. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 16 17 Good morning. 18 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: I just have a couple of questions. I understand that 19 20 most of the questions that I had wanted to 21 pose have already been asked of you, so I won't be redundant. 22 23 But I would like to just ask, are you 24 committed to the bail reform process that was

1 begun by Chief Judge Lippman last year? And 2 how soon do you think, if you're committed, that that would roll out? 3 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 4 5 Well, the bail reform process has mostly been put in place. The new Chief Judge supports 6 7 it. We're going to continue that. We feel 8 that there are a number of people who are not a threat to anyone -- you know, people who 9 don't have a history of violence, who are 10 11 detained pending the outcome of the 12 disposition of their case simply because they can't afford to make bail. 13 14 There are a lot of alternatives that 15 we feel that judges could be using to avoid 16 that situation. We're trying to encourage judges -- in the end, it's a judge's 17 18 decision, an individual judge's discretion on whether to set bail or not and how much. 19 But 20 we are trying to be supportive of judges and 21 to provide them with sufficient resources and 22 alternative resources so that people -- look, 23 some people, you know, should be detained who 24 clearly are a threat to society, a threat of

committing further violence, but many people 1 2 are not. And they're sitting in jail 3 awaiting the disposition of their case simply because they don't have the means to make 4 5 bail, and that's a problem that we're trying address. 6 7 There's also a statutory solution which has been proposed, and I think we'll 8 pursue that as well. And I think that the 9 10 new Chief Judge will want to pursue that as well. 11 12 But this is a problem that we're 13 committed to addressing and committed to 14 trying to resolve it as best we can. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: What have 15 16 been some of the barriers to getting it resolved? 17 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 18 Statutorily? The proposal that we sent to 19 20 the Legislature a couple of years ago would 21 address, number one, the fact that in New York -- and it's almost kind of 22 completely upside down, if you think about 23 24 it. In New York, judges are not permitted to

take risk to public safety into account when they make a bail determination, which doesn't seem to make any sense. We're one of only a few states that prohibits judges from taking that into account.

Judges should be able to take that
into account, so that if there is someone
with a real propensity for violence before
them, that that should be a factor that the
judge should consider in setting bail.

But on the other hand, we feel that where someone does not present a risk of violence and does not present a risk of failing to return to court if they're released, that there should be a presumption of release without bail.

17 So it sort of addresses two kind of 18 different but in some ways related problems 19 that we feel, you know, the Legislature 20 should take a careful look at. And both of 21 those problems could be resolved, we feel, in 22 the bill that we presented to the 23 Legislature.

24 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: I'm

1 confused. I'm confused because if you're 2 saying the bail happens before the case goes 3 to trial, there still is a presumption of innocence. So where -- the argument that 4 5 you're raising confuses me tremendously. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 6 7 Well, look, there are people who have a history of interaction with the criminal 8 9 justice system, have had prior cases and have 10 a history of having been released pending the 11 disposition of their case and not returning 12 to court. And bench warrants get issued. 13 And, you know, that's a real problem for the 14 courts, it's a real problem for society when 15 people have a criminal charge against them -presumed innocent, you're absolutely 16 correct -- but have a history of not 17 18 returning to court when they've had a 19 criminal case. 20 So bail, we feel, in those instances 21 is entirely appropriate, when there's a 22 history of not returning to court when they should be doing that. 23 24 We also feel -- and this is the law in

1 the vast majority of states in the country --2 that in making a bail determination a judge should be able to take into account whether 3 the person before them is a violent person 4 5 and may, if released, commit a further act of violence. To us, that seems like a very 6 7 commonsense approach and an approach that should be reflected in the bail statutes in 8 New York. 9 10 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you. 11 Just to go back for a minute to the 12 explanation that you were giving on the 13 implementation of Raise the Age. Answer for 14 me again, how many new parts and attorneys 15 will OCA need in order to fully implement --

I know you have -- you know, the 16 implementation is not going to occur in '16. 17 18 But we're also looking at you absorbing a 19 tremendous deficit this year in terms of the 20 new judges that have come on, and judge raises and a lot of other issues. I would 21 22 not like to see any of these issues become a 23 barrier to us implementing this program as we 24 move out.

1	So what would the numbers mean given
2	the financial straits that you find OCA in at
3	this moment?
4	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
5	Frankly, I don't think we would need
6	additional resources to accommodate a
7	statutory raise of the age of criminal
8	responsibility. I think we could accommodate
9	the again, it wouldn't create more cases
10	in the court system, it would move certain
11	cases from one court to another court.
12	So, you know, we have flexibility in
13	reassigning judges from one court to another
14	court. We have flexibility in reassigning
15	court staff the court officers, court
16	clerks and the like from one court to
17	another court.
18	If you combine that with the 25
19	additional Family Court judgeships that we
20	have now and the fact that the rest of
21	16-and-17-year-olds, you know, are much lower
22	than they were a few years ago, we feel that
23	we could accommodate this change which,
24	again, would not be more cases, it would be

1 moving cases from one court to another. We 2 feel we can accommodate that with what we 3 have. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Is it not 4 5 true that when you took the last budget cut that you lost close to 2,000 employees across 6 7 the spectrum? So I'm --CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 8 Yes. But we're dealing with -- it's the same 9 10 number of cases. Raise the Age doesn't 11 necessarily reduce the number of cases, 12 although it can. It could lead to more diversion of cases out of the courts and 16-13 14 and 17-year-olds going into programs. You 15 know, rather than having their cases go 16 through the court system. 17 But we're not expanding the number of 18 cases, we're merely moving them from one 19 court to another. We feel a court that --20 cases can be better served and can be better 21 handled in the Family Court than in the 22 criminal courts. So given that and given our flexibility to move judges around and our 23 24 flexibility to move court employees around,

1 since this wouldn't be more cases for the 2 court system, it would be the same number of 3 cases or maybe even fewer cases, that we 4 could accommodate them. 5 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Okay, my time is going to run out. But I guess the 6 7 crux of the question for me is we've given you 20 new judges, but do you have the court 8 support staff for those 20 judges in the 9 10 numbers given the cuts that you've taken? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 11 12 Yes. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: And I think 13 14 that's the basis of my question, because 15 these are Family Court judges. 16 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: We have sufficient staff for the new Family 17 18 Court judges, yes, we do. 19 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you, 20 Judge. 21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. 23 Next, Assemblyman Graf. 24 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Hi, Judge, how are

1 you?

	-
2	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
3	Good morning.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Now, you have one
5	program where at arraignments everyone gets
6	assigned an attorney. Right? And even if
7	the person is making \$200,000, \$300,000 or
8	no matter what he makes, right, they get
9	assigned an attorney at arraignment. How
10	much is that costing us?
11	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
12	People making \$200,000, \$300,000 a year are
13	getting attorneys at arraignments? I can't
14	tell you that that's never happened, but I
15	can honestly say I don't believe that's a
16	major problem in the court system.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Well, that's what
18	happening. In Suffolk County they have
19	assigned attorneys, okay, that sit in the
20	courtroom. And if somebody doesn't have an
21	attorney, and it doesn't matter what they
22	make, for arraignment they're getting an
23	attorney.
24	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: :

1 Yeah, I think that attorneys staff the 2 arraignment parts in places like Suffolk 3 County. And, you know, the courts are under a very strict mandate from the Court of 4 5 Appeals that people have to be arraigned within 24 hours of their arrest. So if 6 7 someone is arrested, is brought by the police to the courthouse, is brought to the 8 9 courtroom to be arraigned and there's a 10 lawyer assigned to that arraignment part, 11 yes, that could happen, that somebody who 12 otherwise could afford a lawyer would have the services of that lawyer for the very 13 14 brief arraignment proceeding. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Well, they have --16 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: But they would not receive a free lawyer for the 17 18 pendency of the case. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: If I can, Judge. 20 You have Legal Aid assigned to the courtroom, 21 but there are income requirements. All right? So anyone that doesn't meet the 22 income requirement in Suffolk County, right, 23 24 who cannot be assigned Legal Aid is being

1 assigned almost like an 18-B attorney. All 2 right? Even if they're making \$200,000 a 3 year, if they're being arraigned.

4 That money -- and I'm looking -- could 5 be better used, all right, to staff court personnel. Because let me explain what's 6 7 happening. It takes me, in Suffolk County in district court, up to three and a half years 8 to get a hearing. I just did a trial on a 9 10 misdemeanor. It took me five years, five 11 years, to get a jury trial.

12 And what's happening is we've come to 13 a point where we've cut the court staff so 14 much in an attempt to save money that it's 15 actually costing us money.

16 So what's happening in Suffolk County -- and I don't know about the rest of 17 18 the state, because that's mainly where I 19 practice -- is if somebody has to be taken 20 into custody, the entire courtroom shuts 21 down. That slows down the entire process, 22 right, and leads to court congestion. There are times where they have to 23 24 bring a person from custody up to the

1 courtroom. That takes forever, because they 2 have limited personnel to bring that person 3 to the courtroom. There have been times in Suffolk County where you have an individual 4 5 who's in custody and it's so hard to get that person into the courtroom that where there 6 7 would have been disposition in the case and 8 that person would have been released that 9 day, they wind up getting adjourned for two 10 weeks, so they spend more time in custody.

11 So what I'm saying to you -- you know, 12 and I'm just looking at all the things that 13 you've been forced to do because of budget constraints. And I'm not picking -- I'm 14 15 saying we need more money for court officers, 16 we need more money for court clerks, because we're at a crisis point where the safety of 17 18 the personnel in the courtroom are in jeopardy. The safety of the people appearing 19 20 in the court is now in jeopardy because of the lack of court officers. The 21 22 courtrooms are not functioning properly because of the lack of personnel. 23 24 And I mean you have gotten creative,

1 and I'm not blaming the judges and I'm not 2 blaming the administration, I'm blaming us 3 for not looking at the problems here and identifying these problems and making sure 4 5 that we're not stepping over a dollar to pick up a dime, which is what I think we're doing 6 7 here. You've seen the slowdowns in the 8 9 courtroom. You know, you watch the calendars. So, I mean, do you agree with the 10 fact that we've gotten to the point where 11 12 it's actually costing us money because it's 13 slowing down the process? 14 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 Yeah. No, I think there are delays in cases 16 throughout the court system. But I have to tell you, if it's taking 17 18 five years to get a misdemeanor trial in Suffolk County, that is absolutely 19 20 unconscionable. And I will -- I can promise 21 you I will look into that today, this 22 afternoon, because that's -- that's unconscionable in a --23 24 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Judge, half the

1 other problem, if you want to relieve the 2 congestion, is the 30.30 statute doesn't 3 exist in New York State. Okay? Because all 4 we get is it's always court time, it's always 5 court time. That's nonsense. They're denying clients' rights to a speedy trial. 6 7 And I look at the appellate decisions, and never, never is there a decision on 8 30.30, for the most part. So it's like --9 10 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: The 30.30 is -- I agree with you, it's a 11 12 misnomer. It's never been an effective speedy trial statute. It is not effective in 13 14 moving cases to trial. I agree with you 15 completely on that. ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Well, year after 16 year I keep saying that we have to do 17 18 something with this. You know, it's 19 nonsense, when I sit there -- and I've been in front of judges and I'm ready for trial, 20 21 I'm ready for a hearing, and the judge goes, 22 "Well, we can't do a trial today." I say, "Well, send me to another courtroom." Okay? 23 24 And I get court time. And then if I do an

1 appeal, it's never decided on 30.30. 2 So basically we're ignoring the Constitution in the State of New York, and 3 that's causing court congestion. 4 5 So, I mean, I have a lot of problems with what's going on in our courtrooms, 6 7 especially with the staffing requirements. All right? And I do think that we're 8 stepping over a dollar to pick up a dime 9 10 here, and by not funding especially correction officers and clerks and everything 11 12 else, right, it's actually costing us money. The last thing is the recording 13 14 devices that we have for transcripts, it's 15 not the same as a person that is actually 16 taking it down, a court reporter. Because when we get that back, there's nothing but 17 18 errors and everything else in the time 19 period. So I would say, you know, we need to 20 21 fund court personnel. If you really want to 22 save money, we need to hire more court 23 personnel. 24 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I

1 agree with you.

2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
3	Senator.
4	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Our
5	next speaker is Senator Dan Squadron.
6	SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very
7	much, Madam Chair, and the committee. It's
8	good timing, and I want to pick up right
9	where Assemblymember Graf left off, with I
10	think you referred to it as the nonexistent
11	30.30 statute. In fact, we might be better
12	off with none than with this.
13	The current 30.30 statute was written
14	in order to keep the federal government from
15	coming into New York State in the early '70s,
16	signed by Governor Rockefeller, in
17	contradiction to a report from the court on
18	how to actually fix our speedy trial statute,
19	at a time when court congestion wasn't as bad
20	as it is today.
21	I appreciate your testimony. I
22	understand that the Commission on Judicial
23	Pay ties your hands a little bit. But I do
24	want to say when we have the kind of delay

1 and backup that we see, when we have the kind 2 of violation of the accused's constitutional 3 rights, the kind of cost and pain suffered by victims from the sort of court delay that we 4 5 have, I really urge -- and I've done the same thing to the incoming chief judge -- an 6 7 aggressive look at a crisis of court delay, a crisis of constitutional rights to a speedy 8 trial being absolutely ignored in New York 9 10 State. In fact, the statute to protect them 11 is used to damage them.

12 In my home borough of Brooklyn, we're up 26 percent on court delays in 2015. In 13 14 2013 in New York City, 594 days citywide mean 15 age at disposition. Five hundred ninety-four is almost two years. It's 732 days in the 16 Bronx. In 2012, 55 percent of felony cases 17 18 in New York City were pending for more than 19 six months. That is a crisis.

In fact, the Advisory Committee on Criminal Law and procedure gave a report to you last year that said most would agree -as you have already, which I really appreciate -- that 30.30 has been largely

1 unsuccessful in moving criminal trials in an 2 expeditious fashion. 3 It also says the problem is more than just a lack of sufficient judicial resources. 4 5 It also involves a willingness to go to trial. 6 7 You said, in response to Senator Hassell-Thompson, that people are sitting in 8 jail because they can't make bail. I would 9 10 amend that. They're sitting in jail because they can't make bail and because of the kind 11 12 of court delays we have. I carry a bill to fix this named for 13 14 Kalief Browder, who spent more than a 15 thousand days in jail before having his case 16 dismissed. Tragically, he committed suicide 17 last year. 18 What's the solution? How are we going 19 to do it together this year? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 20 Well, I think the -- these are all real 21 22 problems that you've discussed, and the solution is -- and I think the new chief 23 24 judge is very interested in this problem, and

1 I think you'll be hearing more from her 2 shortly about this. But I think she wants to address and focus her attention on this. 3 And this has to be a priority. It 4 5 will be a priority. But I think the ultimate solution -- you know, the criminal justice 6 7 system has many components and obviously the court system is a central component within 8 the criminal justice system. But to 9 10 eliminate some of these problems, address 11 these delays, streamline the process, we have 12 to work together with the other components of 13 the criminal justice system. There's a lot 14 that we can do ourselves, that the judiciary 15 can do, but we can't do it all. And we need 16 to work with law enforcement, with the defense bar, with the institutional criminal 17 defense providers, with probation 18 19 departments. I mean, we need to work 20 together with all the components of the 21 criminal justice system to solve these 22 problems. That's the only way to do it. SENATOR SQUADRON: And just explain to 23 24 me the role of the court system and then the

1 role of the other partners you just 2 described. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 3 It's -- we have a major role, maybe the 4 critical role in --5 SENATOR SQUADRON: And what is that 6 7 role? Just sort of more specifically. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 8 Well, in the end, it's the judge that can 9 10 move the case to trial. I mean, the parties have to be ready, but if there's delay or 11 12 lack of readiness, if there are excuses, in 13 the end it's the judge that has to ensure 14 that there's a quick resolution and an 15 expeditious resolution of the case. 16 So first and foremost and ultimately, the responsibility is with the court system 17 18 and with judges. 19 SENATOR SQUADRON: Let me just ask 20 this question directly. If court congestion 21 didn't stop the clock, wouldn't that move 22 trials a lot more quickly? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: If 23 24 court congestion --

1 SENATOR SQUADRON: If court congestion 2 wasn't a reason to stop the speedy trial clock, wouldn't that move trials much more 3 4 quickly? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 5 Absolutely. 6 7 SENATOR SQUADRON: Is that something 8 you support? 9 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Is 10 that what? 11 SENATOR SQUADRON: Something you 12 support --CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Oh, 13 14 sure. 15 SENATOR SQUADRON: -- allowing the 16 clock to run for the entire time between trial or hearing dates even if it's court 17 congestion that's leading to the delay? 18 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: You 19 20 mean if court congestion is the reason for the delay --21 22 SENATOR SQUADRON: The prosecutor asks for a week and gets a date three weeks hence. 23 24 Is that seven days or is that 21 days?

1 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 2 Under the speedy trial statute? SENATOR SQUADRON: Currently it's 3 seven. If it were 21, I think that would be 4 5 the beginning of solving this problem. I'm asking, is that something that the courts --6 7 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Look, a more effective speedy trial statute 8 could make a great contribution to 9 10 eliminating delays in criminal cases, no 11 question. 12 SENATOR SQUADRON: So it sounds like you also agree that we don't need more money 13 14 before we talk about fixing speedy trial --15 we should fix 30.30 and then next year we'll 16 talk about the money that we need to make that work. Is that the right order of 17 18 operations? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 19 I 20 think there are a lot of things we can do 21 without more money. 22 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very much. I really appreciate it. 23 24 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:

2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: We have been joined
3	by Senator Velmanette Montgomery.
4	Assembly?
5	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: We've also been
6	joined by Assemblywoman Duprey.
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Any questions on
8	this side? Oh. Danny O'Donnell.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Well, it's
10	been a rough morning for me, Judge.
11	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
12	It's part of the job.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Senator
14	Nozzolio suggested \$100 million for legal
15	services; I almost passed out. And I agree
16	with Al Graf, so that's really quite a
17	morning for me.
18	(Laughter.)
19	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I had chosen
20	not to speak, because I would like to go home
21	sometime in my lifetime today, so but
22	there's a couple of things I want to raise.
23	One is I want to say that I
24	100 percent agree with Senator Squadron. And

1 just so you know, I was a full-time public defender from 1987 to 1995. And at the 2 3 beginning of that time, if a DA came into the 4 courtroom and said, "Your Honor, my key 5 witness is in Florida, and I'll be ready tomorrow," and the case was adjourned for a 6 7 month, the judge charged that whole month to the people on the running of the clock. 8 9 So now there's an absolute 10 manipulation of that, where they say "But I'll be ready tomorrow, " and then they 11 12 adjourn the case for two months and only charge one day to the people. With all due 13 14 respect, sir, that's the judge's fault. The 15 judge doesn't have to do that. The judge 16 could say "Well, you're not ready today, you're not ready." 17 18 And in the time that I worked there, 19 it went from when you could expect some 20 attempt to try a case within the speedy trial 21 limits to a point where it could never ever 22 happen. Which leads me to my statement about bail. 23 24 We have too many people in jail

1 awaiting trial on bail. So isn't it true a 2 judge is allowed to take into consideration, 3 in setting the bail, the nature of the crime? 4 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 5 Yes. 6 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Aren't they 7 allowed to take into consideration the facts that they're aware of about the crime? 8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 9 10 Yes. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Aren't they 11 12 allowed to take into effect any history of 13 coming or not coming to court? 14 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 Absolutely. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Aren't they allowed to take into effect family ties, 17 18 community ties and other things determined by 19 the criminal justice system? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 20 21 You've read the statute recently, I guess. 22 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: No, I haven't, I'm just pretty smart about this. 23 24 So my question for you is, how many

1 people are you aware of that have been 2 accused of murder who have never been accused 3 before who get released on bail? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I 4 5 couldn't say on that --ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I would like 6 7 someone -- one of the minions that work for you -- to tell me what the answer to that 8 question is. Because the answer, in my 9 10 opinion, is almost nobody -- except if you're white and rich, but that's not your fault. 11 12 Almost no one. So if in fact almost no one is 13 14 released when they're charged with murder, 15 then what that means is in effect the system 16 is taking into account what the risk might be to society to let them out, and we don't need 17 18 to change the bail statute to give more 19 people reasons to keep more people in jail. 20 We need to change the bail statute so 21 that we're not having people sit in places 22 like Rikers island for years -- years -before they can assert their constitutional 23 24 right to the presumption of innocence.

1 And I think the judiciary needs to take a better role and look at this and not 2 3 advocate for changing it to make the bail 4 statute even harder on people who don't have 5 resources. 6 Thank you, sir. 7 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. 10 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 11 Senator Liz Krueger. 12 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. I also wasn't planning to ask too many questions 13 14 because so many of us are here today. 15 But just going back to civil legal 16 services, even though there has been the growth in money available, can you tell me 17 18 how many people have to go to a court 19 situation without an attorney in the civil 20 system? 21 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 22 It's still about -- although there's been great improvement with that problem, there's 23 24 still a great majority of the people in civil

1 cases who can't afford a lawyer, still don't 2 have a lawyer. It's as much as 70 percent. 3 SENATOR KRUEGER: And someone gave me the number that we were at 2.3 million cases 4 5 without attorneys, and we're down to 1.8 million. Does that seem a realistic 6 7 number to you of the number of people who don't have attorneys for civil cases? 8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 9 Т know -- it's very difficult to kind of 10 document this. But I think that sounds 11 12 correct, if I recall. I know that the estimates are that over the last five, six 13 14 years, the percentage of people in civil 15 cases who can't afford an attorney who have 16 an attorney has gone from 20 percent to 30 percent, which is actually a 50 percent 17 18 increase, if my math is correct. 19 But obviously that still leaves the 20 great majority of people without a lawyer. 21 So it's -- it's an ongoing problem. This 22 additional money has made, you know, an enormous difference in the lives of the 23 24 people who do have lawyers because of it, and

it's hundreds of thousands of cases a year
 where people now have lawyers because of this
 money. But it's a gargantuan problem, no
 question.

5 SENATOR KRUEGER: I certainly -- I represent a part of Manhattan Island, and I 6 7 certainly can verify that the difficulty in finding somebody -- representation in endless 8 numbers of civil cases for disproportionately 9 10 the elderly, the disabled, tenants -- and again, the biggest issue I see in the 11 12 problems here are that in a civil case where 13 it's not you versus the government, it's you 14 against someone, the someone else always has 15 an attorney. And so the unfairness of going 16 through the court process to me seems fairly 17 extreme.

18 So, you know, for the record, we can't 19 support reducing funding for civil legal 20 services. We have to continue our commitment 21 that was a multiyear commitment to expanding 22 funds for civil legal services. 23 Thank you.

24 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:

1 Thank you.

2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator.
3	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblywoman
4	Peoples-Stokes.
5	ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank
6	you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	Judge, I appreciated hearing all your
8	comments today, and I actually appreciated
9	hearing the questions and responses from my
10	colleagues. But I just have one really quick
11	point I want to raise, and hopefully you're
12	able to give me that number today. And, if
13	not, I can look forward to receiving it soon.
14	What is the total number of staff on
15	the Office of Court Administration? And what
16	is the total number of counsel on civil legal
17	services? And what are the diversity numbers
18	there?
19	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I'm
20	sorry, I don't have that with me. But I'll
21	absolutely get you those numbers. We have
22	them. And we'll get them to you.
23	ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEOPLES-STOKES: The
24	numbers and the diversity.
24	numbers and the diversity.

1 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 2 Yes. ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEOPLES-STOKES: 3 Thank you, sir. 4 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Senator Marty Golden. 6 7 SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. 8 I have to believe judges should have 9 10 the discretion to set bail and the ability of the defendant to return to court and also set 11 12 the risk assessment of the violence. And I 13 think you're doing an outstanding job. And I 14 do believe that we have to help you correct 15 the imbalance in the system in putting more 16 dollars made available so we can have more judges and more employees to be able to move 17 18 these cases through the system. 19 Real quick question. I'm also the 20 chair of the Public Employees, and I had them 21 up in my office about a month ago. And I 22 thought I heard 14 percent they're down, and that's different from the number that you've 23 24 given.

1 The court officers across the State of 2 New York are 14 percent off from where they were in 2009? 3 4 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 5 That -- could you repeat that? I'm sorry. SENATOR GOLDEN: The number of court 6 7 officers presently are down 14 percent from the number in 2009 that I have. 8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 9 10 It's 6 percent. But depending on who came to you, they might have been talking about a 11 12 particular court or type of court. SENATOR GOLDEN: That was statewide. 13 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 14 15 Statewide it's 6 percent. I'll show you the 16 numbers. SENATOR GOLDEN: If you could get 17 18 those numbers for me, I'd appreciate it. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I 19 will. 20 21 SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 23 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 24 Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 2 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: That's it. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Okay. Senator 3 Velmanette Montgomery. 4 5 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Madam 6 Chair. 7 Judge, good morning. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 8 Good morning. 9 10 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: I just have one 11 question that I would like to ask. You are 12 familiar with the Center for Court Innovation? 13 14 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 15 Yes. 16 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: And one of the issues or one of the sort of experimental, if 17 18 you will, I guess we can say, courts that 19 they have come up with and have been actually put into action by -- under the auspices of 20 21 Chief Justices Kaye and Lippman, and I hope 22 that we're looking to make that a permanent 23 and central part of our court system, and 24 that is the youth courts.

1 So I'm not -- I'm not -- I don't 2 understand and I don't know how you view 3 that. It has worked so beautifully in one of 4 the community courts in my district. And all 5 of the information that I have in those areas other than the Red Hook Youth Court, which is 6 7 in my district, have really benefited young people extremely well. 8 9 It's also an opportunity to teach 10 young people how the system works, to give them an opportunity to develop some skill and 11 12 some understanding of the system because they play the roles of all of the different 13 14 components of the court. And so it keeps 15 young people out of the system, but it also 16 acts as an extremely important leadership 17 development program. 18 So I'm wondering what you think about 19 it and if we can look forward to continuing 20 to support that court and make it more 21 central to what we do as it relates to young 22 people in our state.

23 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:24 Yeah, the youth courts are terrific. And,

1	you know, we have them in Brooklyn, we have
2	them in places all over the state. They're
3	supported by defense attorneys offices where
4	we have them. And, you know, they're a
5	terrific idea. You find them in other states
6	around the country, not just New York. And
7	we're totally committed to continuing to
8	support them.
9	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you.
10	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator.
11	Senator Michael Nozzolio.
12	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you again,
13	Madam Chair.
13 14	Madam Chair. Judge, coming to the issue of bail,
-	
14	Judge, coming to the issue of bail,
14 15	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because
14 15 16	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because Judge Lippman is not a member of the
14 15 16 17	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because Judge Lippman is not a member of the Legislature, I as chair of the Codes
14 15 16 17 18	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because Judge Lippman is not a member of the Legislature, I as chair of the Codes Committee, as a professional courtesy,
14 15 16 17 18 19	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because Judge Lippman is not a member of the Legislature, I as chair of the Codes Committee, as a professional courtesy, introduced his legislation. It's been
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because Judge Lippman is not a member of the Legislature, I as chair of the Codes Committee, as a professional courtesy, introduced his legislation. It's been pending before the Codes Committee for a
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Judge, coming to the issue of bail, that Judge Lippman drafted a bill but because Judge Lippman is not a member of the Legislature, I as chair of the Codes Committee, as a professional courtesy, introduced his legislation. It's been pending before the Codes Committee for a number of months.

bill, insults judges, overlooks that bail review is available presently, fails to provide a complete record of bail release decisions, and intrudes on the judiciary's independence.

Now, that's not by a member of the 6 7 Legislature, that's by a co-Supreme Court judge, Judge McLaughlin in the City of 8 New York, who indicated that these provisions 9 10 would establish what he called a two-tier system of justice where you'd see an 11 12 automatic judicial review triggered when a defendant is unable to make bail. 13

14 Now, that means, to me, that we'd have 15 50,000 appeals automatically. And you were 16 talking about clogging the system earlier, the demands on the budget. Certainly I know 17 18 those have to be weighed. We're seeking 19 justice here. But from a logistical 20 standpoint -- and I think it would be very 21 fair for you to be able to comment publicly 22 on Judge McLaughlin's public opposition to the legislation. 23

24 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:

Well, I have to say I strongly disagree with
 that assessment of that program. Fifty
 thousand cases, it's just -- that's just not
 true.

5 It's a misdemeanor program. It takes 6 advantage of an existing statutory provision 7 in the law which gives a Supreme Court judge 8 de novo review -- authority, on the 9 application of a defendant, to conduct a de 10 novo review, a full review of a lower court's 11 bail ruling.

12 We've simply set up a part in Supreme Court to allow for that, if the defendant 13 makes an application, to have the case 14 15 calendared in the Supreme Court part. It's not a lot of cases. It's limited to 16 low-level cases. It's not insulting to 17 judges at all. Judges -- you know, judges --18 19 bail is set in the arraignment parts where 20 the volume is enormous. There's strict 21 constitutional and statutory time limits on 22 how quickly cases have to be arraigned. In the arraignment part, it quickly 23

24 follows the arrest. The defense lawyer

1 doesn't really know much about the defendant 2 at that point. The prosecutor doesn't know 3 much about the defendant. The judge certainly doesn't know much about the 4 5 defendant. And the process that was put in place is merely to give an option to the 6 7 defendant to make an application later on to a Supreme Court judge where there will be 8 more time to evaluate the case, there will be 9 10 more information at that point. 11 And there's nothing insulting to 12 judges about this at all. It's a fairer 13 process that's been put in place that's 14 entirely consistent with what the law now 15 authorizes. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Nonetheless, Judge 16 McLaughlin felt pretty insulted by this. And 17 18 I -- certainly opinion differs. And that 19 we'll look to you for further explanation of 20 this from your vantage as a judge 21 experienced. 22 It seems as though, just on its surface, that any defense counsel would be 23 24 tiptoeing around malpractice if they didn't

1 seek an automatic appeal under this 2 provision. And to me, that begs the question in the real world, wouldn't they be doubly 3 4 encouraged to pursue extrajudicial review? CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 5 Well, that's an interesting point. 6 7 But, you know, this is in place now. It's not -- it's been implemented. And the 8 experience of the last couple of months since 9 10 it was implemented is completely to the contrary. There have been very few 11 12 applications made to the Supreme Court judge. Actually, surprisingly few. 13 14 So it hasn't opened the floodgates. 15 Any suggestion that it would, that hasn't 16 turned out to be the case at all. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you for your 17 18 insights. 19 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: 20 Sure. 21 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Madam 22 Chair. 23 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 24 Senator Tom Croci.

1 SENATOR CROCI: Thank you, Madam 2 Chair. Thank you, Judge, for your appearance 3 here today. 4 5 I represent the Third Senate District, which includes the Central Islip Court 6 7 Complex on Long Island, which as you know is collocated with a federal courthouse as well. 8 Some of my concerns come out of a 9 10 recent visit there where there is long lines outside of the courthouse. In light of 11 12 what's happened in San Bernardino and other places, it comes to our attention that having 13 14 long lines of civilians standing outside of 15 federal buildings, state, county, town government buildings, is probably not a good 16 idea. 17 18 Recognizing that some of the staffing 19 levels the court officers are contending with 20 lead to some of these long lines, and also 21 recognizing that on Long Island our law 22 enforcement has stepped up their approaches to combating the heroin and opioid epidemic 23

on Long Island, we're seeing more individuals

24

1	who are incarcerated for those crimes and who
2	are going through the court system.
3	So I have two concerns. One is the
4	lines and the security situation that it
5	presents. And then two is inside the
6	courthouse, we've had instances where rival
7	drug gangs are actually having altercations,
8	and the staffing levels, it seems to me,
9	we're spreading them pretty thin.
10	So I was wondering if you could
11	address that in your remarks. Thank you.
12	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
13	Well, I mean it's a good point that you
14	raise. You know, lines outside the
15	courthouse aren't good because, as you say,
16	they can create public safety concerns.
17	But it's also unfair to the people who
18	have to wait on line. Weather can be
19	inclement, and we don't want people waiting
20	in lines to get into courthouses. It can be
21	a problem. You know, I recognize that.
22	And it again goes back to staffing
23	shortages and, you know, not enough court
24	officers in the lobbies at the magnetometers,

1 you know, moving people through the screening 2 and, you know, getting them through that so 3 they can go up to attend to their court business. So, I mean, it's a problem. We 4 5 have to do a better job to avoid lines, I agree with that. 6 7 The -- what was the second issue? SENATOR CROCI: Talking about actually 8 responding within the courthouse when you 9 10 have individuals who are involved in drug-related offenses. 11 12 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: We 13 do have a process in place that we are -- our 14 court officers in our public safety 15 department try to be aware of when a case 16 comes in, if there's some gang connection. And when we know about that -- and, you know, 17 18 often we do know that, if not always, but usually we will know that -- that there's 19 some gang connection to a particular case, we 20 21 will deploy more officers where they need to 22 be deployed when that case is called in the 23 courthouse.

So it's something we are aware of and

```
1
           have tried to address.
                   SENATOR CROCI: And one follow-up.
 2
            Are court officers instructed in the use and
 3
 4
            administration of Narcan?
                   CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I'm
 5
 6
            sorry?
 7
                   SENATOR CROCI: I said, are court
            officers instructed in the administration of
 8
            Narcan, the anti-heroin overdose drug?
 9
10
                   CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS: I
            believe so, but I'll to check that for you.
11
12
           I'm not sure.
13
                   SENATOR CROCI: Thank you.
14
                   CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
15
            Thank you.
16
                   CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
                   Thank you very much for your testimony
17
18
            today.
19
                   CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
20
            Thank you.
21
                   CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: We truly appreciate
22
            it. Look forward to continuing to work with
23
            you. So thank you.
24
                 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MARKS:
```

1 Thanks so much.

2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
3	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speaker is
4	Commissioner John P. Melville, commissioner,
5	New York State Division of Homeland Security.
6	(Pause.)
7	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: If we could have
8	some order, please. We need to get underway.
9	We have a long, long list of speakers.
10	Welcome, Commissioner.
11	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you,
12	Senator.
13	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Proceed.
14	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you.
15	Good morning. Thank you, Chairwoman
16	Young, Chairman Farrell, and distinguished
17	members of the Joint Committee. I am John
18	Melville, commissioner of the Division of
19	Homeland Security and Emergency Services.
20	I appreciate the opportunity to
21	discuss with you today some of the good work
22	of the agency over the past year as well as a
23	few of the highlights of Governor Cuomo's
24	public safety budget.

1 The division is charged with an 2 enormous responsibility, which includes an 3 all-hazards prevention, preparedness, response and recovery mission. The 4 5 Governor's budget provides the resources needed to accomplish our mission and protect 6 7 public safety. Total appropriations are \$1.5 billion, up \$583 million over last year. 8 Six hundred million dollars is added in the 9 10 event of future disaster. A reduction of 11 \$3.2 million in one-time appropriations for 12 citizen preparedness, reduced need for 13 capital financing in the amount of 14 \$15 million, and the addition of \$1.3 million 15 for an expanded counterterrorism program, all 16 contribute to the change. 17 Unfortunately, this past year our 18 nation witnessed an increase in the number of terrorist attacks and plots -- three here in 19 20 New York alone. The most recent example was 21 the New Year's Eve Rochester arrest, which 22 ultimately proved to be an intelligence and operational success. 23 24 In December, Governor Cuomo stated

that the threat of terrorism is a "new 1 2 normal" for Americans. Unfortunately, I have 3 to agree. Let me discuss some of the efforts we 4 5 are undertaking to ensure the safety of New Yorkers from Montauk to Buffalo. This 6 7 past year, the Governor launched the "See Something, Send Something" mobile application 8 so that people can report suspicious 9 10 activities. To date, it has been downloaded over 40,000 times. 11 12 In addition to community-level 13 awareness, we have to arm our first 14 responders with the intelligence information 15 they need to keep pace with emerging terrorism trends. The Governor outlined a 16 plan to consolidate the division's 17 18 intelligence and analysis function into the 19 New York State Police to continue their work 20 at the New York State Intelligence Center,

which serves all law enforcement and public
safety agencies throughout the state. This
will allow the division, as a primary

24 consumer of the intelligence, to focus on key

1 preparedness activities, and will be used to 2 inform our decision-making in the areas of 3 grant funding, the homeland security strategy 4 and target hardening. 5 Ultimately, the collective goal is to provide quick and actionable intelligence to 6 7 our local law enforcement and public safety partners who, along with vigilant private 8 citizens, truly are the first line of 9 10 defense. 11 The Governor also proposes 12 \$1.3 million in funding to drastically 13 increase the number of vulnerability 14 assessments -- or, as we term them, "Red Team 15 exercises" -- the division will execute 16 across the state. In conjunction with Operation 17 Safeguard activities and our "See Something" 18 19 campaigns, we want to increase the state's 20 collective detection capacity of tactics that 21 may be used by terrorists in preoperational 22 planning. The division's Red Team will then 23 24 test, through a series of adversary-based

assessments, to determine the success of the
 preparedness strategy. As a target-rich
 state, New York continues to rely on federal
 homeland security funding.

5 In 2015, New York State received over 6 \$262 million from the Homeland Security Grant 7 Program, which has been used in communities 8 throughout the state to prevent, protect and 9 prepare for terrorism and other catastrophic 10 events.

The division continues to advance the 11 12 state's preparedness posture for all hazards, 13 including natural disasters. Last August, 14 the Governor announced a new incident 15 management system called "NY Responds" to 16 establish a uniform electronic system to be used throughout the state and by all 17 18 counties. We completed the first phase of 19 the transition in December, with a full 20 implementation expected to be completed this 21 year.

We also continue our recovery work,
which includes the reimbursement of over
\$5 billion to New York communities for Sandy,

Irene and Lee rebuilding and resiliency
 projects.

3 Last year the Governor announced the first-in-the-nation College of Emergency 4 5 Preparedness, Homeland Security and Cybersecurity at the University at Albany. 6 7 To date, 159 students have enrolled in the college's minor program and, by fall of this 8 year, the major program should be available 9 10 as an official offering.

11 The college also leverages the network 12 of resources of the State Preparedness 13 Training Center in Oriskany for 14 out-of-classroom, hands-on training. The 15 SPTC is quickly being recognized as a 16 world-class facility.

The U.S. Departments of Defense and 17 Justice chose the SPTC to host the annual 18 19 Raven's Challenge, which is an 20 interoperability exercise to test the 21 capabilities of bomb squads and military 22 explosive ordnance disposal units. It was such a success that, this May, New York will 23 24 once again host the Raven's Challenge at the 1 SPTC.

2	Moving to citizen preparedness
3	training, in conjunction with the National
4	Guard, the Red Cross and together with our
5	partners in the Legislature, we have been
6	able to train over 95,000 new people.
7	Last year the Governor announced that
8	the Office of Fire Prevention and Control
9	would be deploying 19 trailers equipped with
10	firefighting foam to local fire departments
11	and county hazmat teams. Prepositioning this
12	equipment ensures the state is well-prepared
13	to confront fires caused by crude oil and
14	other highly flammable substances.
15	Finally, the division's Office of
16	Interoperable and Emergency Communications is
17	modifying its approach to the state's
18	interoperable communications grant
19	distribution strategy. This year there will
20	be two separate programs: One will include a
21	formula-based distribution, and the second
22	includes a targeted distribution of
23	\$20 million towards statewide
24	interoperability.

1 While not possible to cover all the 2 great work of the division during my 3 testimony today, I hope that I have provided you with an idea of the priorities for the 4 5 Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services into the next fiscal year. These 6 7 include strengthening response integration and coordination, intelligence-driven target 8 9 hardening, training, and thoughtful 10 investments of state grants to bolster the 11 state's preparedness and response posture. 12 I appreciate the opportunity to be 13 here and appear before you today, and I am 14 pleased to answer any questions you may have. 15 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 16 Commissioner, for that testimony. Protecting our communities and our citizens is job one 17 18 for New York State government, and there's an 19 intense interest in what you have to say 20 today by the Senate. At this time I would like to introduce 21 22 our chair of the Homeland Security, Veterans

and Military Affairs Committee, and that'sSenator Tom Croci.

1 SENATOR CROCI: Thank you, Madam 2 Chair. 3 And thank you, Commissioner, for your appearance today. It's been a great 4 5 privilege to have the opportunity to work with you and the staff over the past year. 6 7 One of the things I'd like to compliment you on is your investment in the 8 prevention and preparedness for the State of 9 10 New York. I think that was best seen in he recent blizzard that we had downstate. 11 12 Pre-staging of assets certainly saved a lot 13 of time in responding when the storm finally 14 stopped, and I think that it's partly due or 15 in large part the amount of snow that was 16 able to be moved was because of that 17 investment in prevention and preparedness. 18 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you, 19 sir. SENATOR CROCI: I listened with 20 21 interest to your testimony, and of course 22 we've had conversations about some of the proposals in the budget. In talking about 23

the Article VII language in Part D of the

24

1 ELFA budget bill, you mentioned in your 2 testimony that the transfer of certain 3 assets, human assets in this case, would 4 focus on key preparedness activities, will be 5 used to inform our decision-making in certain 6 areas.

7 So I'm wondering, with respect to that 8 transfer of personnel to State Police, what 9 if any counterterrorism functions does the 10 Division of Homeland Security retain in that 11 transfer?

12 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you, 13 Senator. We propose to transfer 10 people, 14 or 10 positions, from our intel and analysis 15 section in the Division of Homeland Security 16 and Emergency Services to the State Police.

That transfer sounds a little more 17 18 ominous than it really is. In actuality, those people will probably be sitting in the 19 20 same seats they sit in now. They work at the 21 New York State Intelligence Center with the 22 State Police. They are supervised not only by us, but by the State Police. And what we 23 24 plan to do is just streamline the chain of

command with the analysts so the information can get right to the people that it needs to right away.

I need it; I still will get it. But I
am not operational as the State Police are.
They get that information right out to the
people on the ground that need it first. I
will still get it.

As far as maintaining duties with 9 10 respect to the Office of Counterterrorism, we have a critical infrastructure team that 11 12 we're very proud of. They do inspections all around the state, some legislated, some not. 13 14 We are proposing a significant increase in 15 our Red Team exercises that we will be conducting throughout all the 16 counterterrorism zones in New York State, 17 which there are 16 of them. 18 19 We have our training center at Oriskany, which we run. It's first responder 20 21 training for not only police but fire, EMS, emergency managers, and it's very 22 counterterrorism-based. 23 24 So in actuality, our core mission will

remain the same, Senator. We will still be 1 2 receiving that intelligence information. I 3 still will remain the homeland security advisor to the Governor. I will report to 4 5 the legislature. And I am still the point of contact for the Department of Homeland 6 7 Security of the federal government. SENATOR CROCI: So you mentioned that 8 you'll still receive the information 9 10 regardless of where these analysts are 11 positioned and where they're sitting. That's 12 not clear statutorily in the budget. I guess we would have to statutorily amend the 13 14 article in order so that you receive that 15 information? Because otherwise how would 16 that information flow from the State Police now up to you? 17 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Well, the 18 19 analysts will actually physically be 20 supervised by the State Police in this 21 proposal. 22 I will still be a consumer of that intelligence information. As a matter of 23 24 fact, we recently took on a director in the

1 Office of Counterterrorism in the Division of 2 Homeland Security and Emergency Services. 3 His name is Mike Cerretto. He's very qualified, well respected, a 30-year member 4 5 of law enforcement. And he is actually still a member of the New York State Police even 6 7 though he has been detailed to the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services 8 and in actuality works for us now. So Mike's 9 10 still being -- Director Cerretto's still 11 being a member of the New York State Police 12 will ensure that we receive that information, as I have no doubt. 13 14 SENATOR CROCI: So hypothetically we 15 have a new -- someday we have a new 16 commissioner, we have a new director and 17 another governor, maybe a Republican 18 governor, so the relationships will change. 19 How do we ensure that that information flow 20 remains the same regardless of those 21 relationships? 22 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Well, the 23 analysts will be at the NYSIC, working for 24 the New York State Police. The NYSIC is the

fusion center for all of New York, all of our
 law enforcement partners. It's federally
 funded, and the mandate to the New York State
 Police, who runs the NYSIC, is to share that
 information with everybody.

I fortunately have the unique 6 7 distinction of having worked in the New York State Police for 32 years before I became the 8 commissioner in the Division of Homeland 9 10 Security. I have the utmost respect and 11 confidence, I know how the organization 12 works, and its main goal, main mission, main 13 function is to push that intel out to the 14 people that need it. It will not be 15 stovepiped.

SENATOR CROCI: But there's nothing 16 that's going to be in statute to ensure that. 17 18 It's because we have great relationships, 19 very qualified individuals in yourself and 20 your new director, no doubt about that. But 21 there's no formal pipeline that's laid out in 22 statute. Is that your understanding? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I believe, 23 24 Senator, that the fact that it is New York

State's fusion center, funded by the
 Department of Homeland Security, they are
 mandated to share that information with
 everyone.

SENATOR CROCI: Okay. Obviously
you've had a very distinguished career. And
again, it's been a great privilege to work
with you and get to know you personally.

9 In your professional opinion -- and 10 you better than anyone personally dealt with 11 the attacks of September 11th, as did so many 12 in this room and so many in our state -- do 13 you believe that we're doing everything we 14 can as New Yorkers, as the State of New York, 15 to protect us, to protect our residents?

16 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I do, Senator. 17 Unfortunately, the threat remains to New York 18 State. New York State is certainly a target. 19 I believe we certainly put our resources into 20 every effort that we can to keep New Yorkers 21 safe. That is our main function, is 22 emergency preparedness, training, response coordination, recovery. I think that we have 23 24 what we need to do that, and we do do it.

1 And we do it very well.

2	SENATOR CROCI: So one concern, in
3	looking at the proposal, is that information
4	flow, and to ensure that not only the
5	individuals charged with the counterterrorism
6	mission in the state in the executive branch,
7	at the higher levels, who are advising the
8	Governor on these matters, are receiving the
9	latest and the best intelligence and the most
10	timely intelligence that they possibly can.
11	The National Security Act and the way
12	the National Security Councils have been set
13	up is there just for that reason, so that the
14	decisionmakers, the policymakers are
15	receiving that information on which to make
16	good legislative decisions and good executive
17	actions. So I'm looking forward to working
18	with staff and finding a way that we can
19	accomplish this and ensure that regardless of
20	who sits in our chairs my chair, your
21	chair, or your very experienced and diligent
22	staff we want to make sure that that
23	information flow happens regardless of
24	personality, regardless of relationship. The

1 process piece I think is something we need to 2 continue to work on.

3 And with regard to your training center, I think I've mentioned that one of 4 5 the key lessons from the 9/11 Commission report, and certainly something we've learned 6 7 locally in the wake of Superstorm Sandy and recent weather events, is that we should 8 train the way we fight. So on the ground in 9 10 response and recovery operations, 11 preparedness as well, we should train at the 12 local level the first responders who actually 13 will be responding to those disasters, 14 whether it's New York City or Buffalo or Suffolk and Nassau counties. 15 16 While it's great that we have these statewide investments in the training 17 18 centers, I hope we can work with the 19 Executive and with your department to make 20 sure that we're pushing some of that training 21 and those training dollars down to the local level -- to the cities, to the counties --22 who are asking us for that, to bring fire, 23

law enforcement, police, your first

1 responders, your ambulance companies, bring 2 them together for realistic training at the local level, because in the event of a 3 catastrophic attack or weather event, they're 4 5 going to be responding together. 6 And going back to that personality 7 issue, it's great that those personalities know each other before they're responding, as 8 I'm sure you could attest to in your 9 10 distinguished career. I think it's very important, and I hope to work with the staff 11 12 and your division to ensure that that occurs. COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I look forward 13 14 to that, Senator. 15 SENATOR KRUEGER: Assembly, thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. Assemblywoman Peoples-Stokes. 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank 18 19 you, Mr. Chairman. 20 And thank you, Mr. Melville, for your testimony this morning. I would join my 21 22 other colleagues who have already expressed how the number-one issue for everyone who 23 24 lives and represents this government is that

our citizens must be safe. And we do realize
 that we live in a difficult time. And so
 your due diligence to make sure that we are
 safe is very much appreciated.

5 I did want to just really comment on the citizen preparedness. I have had a few 6 7 of them in the district, and they've been located in different places and different 8 9 citizens have attended it, and they have very 10 much appreciated that. So while, you know, 11 our first responders are highly skilled and 12 trained, I think it's also important to --13 for the average citizen to understand what 14 should you do in case of some disaster. So 15 thank you for that.

16 I understand from looking at the budget that there's \$14 million in additional 17 18 dollars for counterterrorism in New York City by the State Police, and an additional 19 20 \$23 million by the National Guard for 21 New York City. And so I guess my question is 22 clearly New York City, having been targeted before, and the seat of finance is in our 23 24 state -- and quite frankly, the seats of

1 finance in the world should be protected. 2 But I'm just wondering how far will, you 3 know, these dollars be able to go to protect other parts of the state? I did hear your 4 5 comments about Rochester. And as you know, I'm located very close to that, so we were 6 7 paying attention to that issue. But we are a state that borders Canada, 15 minutes if 8 you're in Buffalo, and closer in some other 9 10 places. 11 And so I wondered could you speak a 12 little bit about why all those dollars are 13 being designated -- excess dollars are being 14 designated to New York City? 15 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Sure, 16 Assemblywoman. Thank you for your comments about the citizen preparedness; we're very 17 18 proud of that training effort. 19 We fund -- we, being the Division of 20 Homeland Security and Emergency Services, 21 fund every county in the state through our 22 State Homeland Security Grant program. We also fund different areas across the state 23 24 through our targeted grant programs and other

1 grants that we administer. There's also a 2 UASI federal grant that a lot of money goes 3 to New York City, Long Island, Westchester. That is a decision that is made by the 4 5 federal government with respect to where UASI -- it stands for Urban Area Security 6 7 Initiative -- where they are. We don't 8 decide that, the federal government does. I believe -- and I really can't speak 9 10 to the National Guard budget items or the 11 State Police. But I would suspect that that 12 money is probably going to be used to 13 continue the Governor's initiative of putting troopers and National Guard soldiers in the 14 15 very important transportation hubs in and 16 around New York City, whether it be Grand 17 Central, Penn Station or those types of --18 but that's -- probably that can be better answered by either the superintendent or 19 20 General Murphy.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEOPLES-STOKES: Okay.
Well, I was very excited about the
announcement of the cybersecurity curriculum
at UAlbany. And I note from your comments

1 that there are some 159 students that have 2 availed themselves of that opportunity. That 3 might seem like a large number now, but it's 4 really not, particularly with the increasing 5 rates of people being hurt, average citizens being hurt by people abusing the internet. 6 7 Not to withstand what could happen from a violent perspective, but from a consumer 8 perspective, it's a huge issue. 9 10 And so is there any thought by your agency -- or I guess I can also ask this 11 12 question of Nancy Zimpher from SUNY as well, and CUNY -- if there's any thought about 13 14 expanding this curriculum to other colleges 15 and universities throughout the state. 16 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I can't answer that, Assemblywoman. I don't know. I can 17 18 tell you that the college originally was 19 hoping for 50 students to sign up for the 20 minor; they got 159. The major will 21 hopefully be available this fall. We're excited at the Division of 22 Homeland Security and Emergency Services 23 24 about the college because it will prepare

1 professionals that we can utilize in our 2 field. We're looking forward to that. We're also excited about it because 3 the SPTC, the training center in Oriskany, 4 5 will be the out-of-classroom training spot for the students who attend the State 6 7 University of New York at Albany College of 8 Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness and Cybersecurity. So we're happy to 9 10 showcase that, and we hope the students find that that is a world-class facility. 11 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank 13 you. 14 I recently had the opportunity to 15 speak to some veterans in the state of 16 Florida who -- where they've established a program specifically to train veterans in 17 18 cybersecurity. So I'd like to connect with 19 you real soon, perhaps late next week, and have an additional conversation about that 20 21 end of it. Thank you. COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Perfect. 22 23 Thank you, Assemblywoman. 24 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.

1 Senator?

2 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 3 Next, Senator Joe Addabbo, ranker on the committee. 4 5 SENATOR ADDABBO: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Commissioner, for being 6 7 here today. COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you. 8 SENATOR ADDABBO: And let me echo the 9 10 sentiments of my colleagues: The daunting 11 task of protecting the roughly 20 million 12 people in New York State, I want to again 13 thank you very much for your efforts on that 14 of the division. I think the critical movement of the 15 16 services to New York State Police is a major move, certainly for, again, protection of our 17 18 people. I'd like to know the further 19 details, if I may. I need to convince, as we 20 all do, our constituency that this is a more 21 efficient move for the protection of our 22 people. Briefly, how do we convince our 23 24 residents that this is a more efficient move

1 as we look to secure, again, the people of 2 our state?

3 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Sure, Senator. And, you know, I've been in this position for 4 5 a little over a year and have had the 6 opportunity to look at the agency as a whole 7 and all the different missions that we were 8 charged with. And the counterterrorism 9 mission is certainly at the forefront of all 10 of those.

11 So we constantly evaluate how we do 12 things and why we do things and, you know, 13 can we do them better. And during the course of this past year I've had several 14 15 conversations with members of my staff as 16 well as the State Police, and eventually Ray 17 Kelly, the former commissioner in New York 18 City, who was asked by the Governor to review 19 the counterterrorism efforts of all the state 20 agencies. After that year of review, my 21 discussions with the superintendent and other 22 public safety partners, and Commissioner Kelly, we all agreed that we thought that 23 24 this was a smart move.

1 What it really does is just defines 2 the line of communication and the chain of 3 command a little bit clearer. As I said, those people work in the NYSIC. They're very 4 5 talented, I'm very proud of them. They're literally probably not going to change their 6 7 seat at their desk, it's just that the line of authority will be right to the 8 State Police, it will get to the people that 9 10 need that information instantaneously.

11 I use that information to pass out to constituents across the state, but I don't 12 13 need that actionable intelligence as fast as they do. I can set the state homeland 14 15 security strategy the next day, depending on 16 the intel; they need it right then and there to push out. And that's really the reason, 17 18 it's just to try and streamline the chain of command and make things work better, faster, 19 20 safer for the public.

21 SENATOR ADDABBO: We've seen obviously
22 the importance of information-gathering.
23 Rochester you mentioned earlier as well in
24 your testimony. So getting that information

1 quicker certainly makes it more efficient. 2 And I look forward to working with you and 3 furthering obviously this critical change. But that being said, with the change 4 5 going, with services to the New York State Police, the terror alert system, the New York 6 7 State Police will then have the authority to 8 use the terror alert system? It would be 9 under their jurisdiction at that point? 10 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Well, we're 11 not giving up any authority in the Division 12 of Homeland Security and Emergency Services. As I said, Senator, I remain the state 13 14 homeland security advisor, the point of 15 contact from the federal government and to 16 the Governor and to the Legislature. So that will -- inasmuch as it does now, it will 17 18 remain with us. 19 SENATOR ADDABBO: So basically there 20 is some sense of shared responsibilities 21 here. 22 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Yes. We still 23 are maintaining our core mission, which is --

much of that is counterterrorism. This is

24

1 just a small piece, albeit a very important 2 piece of it.

3 SENATOR ADDABBO: The restoration of
4 \$600 million to now get the total to
5 \$1.2 billion for disaster assistance locally,
6 can we talk about possibly how the plan is to
7 spend that money?

8 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: That money, 9 Senator, the \$600 million, is just an 10 appropriation. It gives us the authority to 11 spend that if we have to. That's really to 12 be used for future disasters. Hopefully we 13 don't have to spend it, but it's there in 14 case we need to.

SENATOR ADDABBO: I would be remiss if 15 16 I didn't say thank you. A third of my district was affected by Sandy. You know, 17 18 the areas of Howard Beach, Broad Channel, 19 Rockaway. I still have roughly over 4,000 20 people still on the road to recovery three 21 years after the storm. So again, I want to 22 say thank you.

23 There has been, again, monies for24 Sandy. Can you detail or explain those

1 additional monies for Sandy recovery? 2 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Sure. We have 3 funneled more than \$5 billion in recovery money to the victims of Superstorm Sandy, 4 5 Irene and Lee. We've also funneled approximately \$1.4 billion through these what 6 7 we call HMGP grants, which are Hazard 8 Mitigation Grant Programs. 9 The Hazard Mitigation Grant program 10 money that has been used in your district, 11 Senator, has basically been used for big 12 projects that would benefit whole communities. The individual homeowner would 13 14 not really be covered through us under that. 15 That would be under a different funding 16 stream, a HUD funding stream, CDBG money that comes under a different -- the Office of 17 Storm Recovery. So if those people in your 18 19 district are struggling, we'd be happy to 20 talk about that and to help them in any way 21 we can, but we don't really control that 22 funding. SENATOR ADDABBO: No, and again, I 23 24 understand. I just want to thank the efforts

1 of all those associated with New York Rising, 2 and working with HUD and their requirements. 3 But -- and certainly helping not only my constituents, but those throughout the state 4 5 who are still, again, recovering from Superstorm Sandy. 6 7 And lastly, you had mentioned in your testimony the "See Something" app, 40,000 8 downloads. Can you just walk us through the 9 10 process of somebody downloading that app and the information that you may receive and how 11 12 it goes forward after that? 13 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Sure. Happy 14 to. It's a free app. Any cellphone, you Google it, you'll find it, you can download 15 16 it. And what it allows you to do is take a 17 18 picture of whatever you might term 19 suspicious. You can add a text to it and 20 send it along, or you can just send the 21 picture. And what it does is it goes to the New York State Intelligence Center, where it 22 is then reviewed and evaluated by members at 23 24 the center, and it is pushed out to -- the

1 way we handle -- or the way the State Police 2 in the NYSIC now, it's pushed out to the 3 Joint Terrorism Task Force in the particular area that it might have been sent from. They 4 5 have the right of first refusal per se. And if they don't feel it's appropriate for them 6 7 to adopt the case, it will go to a local 8 police department. It can be geotagged so even if you 9 10 don't include a text, we can tell, normally, where it comes from. 11 12 SENATOR ADDABBO: I was going to say, those who give the information, is it 13 14 confidential information on their end? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: It is. 15 16 SENATOR ADDABBO: It is, okay. COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I believe that 17 18 the State Police and the people at the NYSIC reserve the right to try and contact them if 19 20 they need to, but they don't have to. 21 SENATOR ADDABBO: Commissioner, once 22 again, thank you very much for your efforts. And of course through our good chair, Senator 23 24 Croci, I look forward to working with you as

1 well. 2 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you, 3 Senator. 4 SENATOR KRUEGER: Assembly? 5 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much. 6 7 Assemblyman Lentol. ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Good morning, 8 Commissioner. 9 10 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Good morning, 11 sir. 12 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: And thank you for 13 your service. 14 I just was wondering, while you were 15 testifying -- maybe I'm behind the times, but 16 I remember after 9/11 how much we were shortchanged by the federal government in the 17 resources that New York City as well as New 18 York State deserved because we were the 19 20 primary target of terrorism. 21 So I have two questions leading from 22 that. Is that still true? And does your agency have an advocacy function in 23 24 Washington to make sure that we get the

1 resources from them that we deserve for this
2 problem?

3 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Well, I can tell you that we are always advocating for 4 5 more money from the federal government. And I believe that the Governor's office has that 6 7 issue handled for the most part. We do not really lobby Washington for that. But we 8 deal with FEMA and the Department of Homeland 9 10 Security all the time.

11 We receive, in New York State, 12 probably 30 percent or in the area of 30 percent of the UASI money that's 13 14 distributed throughout the country, and I 15 would say 18 percent or so of the State 16 Homeland Security Grant Program. Is that enough? I don't know if we could ever have 17 18 enough. But we certainly do great things 19 with that amount of money that we do get from 20 the federal government.

ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: As far as
disaster preparedness goes, I remember, even
though it wasn't my district, but in some
places upstate during Irene and Lee, there

1 were people who were flooded out and who died 2 as a result of not being able to be rescued. 3 And I wonder, since then, if we've developed a better, for lack of a better word, roadmap 4 5 to be able to go by boat, by helicopter or 6 any other means in order to rescue people who 7 may in the future need to be rescued from a 8 storm like Sandy, Lee or Irene.

9 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Unfortunately, 10 Assemblyman, we do learn from the tragedies, 11 and we react to them. We change our training 12 structure and our tactics all the time based 13 on the intelligence that we've received and 14 the events that have occurred in New York 15 State and around the world. We have targeted 16 tech rescue grants, we call them now, that go to fire departments. We have swift water 17 18 rescue programs that we train on.

19So we're well aware of that. Our20first responders and our Office of Fire21Prevention and Control teach many, many, many22courses around the state in just that type of23circumstance.

24 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you, sir.

1 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you. 2 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 3 Our next speaker is Senator Michael Nozzolio. 4 5 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Chairwoman. 6 7 Good afternoon, I guess it is now. Good afternoon, Commissioner Melville. 8 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Good 9 10 afternoon, Senator. 11 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Kudos to you and 12 the division for taking charge, working with 13 the Governor, under his direction, in 14 managing the emergency preparedness of our 15 state. The reaction in storm management, 16 communication, ensuring safety is improving with every instance of those kinds of 17 challenges, and I thank you and your division 18 19 for that effort. 20 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you, 21 Senator. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I would like to 22 23 focus, however, on some issues that are not 24 so seen, they're unseen, but personally could

1 be extremely devastating to individuals,

2 taxpayers, constituents of this state -- and 3 that's the issue of security, and 4 specifically cybersecurity.

5 That your division's experiences with 6 cybersecurity -- and with all admiration for 7 encouraging student participation in 8 education, tell us beyond that, what is the 9 division doing to beef up our cybersecurity 10 efforts?

COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Well, the 11 12 analysts that we have now, Senator, are collocated at the NYSIC with the Multistate 13 14 Information Sharing and Analysis Center, 15 which is the federal government's 16 cybersecurity watchdog, if you will. They also work with the state --17 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Is that in 18 Rensselaer? Where is that located? 19 20 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Yes, it is. 21 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Rensselaer? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Yeah. That's 22 collocated with our New York State 23 24 Intelligence Center. And the State Police

1 also are collocated there with their 2 cybersecurity investigative teams. 3 Probably in 2013, the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services --4 5 cybersecurity was taken away as one of our core functions, and removed to the ITS, along 6 7 with our funding and personnel. We don't have a main role in 8 cybersecurity. We're well aware of it, we 9 10 use it in terms of intel passing all the time. We have a critical infrastructure unit 11 12 that goes all around the state and is 13 legislated in some respects to do certain 14 types of critical infrastructure, in others 15 not. But they take a cybersecurity component 16 with them from ITS to do the cybersecurity inspections of, say, pipelines or energy 17 transmission facilities, things of that 18 19 nature. 20 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: This expands on 21 Senator Croci's comments, that you were 22 finding the Division of Homeland Security not 23 having direct reportable information by law

24 and channel, that is strengthened by law,

that provides that security function. And
 I'll be probing this with those
 representatives of Office of Information
 Technology later today and others.

5 That you'd have to be totally immune from what's going on if we didn't recognize 6 7 this. Last year alone, we've seen cyber attacks on the Internal Revenue Service, the 8 Office of Personnel Management, even the 9 10 Joint Chiefs of Staff. And if that's the case, isn't the New York State Department of 11 12 Taxation and Finance going to be next? We've 13 seen a major security breach in the largest 14 repository of health and financial data 15 probably in this state, in the data breach 16 that occurred with Excellus last year.

17 So I am wondering what type of 18 commitment do we have to help, first, guard 19 our public sector-held information and, 20 secondly, encourage and assist those private 21 companies in doing business in New York to 22 protect the data of its citizens.

23 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Senator, we're24 well aware of the cybersecurity threat. We

1 at the Division of Homeland Security and 2 Emergency Services view our role in 3 cybersecurity as an intelligence-driven role, passing information along about schemes, 4 5 attacks, issues. We also have the role of responding to 6 7 an emergency that would occur as a result of 8 a cyber attack. So it would not necessarily be the attack itself, but the issues that 9 10 follow after that attack. And that's really 11 what we would be functioning or at least 12 focusing on with our Office of Emergency 13 Management. 14 I think that the state is 15 well-prepared with their Multistate ISAC, the 16 NYSIC, and the State Police and the other efforts across the state from ITS, to deal 17 18 with those types of investigations. It's just not what we do per se. 19 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And I understand 20 21 that, Commissioner. I'm not suggesting that 22 you be an investigatory or law enforcement operation. That's not your role, it's not 23 24 something I would even suggest.

1 However, just as you are involved in 2 storm preparedness, just as you are involved 3 in other disaster preparedness, why are we not having you involved -- and I ask that 4 5 question because I think it's something the Legislature ultimately has to deal with, 6 7 along with the Governor -- why aren't we involved, Homeland Security involved in 8 issues of cybersecurity protection? Ensuring 9 10 that someone is overseeing, with security in 11 mind, the vast data systems that are being 12 held by state government? That's what I believe we need to address. 13 14 And certainly your -- after the fact 15 is too late. The horse is out of the barn, 16 it's too late a question for you to be involved. Then it's a question for law 17 enforcement. 18 19 But what should be done proactively by 20 the Division of Homeland Security to protect the data of New Yorkers? 21 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I believe we 22 are doing what we need to do now, Senator. 23 24 We react to issues that may or may not be

1 created by a cyber breach. We have analysts 2 that work with the State Police in close coordination with the Multistate ISAC Center. 3 So we are there to push information out that 4 5 we receive about cybersecurity issues to our partners, to the public, to the private 6 7 sector. So I believe our role is being fulfilled at this point. 8 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Yes, from a 9 10 statutory standpoint that is, I'm sure, accurate. But shouldn't the role be to 11 12 protect in the first place? Shouldn't the role be -- not as a law enforcement 13 14 enterprise and a, again, closing the barn 15 door after the horse ran away -- shouldn't it 16 be more to make sure the barn door is locked and not tampered with and having the 17 18 appropriate security to ensure that 19 particularly the data is protected? 20 And that I think is -- let me ask you 21 this. Who is in charge of the state to 22 protect the data of its citizens, that's entrusted with the state? 23 24 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I would say

1	the ITS, the State ITS, as well as the State
2	Police and their partners at the NYSIC.
3	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Commissioner, thank
4	you. We'll certainly be probing that issue.
5	And it may be something that our chair of the
6	homeland security, Commander Croci, is going
7	to be dealing with in the months ahead. So I
8	appreciate your candor and your forthcoming
9	comments. Thank you.
10	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you,
11	Senator.
12	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator.
13	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Ortiz.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Good morning,
15	Commissioner.
16	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: How are you,
17	sir?
18	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: I am doing well.
19	I have a few questions, very quick, if
20	I can put on my glasses.
21	My first question is, what is the
22	working relationship that you have with the
23	ICE and Homeland Security at the federal
24	government?

1 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: The federal 2 Homeland Security? 3 ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: No, yours. What is the relationship between your Homeland 4 5 Security and the federal Homeland Security? Do you guys talk to each other often? And 6 7 how often? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: We do talk to 8 each other often. I would say more through 9 10 email communication, but I do have conversations with people in Washington. I 11 12 am the homeland security advisor for the 13 Governor, so I am the point for contact for 14 certain things with the Department of 15 Homeland Security. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Okay. So right to my second question, so you are familiarized 17 18 with the Obama deportations approach 19 throughout the country; correct? 20 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: The what? I'm 21 sorry. ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: The Obama 22 deportation, the President of the United 23 24 States has said we -- you know, he has given

1	ICE the green light to go through state by
2	state to deport folks after January 2014.
3	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Okay.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Are you
5	familiarized with that?
6	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Somewhat.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Okay. So my third
8	question goes along the lines of if you are
9	somewhat familiarized with it, I represent
10	the areas of Sunset Park in Brooklyn. I have
11	a lot of undocumented immigrants who live in
12	my district. And what we've been getting in
13	my office is that there has been some folks
14	from ICE, some local enforcements, who has
15	been knocking on their doors and going
16	through the churches and looking for folks
17	who are not legally in this country.
18	Are you familiarized with this?
19	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: No, I'm not,
20	Assemblyman. And really that has that
21	issue, albeit a very important issue, has
22	really no place in the Division of Homeland
23	Security and Emergency Services at a state
24	level. That's a federal program and a

1 federal issue. We don't have anything to do
2 with that.

3 ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: So you have not anything to do -- despite the fact that you 4 5 have a relationship with the Homeland Security/ICE agency at the federal 6 7 government? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: My 8 9 relationship with the Homeland Security 10 people at the federal level really has to do 11 with our grant funding, what we get from 12 them, what we spent it on, how we spend it, 13 what we target. It really has nothing to do 14 with immigration issues. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Okay. And you 16 just stated that you serve as an advisor to the Governor to ICE, to Homeland Security; 17 18 correct?

COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I am the
 advisor to the Governor for homeland security
 issues here in New York State.

ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Well, let me just recommend a couple of things. I think that we do have a lot of serious issues regarding

law enforcement. And I know the -- I 1 2 addressed this issue to the superintendent 3 last year about folks in the law enforcement stopping individuals, Hispanic individuals in 4 5 Buffalo, in the Western Hemisphere {sic} and then that came to Long Island as well. 6 7 I think that if you are the advisor to 8 ICE and you work for our Governor, my advice will be probably to try to have a more 9 10 preactive action plan, that these families will not have fear, these families will not 11 12 have fear as they have bring their children 13 to the hospital, their children to the 14 schools. Right now in my district we have 15 seen a decrease of kids going to school as a 16 result of this initiative. So if you are the advisor, I would 17

18 recommend that you take that message back to 19 those folks that you're speaking to, either 20 via email -- on behalf of the people that we 21 represent in our own community.

And thank you for the job that you
continue to do in serving us in the state.
Thank you.

1	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you,
2	Assemblyman, and I would love to have a
3	dialogue with you about that at some point.
4	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
5	Senator Marty Golden.
6	SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you, Madam
7	Chair.
8	And thank you for your service.
9	You're doing an outstanding job.
10	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you,
11	Senator.
12	SENATOR GOLDEN: I don't want to beat
13	a dead horse, but I know we went over
14	this, seven two downstate, five upstate,
15	and we probably beat it to death. But just
16	in my family, my son went down with the viral
17	last weekend, I went down with the viral on
18	Wednesday and Thursday, my wife went down
19	with the viral on Friday, Saturday, and
20	Sunday. When the wife goes down, the whole
21	house gets shut down. All right? So we went
22	down, it was different.
23	You got seven people, two downstate
24	and five upstate. How do we if there's

1 any type of sickness, vacations, how is that 2 manned? How does that work? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: You're 3 referring to the intelligence analysts, 4 5 Senator? 6 SENATOR GOLDEN: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Yeah, we have seven presently. There's 10 actually being 8 proposed to be transferred. We have three 9 10 openings that we haven't been filled yet, and we probably -- we're waiting till this 11 12 transfer occurs and they go to the State Police. 13 14 But each one of those analysts is cross-trained in different types of 15 counterterrorism, and they have different 16 expertises, although some are experts more so 17 in one field than the other. So if one is 18 19 out, another covers. But for the most part, that's never been an issue for us. 20 21 SENATOR GOLDEN: What was a little shock for me last week is when the Port 22 Authority -- not the Port Authority, but the 23 24 ILA went out on strike and ports were shut

1	down in Jersey and in New York. Anybody
2	having some idea that that was going to
3	happen obviously would have had some
4	advantage.
5	How did were we informed of that?
6	Did we know about that? And how do we stay
7	in touch with our ports, and how are we
8	dealing with our maritime.
9	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: The
10	longshoremen issue that was last week? Yeah,
11	I was made aware of it after it happened,
12	actually, and was made aware of it when it
13	ended. But it wasn't really a I would say
14	a counterterrorism issue per se. So even
15	though our analysts track all open-source
16	intel about all different things, the ports
17	being one of those areas, I don't think we
18	received any previous Intel that this was
19	coming.
20	SENATOR GOLDEN: But we are in touch
21	with maritime? If there's a ship coming in,
22	we have problems with the ship, or a cruise
23	ship or a tanker?
24	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: We have

1 analysts that brief monthly at the ports who 2 are very familiar with shipping industries 3 and the Coast Guard and all the partners that certainly are involved in various ports 4 5 around the state. 6 SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you. 7 The Superstorm Sandy -- which again, you did an outstanding job -- but again, 8 we're in our fourth year and there are still 9 10 thousands of people that are still not in their homes and still waiting to get their 11 12 homes razed, and there's still a whole lot 13 that has to be done and hardening of our 14 arteries. And you've explained to us and 15 expressed to us how to fund it and gotten 16 money out from the federal government and from the state government into the city and 17 18 state and Long Island. Is there anything 19 that's not -- are there any obstacles in your 20 way of not getting that money out? Is there 21 anything that's not giving you the 22 opportunity to let that money flow more freely? 23 24

COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I would have

1 to say no, Senator. We had over 12,000 2 contracts for public assistance -- repairing 3 bridges and tunnels and roadways and things 4 like that -- and we're current on all 12,000. 5 The issue with some of those funding problems is the work has to be done first. 6 7 The municipality has to pay for the work. Once that municipality pays, we reimburse 8 9 through the federal government. So it's 10 not -- we just can't give the money up-front 11 and say okay, go do your project. It has to 12 be done, the work has to be completed, it has to be inspected, it has to be paid, and then 13 14 we reimburse. 15 And we are current on all those 16 contracts. We don't have any outstanding 17 bills as far as I know. 18 SENATOR GOLDEN: So you're working closely with the Army Corps of Engineers and 19 20 in certain areas where we need dredging to be 21 able to get our police boats, our fire boats 22 in and out of -- and get them operable when needed, you're on top of all of that? 23 24 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I believe so,

1 Senator. That's probably those HMGP grants 2 that aren't really targeted at individuals or 3 communities. They're large-scale projects. For example, they're -- one of the projects 4 5 is bridge scour projects for 106 bridges across the state. There's projects like that 6 7 that HMGP money goes for that just take a 8 long time to complete. And we pay as the bills come in. So, you know, those 12,000 9 10 contracts that we have open, we are current on, but they just take a long time to get to 11 12 the end.

SENATOR GOLDEN: I have a town hall 13 coming up in Garrison Beach, Manhattan Beach 14 15 and Sheepshead Bay in the Brooklyn area in 16 the City of New York. I may ask somebody from your office to attend. It's coming up 17 18 on March 1st, March 2nd. So if I can get somebody to attend, I would appreciate it. 19 20 Because I'm going to have both -- not only 21 the homes and the people that are affected by 22 Build It Back and by other streams of funds that are being made available for the 23 24 building and rebuilding of these homes, but

1 also they're going to have people there from 2 the hardening of the arteries in and around 3 those areas, to make sure that that water doesn't come in and hit them again. 4 5 So if you can, I'd appreciate somebody from your office at that, if I can. I'll 6 7 send a memo to your office. COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: We'll 8 certainly look forward to that, Senator. 9 10 SENATOR GOLDEN: The settlement funds, 11 are you guys getting any of the settlement 12 funds that the -- coming in from the Attorney General and other areas? Is Homeland 13 Security getting any of that at all? 14 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Settlement 15 funds? I'm not familiar with that. 16 SENATOR GOLDEN: Settlement funds from 17 18 the different settlements that the Attorney General has made or others have made with 19 20 financial institutions of wrongdoing, where we see billions of dollars coming into the 21 22 State of New York. Are you getting any of those funds coming into your organization? 23 24 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Those funds

1 don't get channeled through us.

2	SENATOR GOLDEN: They don't get
3	channeled at all. Last question, or last
4	series of questions.
5	The interoperability, how long is this
6	going to take? I know that it's a tough
7	question, but I've still got the Port
8	Authority in one area and I still got NYPD in
9	another area. And we know the 9/11 was
10	Port Authority. So we want to make sure
11	we're on top of that in the city, and for the
12	state. If you can I know it's a leap
13	here, but if you can give us some timeline as
14	to when this interoperability is going to be
15	in effect across the State of New York or,
16	more so, when it's going to be effective with
17	Port Authority and NYPD, I would greatly
18	appreciate it.
19	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Hey, I
20	understand the issue, Senator. And I'm no
21	radio geek, so that's a hard thing for me to
22	say. I asked the same question when I came
23	to the agency: How long is this going to
24	take? We keep throwing money, money, money

1 at this. You know, \$228 million, I think, to 2 the counties to get this done. 3 It's a hard problem. You'll probably hear from the superintendent later this 4 5 afternoon about the issues maybe they had in Dannemora with radio interoperability. And 6 7 we sent people up there to assist with that. We're close. We're throwing another 8 \$75 million at this problem this year to the 9 10 counties to take care of this. 11 We're trying to fill gaps now. We're 12 almost there. I would say our goal is to be 13 interoperable statewide by the end of 2017. 14 But New York's a big state, it's got a lot of 15 topography issues, a lot of -- it's just a hard issue to finish. But we're almost 16 17 there. 18 SENATOR GOLDEN: My time is up. If you could let me know when Port Authority --19 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Yes, it is. 21 SENATOR GOLDEN: -- NYPD is going to. 22 If you can get a memo to my office on Port Authority and NYPD. I would appreciate it. 23 24 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: We will do

1 that, Senator.

2	SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator
4	Golden.
5	SENATOR GOLDEN: You're quite welcome,
6	Madam Chair.
7	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Assembly?
8	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: I think we're done.
9	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Senator Bonacic.
10	SENATOR BONACIC: Thank you,
11	Commissioner. I think you're doing a
12	terrific job since you've taken on this
13	responsibility.
14	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Thank you,
15	Senator.
16	SENATOR BONACIC: Especially
17	outstanding when it comes to natural
18	disasters floods, fire, Sandy. And
19	dealing with us, as Senator Golden said.
20	But I want to talk about terrorism.
21	Terrorism has now moved up to maybe the top
22	two things that are on Americans' minds, that
23	we want to be safe in America. And I myself,
24	a little upset when I hear the Governor say

1 that terrorist attacks on America is the new 2 normal. If we're the greatest country in the 3 world, we should never have the mindset of terrorist attacks on the homeland being 4 5 normal. It's a crisis. Okay? And I know you don't walk on water, 6 7 and I know many of these things that are happening are beyond your control. But my 8 view of this -- and I'm not a dramatist -- I 9 10 think there is a clear and present danger to 11 New York and America. New York especially 12 has the biggest bull's-eye of all the states 13 in America. And how we handle the Syrian 14 crisis, with refugees, how we handle 15 deportation for visas that have expired, how 16 we handle our borders, how we handle immigration issues -- when are we going to 17 18 stop gutting the military? -- all of these factors are happening, challenges, because of 19 20 a failure of leadership in Washington.

21 So I wanted just to say that. And I 22 know that may not be within your province. 23 But Senator Croci, Senator Nozzolio and I 24 have talked about -- at length about this

1 cybersecurity. Now, we've seen a pattern 2 over the last few years. We see the Chinese 3 hacking our military secrets. We see them hacking the IRS. We see them hacking Hillary 4 5 Clinton's personal server that has national security issues. 6 7 So I just think -- and this has gone on for a while. I think they're sleeping at 8 the switch, some of these people in 9 10 Washington. There's a loss of confidence, in 11 my mind. This is only me speaking. 12 So I would suggest to you, if it's 13 within your power in working with the 14 Governor, to come up with a budget on how we 15 can do more cybersecurity in the State of 16 New York, to give you more resources so you don't have to depend on what other 17 18 bureaucracies and what other people are 19 doing, because I see us as having the biggest 20 bull's-eye in New York. 21 So if it's within your power, I would 22 certainly be supportive of more money for

23 homeland security -- on cybersecurity,

24 in-house, under your leadership and whatever

1 agencies you need to make us the best that we 2 can be. And for the law enforcement that we 3 have in New York and in this country, I think 4 5 they have the most challenges in the world and they're doing the best job that they can 6 7 with all that's facing them. And we're so grateful for the work that they do. 8 Thank you, Commissioner. 9 10 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I agree. 11 Thank you, Senator. 12 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 13 much, Senator Bonacic. 14 Our next speaker is Senator Squadron. 15 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very 16 much, Madam Chair. Thank you, Commissioner, for the work 17 18 you do and the testimony you're providing. 19 So as we look at a growing mandate, 20 for the reasons we've heard and so many 21 others, speak just briefly to something I've 22 worked with the department on going back many years, to the coordination especially with 23 24 New York City -- which as we know is a

1	central target, has been centrally impacted
2	by Sandy and other severe emergencies, and
3	has in its NYPD one of the great
4	counterterrorism programs in the nation, and
5	in its own Office of Emergency Management a
6	very, very sophisticated emergency response
7	system. How is that coordination with the
8	City of New York going?
9	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Excellent.
10	SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. So that's
11	true vis-a-vis NYPD?
12	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Yes, it is. I
13	meet with Chief Waters regularly, the chief
14	of counterterrorism. Superintendent D'Amico
15	of the State Police and I are good friends,
16	we converse often about those types of
17	issues. And the cooperation between the
18	Office of Emergency Management in New York
19	City, the Police Department, and us is
20	outstanding.
21	SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. And the
22	office of Fire Protection and the FDNY?
23	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Perfect.
24	SENATOR SQUADRON: Excellent. I

1 passed a bill a number of years ago that 2 produced a report about some of the real 3 dangers to residents in New York City and FDNY due to the fact that state buildings, 4 5 buildings under the state code in New York City are not covered by the city building 6 7 code, historically did not have shared 8 building plans, which meant that tragically, in my district, when FDNY went to respond to 9 10 a fire at 130 Liberty Street at the World 11 Trade Center site, they didn't have the same 12 plans on file they would for another 13 high-rise fire, and in that case leading to 14 truly tragic circumstances.

15 There had been a plan to embed State 16 Office of Fire Protection personnel with FDNY in their emergency response so that it was 17 18 much easier to coordinate that information 19 up-front and make sure that we weren't 20 putting FDNY personnel at risk and were 21 ensuring the kind of safety we have in state buildings in city buildings. 22

Is that program still continuing? Andwhat confidence can we have that FDNY is

1	going to have the same information going into
2	a building under state jurisdiction as it
3	does every other building in the city?
4	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Can you just
5	provide some context as far as a date for
6	that, Senator? Because I've only been here a
7	year, and I don't know if that goes way back
8	or
9	SENATOR SQUADRON: Sure, of course.
10	Yeah, that report I believe came out in 2012.
11	And then through 2012 and '13 and into the
12	beginning of 2014, we worked with
13	then-Commissioner Cassano and Hauer on this
14	quite extensively.
15	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Okay. I'm
16	going to have to get back to you, if that's
17	okay, Senator. I know there was some issue
18	about state buildings in the city and it was
19	a legal issue that our legal team was looking
20	at. I don't know if it's the same issue that
21	you're referring to it may be. But I
22	don't have an answer for you.
23	SENATOR SQUADRON: Okay. Well, this
24	is a critically important issue. We need a

path to a solution here. And we can't, you know, rely on sort of the status quo or on, you know, bureaucratic attempts to hold on to one role or the other.

5 The fact is building plans are available to FDNY when they get an emergency 6 7 in every building in the city unless it's not 8 under city jurisdiction, which means all the state buildings, the Port Authority 9 10 buildings, the buildings at the World Trade Center site are not automatically shared in 11 12 that way.

13 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Okay. 14 SENATOR SQUADRON: Further, some of 15 the roles and the consistency between the 16 roles and the processes for how you create safe buildings or fire-safe buildings are not 17 the same. And therefore, it can create 18 19 concerns and risks both for the users of 20 those buildings and for emergency personnel 21 who are responding.

22 This is something that has to be 23 better coordinated than it has been in the 24 past. We started that process, and it sounds

1 like -- and thank you for your sort of 2 straightforwardness in this answer -- it's 3 not clear that process has been completed in a way that's sufficient. So I would love a 4 5 report on where that is and why it is that we can have more comfort now than a half-decade 6 7 ago when tragic consequences ensued and 8 firefighters lost their lives at 130 Liberty Street related to this issue. 9 10 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Yeah, don't misunderstand me, Senator; I don't know if 11 12 that issue has been resolved. I do know that 13 we have a wonderful working relationship 14 between our Office of Fire Prevention and Control and the FDNY. I would assume that if 15 16 it was some critical issue, as you described, I would be aware of it. I really haven't 17 heard -- I know there was an issue about 18 building inspections or something --19 20 SENATOR SQUADRON: Exactly. 21 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: -- but it 22 hadn't risen to the level of really a critical problem that I certainly would hope 23 24 that I would be aware of.

1 So it may be solved, it may be done, 2 but I guarantee I'll get back to you. 3 SENATOR SQUADRON: I mean, one of the issues is this long-standing problem folks 4 5 have gotten used to -- which doesn't mean it's not a problem but sometimes it doesn't 6 7 rise to the level of an alarm bell being rung. It's smoldering as opposed to sort of, 8 you know, really burning out of control right 9 now. But let's stop it while it's 10 11 smoldering. 12 So I'll look forward to some feedback 13 and follow-up on where we are with that issue 14 over the next couple of weeks. Thank you so 15 much. COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: As do I. 16 Thank you. 17 18 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 19 much. Senator Krueger. 20 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much. 21 And thank you for your excellent work. A number of my colleagues were 22 discussing their support for even more money 23 24 for your agency. My question actually is,

1 your agency is receiving \$600 million 2 additional in federal revenue this year 3 compared to last year. So last year you had 4 \$653,774,000 in federal special revenue; this 5 year it increases by \$600 million. 6 Where is all this money going in the 7 current budget? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: That 8 \$600 million increase in Aid to Localities, 9 10 Senator, is really just an appropriation, in case we need to pass federal funds through 11 12 for a future disaster, that we have the 13 ability and the appropriation to do that. 14 We don't have any plans to use that 15 money. I hope we don't. 16 SENATOR KRUEGER: So it's a cash infusion from the feds or a line of credit, 17 18 that if something happens, we can make 19 requests for certain categories of things? 20 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: The latter, is 21 my understanding. SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. Can you talk 22 a little bit about how you used last year's 23 24 \$653 million, or is that also still just a

1 line of credit that we drew down some of but 2 not all of? COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: That is 3 4 correct. And this is just increasing that \$600 million in case we need to use it. 5 6 SENATOR KRUEGER: Did we use any of 7 that \$653 million from the fiscal year that's closing? 8 9 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: We did not 10 have a federally declared disaster in all of 11 2015. I'm taking credit for that. But --12 (Laughter.) COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: So I'm going 13 14 to say no, Senator. But as much as I'm not a 15 radio geek, I'm really not a budget person 16 either. But I -- that's my understanding. SENATOR KRUEGER: And do you know, is 17 18 there a specific set of language somewhere, 19 and perhaps that you could get us, that 20 explains under what circumstances we can draw 21 that money down? 22 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Certainly. 23 SENATOR KRUEGER: I would appreciate 24 that.

1	And do you have any understanding of
2	whether, if we don't spend it by some date,
3	do we not have access to it?
4	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: I think it
5	just gets my understanding and again,
6	take it from where it's coming from is
7	that it would have to be reappropriated next
8	year. But I'm not sure.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much.
10	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you,
11	Commissioner. By the way, good work on not
12	tapping that fund, so keep it up.
13	I want to just quickly ask, to follow
14	up on Senator Krueger's question, so
15	generally that fund would be used, for
16	example, for FEMA disasters or some kind of
17	terrorism attack, is that basically it?
18	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: If we had a
19	flood, if we had a hurricane, if we had a
20	tornado, that type of disaster, we would be
21	able to appropriate those funds. Because the
22	Legislature had said it was okay to do that.
23	And that money would come to us
24	through FEMA or DHS.

CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Correct. Thank
 you.
 Our final speaker, to wrap up, is
 Senator Croci.

5 SENATOR CROCI: Well, thank you, Madam Chair, for the opportunity to ask a couple of 6 7 follow-up questions, Commissioner. And I appreciate your patience here today with us. 8 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: My pleasure. 9 10 SENATOR CROCI: We touched on a little about the Governor's statement about a "new 11 12 normal." My colleague brought that out. And 13 I think Commissioner Kelly, Ray Kelly, is one of those individuals who helped redefine what 14 15 our actions needed to be, particularly in 16 New York City, in the wake of the attacks in the early '90s on Lower Manhattan, but also 17 18 specifically after September 11th and the 19 kind of counterterrorism unit and capability that the NYPD built. 20

21 So I'm very interested in having the 22 opportunity, perhaps the Legislature to see 23 that report. Given his expertise and his 24 national recognition, it would be very

1 interesting to see that.

2	But I am curious you have a direct
3	one-on-one relationship with the head of
4	counterterrorism at the NYPD. And I'm just
5	curious, why we would take away statutory
6	language that puts you in charge of
7	counterterrorism in the State of New York by
8	taking that title away, along with bodies, if
9	you are the individual who has relationships
10	in counterterrorism. That's a question that
11	I had, if you had any follow-up answer.
12	COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Sure. I don't
13	view this transfer of the analysts from my
14	division to the Division of State Police as
15	anything more than getting them in line to
16	streamline their intel to the people who need
17	it first, and then we'll get it.
18	I don't think that I will not be
19	considered a counterterrorism person anymore.
20	I mean, I'll still have those relationships,
21	I'll still have different functions with
22	respect to counterterrorism in the Division
23	of Homeland Security and Emergency Services,
24	just not the intel and analysis report.

1 SENATOR CROCI: So why take that 2 statutory responsibility away from you, then, 3 counterterrorism, by changing that language in the statute as proposed here? 4 5 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: Are you referring to the analysts? 6 7 SENATOR CROCI: Well, but it also -there's a deletion of the term 8 "counterterrorism." So I was just wondering 9 10 if that's something that you had a thought 11 on. 12 COMMISSIONER MELVILLE: My impression, 13 Senator, is that it's just the analysts moving over and that all other 14 15 counterterrorism responsibilities lie with 16 the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services, the ones that we have 17 18 now. 19 I remain, again, the homeland security advisor to the Governor and the contact for 20 21 the Department of Homeland Security in 22 Washington. And I really don't think it's 23 going to change anything other than make it a 24 little clearer for the analysts to get their

information to the people that need it first,
 and then we'll get it. And so will everybody
 else.

SENATOR CROCI: Touching on what 4 5 Senator Nozzolio mentioned about the transfer of cybersecurity responsibilities to ITS and 6 7 then, two years later now, a proposal to take counterterrorism and certain bodies out of 8 that pool, I think it's a conversation that 9 we'll have to continue to have. I'm 10 11 concerned at the deemphasis of it because I believe at the executive level, the lessons 12 of 9/11 and the "new normal" have suggested 13 14 that we need to continually augment that and 15 we need to continually highlight that from the executive level. And that I would want 16 any executive, but particularly the Governor 17 18 of this state and his staff, to be getting the most timely and accurate intelligence 19 20 possible so that good decisions could be made 21 and good policies could be passed to protect 22 New Yorkers.

23 My last statement was just that I
24 really -- I do believe that you have, in the

1 year, been able to work well with the 2 Legislature. These are very complicated 3 issues. I share my colleagues' concerns that we're out of time with regard to attacks. 4 5 And if Paris and San Bernardino and going back to the attacks in the Boston Marathon 6 7 and others, if that isn't indicative of what's coming -- it's an inevitability that I 8 hate to concede, and I'm sure every New 9 10 Yorker hates to concede. But I believe that 11 there are things we can do, there are 12 prevention preparedness moves that we can 13 make in the State of New York, legislative 14 and others.

15 It does take us out of our normal 16 comfort zone, and that's the new normal, that 17 we have to take actions we ordinarily 18 wouldn't as a Legislature, and look at laws 19 and administrative controls for the Governor 20 and authorities that we wouldn't ordinarily.

21 So I'm concerned about what's coming 22 for us, certainly. I heed the message of the 23 director of the FBI, who has since last year 24 asked state and local governments to look at

this in a new light and to come up with 1 2 innovative ways to assist our federal 3 partners. And I just don't want to 4 deemphasize that in statute, I don't want to 5 deemphasize that in our administrative rules, and I would hope that we could continue to 6 7 work together with the Governor's office to make sure that we're doing everything we can 8 to protect New Yorkers. We have no higher 9 10 priority. We have no more solemn duties than the security of our state and the residents 11 12 of New York. So thank you, and I look forward to 13 14 working with you in the future. 15 Thank you, Madam Chair. 16 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Chairman Croci. 17 Commissioner, we truly appreciate your 18 19 participation today and for being so patient 20 and sticking with us as we had our questions 21 asked and answered. So thank you for that. 22 And our next speaker is Executive Deputy Commissioner Michael C. Green --23 24 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.

1	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
2	New York State Division of Criminal
3	Justice Services.
4	(Pause.)
5	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Could I have your
6	attention, please. Thank you.
7	Executive Deputy Commissioner Green,
8	welcome. We're glad to have you here. We
9	look forward to your testimony.
10	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank
11	you.
12	Good afternoon, Chairwoman Young,
13	Chairman Farrell, and distinguished members
14	of the Legislature. I'm Mike Green, head of
15	the Division of Criminal Justice Services,
16	and I appreciate you having me here today.
17	Governor Cuomo's proposed budget for
18	fiscal year 2016-2017 will allow DCJS to
19	support the criminal justice system in
20	communities across our state, expand the use
21	of evidence-based programs proven to be
22	effective and cost-efficient, and continue
23	the development of innovative programs that
24	position New York as a national leader in

1 effective public safety policy.

2 New York continues to experience 3 reductions in crime and prison population. Reported crime reached an all-time low in 4 5 2014, and that year we maintained our standing as the safest large state in the 6 nation. New York also has the lowest 7 imprisonment rate of any large state. 8 Statewide crime data is not yet 9 10 available for 2015, but preliminary trends indicate that crime continued to decline last 11 12 year. And we will have better numbers by 13 mid-spring. 14 In addition to reintroducing 15 legislation to raise the age of criminal 16 responsibility, the Governor has proposed a range of other reforms to enhance the 17 fairness and effectiveness of our criminal 18 19 justice system and build trust between law 20 enforcement agencies and communities. 21 In his Built to Lead agenda, Governor 22 Cuomo advocates for legislation requiring recording of interrogations in serious cases, 23 24 and reforming identification procedures, to

1 bring New York in line with 49 other states 2 that allow photo-array identifications into evidence at trial. 3 Law enforcement agencies have embraced 4 5 recording, and we have already provided approximately \$3 million for them to purchase 6 7 and install the technology. DCJS plans to 8 announce additional funding this year. The Innocence Project and the District 9 10 Attorneys' Association support these 11 concepts; it's time they became law. 12 The Governor also is committed to reforming New York's bail statute. New York 13 14 is one of only four states that prohibit 15 judges from considering risk to public safety 16 as a factor when setting bail. A commonsense amendment will allow judges to consider that 17 18 risk when setting bail or allowing release 19 and permit them to use proven risk 20 assessments to aid in pre-trial release 21 decisions. Other jurisdictions have 22 successfully implemented the use of risk assessments, which has resulted in fewer 23 24 individuals being detained pre-trial as well

1 as increased public safety.

2	Through the Pew-MacArthur Results
3	First Initiative, DCJS has strengthened the
4	state's community-based alternative to
5	incarceration network, funding programs that
6	are effective in reducing recidivism and
7	cost-efficient. We are training ATI
8	providers, in addition to implementing a
9	fidelity and evaluation system to ensure the
10	programs we fund are delivered as designed.
11	New York's ATI realignment work has
12	been touted by Pew-MacArthur in a recently
13	published case study as a best practice for
14	other states to follow to reduce recidivism
15	and maximize taxpayer dollars.
16	The Governor's budget invests nearly
17	\$26.2 million through DCJS in programming
18	that reduces incarceration and recidivism.
19	That figure includes new funding: \$1 million
20	to expand the state's County Re-Entry Task
21	Forces to include new task forces in Queens
22	and increase the capacity of existing county
23	task forces; and \$1 million to create new
24	defendant screening and assessment programs

1 in jurisdictions outside New York City. 2 In its second year, New York's Gun 3 Involved Violence Elimination initiative, or GIVE, supports the use of proven strategies 4 5 to reduce shootings and save lives. GIVE targets the 17 counties that collectively 6 7 report 87 percent of the violent crime outside of New York City. GIVE provides 8 9 police departments and their county law 10 enforcement partners \$13.3 million in 11 funding, in addition to training and 12 technical assistance from national experts to 13 help implement programs proven to be 14 effective. 15 New York is unique among states in its 16 commitment to funding only evidence-based work through GIVE. The initiative's emphasis 17 18 on procedural justice -- which focuses on

19 ensuring that interactions between law 20 enforcement and individuals are fair, and that individuals who come in contact with 21 22 police believe they are being treated fairly and respectfully -- also sets GIVE apart. 23 24

More than 200 law enforcement

1 professionals recently attended a two-day 2 symposium to help them put procedural justice 3 into action. Research shows that positive police-community relations contribute to 4 safer communities. 5 To help stem the tide of gun violence 6 7 that continues to claim too many lives, particularly those of young men of color, 8 DCJS encourages GIVE jurisdictions to 9 10 implement street outreach work into their strategies. We've provided additional 11 12 funding to support street outreach in 10 GIVE jurisdictions and in the Bronx. The 13 14 Governor's budget proposal funds GIVE and 15 street outreach work at the same level as the 16 current budget. This 2016-2017 budget proposal will 17 18 allow DCJS to continue supporting our local 19 partners, expanding our evidence-based work, 20 and implementing initiatives designed to 21 foster fairness, respect and transparency in 22 the state's criminal justice system. I thank you for the opportunity to 23 24 speak with you today, and I'd be happy to

1 take any questions you have. 2 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 3 Executive Deputy Commissioner Green. Our first speaker is Senator Gallivan, 4 who is chair of the Senate Crime and 5 Corrections Committee. 6 7 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. 8 9 Good afternoon, Commissioner. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Good 10 11 afternoon, Senator. 12 SENATOR GALLIVAN: I have questions in three different areas that is outside of the 13 14 testimony that you just gave us. And you may 15 not or may not be aware -- and if this is not 16 your area of responsibility, if you can point me in the right direction so I can follow 17 18 through. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: 19 20 Certainly. 21 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Two years ago, in 22 the 2014-2015 budget, there was language in that budget to provide for a statewide law 23 24 enforcement records management system. And

the goal, of course, was to do a number of things -- to increase the ability of law enforcement agencies statewide to interact with each other, streamline reporting, help them provide better service in the area of case management, things like that.

What is the status of that?

7

EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I am 8 aware of the issue you're speaking about, and 9 10 it's an issue that involves both DCJS and the New York State Police. The State Police side 11 12 of it -- and I'm sure the superintendent can address this better than I do -- is that 13 14 their records management system needs to be 15 updated. The technology that it's built 16 upon, as I understand it, is on the verge of 17 becoming unsupported.

Basically the same records management system through DCJS is offered to local law enforcement agencies. At one time there were well over 200 local law enforcement agencies that took advantage of that offer and used that as their records management system. Again, that same system has the same problems

1 as the State Police one, in that the 2 technology was becoming unsupported two years 3 ago when that proposal was put forward. 4 That proposal was subject to the 5 approval by the Legislature of a plan submitted to the Legislature by the 6 7 Executive. The State Police and DCJS put together that plan, submitted it to the 8 Legislature, we met with legislative staff 9 10 repeatedly. And it's my understanding that 11 to this date there is still not legislative 12 approval for that plan. 13 What's happening on the ground, in the 14 meantime, is I have local law enforcement 15 agencies calling me literally every week 16 saying, I need a new records management system, do I need to go out and buy my own 17 18 records management system or is this ever 19 going to happen? Just last week I received 20 an outreach from the Sheriffs Association 21 asking me the same thing. So I really 22 appreciate you raising the issue. I think it is an issue that needs to be addressed 23 24 urgently. And we're still waiting for

1 approval.

2	SENATOR GALLIVAN: I was aware, I
3	think it was late last session and into the
4	summer, perhaps into the fall, I was aware
5	that there was discussions that were ongoing.
6	Has there been recent discussions over the
7	past several months, to your knowledge?
8	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have
9	not personally heard anything from the
10	Legislature. I've met, I'd say, at least
11	three or four times with staff, we've
12	answered questions in person, we've responded
13	to all the written questions that we've
14	received. So I'm not aware of any
15	unaddressed inquiries from the Legislature to
16	DCJS.
17	SENATOR GALLIVAN: How can I find out
18	where this is, the status of it?
19	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Again,
20	to the best of my understanding and I have
21	been following this on a weekly basis because
22	of the inquiries and the concerns I get from
23	local law enforcement is that we're just
24	waiting for approval from the Legislature,

1 that the RFP is drafted and ready to go, the 2 RFP was provided to the Legislature. The 3 plan was drafted, it was amended a number of times in response to concerns that the 4 5 Legislature raised. The plan was provided to the Legislature. 6 7 So, you know, everything is done, 8 ready to go, and the RFP is waiting to go out the door. And the only thing we're waiting 9 10 on is the legislative approval. 11 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right, thank 12 you. 13 The next question has to do -- it does 14 have to do with the Governor's budget 15 proposal this year, but more so pointing to 16 last year. So in the last fiscal year there was \$60 million allocated, the category was 17 18 for law enforcement safety equipment. But it 19 was to include vehicles for State Police and 20 then some other equipment, bulletproof vests, 21 things of that nature. 22 There was a recent news article within the past three or four weeks where a 23 24 spokesperson for the Governor said that that

money was contingent on the Legislature reaching an agreement with the Governor on last year's various criminal justice proposals. I was in on many of those meetings; I don't recall any time that that funding was contingent when we put that budget forward.

So this year's budget essentially 8 9 takes that \$60 million for badly needed State 10 Police cars, for badly needed equipment and the other things, and reallocates it for 11 12 different things. I do know that there was a 13 much smaller amount allocated for equipment, 14 I think it was \$4 million or something of 15 that nature. Are you able to comment on that 16 and maybe allay our concerns that the State Police does not need vehicles, does not need 17 18 additional equipment?

19EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: First of20all, you would certainly have better21information than I in terms of what was said22in the negotiating sessions. I wasn't there.23I am well aware of the \$60 million you24talk about. What I can tell you is that that

1 money was never provided to DCJS. Originally 2 there was conversation about DCJS doing an RFP or solicitation for local law 3 enforcement. I know one issue related to the 4 5 appropriation language. The way the language was drafted, it did not give DCJS the 6 7 authority to pass that money through on the local assistance grants. I know that the 8 Executive and DCJS provided input as to 9 10 language that would fix that problem, and it's my understanding that language never 11 12 made it into the bill. You know, I do know that the state 13 14 does invest through other sources in -- you 15 know, for example, bulletproof vests and 16 other funding sources that law enforcement can use. But that \$60 million has never come 17 to us for distribution. 18 19 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Fair enough. Where 20 can you point me to get answers? 21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Again, 22 you know, I think there were negotiations between the Executive and the Legislature. 23 24 And I -- you know, I know one of the things

1 that would need to be fixed is that

2 appropriation language.

3 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right. Thank4 you.

5 The last question has to do with an overall small item in the State Budget, but 6 7 very significant for some of the local law enforcement agencies that enforce the 8 navigation law. The Governor's budget calls 9 10 for a reduction in reimbursements to those specific local agencies that provide those 11 12 services -- some of the Finger Lakes, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, agencies like that. 13 14 The budget -- the reduction was from 15 50 percent to 25 percent. In the overall scheme of the State Budget, \$1 million is not 16 significant. But to these local agencies, 17 18 it's huge. Some of them have expressed to me 19 they won't have the ability to provide the 20 enforcement of the navigation on these

21 various bodies of water.

How can you suggest we deal with that?
EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Again, I
do not believe that that is through the DCJS

1	budget, because I'm not familiar with that
2	and I believe I know our budget fairly well.
3	But I can certainly look into it and get you
4	information on what budget stream that is in.
5	SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right. Thank
6	you.
7	SENATOR KRUEGER: Assembly?
8	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Yes. Assemblyman
9	Joe Lentol Chairman Joe Lentol.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you,
11	Chairman, Chairman Dennis Farrell.
12	(Laughter.)
13	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: And thank you,
14	Commissioner Green, for the work that you've
15	been doing. I've been watching you, and I
16	admire all the work that you've done in this
17	job.
18	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank
19	you.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: I just wanted to
21	digress from some of the questions that I
22	wanted to ask you because of some of your
23	testimony, and following up on what
24	Mr. Gallivan asked. And I guess the first

1 thing I'm going to ask is about the cloud 2 that he discussed. And we have had and we 3 have sent letters over to you regarding some issues that we'd like to resolve in order for 4 5 us to get on board with some legislation that's needed either independently or in the 6 7 budget. So I'm just hoping that you'll be able to meet with our staff, that your staff 8 will be able to meet with our staff to clear 9 10 up some of those issues. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm 11 12 sorry, I missed -- you said with regard to what issue? 13 14 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: With the cloud. 15 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I guess I -- when you say cloud, I really don't know 16 what you're talking about. The issue is a 17 18 records management system --19 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Yes. 20 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: -- it's not a cloud. 21 22 So, you know, we have met every single time we've been asked to meet; we've reached 23 24 out and asked for meetings. To my knowledge,

1	we've answered every single inquiry.
2	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Okay.
3	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I
4	will make myself available at any time going
5	forward to meet with you, your staff, or
6	anyone else from the Legislature with regard
7	to the records management system.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you.
9	That's all I can ask.
10	And secondly, I'm very perplexed by
11	the Governor's commitment to reforming the
12	bail statute. Because the mayor of the City
13	of New York as well it's not only the
14	Governor have proposed issues like the
15	Governor is proposing with respect to public
16	safety being required and having a statutory
17	change in order to include public safety in
18	bail reform.
19	At the same time, trying to implement
20	a program to allow people to get out, rather
21	than on bail, as opposed to having them
22	languish for two or three years and then
23	committing suicide like what happened in the
24	case in the Bronx.

1 And so I don't want to ask a long 2 question, but I know historically that -- and 3 I don't know if you were here to hear Mr. O'Donnell's questions earlier --4 5 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I heard the questions. 6 7 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: -- about bail reform and how we know that judges take into 8 account all of the things involving public 9 10 safety when they set bail. 11 So my most important concern is that 12 this will prevent the judges from letting 13 anybody out if they have a new component 14 that's added to the statute regarding risk 15 assessment or public safety. Because I don't 16 know, some of the judges that I've seen aren't brave, and they might take the 17 18 position, well, the Legislature just passed a 19 statute that we have to take public safety in 20 mind, so why should I let anybody out who 21 comes before me? That's my question. 22 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I think 23 that's a very good question. You know, and I 24 know you've spent a great deal of time both

in and dealing with the criminal justice
 system, as has Assemblyman O'Donnell.

And I think that sometimes your first instinct is to say, well, if you let judges consider that type of risk, we're going to hold more people. You know, and certainly I can admit that when I first heard the issue, that was one of the things that crossed my mind.

10 But I'm a firm believer in evidence-based work. I think that we 11 12 constantly need to look at our system and see 13 how can we make it better. I think we need 14 to look at what's happening in other parts of 15 the country in terms of new practices that 16 have been studied and shown results, and see what we can learn from them. And this is one 17 18 of the areas where I think we can learn.

19If you look at, for example, some of20the work the Arnold Foundation has done where21you allow judges to consider that risk and at22the same time you provide a framework -- so23right now, assuming what Assemblyman24O'Donnell said is true -- and I certainly

1 can't tell what's going on in the mind of 2 judges, but, you know, I have to say that I 3 think the inference that he asked people to 4 draw is reasonable -- then you have judges 5 right now with no guidance, no legislative 6 authority, considering that risk.

7 I would argue that it's much better to put it in legislation, establish guidelines, 8 and then allow judges to use evidence-based, 9 10 validated risk assessment instruments as a 11 tool -- not to replace their judgment, but as 12 a tool in addition to their judgment -- and 13 train judges and prosecutors and defense 14 lawyers on how to use those instruments. And 15 what the evidence has shown in the 16 jurisdictions that have done that is that you 17 actually end up holding fewer people, not 18 more people, and at the same time you have fewer crimes committed by people who are 19 20 released because you're making better 21 decisions as a system as to who to release.

And, you know, to your point about
judges being concerned or not wanting to take
a risk, if you have valid risk assessment

1 instruments, in some cases that may give the 2 judge the cover that the judge feels he or 3 she needs to make that decision and release somebody who doesn't pose a public safety 4 5 risk and could safely be released. ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Just to let you 6 7 know that I'm kind of a student of history, because my father had been here before I was, 8 and he was here during the 1965 revision of 9 10 the State Penal Law, when the Republican 11 Party controlled both houses of the 12 Legislature and the Governor was a 13 Republican.

And at that time, the Penal Law was amended by a sentencing commission, I guess, or a -- I'm sorry, a law revision commission that was basically headed by Mr. Bartlett, Assemblyman Bartlett, who was a Republican member -- I guess from Ms. Duprey's district, I'm not sure, upstate New York.

21 And that commission recommended, after 22 a long arduous discussion about the issue of 23 preventative detention, that we should leave 24 it out of the Penal Law, we should put in

1 provisions to allow judges to make the 2 assessment based on the risk factors that 3 Mr. O'Donnell mentioned earlier about it, so that a judge's hands wouldn't be tied by a 4 5 preventative detention statute that would 6 require them to set high bail in most every 7 case. I just wanted to point that out to 8 you, because that was done in 1965 when the 9 10 Penal Law was revised. So ... EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: From the 11 12 question, it sounds like you have an 13 advantage and may be a little bit older than 14 I am --15 (Laughter.) 16 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Just a little bit. 17 18 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: But, you know, I think that that's a good point, that 19 20 we should learn from history. But I think we 21 also have to learn from the experiences. And I'm not sure that the science behind risk 22 23 assessment that exists today existed back 24 then when they were making that decision.

1	And expire if you look to
1	And again, if you look to
2	jurisdictions that have implemented this and
3	implemented it properly, the result is fewer
4	people being held.
5	And back to your initial statement,
6	this proposal is being put forth by the
7	Governor because of his belief that if we
8	make better decisions and we use the science
9	that's available, we can hold fewer people
10	and make the state safer.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: I want to move
12	on, but I should also point out, which I
13	forgot to mention, that at the time in 1965
14	we had a crime rate that was much worse than
15	today, when that decision was made.
16	But let me move on to the independent
17	monitor. Because we talked about this last
18	year when you were here, and I don't want to
19	ask a whole host of questions. But it's hard
20	for me to understand whether this was a
21	mistake to be put back in the budget or not.
22	Because since the Governor issued an
23	executive order to allow the Attorney General
24	to act as a special prosecutor and an

independent monitor would have no resources at all within which to work, and the Attorney General would have a multitude of resources to handle these cases -- why are we asking again for an independent monitor and why not let the Attorney General handle these cases as a special prosecutor?

8 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: To 9 address your first point, it is not a mistake 10 that it was put back in. I think -- at least 11 from my position, I think the Governor made 12 clear last year that he believed that the 13 best option was the legislative option that 14 he put forward.

As I know you're well aware, there are many very important considerations to be balanced here. One of those is that every county has an elected district attorney that the people of that county elected to handle cases like this and make decisions like this in their county.

22 And a countervailing consideration is 23 public confidence in the criminal justice 24 system, which we know is critical, you know,

for a number of different reasons. One of
 which is studies show that when public
 confidence in the criminal justice system
 erodes, one of the things that can follow is
 lawlessness and higher crime rates.

So in balancing those things, the 6 7 Governor put forth a proposal that would not automatically take away the district 8 attorney's ability to handle cases but would 9 10 put a provision in place when the district 11 attorney either did not go to the grand jury 12 within a reasonable time on the case or the 13 grand jury issued no bill, to have an 14 independent monitor come in, review the facts 15 of the case, review the grand jury 16 proceedings and make a report to the Governor, so when the Governor exercised his 17 18 or her powers in terms of whether or not to 19 appoint a special prosecutor, it would be made based on solid information about the 20 21 facts and circumstances of that particular case. And if the Governor felt that there 22 was an injustice or that there was new 23 24 evidence, the Governor could appoint a

1 special prosecutor.

2	And I don't agree with your assessment
3	that there would be no resources, because I
4	think that it is envisioned under their
5	proposal that both the independent monitor
6	and, if necessary, the special prosecutor
7	would have the resources necessary.
8	Now, last year the Governor made clear
9	that that was his preference, but that if it
10	didn't pass, he felt something had to be
11	done. And when nothing was passed, he felt
12	something needed to be done, he signed the
13	executive order.
14	We're obviously in a different
15	position this year. You know, now there's an
16	executive order in place. But that doesn't
17	change the fact that the Executive feels that
18	the best path forward is a path that creates
19	that balance between those two very important
20	considerations. And I believe that that is
21	the reason why this legislation is put back
22	in again in the Governor's Article VII
23	budget.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: I listened very

1 carefully to the Governor at his State of the 2 State message, and I thought I heard him 3 say -- and maybe I'm mistaken, because you said I'm getting older; my hearing may be 4 5 getting bad. But I thought the Governor said that he was asking for not an independent 6 7 monitor but passage of the Keith Wright bill to make permanent a grand jury -- I'm sorry, 8 9 a special prosecutor in the Attorney 10 General's office to prosecute these cases and 11 investigate whether or not an additional 12 prosecution is necessary. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I was 13 14 sitting much farther back than you were, so I 15 might not have heard right either. But my 16 comments are based on the language of the Article VII bill that was submitted. And I 17 18 believe what I have just indicated in my 19 comments is consistent with the language that's in that Article VII bill. 20 21 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: You're at zero now. 23 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: I'm at zero, so 24 I'll turn my time over to the next speaker.

1	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
3	much.
4	SENATOR KRUEGER: Our next speaker is
5	Senator Mike Nozzolio.
6	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you very
7	much.
8	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Good
9	afternoon.
10	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Mr. DCJS
11	Commissioner, former district attorney and
12	good friend. How are you, Mike?
13	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Good,
14	thank you.
15	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Senator Funke and
16	Senator Akshar may be talking about other
17	issues regarding parole, and I want to put
18	you on notice in this forum that we are very
19	concerned with by we, those of us in the
20	Senate as we review the budget, in terms
21	of the allocation of resources for parole. I
22	know that's not directly within your purview,
23	but certainly we will be probing that with
24	Acting Commissioner Annucci and others.

1 But I wanted you to know that that's a 2 big concern of ours, and particularly in 3 Western New York. The supervision and the problems we've had with the caseload of 4 5 parole officers as well as the results of very tragic incidents occurring in your 6 7 hometown over the last few years regarding those who are out on parole and committing 8 very violent crimes soon after their 9 10 discharge. So putting you on notice of that, Mike. 11 12 Again in your region, but this is --13 we're finding this happening throughout the 14 state, is the scourge of heroin. It's a 15 scourge, it's a deeply rooted problem that is 16 no longer isolated in the inner cities but expanding well into the suburbs and rural 17 18 areas.

19Just as an aside, the sheriff of20Seneca County had a forum late last fall, and21it was discussed how those traveling from the22Central Finger Lakes, going to Rochester and23Syracuse to buy their supplies, and then24coming home, a round trip of 80 to 100 miles

1 and actually distributing, as dealers of 2 heroin, and having a market in the Central 3 Finger Lakes, which never existed before. But you travel the Thruway, we travel 4 5 the Thruway. Just think of those who are high on heroin going back and forth to their 6 7 places of obtaining supplies and being high on the road -- in fact, inebriated, under the 8 influence. And that just is nonetheless a 9 10 very disturbing situation. 11 What is DCJS doing, your agency, to 12 stem the heroin epidemic and to address the 13 heroin epidemic in our state? 14 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: That's a 15 very good question. You know, and I 16 certainly agree with you that heroin is a very serious problem. One thing I'd say to 17 preface my remarks, as you noted, I was a 18 19 prosecutor, I spent 25 years in the DA's 20 office, the last eight years as the DA. And 21 I can't tell you how many wiretap 22 applications I signed on drug cases, how many search warrants, you know, how many thousands 23 24 of drug dealers were prosecuted and, you

know, God knows how many pounds of heroin and
 coke and whatever else. And none of it made
 the drug problem go away.

So, you know, when we think about this 4 5 problem, I think we need to think about it from more than just a law enforcement 6 7 perspective. You know, if all we do is figure out how to arrest people and how to 8 confiscate drugs, we're on a never-ending 9 10 treadmill and we'll just keep doing that with 11 no change.

12 So, you know, a huge part of the equation has to be on the treatment side. 13 14 And I, in my remarks, briefly talked about 15 how we are bringing evidence-based practices 16 to the support of the funding that we do, to make sure that the money that we provide to 17 18 Alternative to Incarceration programs -- so 19 when people come into the criminal justice 20 system, need help and get referred to help, 21 the help that they're getting is effective 22 help that's done by agencies that are running in a way that is designed to make sure that 23 24 they get effective treatment and don't keep

cycling through the system. So that's one
 area that we're working in.

3 We've also been very active in terms of Naloxone, working with a number of other 4 5 state agencies. We've been engaged in a program for about two years now to train and 6 7 provide law enforcement officers across the state with Naloxone. So far, over 8,000 8 officers have been trained as part of that 9 10 program, including about 2,500 trainers under the Train the Trainer model. They've 11 12 administered Naloxone about a thousand times. Over 900 of those 1,000 administrations have 13 14 resulted in saves.

15 In addition, we've provided funding 16 and do provide funding to the special narcotics prosecutor, to district attorney's 17 offices across the state, some of which is 18 used for the prosecution of drug cases. And 19 20 then through our work with crime analysis 21 centers, we provide resources to local law 22 enforcement on the crime analysis side to help fight this. So those are some of our 23 24 efforts. I'd be happy if you want to follow

1 up.

2	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Is there any area
3	of the state that is doing better than is
4	establishing better successes than maybe
5	other areas of the state?
6	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I travel
7	the entire state from, you know, the North
8	Country to Buffalo to Long Island and
9	everywhere in between. And I you know, I
10	consistently hear that this is an issue. I
11	couldn't point to one area and say they've
12	got it figured out.
13	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Well, please
14	there are many in our conference and all
15	across the Legislature, they're deeply
16	concerned about this issue. And your
17	suggestions and guidance in the future will
18	be very helpful as we try to appropriately
19	provide legislative solutions.
20	And I must say the task force that a
21	number of members have served on, the Heroin
22	Task Force, has not just relied on the
23	traditional law enforcement measures. We
24	agree with you that treatment is paramount to

1 ever finalizing and reducing the demand. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I 2 3 certainly share your concern, appreciate it, 4 and would look forward to working with you on 5 this very important issue. And I also wanted 6 to thank you for your service as a Senator, 7 too. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Madam 8 Chair. 9 10 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 11 Assembly? 12 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Graft 13 {sic}. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Thank you, Denny. 15 You can leave off the T, though. 16 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN FARRELL: I'll take it off if 17 I find it. 18 19 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Okay, a few 20 questions. Going back to the police vests. 21 Now, the report that I read was that, you 22 know, we had money allocated to upgrade vests for police officers. And the Governor didn't 23 24 get his whole package, and he basically took

his ball and went home. And he gave the
 money to the DOT. That's the report that I
 had. Right?

So I don't know if the plows need 4 5 Kevlar, that the snowmen are shooting at them, but I don't appreciate the Governor 6 7 sitting there and playing politics with the lives of hardworking police officers. And 8 now I look at this reform package that the 9 10 Governor has, and he's just jumping on the 11 anti-cop bandwagon again.

12 As far as special counsel, now, you 13 know the grand jury proceedings have been 14 secret, and there's a reason that they're 15 secret, for -- you know, from the inception. 16 And I'm reading through this stuff. And if I'm not mistaken -- and you can correct me if 17 18 I'm wrong -- most of this stuff here says 19 they're allowing the DA to turn over a report 20 if they don't indict. Is that correct? It 21 allows them to. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: 22

23 Basically the provision would allow the 24 district attorney to either do a report or

write a letter to make information available
 to the public explaining why the case
 resulted the way it did.

And I can tell you, you know, I first 4 5 of all spent my entire career trying to support law enforcement, and I strongly 6 7 disagree with your characterization. But secondly, I personally have been in a 8 9 position where I have presented high-profile 10 cases to the grand jury where police shot 11 somebody -- and shot and killed somebody, in 12 circumstances -- and I felt like my hands 13 were unduly tied in those circumstances, 14 where I had to go out and tell the public, 15 this is what happened, and by law I'm not 16 allowed to tell you one additional word.

You know, I don't think anyone wants 17 18 to disclose names of witnesses that testified 19 or other information that would compromise 20 anybody. But to give the public just a basic level of information so that there can be 21 22 some understanding. If the case gets 23 no-billed and the determination was that a 24 police officer was justified in doing what he or she did, then I think it's only fair not only to the public but to the police officer that the community have some understanding of why that happened so that they don't have this notion in their head that there was some kind of fix that happened and it was a bad result.

8 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: You know, we have 9 duly elected DAs, and that's their job to 10 make this decision whether they're going to 11 indict or not. And this just looks to me, 12 for political purposes, all right, to be able 13 to get another bite at the apple when it 14 comes to police officers. That's --

EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN:
Actually, it does not. This does not give
anybody another bite at the apple. This does
not in any way, shape or form change the law.

19Right now, under existing law if a20case goes to a grand jury and the grand jury21no-bills, there's a provision in the law that22allows the district attorney or any other23prosecutor who's duly appointed to go to a24judge in that jurisdiction and seek

1 permission to get that case re-presented to a 2 grand jury based on either new evidence or 3 some flaw with the posterior proceeding. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: But you're removing 5 that. 6 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: That 7 same rule would continue to apply. There is no new bite at the apple. This simply goes 8 to who it is that will be carrying out that 9 10 function. Will it be the district attorney, or will it be a special prosecutor? But it 11 12 does not create --13 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: But wait a minute, 14 wait a minute, wait a minute --15 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: -- a 16 second bite. ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Wait a minute. 17 18 Now, if the special prosecutor does not like 19 the way that the DA presented the case to the 20 grand jury, right, the special prosecutor can 21 bring the case again; correct? 22 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: No. 23 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: That's the way I 24 read it.

1 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: First of 2 all, "does not like" is not the standard in 3 the bill. There has to be a substantial flaw 4 with what happened, or there has to be new 5 evidence.

And secondly, the law right now 6 7 requires anybody who wants to go back into a grand jury after there's been a no-bill to 8 get permission from a judge. And under this 9 10 proposal, it simply says that there would be a special prosecutor, not the DA. But it 11 12 does nothing to change that existing section of law. 13

And that special prosecutor would still have to go back in front of a judge and show the judge that there was cause under the existing standard to go back into grand jury before he or she could do so.

19ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Okay. And -- so20the way I'm reading this, a lot of this21allows the DA, the DA may -- correct? He22doesn't have to give a statement. He doesn't23have to write a letter.

24 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: He doesn't have to
 go out there.
 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: But if

the DA, like me in that situation I was in, 4 5 felt that it's important that the public understand at a basic level what happened, it 6 7 gives them the ability to do that. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Okay. Now, is part of this the video cameras 9 10 for the police officers too? Is that what 11 he's looking at, with the ones that they 12 wear? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, 13

14 that is one of the items that the Governor 15 has put forward -- not as a budget bill, but 16 in his State of the State, the Build to Lead 17 agenda book.

And frankly, my recollection is that two years ago in his State of State, it was something he talked about. I know there was legislation last year that both the District Attorneys Association and the Innocence Project had signed off on that I believe passed the Senate. And that same framework

is the framework that the Governor is
 proposing.

3 You know, A, we're the only state in the country that doesn't allow photo-array 4 5 identifications into evidence at trial. And all of the research on this issue suggests 6 7 that if it's done properly, your best identification is the one that's done first 8 and soonest in time to the crime, which 9 10 almost always is a photo-array 11 identification. And yet we keep that best 12 identification from the jury.

13 So that was half of the package. The 14 other half of the package is video recording 15 of interrogations in serious cases. And 16 again, you know, the MPTC has adopted policies regarding it. Almost every major 17 18 police department in the state is recording. 19 You know, I can tell you, as someone 20 who tried cases, the last case I tried was a

23 who effect cuses, the fast cuse f effect was a
21 case where two police officers were shot and
22 one of my best pieces of evidence was
23 3½ hours of a recorded interview with the
24 person who was convicted of attempting to

1 murder those police officers.

2 You know, it's something that I think 3 almost everyone who's up on these issues in 4 law enforcement agrees we should be doing. 5 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Yeah, I'm talking about the body cams. Is that part of these 6 7 proposals? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, I 8 don't believe there's legislation with regard 9 10 to body cameras. 11 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 12 13 Senator Squadron. 14 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very 15 much. 16 I've got a lot to cover here. I don't know if you were here earlier when we had 17 18 that extensive conversation about speedy 19 trial or the absolute lack of speedy trials in New York State. 20 21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I was 22 listening to all of it. 23 SENATOR SQUADRON: I appreciate it. 24 What if any data does DCJS keep on the period

1 from arraignment to disposition or trial 2 delays in general? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I don't 3 have it with me, but I do believe we have 4 5 county-by-county data on time from arraignment to disposition. 6 7 SENATOR SQUADRON: County by county. Also related to charge levels -- felony, A 8 and B misdemeanors -- to sort of track the 9 10 ready for trial statute? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'd have 11 12 to check and see how far it's broken down. 13 But I can certainly find out and get back to 14 you on that. 15 SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. And then 16 sort of taking off the data hat and putting on the policy hat, what do you think DCJS can 17 18 do to help solve this crisis? 19 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I think 20 that it's mainly an issue within OCA. You 21 know, our role -- you know, we provide 22 support, provide funding to prosecutors. We provide a very small amount of aid to 23 24 defense. It's mainly the Office of Indigent

1 Legal Services that does that.

2	So I think our role is minor. I do
3	agree with you that it's a very important
4	issue. You know, when we talk about things
5	like the number of people being held in
6	jails, you know, one part of it is who's
7	going to jail, but another part of it is how
8	long are they in jail. And certainly on the
9	pretrial side it's a huge issue.
10	So, you know, I'd be happy to follow
11	up on the data piece and certainly be willing
12	to work with you, OCA, and anyone else on
13	what I think is a very important issue.
14	SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. Thank you
15	very much. We'd really like to see trends
16	especially. I mean, you know, it's something
17	that the five boroughs of New York City know
18	a lot about. We heard about it from the
19	Long Island perspective as well.
20	Speaking of reporting, the Governor
21	proposes the sort of expanded reporting for
22	summonses, et cetera, similar to last year's
23	proposal, as I understand it. Is that fair
24	to say?

1	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.
2	Basically right now we get fingerprintable
3	offenses and we can do all kinds of reports
4	or data with regard to fingerprintable
5	offenses. This would give us information
6	with regard to non-fingerprintable offenses.
7	SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. And last
8	year we covered that it would be sort of part
9	of a unified database with the
10	fingerprintable offenses so there would be
11	ways to sort of cut it to include
12	fingerprintable and non-fingerprintable
13	offenses in terms of how it was sort of
14	stored and analyzed.
15	EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yeah, I
16	don't want to say unified. I don't know in
17	terms of the logistics. I don't think they
18	would be combined.
19	But certainly our intention would be
20	to be able to provide the same level of data
21	with regard to those offenses that we provide
22	you now with regard to the fingerprintable
23	ones.
24	SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. And

Assemblymember Lentol and I carry a bill that
 would do this.

3 Let me just kind of speed around here for a second. Which of these factors either 4 5 would be authorized or required to be included in the information? Obviously, 6 7 offenses and violations are included; right? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, 8 9 like harassment, disorderly conduct. 10 SENATOR SQUADRON: Demographics on an individual's charge, race, ethnicity, 11 12 et cetera? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes. 13 SENATOR SQUADRON: Whether the summons 14 15 or appearance ticket contained a custodial 16 arrest or not? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I don't 17 18 know if the proposal is that specific. And 19 I'd have to check. But there may be language 20 in there that indicates that it is subject to 21 regulation by the commissioner of DCJS in 22 terms of how it gets reported. SENATOR SQUADRON: Disposition? 23 24 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, I

1 don't believe it's disposition, because it's 2 coming -- the requirement is for the police 3 department. So I don't believe they would have the disposition information. 4 5 SENATOR SQUADRON: And therefore not sentence, either, right? Neither disposition 6 7 nor sentence. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, that 8 would have to be information that would come 9 10 from OCA. 11 SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. And then of 12 course that could be aggregated countywide, 13 statewide, any -- regionally, et cetera? 14 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: 15 Absolutely. SENATOR SQUADRON: Okay. That's 16 17 important. And hopefully this year we can 18 get that over the top, since knowing what 19 we're talking -- you said fact-based a number 20 of times; I couldn't agree more. 21 Speaking of which, let's talk about 22 the Arnold Foundation briefly that you referenced earlier. How do you ensure that 23 24 sort of algorithm that goes into the

1 predictive score that the Arnold Foundation 2 throws out is sufficiently transparent? 3 Sure, it's showing preliminarily to do a better job of having fewer people held on 4 5 bail and arguably or potentially lowering violent crimes or violent actions among those 6 7 who are out in that period. But for each individual case, how do we know that there's 8 a relationship between what that individual 9 has actually done in the past and the 10 likelihood that they'll be given the capacity 11 12 to get out on bail? 13 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I quess 14 two points I'd make. 15 First, I indicated that we believe 16 that this should be given to judges as a tool. I don't think you can ever replace the 17 18 judgment of a judge with a tool. But I think the more tools you can give a judge to help 19 20 them exercise that discretion so -- you know, 21 there may be a case where the risk instrument 22 says one thing but a judge, you know, given 23 his or her experience, says I can safely 24 release this person regardless of what --

because there's some factor that didn't get
put in here.

3 Secondly, as to the algorithm, we in other settings have taken algorithms that 4 5 have been developed, used our research staff and our DCJS data and improved on them to 6 7 make them New York-specific, to be as tailored as they can to, you know, our 8 particular circumstances here in New York. 9 10 And I certainly would anticipate that

11 we do that. And I think it's got to be a 12 very transparent process. I think that in 13 creating that, you know, we need to make sure 14 everyone understands what we're doing.

15 And then the last thing I would say is 16 I mentioned training. You can't just put an instrument out, throw it out there and say, 17 18 use it. I think it's important, if you're 19 going to do this and do it right and expect 20 to get the results that we truly do lower 21 jail populations and increase public safety, 22 everyone needs to be trained. So the judges, the lawyers on both sides using this know 23 24 what the algorithm is, know how we came up

with it, know what it means, you know, know
how to use it.

And I think if you do all those things, the evidence shows that you do get to a point where you can drive down the jail population and at the same time make the state safer.

SENATOR SQUADRON: I would strongly 8 urge that anytime we're talking about these, 9 10 whether as part of a change in the methodology as proposed by the Governor or 11 12 not, that we are a lot more careful about 13 telling the judges and requiring the judges 14 consider what it really means, what the 15 underlying factors are that go into that risk assessment, not just -- you know, it's very 16 appealing to simplify everything and every 17 18 human being to a score. That actually is not 19 how the criminal justice system works. It's 20 the reason we have the criminal justice 21 system we have.

22 And to implement a score absent a 23 whole lot of requirements for due diligence 24 and understanding by the judge is likely to

1 cause constitutional among other problems. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I 2 3 couldn't agree with you more. SENATOR SQUADRON: Briefly, I believe 4 5 just a final issue on transparency. We did talk about body cams before briefly. Does 6 7 DCJS have an opinion or a willingness to be 8 part of the solution on how we make body cam footage available to the public while still 9 10 protecting individual privacy rights? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: We 11 12 certainly have spent time with the issue of 13 body cameras. Specifically the issue was 14 considered by the Municipal Police Training Council. We're the staff arm for that 15 council. We did a lot of research over the 16 period of about a year. The council recently 17 18 adopted a model policy with regard to the use 19 of body cameras which does touch on some of 20 those issues but certainly I don't think is the end of the discussion. 21 22 But yes, you know, I think body

cameras clearly have a place. And I thinkthat there are a lot of issues that go along

with them that are very important issues that
 need to be hashed out. So we'd be happy to
 be involved.

SENATOR SQUADRON: They have the 4 5 potential to really help both law enforcement and civilians who are in contact with law 6 7 enforcement. Frankly, I would like to see 8 some funding in here to help us devise a 9 system and a storage capacity for how that 10 becomes public and when it becomes public. 11 Because absent that, the truth is that's 12 going to hold up any kind of expansion of 13 body cameras, which I think there's 14 increasingly a consensus is something we need 15 to do. We're not going to be able to do it 16 without funding sort of the back end data question. That's not an additional question 17 18 when it comes to this new technology, it's a core question about whether the technology 19 20 can move forward.

21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, 22 that's the cost. The cost of the cameras 23 up-front is almost nonexistent compared to 24 the data shortage and management cost.

1 SENATOR SQUADRON: And "management" 2 being the key word there, even more than 3 storage, probably, if the curve continues on 4 storage. 5 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yeah, if you never need it, it's easy to store it. 6 7 SENATOR SQUADRON: Finally, the special counsel was proposed. I asked a 8 question last year, there was a little 9 10 ambiguity on it. It's been a year, the special counsel proposal seems similar to 11 12 last year's, so maybe there's more clarity 13 this year. 14 The Governor appoints a special

15 counsel to consider whether to recommend an 16 independent prosecutor is appointed. That 17 special counsel has the capacity to access 18 the grand jury findings and transcripts, all 19 of the information related to the grand jury 20 proceeding.

Is the special counsel able to share that information with the Executive or not? And if not, is the special counsel able to make a recommendation other than yea or nay

1 to justify or explain why the recommendation
2 is what it is?

3 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: The way 4 I read and understand the proposal, the 5 special counsel would have the ability to 6 share as much information as necessary in the 7 context of making a recommendation to the 8 Governor.

9 I don't believe that a reasonable 10 reading of this bill or a reasonable 11 interpretation would say that the special 12 counsel is limited to walking into the 13 Governor's office and saying yes or no and I 14 can't answer any other questions.

15 SENATOR SQUADRON: And would the 16 Governor be allowed to share that information 17 in announcing to the public his or her 18 decision, or would the Governor be under the 19 same limitations on sharing information that 20 emanates from a grand jury proceeding as 21 everyone else is?

22 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I don't 23 read the bill in a way that would allow for 24 additional disclosure of that information beyond from the special counsel to the
 Governor.

3 SENATOR SQUADRON: Doesn't that take the black box of the grand jury room, extend 4 5 it into the Executive, and then stop it right there, so that from the perspective of the 6 7 public and policymakers and law enforcement in general, they're left with the same black 8 box, just one where a different branch of 9 10 government has also the ability to come out and tell us no more than we've heard before, 11 12 which is just yes or no?

EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: If that 13 were the end of the day, you know, you could 14 15 make that argument, I think. But first of 16 all, you're balancing or trying to balance some very important policy considerations 17 18 here, and grand jury secrecy is one. 19 And secondly, if the Governor, 20 following a recommendation from the special

21 counsel, appoints a special prosecutor, you
22 know, I would argue that it's not the
23 Governor's position at that point to be
24 making public statements about the case

1 before the special prosecutor has a chance to do his or her work. I think that the 2 appropriate course of action at that time 3 4 would be not to disclose anything further 5 until the special prosecutor has had an 6 opportunity to do their job. 7 SENATOR SQUADRON: Look, it's both -it's those two competing conclusions that 8 9 lead to such concerns about this. You're 10 probably right about that, but what does that 11 say about the overall proposal? I think 12 that's something that we still need to really 13 consider. 14 Thank you. 15 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank 16 you. SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 17 18 Assembly. 19 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. 20 Assemblyman O'Donnell. 21 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Thank you very 22 much. 23 Once again, I agree with Mr. Graf. 24 Okay? So I will take some medication when I

1 get home --2 (Laughter.) ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: -- to make 3 sure I arrive tomorrow in the same state I 4 5 arrived yesterday. But I believe in the secrecy of the 6 7 grand jury. And I believe that it serves a 8 very important function. And mostly what I believe, that it's outrageous to suggest that 9 10 because a defendant happens to be a member of law enforcement that her or his rights are 11 12 less than all the other people who are 13 defendants in a grand jury. 14 So having said that, I don't believe 15 we should be opening them up. I don't 16 believe we should be giving the names of witnesses. And I don't believe we should be 17 18 giving out what the nature of the testimony 19 is. 20 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I quess that's --21 22 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: However --23 there's a however -- what a DA charges to the 24 grand jury is different. You and your

cohorts who are DAs are elected, they owe an
 obligation to their citizenry.

3 So to that end, I have a bill that would allow any citizen to request from a DA 4 5 what did you charge that grand jury in this case. Because in the cases where we've had 6 7 these problems where there's been great public outcry, I fear that the DA is not 8 charging the grand jury in a way that many of 9 10 their constituents would have wanted them to 11 do.

12 And so just like my votes are public, 13 just like my speech here will probably be put 14 up by one of the people in this room a little 15 while from now, the actions of DAs should be 16 subject to the same scrutiny.

So do you think it would be 17 18 appropriate to require that DAs be required 19 to release what charges they gave to a grand 20 jury in cases where the public wants to know? 21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: First of 22 all, I think I differ with you in terms of your characterization of the proposal. I 23 24 don't think it subjects police to a different

1 standard. Right now the Governor --2 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: No, sir, I 3 wasn't saying that was in the proposal, I was saying that was my opinion. 4 5 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'd 6 appreciate the opportunity to respond. 7 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Okay. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right 8 now the Governor has the power to appoint a 9 10 special prosecutor. I remember the death 11 penalty case in the Bronx where Governor 12 Pataki exercised that power, and frankly the 13 ability to review that power is very limited. 14 And right now the information that the 15 Governor has at his or her disposal when 16 making that very important decision is very limited. 17 18 What this proposal does is not give 19 the Governor any additional powers in terms 20 of appointing a special prosecutor in cases 21 involving police, because frankly he can do 22 that already. What it does is give the Governor a mechanism to get information other 23

24 than what's reported in the press, but real,

accurate information about the case so the
 Governor can make an informed decision about
 whether or not it furthers good public policy
 to appoint a special prosecutor in that
 particular case.
 In terms of your point about release

7 of the instructions to the grand jury, I 8 certainly think that that's an important 9 issue that should be discussed in the context 10 of any legislation in this area.

11ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Well, I wrote12the bill, so I'd like to get, you know, my13name on that. That would be good. Okay?14I'd like to now talk a little bit

15 about photo arrays. You had mentioned it in 16 your testimony that most places use photo 17 arrays.

18 In my experience, one of the problems 19 with photo arrays is the pictures that are in 20 them. So how does someone get to have their 21 picture in a photo array? Well, chances are 22 that's because they've been arrested before, 23 and that's the picture that's there.

24 Then you have the problem with what

1 the picture looks like. Now what we know 2 from just reading the paper, when famous 3 celebrities who are really drop-dead gorgeous, they get paid millions of dollars 4 5 because of how good-looking they are, when they get arrested, they look like they went 6 7 to hell in a handbasket. Right? So even 8 among the most gorgeous creatures in America, 9 their arrest photos, they look guilty as can 10 be.

11 So isn't there some inherent risk in 12 putting in front of a jury a picture of a 13 criminal defendant in their worst possible 14 moment, looking the worst they could possibly 15 look, and creating a -- and trampling on the 16 presumption of innocence by putting such an 17 image in front of them?

EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I guess the first thing I'd say is that the Innocence Project has been strenuously advocating for this, to me and publicly, for some period of time. And I can't believe that the Innocence Project would advocate for this if they felt that it was trampling on people's rights.

1 And secondly, you know, in this day 2 and age -- you know, there was a time where I 3 think it would be reasonable to say if you have a photo, it must be an arrest photo. If 4 5 I want a photo of someone in this day and age, I go on the internet -- you know, and I 6 7 don't know how to do it as well as, you know, so many --8 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Your 9 10 grandkids. Yes, I understand. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: -- other 11 12 people could, but you pull up a Facebook 13 photo, you pull up any other photo. You 14 know, so I think that the idea that the 15 public perception that you have a photo, it 16 must be an arrest photo may have been true 40 years ago. If I asked my kids today, I don't 17 18 think their first instinct would be you got it from an arrest, I think their first 19 20 instinct would be you got it off the 21 internet. 22 So, you know, I think things are changing. And I think that all of those 23 24 things are important considerations, but at

1 the end of the day, when the Innocence 2 Project is advocating for me saying this is 3 the best way to ensure against wrongful identifications that lead to wrongful 4 5 convictions, and this is what you should do -- and I think the last thing I'll say is 6 7 they do that with a caveat, that the photo 8 arrays have to be assembled and put together 9 properly and the procedure has to be 10 conducted properly before it's a good idea to 11 let a jury see it. So it's not just that any 12 photo array should go in and a jury should see it; we should have guidelines and 13 14 standards about how the arrays have to be put 15 together and about how the procedures have to 16 be done. And if and only if you meet those standards, then we should allow a jury to 17 18 hear them. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I wouldn't 20 dream of questioning Mr. Scheck or 21 Mr. Neufeld and their commitment to 22 innocence. And in fact, Mr. Scheck once

24 skills at cross-examination during one of

tracked me down and congratulated me on my

23

1 these hearings, so I consider that a high 2 mark. 3 But most of the defender organizations in the state do oppose this idea. And I 4 5 quess this is one of those cases where the devil will always be in the details. 6 7 The third point I'd like to raise has to do with these verified instruments that 8 you want to talk about. You know, we have 9 10 some experience in putting verified instruments out there. Where do we do that 11 12 legislatively? We did that before the Parole 13 Board. The Parole Board is currently 14 required to use a verified instrument in 15 determining release rates. And you know what happens? They ignore it. They ignore it, 16 sir. We made them use them, they've used 17 18 them, they look at them and say despite the 19 fact that this instrument says X, I'm going 20 to keep you in prison for two more years 21 because I think that's the right thing to do. 22 So in the end, any instrument, no matter how good it is, is only as useful as 23 24 the person who's using its ability to use it

1 correctly. And so from my own personal --2 I'm not speaking for the panel -- from my own 3 personal perspective, I would be unwilling to 4 do that anywhere else in the state until you 5 can talk to the people who work in the Parole Board to get them to do the job that we 6 7 mandated that they do, which is take into 8 account the information on that very instrument. 9 10 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I 11 certainly can't speak for the Parole Board, 12 but I agree with your point that the instruments are only as good as the use that 13 14 the people who need to use them make of them. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Thank you very 16 much. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank 17 18 you. 19 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 20 Assemblyman. 21 Our next speaker is Senator Ruth 22 Hassell-Thompson. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you, 23 24 Madam Chair.

1 Good afternoon, Mr. Green. 2 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Good 3 afternoon. 4 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: I'd like to 5 explore some of the stuff we've been talking about, but my time is going to be very 6 7 limited. So let's flip the switch a little 8 and go to the GIVE initiative that you talk about and certainly that's in the budget. 9 10 We understand that the GIVE initiative 11 is a replacement for Operation Impact, for 12 the most part. But you don't discuss the 13 specificity of what these outreach programs 14 are. Would you identify SNUG as perhaps 15 being one of those, or that type of model? 16 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: 17 Absolutely. GIVE did replace Impact, you're right. 18 19 Whereas Impact allowed a wider focus, GIVE 20 focuses on shootings and homicides, and GIVE 21 identifies four strategies that law 22 enforcement can receive training and technical assistance on and that we'll fund. 23 24 That's focused deterrence, hotspot policing,

1 crime prevention through environmental 2 design, and street outreach work. So street outreach work is 3 specifically one of those four strategies 4 5 that we will support, that we do support and we provide training on. 6 7 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Okay, then I may be confused, then. You're saying that 8 the street outreach that's a part of GIVE is 9 10 not SNUG. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: No. 11 As 12 part of GIVE, one of the requirements of GIVE 13 is that all of the efforts that are funded by 14 the state to get at shootings and homicides 15 be aligned, so that we shouldn't have a GIVE 16 initiative over here designed to reduce shootings and homicides and a SNUG initiative 17 18 over here designed to do the same thing, but 19 no coordination between the two. 20 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Okay. Okay, good. 21 22 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: You 23 know, and that's not to say we don't 24 recognize that in a good street outreach

1 program, you know, there are pieces of it 2 that can't be aligned with the police. 3 For example, when your outreach workers are out on the street, it's very 4 5 important that people do not view them as an arm of the police. But by the same token, 6 7 they both have the exact same goals. There's information they both have at a higher level 8 that's very useful to both of them. So there 9 10 has to be at least some level of coordination between those efforts. 11 12 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: How 13 successful do you believe that the outreach -- it's been a year. And how 14 15 successful do you think, number one, the 16 outreach overall has been? And number two, its coordination with SNUG in terms of 17 18 reducing crime in your hotspots? 19 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: We're 20 actually heading into our third year, I

21 believe, with the street outreach work. And 22 I think that it is a huge asset. I think it's something we all should be very proud 23 24

of. You know, certainly the Legislature for

1 providing the funding.

2	We've provided a structure, we have a
3	statewide coordinator for the street outreach
4	programs across the state. He visits every
5	program at least once a month. He
6	communicates with them regularly. In
7	addition, we have a training director now, so
8	we train every program manager, every
9	supervisor, every outreach worker.
10	If you look at the jurisdictions
11	across the state, you know, some are more
12	advanced than others, they have different
13	strengths. But, you know, there are
14	instances in one jurisdiction where the
15	police were having a spike in homicides and
16	they reached out to the street outreach
17	program, who on at least two separate
18	occasions helped them get a handle on what
19	was going on and really quashed the violence.
20	You know, there are stories from
21	around the state where in different ways
22	those street outreach programs have really
23	helped control shootings, so and the other
24	thing I'd say is I'm not aware of any other

1 state that has a statewide street outreach 2 network that's organized and coordinated the 3 way ours is. So, you know, I think it's a huge tool 4 5 in the toolbox and would certainly advocate that at a bare minimum we continue it. 6 7 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: We've used the Chicago Ceasefire model and some other 8 models. Do you see us moving toward creating 9 10 a New York model? 11 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes. 12 You know, as with everything that I 13 do, I like to look at everything that's out 14 there, try and understand what the strong 15 points are of all of the different 16 approaches, and then take the strong points of all of them and put them into what I think 17 18 is the best approach. 19 And, you know, certainly there are a 20 lot of really good ideas in the Ceasefire 21 Chicago Cure Violence model. But, for example, Teny Gross, out of the Institute for 22 Nonviolence, has been doing this work since 23 24 the mid-nineties and has a lot of good ideas

1 as well, and has done a lot of good work. 2 And his ideas aren't necessarily the same as 3 all of the Cure Violence ones out of Chicago. So what we've tried to do is really 4 5 work with Teny and understand his program and his thoughts, work with Cure Violence and 6 7 understand theirs. And yes, at the end of the day I do envision us taking all of those 8 ideas and putting them into what we think is 9 10 the best model. 11 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you. 12 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. Our next speaker -- well, I'm sorry. Do we 13 14 have anyone from the Assembly? 15 Okay, our next speaker is Senator 16 Velmanette Montgomery. 17 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Madam 18 Chairwoman. 19 Good afternoon. It's finally 20 afternoon. 21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Good 22 afternoon. SENATOR MONTGOMERY: I just wanted to 23 24 ask you about the -- I guess two areas. One

is the reentry issue, and the other one is
 juvenile justice.

3 On reentry, I'm looking at the proposed budget for this time which reflects 4 the Governor's -- some of the Governor's 5 primary concerns, one of them being the whole 6 7 question of reentry. And I know that the 8 Governor has been working on that for some time, and I really appreciate the fact that 9 10 this has become a primary concern.

I am, however -- I don't understand 11 12 why it is that at the same time that we are 13 concerned about reentry, there's 14 \$12.8 million in reductions or eliminations, 15 proposed eliminations of programs that are 16 basically community-based, many of them specifically related to providing support 17 18 services to people reentering the community. 19 And so I have a big question as to --20 obviously, many of these are legislative 21 adds. However, I would like to hear from you 22 how you, from your perspective, will be ensuring that we continue some of those very 23

24 critical services. Because when people

1 return to community, when they return home, 2 they look for people like me to find out 3 where they can get some help immediately. They need housing, they are looking for 4 5 employment, they need services that help them repair or access necessary papers that they 6 7 -- or other information that they would need. So where will those services fit into 8 9 your budget as proposed? 10 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I 11 can't speak to the legislative adds. It's my 12 understanding that those are things that will 13 be discussed as you go forward with the 14 budget negotiations. 15 But in terms of the Governor's budget, 16 there is no reduction in the DCJS budget with regard to any of our reentry or Alternative 17 18 to Incarceration funding streams. And in 19 fact, there's a \$2 million increase. 20 There's a \$1 million increase -- the 21 prior budget was just over \$3 million for 22 19 reentry task forces around the state. This year in the Governor's proposed budget 23 24 it gives us another million dollars. That

1 will allow us to, assuming -- or if it is
2 approved, start a 20th reentry task force in
3 Queens, which obviously, given the volume of
4 cases, is in need of a task force, but also
5 strengthen all of the task forces across the
6 state.

7 And then, secondly, there's an 8 additional million-dollar add with regard to 9 the Alternative to Incarceration programs 10 that would allow us to help develop screening 11 and assessment programs to make sure that the 12 people coming into the criminal justice 13 system at a very early point in time are 14 screened and assessed so that their needs are 15 understood by those making decisions -defense attorneys, judges, prosecutors -- and 16 at the same time they understand what the 17 18 needs are, they understand the inventory of 19 programs available in that area so that 20 people can get matched to the right programs 21 and we have the best chance of breaking that 22 cycle of recidivism.

23 So as to the programs or as to the 24 funding streams for DCJS in the Governor's

1 proposed budget, none of them were cut and in 2 fact they were increased by \$2 million. 3 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: All right. I just -- when I look at this list and I see 4 5 programs like Exodus Transitional Community Center and Fortune Society and Community 6 7 Service Society and those programs -- so obviously they will be coming to the 8 Legislature to say we need funding. And 9 10 these are, relatively speaking, small amounts -- \$100,000, \$200,000, and so forth. 11 12 However, the fact of the matter is 13 each of those programs -- and if you put all of that together, we then begin to have a 14 15 real network of reentry organizations, and 16 each one is important and related to our success. The task forces, all due respect, I 17 18 appreciate the work that they do, but they're not on the ground providing actual services. 19 20 And so that's what I feel is missing, and I 21 certainly hope that together we're going to ensure that the programs that need support 22 will receive it. 23 24 And I would like to, in order for me

1 to see where the programs -- some of them 2 certainly in my district, but in the city in 3 particular -- where they fit into your 4 framework, I would really appreciate having a 5 list of those, because I don't know exactly where they all are at this point. 6 7 The second question -- and I'm out of time, unfortunately -- but I have a real 8 interest in the juvenile justice work that 9 10 you're doing and where you are with that, especially as it relates to Alternative to 11 12 Incarceration programs. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: I 13 14 just -- I know you're out of time. I'll 15 briefly say the Governor's budget does put 16 \$26.2 million through DCJS into those on-the-ground programs you're talking about. 17 I don't have the list with me. We'll 18 19 certainly get it to you. 20 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you. 21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: But just 22 for example, Fortune gets a sizable amount of money --23 24 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Fortune Society?

1 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Fortune 2 Society, for their employment-based work, 3 working with people who are reentering, on 4 employment services. 5 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: And there are 6 several others that you will let me know 7 where they stand as well? EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes. 8 9 We'll provide you a list of our funded 10 programs. 11 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you very 12 much. EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank 13 14 you. 15 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 16 That closes our discussion. So I want to thank you very much, Executive Deputy 17 Commissioner Green. It's good to see you 18 19 again. And thank you for your testimony 20 today. 21 EX. DEP. COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank 22 you, Senator. Appreciate the time. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Great. Our next 23 24 speaker is Acting Commissioner Anthony

1 Annucci, New York State Department of 2 Corrections and Community Supervision. 3 Thank you very much. Could I have some order, please. 4 5 Welcome, Acting Commissioner Annucci. We're very glad to have you here today. I'm 6 7 sure that the members, between the Senate and the Assembly, will have a lot of questions, 8 and we look forward to your testimony. And 9 10 at this time, you may begin. ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Thank 11 12 you. 13 Good afternoon, Chairwoman Young, 14 Chairman Farrell, and other distinguished 15 chairs and members of the Legislature. I am 16 Anthony J. Annucci, acting commissioner of the Department of Corrections and Community 17 18 Supervision. It is my honor to discuss some of the highlights of Governor Cuomo's 19 20 Executive Budget plan. 21 The Governor's policies are moving 22 corrections in the right direction. Last year New York State's inmate population 23 24 continued to decline, and there are now over

1 20,000 fewer inmates than there were in 1999. 2 Still, New York State continues to be the 3 safest large state with the lowest incarceration rate. 4 To continue this trend of reduced 5 incarcerations coupled with increased public 6 7 safety, the department's proposed Executive Budget contains a number of important new 8 initiatives. These include groundbreaking 9 10 special housing unit reforms; the increased use of technology and updated policies to 11 12 better supervise and secure our facilities; 13 and several reentry initiatives designed to 14 further reduce recidivism by upgrading 15 educational opportunities and vocational 16 training. Within our \$310 million capital 17 18 budget, we are also moving forward with plans 19 to transform Hudson into a hybrid youth

20 facility for 16-and-17-year-olds. Despite 21 the reduction in inmate population, the 22 Executive Budget does not recommend any 23 prison closures this year.

24 Prison discipline is vital to the

1 safety of correction officers and inmates 2 alike. We will undertake historical reforms 3 in our approach to solitary confinement which will modernize prison discipline. These 4 5 reforms will improve conditions within our segregation units and revise our disciplinary 6 7 guidelines, while preserving safety and security. As we did for the seriously 8 mentally ill, we will develop specialized 9 10 programs to safely provide out-of-cell programming and treatment to inmates. 11 12 Inmate reentry programming, including education and vocational training, is a vital 13 14 part of the reform process. DOCCS will 15 continue its expansion of college programming 16 through \$7.5 million in funding from the Manhattan district attorney's office. This 17 18 expansion will not cost taxpayer dollars. 19 College programming has been shown to 20 significantly lower recidivism and increase 21 the likelihood of a successful transition 22 back into society. It also creates positive

23 role models for other inmates to follow,

24 ultimately leading to safer prisons.

1 Further, in an effort to increase the 2 issuance of high school diplomas, we will 3 hire psychologists to diagnose adult inmates with learning disabilities, and update our 4 5 Thinking for a Change program with a new version issued by the National Institute of 6 7 Corrections, or NIC. In an effort to modernize vocational training, we will also 8 upgrade several vocational print shops and 9 10 expand our computer vocational shops to 11 include computer coding. 12 The department is focused on creating 13 the safest environment possible. In 14 partnership with the unions, we will continue 15 to develop strategies to reduce violence

16 within prisons and to conduct security 17 staffing reviews as outlined in the fiscal 18 year 2014-2015 budget. Last year we hired 19 103 correction officers.

Also, we have either begun or will pursue technological enhancements, training improvements, and policy changes that will enhance overall safety and security within DOCCS facilities. These initiatives include

1 installation of fixed cameras, the deployment 2 of thermal imaging and heartbeat detection 3 devices, the installation of the rounds tracker system, the procurement of portable 4 5 metal detectors, and the piloted use of body cameras to be worn by staff. The department 6 7 will also be refining training in the areas of use of force and interpersonal 8 communications to provide our staff with 9 additional avenues to deescalate situations, 10 11 before force becomes necessary.

12 In the upcoming year, we will also be pursuing many policy changes such as a new 13 14 rule designation for synthetic marijuana, the 15 expanded use of K-9 units, the elimination of 16 metal containers from our commissaries, the use of secure vendors for packages, the 17 18 piloting of pepper spray, and enhancement of tool control practices. 19

20 Our internal investigations unit has 21 been completely overhauled and is now called 22 the Office of Special Investigations, or OSI. 23 A new chief and a new director of operations 24 have been appointed. The chief now reports

1 directly to me, and we meet regularly. The 2 new leaders are both attorneys with 3 significant law enforcement backgrounds. Under their leadership, a number of new 4 5 initiatives have been implemented to foster an atmosphere of ethical behavior and 6 7 thorough investigations. OSI has also bolstered its ranks with 8 highly qualified investigators and analysts 9 10 with decades of experience from outside law 11 enforcement agencies. 12 Most importantly, DOCCS will be 13 working with our federal partners to establish best practices. In 2015, the NIC 14 15 conducted comprehensive security audits at several facilities, and in 2016 they will 16 audit several more. The NIC will also review 17 our training academy, and train selected 18 19 staff members on how to conduct security audits. 20 21 To build upon these best practices, 22 DOCCS will be instituting a process for unannounced security audits and risk 23 24 assessments in line with NIC's suggestions.

1	DOCCS is also responsible for
2	approximately 36,000 parolees. In 2014, we
3	issued a recidivism report showing that just
4	nine percent of ex-offenders released in 2010
5	were sent back to prison within three years,
6	based upon a new felony conviction. This
7	figure was the lowest since 1985. And for
8	those released in 2011, the figure has been
9	lowered further to 8.6 percent. We are
10	making an impact.
11	Despite this positive trend, we know
12	there is still work to do. we have undertaken
13	an enhanced supervision project in
14	Monroe County that focuses on our
15	highest-risk parolees with GPS monitors and a
16	lower caseload ratio. We also launched
17	combined operations, involving Community
18	Supervision and our Office of Special
19	Investigations, to apprehend parole violators
20	in careful coordination with our federal,
21	state and local Law enforcement partners.
22	We also implemented last year's law
23	ensuring next-day reporting, and we arranged
24	for inmates to be released from facilities in

1 closer proximity to their home communities. 2 Opioid abuse is a serious concern when 3 it comes to recently released inmates. To address this, DOCCS has started an opioid 4 5 overdose prevention program, in collaboration with DOH and the Harm Reduction Coalition. 6 7 We now issue Naloxone kits -- the opioid antidote -- to inmates scheduled for release, 8 and provide training on how to use it. To 9 10 help prevent relapse, DOCCS will also be using Vivitrol paired with traditional drug 11 12 treatment counseling. In conclusion, there again will be 13 14 many challenges and expectations for DOCCS 15 and the thousands of hardworking employees 16 who perform their responsibilities in an exemplary manner, often under dangerous and 17 difficult circumstances. The Governor's 18 19 proposed budget will place DOCCS in an 20 advantageous position to fulfill these 21 expectations. 22 Thank you, and I will be happy to answer any questions. 23 24 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very

1	much.
2	Our first speaker is Senator Mike
3	Nozzolio.
4	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Madam
5	Chair.
6	Good afternoon, Acting Commissioner.
7	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good
8	afternoon, Senator.
9	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Another year of
10	acting, Anthony.
11	But you've had a hard year. All
12	kidding aside, it's been a very, very
13	difficult year for the department, for the
14	people who work in the department. And I
15	want to probe just a couple of things
16	regarding what was so costly an effort last
17	year.
18	The cost of the prison break from
19	Clinton, what does the department estimate
20	those costs to be?
21	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: \$12.7
22	million for the escape.
23	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Now, are these
24	exclusively personnel costs, or how do you

1 estimate those elements?

2	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Mostly
3	those expenses were related to overtime for
4	staff involved in the pursuit. Some
5	ancillary services like food and things of
6	that nature, lodging. But mostly the
7	overtime.
8	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: That those costs
9	are exclusively for the department
10	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes.
11	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: not inclusive of
12	costs that coordinating agencies,
13	particularly the New York State Police, had
14	to engage in; is that correct?
15	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Those
16	were just DOCCS's expenses.
17	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Our estimates have
18	the total cost on or about \$23 million to
19	\$25 million. Does that sound about right to
20	you?
21	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I really
22	can't speculate on those other costs,
23	Senator.
24	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Tell us what kinds

1 of things has the department had to 2 reevaluate since that prison break? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: There 3 are many steps that we have taken to bolster 4 5 security. I've had conversations with every one of my superintendents, in 6 7 particular my maximum security superintendents. We've issued a number of 8 memoranda to reinforce basic security 9 10 protocols, basic frisk practices, ensuring 11 that superintendents understand their 12 responsibility to oversee all three shifts, 13 to be there at unannounced times, to ensure 14 that security supervisors are making rounds. 15 We are also investing in a lot of new 16 equipment to better enable our security staff to perform their responsibilities. We have 17 18 the thermal imaging devices, we have portable 19 metal detectors. We are enforcing a lot more 20 frisking of staff periodically. Going 21 forward with our training, we have the Games 22 Inmates Play video so that that will be shown to every employee, and they can understand 23

the dangers involved with becoming too

24

1 familiar with inmates.

2	There are many, many things that we've
3	done, Senator. I can provide you a full
4	list. I don't want to take up too much time.
5	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I think that broad
6	outline is important, it's important that you
7	provide it to our members of the Public
8	Protection Budget Subcommittee, especially
9	Senator Gallivan, as chair of the Crime and
10	Corrections Committee.
11	And I'm not going to ask you any more
12	questions about those issues; that's, I
13	think, certainly a topic Senator Gallivan
14	wants to pursue.
15	There is one area that I'd like to ask
16	you about, and that's the employee Joyce
17	Mitchell. Obviously you're familiar with who
18	that is, one of the linchpins in the ability
19	for the prisoners to escape. Do you know
20	what her title was?
21	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I think
22	it was industrial training specialist,
23	something along those lines.
24	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: It's my

1 understanding that it's something to that 2 effect, industrial training, in the prison 3 tailor shop, as a prison tailor shop instructor. Her salary, we looked it up, is 4 5 \$57,697 a year. Did Joyce Mitchell have any advisory 6 7 capacity to the Department of Corrections in 8 any way, any management or reporting beyond management within the correctional facility? 9 10 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Senator, before I go further, I cannot comment on 11 12 anything that is the subject of a pending 13 investigation. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: The inspector 14 15 general -- I know Senator Gallivan has asked 16 a number of these questions, and we've gotten the same answer so far, Commissioner. Do you 17 18 have any idea how long that investigation 19 will take and when a report will be issued? 20 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I cannot answer that. 21 22 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Here's my -- let me just ask you, then, not about Joyce Mitchell 23 24 but about your other industrial training

1	supervisors across the correctional system.
2	Do any of your industrial training
3	supervisors have policymaking
4	responsibilities within the Department of
5	Corrections?
6	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I have
7	met with my industrial training
8	superintendents. The Corcraft industry
9	aspect of our operations is very important.
10	Inmates are meaningfully employed, they learn
11	a skill, they provide an important service
12	for our customers throughout the state. And
13	I am hopeful of continuing that and upgrading
14	it in many ways.
15	They can occasionally sit in on
16	executive staff meetings at the facility
17	level, because everybody is important. And
18	they certainly should listen to all the
19	security concerns and other
20	cross-disciplinary issues. But I don't think
21	they have formal policy roles as you define
22	it, if I understand your question correctly.
23	But they certainly every one of my
24	staff and I hammer this to the

- 1 superintendents: Your primary

2	responsibility, among other things, is you
3	have to know your jail. You have to walk and
4	talk with everybody. Every employee is
5	important in this agency. Everyone might
6	have possible suggestions for you as to how
7	to better improve operations for everybody's
8	safety and security. So that is fundamental
9	to me, that they have to make those kinds of
10	rounds regularly.
11	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And that's
12	exemplary. I know you've always listened to
13	us. We're hopeful that you continue to
14	listen to all the correctional employees with
15	their suggestions and their input.
16	But I guess in the hypothetical, it's
17	safe to say that normally the industrial
18	training supervisor doesn't have policymaking
19	responsibilities within the correctional
20	system. Is that safe to say?
21	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I
22	believe that's safe to say, if I understand
23	your question.
24	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And yet

1 potentially, if an industrial training 2 supervisor was involved -- again, in the 3 hypothetical -- directly involved with criminality regarding a prison escape which 4 5 cost the taxpayers of this state at least \$12 million from the Department of 6 7 Corrections, and our estimates are another \$11 million to \$13 million for the Department 8 of State Police, as well as other federal 9 10 costs to the FBI -- that one industrial training supervisor could have cost the 11 12 taxpayers of this state at least \$25 million. 13 And that employee of the State of 14 New York and the taxpayers of this state has 15 had absolutely no policy implications, or 16 extremely limited policy implications within her -- within their position of 17 responsibility. I think that's the point 18 19 that glares to me, Commissioner, that the 20 impact of wrongdoing within state employment, 21 entrusted to the taxpayers through state 22 employment, can have enormous financial implications. Not to mention the havoc that 23 24 it created within your department in trying

1 to deal with these issues, and that you're 2 going to continue to deal with these issues. 3 I know Senator Gallivan is awaiting the inspector general's report, certainly 4 5 other members of the Corrections Committee as well as the Codes Committee are waiting for 6 7 that report, and we hope that we'll have the opportunity to sit down with you as you 8 continue to make improvements in the 9 10 correctional system on a day-to-day basis. So thank you for your dialogue, and I 11 12 appreciate the important responsibilities 13 that you have. ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Thank 14 15 you, Senator, especially for all your years 16 of service to our agency. We will miss you. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, 17 18 Commissioner. 19 SENATOR KRUEGER: Assembly? 20 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you. Our 21 next speaker is Assemblymember O'Donnell. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Good 22 afternoon. It's very nice to see you again. 23 24 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good

1 afternoon.

2	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I was watching
3	TV last night; I got to watch Mr. Sweat's
4	sentencing time, and he was sentenced to
5	\$80,000 of restitution. Which I thought was
6	an odd number, given the number you just gave
7	us, \$12 million. And of course when you pay
8	your inmates \$1.25 an hour, I don't think
9	you're going to get back that \$80,000 anytime
10	soon.
11	But I also assume you don't have a
12	budget line for escapes, right? So where did
13	the \$12 million come from?
14	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: The
15	Division of the Budget provided the money for
16	us.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: So did you
18	call somebody up and say "We need \$12 million
19	for overtime?" Is that what like that?
20	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: They
21	found a funding source for us.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: They're very
23	good like that. Funny how that is.
24	Let me talk about this new Office of

1 Special Investigations, which used to be the 2 inspector general's office, is that correct? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: You know, the 4 5 other day I went out and bought some new jeans and they were called skinny jeans. But 6 7 that doesn't mean I'm skinny. You know what I mean? 8 So I wonder if by changing the name 9 from one entity to another is enough to 10 effectuate real change. I just heard you 11 12 answering some of the Senator's questions. I 13 don't want you to divulge anything you know 14 about the inspector general and when and if 15 her report will be coming out, nor about what it says. But internally, your own inspector 16 general's office had a report against 17

18 Ms. Mitchell that they found lacking in
19 veracity or whatever you want to say, and
20 dismissed that.

Isn't that of great concern to you,
that the entity that is in charge,
investigating internally, ignored the fact
that this inappropriate relationship was

going on? I mean, I'm not suggesting that 1 2 you would have guessed that would have led to 3 a \$12 million overtime charge for an escape. But doesn't that give you concern? 4 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I cannot 5 comment on something that's the subject of a 6 7 pending investigation. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Well, then 8 let's talk about the budget. You have 125 9 10 investigators. Can you tell me what is the budget of the Office of Special 11 12 Investigation? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I can 13 14 get that information for you. I don't know 15 the exact amount. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: We did a 16 17 hearing last year, the end of last year, 18 where you unfortunately couldn't come -- we 19 missed you, Tony -- to look at the question 20 of how do other places in the country and in 21 the world deal with this problem. Right? So 22 we have this very high-profile escape that cost us possibly up to \$25 million, people's 23 24 lives were upended. And seemingly, the

mechanisms that you had to provide oversight
 within your system failed.

3 And what we learned was that in something like 42 other states, they have a 4 5 separate office of an ombudsman. In Canada, in England and in Wales, they all have their 6 7 own outside agency specifically for the 8 purpose of conducting investigations inside 9 the prison system. What do you think of 10 that?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, 11 12 Assemblyman, we have a lot of outside 13 entities that have access to our prisons 14 right now. The State Commission of 15 Correction can visit at will, any member of 16 the Legislature can visit at will, together with any number of their aides. We've 17 18 entertained requests where aides can come by 19 themselves. Any district attorney can visit. 20 We have outside entities like PAMI that come 21 and do investigations with respect to their clients. We have the Justice Center that 22 comes in. The Justice Department can come 23 24 in, and U.S. Attorneys in connection with any

1 pending investigation.

2	We know the Correctional Association
3	comes in, they do their site visits, they
4	come in with as many as eight to 12 people.
5	We accord them privileged correspondence
6	rights so that any inmate that writes to
7	them, it goes out sealed, it comes in sealed,
8	it's not read by staff.
9	So there are a lot of entities now
10	that presently have access.
11	I'd like to for a moment talk briefly
12	about how we have reformulated significantly
13	our OSI office. First, there's an attorney
14	at the top now. That wasn't the case. He
15	has an extensive law enforcement background.
16	He brought in another attorney with an
17	extensive law enforcement background. They
18	have since made significant efforts to link
19	with the U.S. Attorneys, with the FBI, with
20	all local district attorneys. They bring
21	cases to them. They've also brought in many
22	other outside investigators.
23	So we have new energy from the outside
24	mixing in with experienced people. You have

1 to understand how jails operate in order to 2 conduct a proper investigation. They have 3 changed how they process cases, they have a new initiative where they're going to do an 4 5 analysis of an entire facility and they're 6 going to speak to every employee and get 7 feedback from inmates so that we can get better results on our investigations. 8

9 There's a lot of things that they are 10 doing that I am very hopeful about, including 11 now they directly report to me, and I meet 12 with them regularly to go over where they've 13 gone. So I think we are moving in the right 14 direction in this area.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Well, I 15 16 appreciate your point of view. I just want to share with you that we are the outlier 17 here in New York in how we do this. Those 18 left-wing places like Indiana do it 19 20 differently, and we had great information and 21 testimony that was provided all day, both 22 from those ombudspersons and what they do. 23 And then we also had family members 24 who were not here -- family members of

1 inmates do not complain about the treatment 2 by the corrections officers. In fact, most 3 of them were complaining about their treatment by other inmates -- but by their 4 5 inability to get information from somebody until they found me. 6 7 And so I think the time has come for 8 New York to say is this the right way to do this, is there another way to run this 9 10 railroad, and we'll be taking that up under consideration. 11 12 In this year's budget you have 13 requested \$3.1 billion, which was up from 14 last year's \$2.9 billion, an increase of 15 8.02 percent -- despite the fact that the prison population went from 53,000 to 51,000. 16 Can you address that? 17 18 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, 19 there are increased costs related to health 20 services, \$120 million alone just for 21 medications. We are spending more money to 22 implement the new SHU settlement, which is groundbreaking. There's a lot of rehab that 23 24 has to be done, there will be new staff added

1 for that.

23

2	There are other initiatives related to
3	reentry that are important for the Governor,
4	and they make a lot of sense, related to
5	upgrading our vocational programming, our
6	Thinking for a Change. So there's a lot of
7	initiatives there, as well as for the youth
8	initiative with respect to the Hudson
9	Correctional Facility. There are additional
10	staff added there. And a lot for the capital
11	projects that we have to undertake to make
12	that happen.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Thank you for
14	bringing that up. I'd like to address that
15	issue. I, as you well know, have been to 27
16	prison visits in my capacity as chair of the
17	Corrections Committee, and I have been to
18	Hudson and Coxsackie twice.
19	And so my first question for you is
20	given the small number of prisoners that you
21	have who are 16 and 17, why are you not
22	putting them all together? So why are you

24 and still yet also building a second -- not

keeping a small cadre of them at Coxsackie

1	building, renovating, whatever you call that,
2	the Hudson? So are you removing all the
3	adults from the Hudson?
4	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI:
5	Eventually, yes. Right now what we
6	implemented was a housing arrangement where
7	16- and 17-year-olds are either placed at
8	Woodbourne, at Greene, or at Coxsackie if
9	they require maximum security placement.
10	Going forward, the plan is for all 16-
11	and 17-year-olds to be removed to Hudson,
12	with the exception of those that still
13	require maximum security placement.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I was at
15	Greene when they began the process of the
16	renovation of Greene to allow for 16- and
17	17-year-olds. That was to be in PREA
18	compliance. So why the change? Like why did
19	you originally come up with the idea we're
20	going to put the medium security
21	PREA-compliant units in different places?
22	And then why did you decide now, no, they all
23	have to be in the same place?
24	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: This is

1 the next logical step. The Governor is 2 really committed to removing 16- and 3 17-year-olds from adult prisons globally, the Raise the Age initiative. We're tied with 4 5 North Carolina in last place, so to speak. It would be a lot easier for us as a system 6 7 if every person walking through our door was at least 18 or over. 8

9 The PREA requirements require us to 10 separate, by sight and sound, all 16- or 11 17-year-olds. And to do that effectively, we 12 looked at the existing services at the time. And it made sense to use Woodbourne because 13 it had some cells, it made sense to use 14 15 Greene, and it made sense to use Coxsackie 16 for those that would require maximum security placement. 17

18 Now this initiative is the next step, 19 because it's going to completely remove them 20 from the adult prisons. But Hudson will 21 still remain as a correctional facility.

22 So it is our hope that you do raise 23 the age, because the other thing is this. 24 With any 17-year-old right now on our system, if they come in just two months shy of their
 birthday, they have to go into one of these
 facilities where we currently cohort them,
 either Woodbourne, Coxsackie, and, in future,
 Hudson. But once they turn 18, we have to
 immediately uplift them and move them to a
 general confinement facility.

So the Raise the Age initiative will 8 allow the Office of Children and Family 9 10 Services to hold on to them, to continue in 11 their program, to decide when the appropriate 12 time is to transfer them to us as adults, either at 21 or possibly later. That, I 13 think, is the best possible solution going 14 15 forward for everyone.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: But back to 16 17 the problem at hand with segregating out the 18 maximum security prisoners into Coxsackie. As I spoke to you beforehand, when I went 19 20 there relatively recently, they were one 21 unhappy group of people who -- not because 22 they were in prison, but they felt that they were almost in solitary, that they were being 23 24 punished. And they kept on saying to me and

the other people there, Why did you do this
 to us?

3 So what do you intend to do at Hudson to prevent that from being repeated for the 4 5 medium-security 16- and 17-year-olds that you're putting into that facility? 6 7 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, the numbers will be much more significant. 8 And they'll be out and they'll be 9 10 participating in the general-confinement program, they'll have free rein of the 11 12 facility because we don't have to worry about 13 any separation by sight or sound. There will 14 be no one 18 or over at that facility. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Well, one last 16 question, thank you. When I originally toured Hudson you 17 18 were a little upset with me because I went to 19 the crappy dorm, or I went to the one place 20 that was really like crumbling down. It was really decrepit. 21 22 Are you intending to put those 16- and 17-year-olds into that crappy dorm? I don't 23 24 know what the word would be. But you know

what I'm talking about, right? So like 1 2 literally there were rooms that eight inmates 3 slept, you know, in beds next to one another in a room that was probably built for four. 4 5 Is that where you're putting these kids? 6 7 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: We are 8 upgrading. We're spending a lot of money to upgrade the place to make it suitable for 9 10 children. 11 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: And there will 12 still be adults on the work release side of 13 the prison? 14 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes. 15 That is outside the secure perimeter. So the 16 temporary release, industrial training program, will still continue to operate in 17 18 that building. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Okay. I just 20 want to take an opportunity to thank you for 21 how responsive you have been to me and my 22 staff and for answering all the letters that I take the time to write. Thank you very 23 24 much.

1	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Thank
2	you, Assemblyman.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you.
4	Senate?
5	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very
6	much. Our next speaker is Senator Patrick
7	Gallivan, chair of Crime and Corrections.
8	SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you, Madam
9	Chair.
10	Commissioner, good afternoon.
11	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good
12	afternoon, Senator.
13	SENATOR GALLIVAN: I can't help but
14	add to the comments of Senator Nozzolio. You
15	have had a very challenging year, and we
16	understand that.
17	I also understand that the inspector
18	general report is still pending, there's
19	pending investigations related to the escape
20	and looking into it. And I think I'd like
21	you to understand how frustrating it is for
22	us. We've got a responsibility, an oversight
23	responsibility, starting with the
24	Constitution, the various laws, the rules of

the Senate. And I'll get into some of the
 safety and security issues.

3 But when we see overdoses, when we see assaults on staff, when we see assaults on 4 5 inmates, when we see drugs in facilities and so on -- I mean, there's a very real 6 7 frustration when, as chair of the Crime and Corrections Committee, people say: What are 8 you doing about it? And how are you trying 9 10 to address it?

11 And I've tried to be very respectful 12 of the investigations that are going on, to 13 not impede on any of them. But there will 14 have to come a time when they're out that 15 we'll have to have a more extensive public 16 airing of the events leading up to that.

But nonetheless, I hope you understand that handicaps us right at this point, especially when we're considering a package that's spending \$3 billion, 3 billion taxpayer dollars.

22 So safety and security. That is --23 it's evident throughout your testimony, very 24 appropriately so. And since my time in this 1 chair and yours in that chair, I know that
2 that is something that you've talked about
3 each time that you're before us, and pretty
4 much every time you and I have a
5 conversation.

And I want to point to just a couple 6 7 of different things. I have a letter that 8 you wrote to all the inmates back in April of 2015 -- which I commend you for taking a very 9 10 responsible action while at the same time 11 admitting failures of the system and warning 12 them about the dangers of synthetic 13 marijuana. And we really should rightly be 14 concerned about that.

15 I've got some data regarding 16 contraband in facilities that has continued to increase each of the last four years, last 17 18 year being the highest total ever. 19 Inmate-on-staff assaults, same thing, have 20 continued to increase each of the last three 21 or four years, highest total ever. 22 Inmate-on-inmate assaults, same thing. So no matter how we look at it, we've 23

24

got problems and concerns. And it doesn't

1 matter if you are there defending the 2 correction officer or some family member very 3 concerned about their brother, sister, whomever it might be in a correctional 4 5 facility. Your foremost obligation is to provide for the safety, security, humane 6 7 constitutional treatment inside those facilities. 8 So of course it begs the question, 9 what are we doing about all this? We're 10 11 going in the wrong direction each of the last 12 three or four years. 13 But having said that, I know your testimony started to address that. So the 14 15 security staffing reviews that we took on two 16 years ago, can you tell me where they -- and I know you briefly mentioned them. But can 17 18 you tell me where you are along that process? 19 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: We've 20 completed the next -- I think it's 18 audits. We've shared that information with the two 21 unions -- NYSCOPBA, Council 82. We're 22 23 awaiting their feedback. And then we'll send 24 the final set of recommendations to the

1 Division of the Budget.

2	SENATOR GALLIVAN: When did you
3	anticipate the review of the entire system
4	will be completed, of all the facilities?
5	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: The
6	third year will be next year.
7	SENATOR GALLIVAN: And partly in
8	response, I'm assuming, to some of the things
9	that have taken place as you're doing your
10	internal review of the escape at Clinton, as
11	well as the security staffing reviews, your
12	testimony talked about the technological
13	enhancements, training improvements, policy
14	changes begun some things, are going to
15	begin some others.
16	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Mm-hmm.
17	SENATOR GALLIVAN: It can't come soon
18	enough. I think you agree with that. But
19	how far along are we with these things, and
20	how can we accelerate it so these which
21	you can't see, but obviously the chart that
22	goes up
23	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes.
24	SENATOR GALLIVAN: starts going in

1 the other direction?

2 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Right. 3 The first thing is that we have made arrangements to change our rules, our 4 5 disciplinary rules, so that K2, or synthetic marijuana, is defined as a drug for purposes 6 7 of our disciplinary system. That required a formal change in a 8 rule and then serving it on every inmate. So 9 10 I think the date where it officially will 11 take effect is the next couple of weeks or 12 few weeks. So that will enhance our ability 13 to discipline appropriately the individuals 14 that engage in that. 15 The next thing that we've done is 16 we've sent out notices to advise the vendors that supply products to our commissaries that 17 18 we will no longer be able to accept canned goods. There are too many instances where 19 20 can lids are being used for weaponry. And 21 we've talked to other systems, we're one of 22 the few states that's in this area that still does that sort of thing. 23

So we're confident that we can supply

other products that are packaged in ways so
 that ultimately we will be removing can lids
 from our commissaries.

And we will make similar steps, you 4 5 know, when you buy from secure vendors. So that's the next change. We're going to allow 6 7 inmates to buy only from secure vendors that we've identified. Because this would 8 prevent -- assuming no one is compromised by 9 10 the secure vendors we select, and they will 11 have to prove to us their track record --12 that purchasing goods from the outside and coming into the facilities, A, will not have 13 14 can lids and, B, hopefully will no longer 15 have drugs secreted --

16 SENATOR GALLIVAN: If I can just stay 17 right along the commissaries, I had -- I know 18 this has been talked about for years. I had a meeting with the deputy secretary for 19 public safety several months ago, and he 20 21 talked about an RFP either being prepared or 22 going out for -- for a central commissary, I think? 23

24

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: Is that still a

2 plan?

1

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: The commissary RFP is still out there. But meanwhile, for the existing vendors, we want to implement this now. That will also be part of the long-range RFP for the winning bidder there, but right now we want to make this change.

10 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right, let's --11 there will be much more to follow, I mean, 12 with all the specific items, about trying to 13 prevent contraband from coming into 14 facilities, trying to stop the various 15 assaults on staff or inmates. So I know 16 we'll have many more discussions.

If I may just talk very briefly -- you 17 18 talked briefly about it as well in your 19 testimony -- inmate discipline, the whole 20 process. I know you had the settlement, you 21 had the SHU lawsuit. Some things were 22 prompted by that. And you've talked about the revamping of an inmate discipline system 23 24 in your testimony.

1 Some of the concerns that people have 2 come to me with from various facilities 3 across the state is that inmate discipline has gone in the wrong direction and there's a 4 5 feeling that that has contributed to the increase in assaults, be it on inmates or 6 7 staff. Can you comment on that? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: We 8 continue to study and meet with our unions to 9 10 get feedback. 11 Certainly, as we know -- we spoke 12 about this maybe a year ago or two years 13 ago -- the demographics of our population 14 have changed. Many years ago we had 24,000 drug offenders, mostly low-level drug 15 16 offenders. And now, disproportionately, we have more violent felony offenders in our 17 18 system, I think maybe 64 percent. We have 19 9,500, 9,600 inmates that are serving sentences with maximums of life terms. 20 21 So those are changing demographics. 22 That may be one of the reasons that we're seeing the uptick in assaults. 23 24 No assault is good. The majority of

1 assaults that do happen -- and as I 2 explained, our definition of what constitutes 3 an assault is much lower than what's in the Penal Law. It does not require physical 4 5 injury. I throw this cup of water, I don't cause you injury, but it's an assault, it's 6 7 a --SENATOR GALLIVAN: No, I understand 8 that. And just if I may -- sorry to 9 10 interrupt -- we can call it anything, but there should never be a time that an inmate 11 12 puts his hands on another inmate or an inmate puts his hands on a correction officer. 13 14 So I appreciate the semantics of it, 15 but I think we're on the same page with that. 16 I mean it's the order within a facility that's of concern. 17 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Mm-hmm. 18 And I think, moving to the reforms that we've 19 20 implemented or are planning to implement with 21 the changes, we see that as very analogous to what we've done with the seriously mentally 22 23 ill. And we planned that out, we spent the 24 right amount of money, we developed programs

like the RMHU at Marcy, the one at Five
 Points, where we can safely bring inmates who
 were otherwise very problematic out of their
 cells to receive programming and treatment
 using secure "Re-Start" chairs.

So we envision that this will help 6 7 safety, because we're going to do the 8 step-down program at one of our facilities, a 9 couple of other step-down to the communities. 10 We're going to change -- we have this 11 elaborate CCP program that we're planning. 12 We have a whole array of options, similar to 13 what we did with the seriously mentally ill.

And I think staff for the most part, unless I'm wrong, will tell you that they see what we've done with the seriously mentally ill in those programs at Marcy as working. And we're effectively changing behavior, which is our ultimate goal. We want to change behavior by difficult inmates.

21 We see that going the same way 22 ultimately -- it will take some time, we have 23 to be patient. When we bring everything 24 online, we think we'll have a safer system

1 for everybody.

2	SENATOR GALLIVAN: Commissioner, thank
3	you. I would love to go on, but the chair is
4	going to turn my microphone off because my
5	time's up. Thank you very much.
6	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you.
8	Our next speaker is Assemblymember
9	Duprey.
10	ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Good afternoon,
11	Commissioner.
12	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good
13	afternoon, Assemblywoman.
14	ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Before I start,
15	I would really be remiss several people
16	have already spoken about the event that
17	happened in my district in June, and I want
18	to extend my thanks to you personally,
19	Commissioner, to your administrative staff
20	for your tremendous cooperation during the
21	most difficult 23 days that I think probably
22	the Department of Corrections, certainly
23	anyone in my district, has ever had to
24	endure.

1 We're glad it didn't go on any longer. 2 I might have asked all of you to register to 3 vote, so -- but I know you were all there, 4 and you were there a lot and for a long time, 5 and your support was greatly appreciated. ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Thank 6 7 you, Assemblywoman. ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: And continues 8 to be. 9 10 A couple of the Senators mentioned the 11 IG report, and I can tell you that there's no 12 one waiting for it more than I am in the 13 State Legislature, as well as several hundred 14 of my constituents. And I know, 15 Commissioner, that we share our concern on 16 safety issues. Certainly there are -- and again, there's been some talk about the 17 assaults. The media seems to want to 18 19 certainly talk a lot about the inmates, the assaults on inmates. And none of us condone 20 21 those. I've also seen way too many assaults 22 on our correction officers. 23 And could you just again -- and I hate 24 to ask you to repeat, but so that I'm clear

on what your recent initiatives are to
 enhance the safety of our correction officers
 in these facilities.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, 4 5 among the other things that we're spending some money on for new equipment are these 6 7 portable medical detectors that we are 8 issuing in maximum security facilities to start with. They are much better than the 9 10 fixed areas, because the inmates know where 11 the metal detector equipment is now. These 12 we can put and move about and therefore 13 effectively conduct metal detection searches 14 on inmates, which is one of the things that 15 we think will help significantly.

16 I mentioned the intention to get rid 17 of the cans, the intention to get secure 18 vendors. Because being the only way that goods can come in, this will mean changes in 19 our package rooms, because we're one of the 20 21 few states that continues to allow packages 22 from anyone. And with new technology, people can disguise, in seemingly a can of 23 24 vegetables from the store, anything.

We have great security staff that we have great security staff that review these, and they're terrific sometimes at finding them. But no matter how diligent they are, things get in. Scalpel blades get in. All those things present a safety threat to our staff and to other inmates.

7 And we continue to regularly meet with our partners in the unions to hear what their 8 suggestions are. And we're looking at things 9 10 also to deescalate situations. We want to 11 introduce pepper spray into the department to 12 see how that works. That may be a way of safely defusing a situation. A lot of other 13 14 jurisdictions use that.

15 We have deescalation training. We're 16 sharing that with the unions now, we're rewriting our policies, we're going to get 17 18 their feedback before putting anything out. 19 But we recognize that everybody's in this 20 together. Nobody has the single answer to 21 every problem. The only answer is that 22 everything requires either hard work or a lot of hard work. But we're willing to do it 23 24 together and get the job done.

1	ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Thank you.
2	And I also want to address something
3	that is, I think, difficult. I'm sure it's
4	difficult for the department, difficult for
5	me. But we recently had a very well
6	respected sergeant in one of my correctional
7	facilities who committed suicide. He left
8	behind a loving family and certainly
9	coworkers in shock. It's one more example of
10	the incredible stress that our correctional
11	officers face every day.
12	About six years ago a retired
13	corrections lieutenant who's a personal
14	friend of mine came to my office in
15	Plattsburgh, and he actually broke down,
16	talking about the flashbacks, the depression
17	that he went through soon after his
18	retirement. Coincidentally, that same day I
19	was having lunch with a couple of
20	psychologists who started talking to me about
21	their wanting to work more with veterans.
22	And I asked them to start working with our
23	correction officers.
24	They've done that. I introduced the

1 two of them. They've had great success with 2 PTSD programs. I think we need to be very 3 open that our correction officers -certainly some who are currently working, but 4 5 those who retire -- are facing PTSD the same as our veterans are. We have now in the 6 7 North Country, in the Plattsburgh area, trained local licensed mental health 8 9 counselors. They recently held a seminar. 10 Commissioner, I know you're trying to 11 reach out to those in need in my district, but I'm also concerned -- and I believe we've 12 13 done that pretty well -- I'm concerned about 14 correction officers across the state. And 15 can you just tell us about what the 16 department is doing to address the stress that these officers are facing? And I worry 17 18 about their stress, the stress of their 19 families.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Sure. And I commend the gentleman that started that program. I read the article on it, I think it was very impressive. I think people don't realize the nature of the job -- mostly for correction officers with stress, but for all
 staff working inside correctional facility,
 what they face every day. And they
 internalize it a lot, and that can build up
 over time.

Two years ago I was concerned about 6 7 the uptick in suicides among our staff, so I put out a notice to all staff. We had worked 8 to give out some materials to our EAP 9 10 coordinators, resources to refer people to. 11 The notice I created was with help from my 12 assistant commissioner in charge of mental 13 health services, where we basically explained 14 depression is something that can affect 15 anybody. And when you reach that state where 16 you think the only solution to your problem, you're so depressed you think the only 17 18 solution to your problem is to take your 19 life, it's a very unfortunate circumstance. 20 There are countless individuals alive 21 today who were at that stage but got help in 22 time, and now they're leading healthy and productive lives. 23

24 So in my notice two years ago I urged

1 that, you know, if you see a fellow worker 2 that's at risk, take advantage of these 3 materials. They have resources in the community. 4 5 Now, more recently, we are working with our partners in NYSCOPBA and the 6 7 Governor's Office of Employee Relations. We 8 are using joint labor-management funding. They've selected a vendor who's going to roll 9 10 out a training program to our union stewards and EAP coordinators on how to prevent 11 12 suicide. 13 Suicide is a terrible tragedy, and we 14 owe it to the hardworking men and women, both 15 inside our institutions and in the 16 communities, to do everything possible to get them help before these tragedies reach 17 fruition. 18 19 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Thank you. I 20 know my time is up, but thank you for that 21 answer. It's certainly something that none of us want to continue to deal with. 22 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Thank 23 24 you.

1	ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Thank you, sir.
2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very
3	much. Our next speaker is Senator Funke.
4	SENATOR FUNKE: Thank you, Madam
5	Chairwoman.
6	Commissioner, thank you for the
7	challenging work that you do.
8	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Thank
9	you. Good afternoon.
10	SENATOR FUNKE: I'd like to talk to
11	you about parole today and what's going on in
12	my particular district, Monroe and Ontario
13	counties. Thomas Johnson, III, was a parolee
14	who murdered Rochester police officer Daryl
15	Pierson. Johnny Blackshell Jr., another
16	parolee accused of killing three people
17	outside the Boys & Girls Club in Rochester.
18	David Alligood, another parolee accused of
19	shooting up a bar in Gates and killing one,
20	injuring six others. Michael Carruthers,
21	released on parole and only hours later raped
22	a 14-year-old girl. The list goes on.
23	People in my community believe that if
24	the parole system is not broken, it is

1

severely cracked. We have 30 program

2	officers in Rochester responsible for 1200
3	parolees in Rochester metro, with three cars.
4	They tell me the cars have about 150,000
5	miles on them, too.
6	Have parole issues become lost in
7	DOCCS since the two have been merged
8	together? Because it sure seems like it to
0	me Hey can up better engure the public

9 me. How can we better ensure the public 10 safety, the safety of our community, the 11 safety of these parole officers as well? How 12 can we better have parolees reporting when 13 they're supposed to report? And what's being 14 done to address those issues, please?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Senator,
your points are very well taken. And the
community supervision aspect of this agency
is extremely important.

19When the Governor merged these two20agencies, his vision was that there should be21a seamless transition between when a person22enters the front door of a correctional23facility, throughout their incarceration, and24then released into the community to continue

with the services. And at that time, even
 though I had many, many years of experience
 and work with the Division of Parole, I
 really learned firsthand the tough job that
 parole officers do.

It's tough enough dealing with some of 6 7 the convicted felons behind the walls, where 8 you know they don't have access to guns. But 9 in the community when you're doing a home 10 visit and you don't know if he's on drugs, 11 you don't know if there's a gun in the room. 12 And our parole officers are very 13 professional, very well trained.

What is going on in Rochester has caused us great concern. And we've rolled out several important initiatives that we think are making difference.

First and foremost, before someone is released to the Rochester area, we have a screening process so that if they are identified as what we call a high-risk parolee, through our risk and needs assessment, we first arrange for that person to get closer to a facility so that they're 1 not traveling a long distance. We then put 2 GPS bracelets on them at the correctional 3 facility. We then transport them to the field office for their official report, so 4 5 that there's no break in the release, so that they're not in the community before they 6 7 officially understand, yes, I'm a parolee, I'm still serving the sentence, I'm subject 8 to jurisdiction. 9

10 We make sure that we have the right 11 individuals on the right supervision level. 12 And we work with our local law enforcement 13 partners. Recently we joined forces with our 14 BSS unit, our OSI unit, to conduct an 15 initiative whereby we would round up 16 absconders in the Rochester area. I forget the raw number that we ended up with, but by 17 all accounts it was successful. Local law 18 19 enforcement welcomed the cooperative 20 initiative.

21 We just recently did one in New York 22 City that went over very, very well, and the 23 police commissioner acknowledged us in that 24 effort. So we envision continuing to do

1 things along those lines.

2 The vehicle issue you mentioned has me 3 greatly concerned. We've been working on a 4 business plan, which I was informed today has 5 been approved by OGS. So instead of the existing ratio -- and I can get the exact 6 7 ratio. I have it in my notes somewhere that 8 we'll be moving to. But over a three-year period we are going to acquire a lot more 9 10 vehicles that are going to be going to 11 community supervision. The first year has 12 been approved, so we will be, I think, spending about \$800,000. I think the number 13 14 is like 37 or 38 more vehicles for use by 15 parole officers so they can do their 16 responsibilities.

SENATOR FUNKE: One quick question. 17 18 Assemblyman Peter Lawrence and the police 19 chiefs in Monroe County have suggested 20 expanding the database within police agencies 21 on parolees, so that if it should happen that 22 a parolee is stopped, a police officer could make an arrest right then and there. Is that 23 24 something that you would support?

1	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well,
2	right now if we have already lodged an
3	absconding warrant, that's on a system that
4	anybody can acknowledge and any police
5	officer in the state can take someone into
6	custody based upon the fact that they're a
7	parole absconder.
8	SENATOR FUNKE: Thank you, sir.
9	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Our next
11	speaker is Assemblymember Lentol.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Hello,
13	Commissioner.
14	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Hi,
15	Assemblyman.
16	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: First of all, I
17	don't want to give you too much praise, but I
18	have a great deal of affection as well as
19	respect for your knowledge, not only of
20	corrections but also of the sentencing law
21	which we studied together which I studied
22	and you knew. And I learned a great deal
23	from you when we served on the Sentencing

1 But I too want to talk about parole, 2 but a different aspect of parole, which is the Parole Board. And I looked at some of 3 the proposals that the Governor has 4 5 propounded in order to open up parole to the public regarding having people come into 6 7 watch parole or video of the live interview, of the interaction between the Parole Board 8 and the inmates. 9

10 And my question is when I looked at 11 this proposal, it looks like a Sunshine Law. 12 But then after reading it or understanding 13 it, it sounds likes it's designed to keep 14 people in prison. Because I don't know how 15 an inmate in the prison would be forthcoming 16 or the Parole Board folks would be able to ask appropriate questions given the fact that 17 18 they know they're on tape.

19And furthermore, if the public heard20the details of the crime, the Parole Board21may be unwilling to release anybody, because22they'd be afraid to.

So I'm just wondering how and why wehave this proposal in the budget.

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, I 2 think what the Governor was responding to was 3 the concern by a lot of individuals in the community who get frustrated at repeated 4 5 denials of parole. And they want to make sure that the Parole Board is weighing all of 6 7 the appropriate factors that they're obligated to weigh under the law. 8

She's not here today, but I have the 9 10 utmost respect for Chairwoman Stanford. 11 She's a terrific individual, she's provided 12 great leadership to the board. In my 13 conversations with all the individual parole 14 commissioners, they want to do the right 15 thing. They really do. They want to weigh 16 the entire record that an inmate has done. No inmate can go back in time and change the 17 18 original crime. That's fixed as is. But 19 they want to be judged on what they've done over the course of their incarceration. 20

21 So we certainly -- my job, and this 22 was part of the merger, is to make sure they 23 have all the resources they need to do their 24 job. But their decision making still has to

be independent from me. The decisions of the
 ALJs have to be independent.

3 One of the things that we're exploring is potentially using outside lawyers in some 4 5 role to assist the inmate with the preparation of his packet. The Governor 6 7 reached out, and there are a number of lawyers who are willing to come forward as 8 the Pardon Initiative and the Clemency 9 10 Initiative. And I had several staff members 11 participate in a webinar to train them so 12 that they could understand all of the 13 different documents that are part of our 14 documentation -- what the commitment means, 15 what program participation means, what a 16 disciplinary record means. 17 Some of these lawyers who might be

18 taking on inmates for clemency applications 19 might also be tapped for responsibilities 20 along this line, to potentially help an 21 inmate prepare his package and appear before 22 the Parole Board. 23 So there's a lot to be discussed,

24 there's a lot to be considered. It's not a

1 black-and-white issue, it's not easy to get 2 people into our correctional facilities. A 3 lot of the Parole Board hearings are done by televideo, so it could be possible that 4 5 somebody could be at a remote site and listen to what's going on. 6 7 We certainly support transparency, but we also want to be fair to everybody. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: And isn't it also 9 10 true that in parole hearings there are certain facts that never come to light, 11 12 either in video or at the Parole Board, because there are confidential communications 13 14 between the district attorney and the judge, 15 as well as others who may have their thoughts 16 not ever brought up at any of these hearings? So the public would be denied knowledge of 17 18 why somebody was denied because of those 19 confidential communications. 20 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I am 21 reluctant to give you a hard and fast answer. 22 I know the crime victim's statement is 23 absolutely confidential. The inmate never

24 gets it. And we take extraordinary means to

1 make sure that that gets delivered to the 2 parole commissioners at the time of the 3 hearing; they take that into consideration. I'm not sure what the practice is if a 4 5 district attorney writes a letter. I'm tending to think that it's part of the record 6 7 that should be made available --ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: I don't think it 8 9 is. 10 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: -- but I don't want to give you a definite answer. 11 12 I'd have to check with the Board of Parole. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you, sir. 14 SENATOR KRUEGER: Senator Ruth 15 Hassell-Thompson. 16 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. 17 Good afternoon, Commissioner. 18 19 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good 20 afternoon, Senator. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: I know 21 there was mention made of both Hudson and 22 Coxsackie's correctional facilities, but just 23 24 a couple of quick follow-up questions,

1 really.

2	What would be the impact you talked
3	in your presentation about \$300 million in
4	the capital budget. And some of that is
5	going to be for the renovation and the
6	reengineering of Hudson. What impact is that
7	going to have on services provided to inmates
8	that are currently at Hudson?
9	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well,
10	eventually the inmates that are currently at
11	Hudson are going to be moved to other
12	facilities.
13	The first phase of the construction
14	project is slated to be completed so that we
15	can start to move 16- and 17-year-olds there
16	by August. We want to move as quickly as
17	possible.
18	The existing inmates that are there
19	will continue to get services while we're
20	still doing the rehabilitation. Gradually
21	they will attrit out and eventually, for
22	those that remain behind, we can transfer
23	them. We have enough vacancies throughout
24	our system. So we do not envision that as

1 being a challenge to us.

2	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: And you
3	know I want to ask you how is that going to
4	impact Close to Home, but I'll leave that for
5	another day.
6	Tell me about Coxsackie. You know,
7	will those housing units be modified to reach
8	the goals that are in our age-appropriate
9	behavioral modification protocols?
10	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: We don't
11	have any further construction changes planned
12	for Coxsackie. These changes were already
13	made as part of the first initial settlement
14	we made with NYCLU.
15	So Coxsackie has a general confinement
16	unit, I forget the number of beds it's
17	either 15 or 30 and then a comparable
18	number if we have to segregate an inmate for
19	disciplinary reasons at Coxsackie. Coxsackie
20	will be used for 16- and 17-year-olds going
21	forward who require maximum security
22	placement.
23	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: No, that
24	I'm aware of. But how does looking at

1	Coxsackie as it current exists, is it part of
2	the developmental plan to meets the goals of
3	this new population?
4	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes.
5	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: That's the
6	question.
7	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: It is
8	part of the goal.
9	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Okay. Tell
10	me a little bit about the hepatitis C crisis
11	that's in the prison population and what's
12	being done to address the rising costs and
13	the proliferation of this disease within the
14	populations?
15	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well,
16	rising costs are something we really can't
17	control. If you need treatment, we have to
18	provide it.
19	Several years ago it was triple
20	therapy, it was pegylated-interferon and
21	ribavirin and a protease inhibitor that
22	combined for the treatment. Now there are
23	new treatments. The cost could be \$84,000
24	for a treatment round. It depends upon the

extent of the disease. And we have to
 provide it. We have to offer it and we have
 to provide it.

I think there's a new law that says that you have to offer the test to everybody between the ages of 45 and 55. So we are doing that. And those that want the treatment, we have to provide it to them.

9 And we also have arrangements to 10 continue the treatment in the community as 11 well, so that we hook that up -- them up as 12 well. But it is very expensive. It could 13 rise as much as up to \$24 million for that 14 this year.

SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: That rolls 15 16 over into my last question, because my clock just seems to be ticking faster than anybody 17 18 else's. But the aging and the medical cost 19 for older patients, what is being done to do 20 consideration of release for this population? 21 Looking at the \$16 billion additional for 22 this population, is nobody cognizant of that? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good 23 24 point, Senator. We're very cognizant of it.

1 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: No, no, no. 2 I don't mean you, but I mean people outside. 3 Because we keep talking about the rising costs of everything, but these are people who 4 5 pose absolutely no threat to public safety, 6 and yet we are keeping them in a facility 7 that exacerbates an already bad condition, and it's costing us an extra \$16 billion. 8 9 You know, everybody wants to be a cost-saver, 10 but that's not a consideration that we're 11 making. 12 Plus it's inhumane. Let's not leave 13 that out of the equation either. 14 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Senator, 15 medical parole is an avenue that I personally 16 would like to use more. We've changed the law last year to try and short-circuit the 17 cases where certain nonviolent inmates who 18 are terminally ill can avoid the Parole Board 19 20 appearance and instead I can make that 21 decision. 22 But the list of crimes that make you 23 eligible are very narrow. Typically like a 24 drug offense. Drug offense sentences now are

very small compared to what they used to be.
 So typically you have to be inside for a
 while for a terminal condition to make itself
 known.

5 There have only been two cases so -well, there's actually been three cases so 6 7 far. And what I have done is turn them around very quickly, but unfortunately the 8 individuals died before the requisite time 9 10 frame within which I had to get feedback, 11 because the law requires me to do that. I 12 have to write to the judge, I write to the 13 sentencing court, the district attorney and the defense lawyer, and I have to allow them 14 15 a period of time before I can make it 16 official.

But the list of crimes is very narrow. 17 18 I have instructed my chief medical officer -because he is the one that forwards the case 19 20 on to me. He sends it to me by an email. I 21 try and answer him the same day. I look up 22 the case, I look up his description. If I have any questions, I will ask him. But --23 24 and I get a million emails, but I've told him if he doesn't get an answer from me that day,
 the next day, get back to me. Because I
 don't want any delays.

4 I'm very sensitive to the humanitarian 5 aspects of this. If we can at all, if at all 6 possible, these individuals deserve to die 7 with dignity in a setting other than a 8 correctional facility.

9 But for those that do stay in our 10 facilities, we do have hospice programs 11 within our regional medical units. We've 12 trained inmates how to be hospice aides, how 13 to be the companion. Because we don't want 14 anybody to ever die alone in our system.

15 And we are looking at ways to try and 16 expedite the process. I know there's a lot of frustration. People want to see a lot 17 18 more medical paroles. We get it. We're 19 going to be taking steps to look, how can we 20 improve things? My initial inclination is we 21 probably have to start backing up the decision a little earlier so that the normal 22 process that has to be followed -- the 23 24 letters that have to go to the district

1 attorneys, et cetera, can go out earlier. 2 The challenge is the standard you have 3 to apply is that you have to be convinced that the person is too sick to present a risk 4 5 of harm. What does that mean? If you can fire a gun, are you potentially a risk? 6 7 So we're trying to weigh and balance 8 all those factors and accelerate the process. It's not easy, but we definitely want to make 9 10 a lot more progress in that area. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you, 11 12 Commissioner. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you. We've been joined by Assemblymember 14 15 Richardson, and we will now hear from 16 Assemblymember Graf. ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Hi, how you doing, 17 18 Commissioner? I'm going to be kind of short 19 here because it's been a long day. 20 Can you tell me the percentage of your 21 inmates that are coming into this system that 22 are opiate-addicted or have a heroin addiction? Do you have a percentage number? 23 24 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I can't

1 tell you a percentage that are coming in 2 opioid-addicted. I might be able to; I know 3 that the inmates coming in with a substance 4 abuse need is very high, so at some point we 5 have to put them into some type of drug 6 treatment program.

But heroin is a serious concern. I
have had inmates die of overdoses inside the
institutions. We've had parolees die of
overdoses. So the two initiatives I
described we think will be helpful.

12 We have a program whereby inmates who 13 will shortly be released -- it's a program we 14 developed in partnership with the Harm 15 Reduction Coalition and the Department of 16 Health. We train them on Naloxone kits, and then we offer it to them as they're leaving, 17 18 free of charge. And we know that there have been a couple of instances where a parolee 19 20 has used his Naloxone kit to bring someone 21 back to life who is an apparent overdose from 22 heroin.

23 We're also the first state agency24 that's approved by the Department of Health

1 for our nurses to give the injectable 2 Naloxone to any inmate or visitor, volunteer, 3 whomever, that apparently is suffering from an opioid overdose. 4 5 So this is part of the Governor's initiative. We're trying to take all 6 7 reasonable steps. But it is a rising concern, there's no question about it, in our 8 communities. 9 10 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: It's becoming a big 11 problem. Would you say in your population, 12 when you're getting new inmates, this is becoming a big problem with the heroin or 13 14 some type of addiction? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: If I 15 16 heard your question correctly, you're asking if I have a problem --17 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: No, has this been 18 an increasing problem as far as --19 20 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yes, in 21 general I would say it's been an increasing 22 problem. ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: All right. Now, 23 24 the Vivitrol that you said you're giving some

1 inmates, Vivitrol, once they're released, are 2 they released into a program or are they just 3 released?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yeah, 4 5 this is a pilot program that we've started at Edgecombe in conjunction with Odyssey House 6 7 and of course our partners at OASAS. And the program is for parolees actually who have 8 relapsed on heroin. And we have this parole 9 10 diversion program where we can put them in for 45 days at Edgecombe. 11

12 So while they're there, recognizing 13 that they have this problem, this addiction, 14 this drug, if they voluntarily will take it, 15 coupled with all of the counseling that we're 16 going to give them in the community, will 17 block the effects of opioid as well as the 18 euphoria from drinking alcohol.

19So we've just started this, we've20mapped it all out, there's a lot of things21that to be lined up -- the physician that's22going to give the injection at Edgecombe, the23follow-up injection in the community if they24follow up accordingly, the identification

1 that they have to wear. We've just lined 2 this all up; we haven't yet had a test case. 3 But it is something that we are hoping, if it produces positive results there, we also have 4 5 PD programs at Hudson and at Orleans for the parole violators who have this opioid 6 7 relapse, come into our system, and then we offer that as a means of trying to block the 8 effects and deal with their addiction. 9 10 ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Now, the Vivitrol, 11 are you able to buy that in bulk when you 12 bring it? Because I know it's like a thousand dollars a shot. 13 14 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yeah, I 15 think that's being supplied by Odyssey House. 16 This is not a department expense for that. ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF: Okay. Thank you 17 18 very much. 19 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 20 Our next speaker is Senator Krueger. 21 SENATOR KRUEGER: Good afternoon. ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good 22 afternoon, Senator. 23 24 SENATOR KRUEGER: You talked about the

1 mental health issues in the prisons in your 2 testimony. What's your estimate of what 3 percentage of the prisoners in DOCCS are suffering from mental illness? 4 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: That 5 number keeps growing. We've crossed the 6 7 10,000 number. We have over 10,000 on the caseload. I think it's 19 percent of our 8 9 population now that are on the OMH caseload. 10 SENATOR KRUEGER: And as we are releasing people from DOCCS back into their 11 12 communities, how is the system of ensuring 13 they are processed for Medicaid before they 14 leave prison going? 15 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Yeah, 16 that's a big initiative on our part to enroll as many inmates as possible into the Medicaid 17 18 program. 19 We've prioritized which inmates we 20 should put to the front of the list, so to 21 speak -- the ones that might get an illness, 22 the elderly inmates, et cetera. I think we're averaging something like 500-and-some-23 24 odd registrations per month.

1 And another big initiative that we 2 have that came out of the Reentry Council, 3 the Governor's Reentry Council, their suggestion -- and we were able to coordinate 4 5 this with our Department of Health partners -- is that we will be able, some 6 7 time this year, in the not too distant 8 future, to activate the Medicaid card prior to release. I think it's 30 days prior to 9 10 release. 11 That will help us greatly with

12 placements. It will help us with the elderly 13 inmates that we're trying to place into 14 nursing homes, where some of them want the 15 inmate on Medicaid with his card prior to 16 leaving. It will help us hook up with 17 certain services in the community. So we're 18 very hopeful about that as well.

19SENATOR KRUEGER: I represent the East20Side of Manhattan, where the intake for the21New York City homeless shelter system for men22is located. And we were provided an estimate23recently that there are 2,000 people who come24out of DOCCS and their discharge plan sends

them to the Bellevue Men's Shelter entry
 system.

3 Do you believe that's an appropriate
4 discharge plan from the New York State
5 prisons?

6 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, we 7 can't legally hold someone past their release 8 date if they are homeless. The law requires 9 us to notify the local DSS if someone is 10 coming out of prison and requires homeless 11 shelter services. So we do that throughout 12 the 62 counties of the state.

13 We try very hard to work with the 14 parolee to know in advance his release date, 15 to ascertain if he has any relative, any 16 friend, anyone who might be willing to offer them a place to stay. The reality is there 17 18 are significant numbers of individuals who 19 leave the prison system without a home to go 20 to.

21 We have contract beds that we use, we 22 have various programs for employment that 23 hopefully get them the money that they can 24 then secure private residences. The numbers

1 in New York City I think were significantly 2 affected by the loss of three-quarter 3 housing. So that amplified the numbers. But the number of undomiciled 4 5 individuals is significant, and the subpopulation of that is the number of sex 6 7 offenders who are covered by the Sexual Assault Reform Act, which requires that any 8 residence that they get can't be within a 9 10 thousand feet of a school. So we will not release someone to a homeless shelter who's 11 12 covered by that law unless the city or the county tells us: We have a bed for that 13 14 person that's SARA-compliant. 15 What we've been doing instead is 16 relying on our authority to put these people into what are called residential treatment 17 18 facilities. They're usually located near the 19 community. We have one, I believe it's 20 Lincoln, and we give them transitional 21 services, we pay them \$10 a day to work on an 22 outside crew, and they come back and they sleep at the facility until such time as we 23 24 do find a SARA-compliant residence. But it

1 is a huge, complicating problem.

2	SENATOR KRUEGER: I am familiar with
3	the sex offender issue, and in fact I think
4	the City of New York is working very hard to
5	make sure that released sex offenders are
6	going into appropriate locations. That has
7	also been an issue in my community.
8	But I will say that there seems to be
9	a pattern of release of mentally ill people
10	from prison without Medicaid kicking in
11	before they get to the city, ending up at the
12	front door of the shelter system. And I
13	propose to you that's a guarantee that those
14	people will end up right back in the prison
15	system or having some terrible trauma happen
16	in the community.
17	So I'm hoping that DOCCS can take a
18	more active review of whether a discharge
19	plan ought to be "there's no other option, so
20	we'll just drop them off at the Bellevue
21	Men's Shelter."
22	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: We try
23	very hard to avoid that. We work very
24	closely now with OMH on discharge planning.

1 We have identified seriously mentally ill who 2 also might be violent well in advance, when 3 they come into the system, as part of our 4 reception centers, to put them into special 5 programs. We know that ultimately they're going to be released. We want to make sure 6 7 we give them the best opportunities to succeed. 8

9 We're establishing new special 10 discharge ICPs for this population. One is going to be at Auburn, one is at Sing Sing, 11 12 where we already have the core program. We release them with medication, I think it's 13 14 either two or three weeks' worth of 15 medication that they have, with scrips to 16 refill.

And your point is well taken, to the 17 18 extent there may be some that may not have 19 been registered on Medicaid, if they've 20 fallen through the cracks, I will make sure 21 that we prioritize getting them Medicaid 22 cards as well before release, Senator. 23 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 24 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you.

1	Our next speaker will be
2	Assemblymember Giglio.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: Good afternoon.
4	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good
5	afternoon, Assemblyman.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: I only have two
7	quick questions for you, Commissioner. And I
8	wouldn't wish the last year you've spent on
9	my worst enemy.
10	But besides that, my first question is
11	you said there are 103 new correction
12	officers. How many retired?
13	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: How many
14	of those 103 retired?
15	ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: No, no. You
16	hired a new 103. How many have you lost in
17	the same period of time?
18	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I should
19	know that off the top of my head because we
20	lose a lot every two weeks. It's something
21	
	like 54 retire. But we keep the 103 are
22	like 54 retire. But we keep the 103 are added over our BFL. So we keep doing
	-

ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: When you lose
 that kind of institutional knowledge, how do
 you make it up?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: You 4 5 can't replace experience, there's no question about that, Assemblyman. I wish our staff 6 7 would stay longer. It's a tough job, they're eligible to retire after 25 years, that's the 8 retirement law. But they're very valuable, 9 10 especially because a lot of them have learned how to deal with a violent situation by using 11 12 their wits as opposed to the normal uses of force. 13

14So we value very much our experienced15correction officers. I can't prevent anybody16from retiring who wants to retire. But we17keep replacing them with classes from the18training academy as quickly as we can.

19ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: In our limited20conversations, you've always been concerned21with staffing ratios and those kind of22things, to keep it safe and secure. And you23talked about that in your testimony.

24 The only other question I have now is

1 this Office of Special Investigations. In 2 that, you said that you hired two attorneys 3 to run it. My question is very simple. There was no one within the Department of 4 5 Corrections that had moved up to the ranks that could have filled those two roles? 6 7 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: There 8 was nobody within that unit that was an 9 attorney. 10 ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: But you think 11 it's necessary to have an attorney then go 12 talk to the men and women on the line to tell 13 the attorneys what's wrong with the facility? 14 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I lost 15 the question. ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: My point is this. 16 You said during your testimony that these two 17 new hires would then, as part of their 18 duties, go talk to individual correction 19 20 officers about what's going on in the 21 facility. My question to you is, would we be 22 better off bringing people up through the ranks and through your command staff that you 23 24 already have to fill these positions, instead

1 of asking outside lawyers to come in and ask 2 the very people you're supposed to work with what's wrong with the facility? 3 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: 4 5 Assemblyman, I think the answer is that we have the combination, the best of both 6 7 worlds. There are still people that have risen through the ranks, and they're still 8 directors, or at least they occupy 9 10 supervisory roles. Those are very experienced individuals. They started out as 11 12 correction officers. But we definitely needed to bring in 13 14 an outside perspective, individuals that had 15 extensive experience dealing with law 16 enforcement, prior experience with district attorney's offices, prior experience working 17 18 with the Attorney General. And they can 19 bring in the linkages they have to work with 20 the U.S. Attorney's office, to work with the 21 federal Civil Rights Bureau, with the 22 Department of Justice, to work with the marshals and bring all of that to bear so 23 24 that we can be a much stronger office.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: Do you think
2	that's what's going to help you when you
3	charge inmates and/or correction officers
4	with any crimes behind the walls?
5	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I think
6	it will.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN GIGLIO: Thank you very
8	much.
9	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you,
10	Assemblyman.
11	Acting Commissioner, I had a couple of
12	questions. And it's related to an issue that
13	you just discussed with Senator Krueger. And
14	I know you remember the notorious case of
15	Daniel St. Hubert, who was a paranoid
16	schizophrenic, violent in prison, was
17	released and ended up stabbing to death
18	little 6-year-old P.J. Avitto in Brooklyn;
19	his 7-year-old playmate Mikayla Capers was
20	stabbed, did survive. He was a suspect in
21	some other murders. And he had been released
22	from the state prison system.
23	As a result of that, Assemblyman
24	O'Donnell and I did a chapter together to try

1 to address some of the issues. And last year 2 the Legislature included in the final budget, 3 along with the Governor, a \$20 million expenditure I believe that you were 4 5 referencing when you talked about discharge planning and that sort of thing. 6 And I did discuss the issue with the 7 OMH commissioner yesterday. And just as 8 background, there was \$20 million in last 9 10 year's budget for enhanced services to reduce 11 recidivism and potential violence in the community. This includes additional 12 13 supportive housing, assertive community 14 treatment, team services for at-risk 15 individuals discharged from prisons and 16 psychiatric centers, increased mental health assessments in prison, treatment for 17 high-risk inmates, enhanced discharge 18 19 planning, staff training, and placement of individuals in OMH facilities. 20 21 So I'm happy to hear you say that you 22 believe things are going better. One of the issues I'd like to raise with you, however, 23

is that when I questioned the OMH

24

1 commissioner yesterday about how much of that 2 money had been utilized so far, she did say \$18 million out of the \$20 million line item. 3 I would assume that you would think that 4 5 these sorts of initiatives have been beneficial -- at least that's what I'm 6 7 gathering from your testimony today -- and 8 you would recommend that that program continues. Because if there's only 9 10 \$2 million left, I don't see anything in the 11 budget, unless I'm missing something or 12 you're aware of something, to replenish those funds. 13 14 Could you comment on that, please? 15 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I really 16 can't comment on these specific appropriations and how they're being spent 17 18 from OMH's side of the ledger. But I can 19 reaffirm that we are very excited about the 20 discharge planning units that are going to be 21 launched at Auburn and at Sing Sing, the 22 continued work with the core program, and the continued collaboration that we do with our 23 24 community supervision and OMH staff,

1 including making sure that when someone has 2 to get to a program, we arrange many times 3 for direct transport. 4 I'm also excited about the early 5 identification of inmates when they come into 6 the system who are both seriously mentally 7 ill and could have these violent proclivities. 8 9 So I think ultimately we will make a 10 big difference in this area. 11 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: So you would 12 obviously be supportive of such programming to continue in the same format? You're 13 14 saying to us as a Legislature that this has 15 been beneficial in the correctional system? 16 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: It's been beneficial, yes. 17 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Very beneficial in 18 19 reducing violence, okay. Thank you. 20 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you, 21 Senator. 22 Our next speaker will be 23 Assemblymember Oaks. 24 ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Hi, Commissioner.

1 Thank you.

2	I just wanted to follow up a little
3	bit. Senator Funke had talked about parole
4	issues, and he listed off a number of
5	different situations of individuals who had
6	recommitted while on parole. And I had, you
7	know, myself one of those types of situations
8	in my district, a recent parolee who broke
9	into a home, the people were away, but he
10	happened on a mother and her daughter who
11	were there to feed the cat, and they ended up
12	losing their lives in that incident and
13	whatever.
14	So all of us, I think, have some of
15	those things. And the issue of parolees
16	obviously it's an opportunity for individuals
17	to find their way back into society, but it
18	doesn't always work.
19	And I think back to Assemblyman
20	Funke's question about Assemblyman Lawrence's
21	legislation, the one thing of making
22	information right now police officers stop
23	individuals for whatever, to check. They can
24	tell that a person is on parole, but they

1 have no information about the conditions of 2 the parole. And so if the individual by 3 their activity at that moment is violating the parole, they would have no way of knowing 4 5 that. And so then it goes through a process of letting the parole officer know that 6 7 that's happened, and then through a process of trying to figure out what happens. 8

Certainly for those who might offend 9 10 quickly after they've been released but may have violated in some way before, his 11 12 proposal would try to make that information 13 available to police and also give police the 14 opportunity, empower them to do something 15 then, as opposed to having to take several 16 days or time down the down the road of dealing with this. 17

And so I think the question -- I know you said if the person has been an absconder or had a problem, obviously they can tell, they can be a help. This would be a way of strengthening that. And I just go back to that, of saying I welcome a comment on it and/or just a willingness to work with us in

1 looking at it. If we can strengthen parole 2 in this way, I think it makes communities 3 safer, makes parole work better for those who 4 are going to follow the conditions of it. 5 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, we value all of the working relationships we 6 7 have with local law enforcement, so we're always willing to share as much information 8 9 as possible. 10 With respect to the specific 11 legislative proposal or concept, we follow a 12 protocol where we submit any feedback, thoughts, to our Governor's counsel's office. 13 14 But we don't independently provide comments 15 or suggestions on the substance or 16 well-thought-outness of a particular 17 proposal. 18 ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Understood. I just 19 think it could end up making your job better 20 and easier, and have us working better 21 together. Thank you. 22 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 23 Assemblyman. 24 Senator Savino.

1 SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you, Senator 2 Young. I'll be very brief because many of the 3 questions that I had have already been 4 5 answered. But you'll recall, Commissioner, that 6 7 in the past we've been somewhat critical of your agency's level of overtime. So backing 8 out the extra overtime that was related to 9 10 the prison break, can you give me a sense of the level of overtime in the past year? 11 12 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I can 13 tell you that if we back out the overtime 14 related to Clinton -- and there was also a 15 significant expenditure related to an 16 individual that was lost in the North Country for a number of days, and we were 17 participating in the search -- that our 18 19 process shows we were only a little over 20 where we were last year. Which is not good. 21 SENATOR SAVINO: No. ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: But the 22 good news is that we have started a process 23 24 whereby, A, I've communicated to all my

1 superintendents the need to justify every 2 expenditure of overtime. We've broken it 3 down by program areas, so that Facility A, this is what you spent on program in this 4 5 quarter and this is what you spent on admin, this is what you spent on security. And then 6 7 we have phone calls to discuss and show to them whether they made progress or whether 8 they went in the wrong direction. And then 9 10 it's incumbent upon them to explain to us the 11 reasons why. 12 There are a lot of reasons why we have overtime --13 14 SENATOR SAVINO: Not to interrupt, but 15 I can predict one of them. And I don't 16 dispute for a moment that the overtime is justified. I understand how hard it is to 17 18 run a prison system. But the problems you 19 have now are the same problems you had five 20 years ago, and your predecessors had -- it's 21 a shortage of staff. And we know that. Whether it's in the civilian titles or in the 22 correction titles. 23 24 I know you've taken steps, though, to

1 increase hiring in the correctional officers 2 titles. But I'm concerned about the other 3 professional titles -- the nurses. You know, thank God that one poor nurse finally 4 5 retired, because every year she would wind up as the highest overtime earner in the state, 6 7 as if she was doing something wrong. As if 8 she had a choice about whether she was going 9 to stay.

10 So my concern continues to be about 11 the level of hiring so that we can 12 sufficiently staff the facilities so you don't have overworked correction officers or 13 14 nurses or psychiatrists or social workers or 15 anybody else that's there because of the 16 level of, you know, security that is so 17 important in maintaining a prison like that.

18 So I just want to keep it on your 19 radar, we're going to continue to watch this. 20 You know, it's something that is of concern 21 to us, the level of overtime -- not because 22 you're spending money, but because you're 23 spending it because you don't have sufficient 24 staff to meet the needs of the institution.

1	Thank you.
2	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Okay,
3	Senator.
4	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. I don't
5	believe there are any other Assembly
6	speakers. So Senator Montgomery.
7	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Good afternoon,
8	Commissioner.
9	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Good
10	afternoon, Senator.
11	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: I will start by
12	offering thanks to you for a couple of
13	things, and then I'll make my complaints,
14	I'll register my complaints.
15	(Laughter.)
16	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: So first of all I
17	want to say my last visit to Sullivan, my
18	staff and I were up there and we were it
19	was a very, very interesting and it was a
20	good experience. And I want to thank the
21	superintendent and her staff because she
22	really made it what I thought to be a very
23	worthwhile experience. So I appreciate that.
24	And I also want to thank you for the

1 fact that you agreed to do the advisory 2 council for the parole facility that's also in my district. And that has really 3 contributed to a lot of reduction in the 4 5 tension that was around that facility when it first opened. So I thank you for that. 6 7 And I will just ask a couple of questions, raise a couple of issues with you. 8 And in the interests of my time not running 9 10 out, I'll do it all together and you can 11 answer accordingly. 12 I am very pleased to see how much 13 emphasis you are placing on the whole issue 14 of offering college and looking at training 15 programs and those programs that really 16 prepare people for a successful reentry back into the communities. I appreciate that. 17 18 The question about that -- two things. 19 One is, have we ever thought about the 20 possibility of creating sort of an 21 educational training facility where one of 22 your buildings, one of your facilities could become sort of a hub, if you will, for this 23 24 kind of activity? I'm so impressed -- I've

1 been to Sullivan, obviously, there's really 2 such a great group up there -- Sing Sing, eastern and the others that I have not 3 visited but I've heard of them. And I'm 4 5 always so impressed with the degree of excitement of the men in there. And people 6 7 who have expressed very serious intentions of 8 coming back to their communities and giving back and becoming productive citizens again. 9

10 So you will play a very major role in 11 that, and I certainly would like to know how 12 you're moving with that and what can we do to 13 enhance that.

14 And the second part of that is, how do 15 we align what you do inside, the kind of 16 training and the experiences that people have inside, creating some sort of a certification 17 18 so that when they do return to the community, 19 they have something that says I have these 20 skills, and that that can be acknowledged and 21 accepted as a legitimate representation of 22 that person's experience? So those are the two things that I'm 23

24 asking. Thank you.

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Okay, 2 Senator. First let me thank you for all the 3 efforts you expended to help with the opening of the new parole office in Brooklyn. There 4 5 was originally a lot of controversy. I know you helped us out. I know it's very well 6 7 accepted now. SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Yes, it sure is. 8 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: In fact 9 10 I think we've actually proven that the crime 11 rates in that precinct have gone down --SENATOR MONTGOMERY: That's right. 12 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: -- since 13 14 we've been there. But it couldn't have 15 worked without your assistance, and we're 16 very grateful for that. 17 I'll take your second question first. 18 We've already started to work with the 19 Department of Labor to create 20 preapprenticeship programs. We're going to 21 have our first meeting, and we're looking at 22 different voc programs that we have and we're look at what's available in the community so 23 24 that we can start a preapprenticeship program

1 and then continue it in the community,

2 wherever it's selected. So we're going to
3 depend upon the DOL to give us some good
4 advice in that area.

5 And thank you for acknowledging the college programming. That's another big 6 7 initiative. Courtesy of the Manhattan district attorney's office, \$7.5 million of 8 asset forfeiture money. College is very, 9 10 very useful, not just in terms of lowering recidivism, but also as a positive role model 11 12 in the institutions.

13I saw the three gentlemen that were14graduates of Bard with the Governor at the15announcement. I went over, I congratulated16them, and I just said "Make sure you succeed,17because you're carrying the torch for a lot18of other individuals coming after you."

19And we know how excited the whole20country was when the three individuals in the21debate team went up and beat Harvard, which22was an amazing story, and they were from23Eastern.

24 So we're very excited about that. And

1 I can tell you that you've asked me have I 2 given thought to a building possibly being an educational institutional. 3 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Fantastic. 4 5 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: The answer is I've given it thought. 6 7 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Great. ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: But it's 8 too early to talk about, you know, what the 9 10 possibilities are. We have to do some outreach with various individuals. 11 12 But the whole idea of an educational institution, so to speak, is something that's 13 at least worthwhile pursuing and exploring to 14 see if that can be done. 15 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Great. Thank 16 17 you. 18 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 19 Senator Nozzolio to close. 20 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you again. 21 Senator Montgomery, it's not unusual 22 that we disagree on subjects and that she and I have had wonderful debates in the past, and 23 24 I'm sure we're going to have a few more this

1 session, that we're going to be scrutinizing 2 whether or not taxpayers' dollars are in fact 3 utilized for this purpose. I know that there are -- it's the purpose of providing free 4 5 tuition for inmates. However, Senator Montgomery and I do 6 7 agree on issues regarding training for 8 skilled opportunities to provide inmates in their exit from prison, entry into the 9 10 community, to have skill sets that are 11 marketable for jobs. And that's something 12 that I don't need you to get in the middle 13 of, but it's something that we are going to 14 be scrutinizing. 15 What I do need you to focus on --16 Senator Funke mentioned this -- it's something that is outside the prison walls, 17 18 but relative to parole. And we talked about the ratios, we talked about Western New York. 19 20 I think your three-point program regarding 21 analysis of high risk, moving inmates closer 22 to the facility they exited from, GPS bracelets, and transferring to official 23 24 reporting, makes a lot of sense.

1	But if our parole officers don't have
2	the appropriate tools, don't have the
3	vehicles you said 38 more vehicles. Since
4	you made that statement, I've been trying to
5	find in the State Budget where that is.
6	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: It's not
7	in the budget. It was just approved today,
8	Senator.
9	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Just approved
10	today.
11	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: The plan
12	by OGS.
13	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Is this a Danny
14	O'Donnell's assemblyman O'Donnell's
15	comment, it's nice that we have these kinds
16	of appropriations available from time to
17	time. It would be nice if the Legislature
18	knew about it. But the fact is if you were
19	able to take those out of last fiscal year,
20	monies from the current fiscal year as
21	opposed to next fiscal year, that this was
22	approved and these are going to be
23	forthcoming by the end of March?
24	ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: I don't

1 know the schedule. I just got the news that 2 our plan, it's a three-year plan to increase 3 the vehicle totals. I think the total we have now is 248. So it's 30-something --4 5 don't hold me to 38, if it's 38 or 35 -- that we will be able to get this year. 6 7 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And why we're 8 discussing this is because we live in areas in upstate New York in particular that are 9 10 vast in terms of geography, and that for the parole officers, as it is they have 11 12 significantly higher ratios than ever before. 13 That we have sheets on the types of offenders 14 and the types of cases and the caseload, and 15 the ratios are anywhere from 25 to 1 to 160 16 to 1, 200 to 1, in terms of the types of caseloads that individual parole officers are 17 asked to absorb. 18

19And I think that in spite of your very20good attention to this criteria, without you21having more staff in the field, I just think22this is not going to work. You're getting23infrastructure, cars -- that's a good thing.24Thank you for that. Thank you for addressing

1 the issues. But the question of more 2 officers -- not just taking those with only 3 Department of Correctional Services training, CO training, and moving them into -- I mean, 4 5 we have many great COs who became parole officers. But the fact is to have them now 6 7 from the prison into parole officer capacity 8 without adequate training is very, very 9 concerning. 10 (Applause from audience.) SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Please address, 11 12 Commissioner, the issues going beyond the 13 foundation you set up. And again, I'm here 14 to thank you for that. But let's -- what are 15 your plans to move forward with the 16 deployment of additional personnel? ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: Well, 17 18 right now I know we have at least two 19 additional classes scheduled for this year 20 for parole officers, Senator. 21 We've also gotten other equipment. 22 We've gotten radios, we've gotten replacement vests, we're replacing -- I believe we may 23 24 have already completed it -- the weaponry,

the Glock that they use. There's no question
 that they need the appropriate equipment.

3 The ratios are driven by the risk management plan that tells us whether someone 4 5 is a high risk or a low risk, et cetera. We haven't changed that. But what I can tell 6 7 you is that there is the ability by the 8 parole officer to make changes, to identify someone as, Listen, this guy needs to be 9 10 supervised at a higher level than what he currently is. And so that's been recognized 11 12 and adopted.

But I can't speak to you exactly what the ratios are in various parts of the state. But I'll certainly go back, we'll look at it and, you know, make recommendations for adjustments as warranted.

18 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Your attention to 19 this is most welcome. I guess you're taking 20 an absconder as a low security risk or lower 21 security risk, because the ratios there --22 our numbers show a 200-to-1 ratio, 200 23 parolees to one parole officer. That sex 24 offenders, 25 to 1. Now, that's not -- I

1 think most of the parole officers, if they
2 only had that to deal with, they would feel
3 more comfortable in their job in terms of
4 being able to manage the system.

5 But what Senator Funke mentioned, those disastrous criminality that occurred in 6 7 Rochester by parolees, it's symptomatic of 8 the structure. And I'm not blaming you for the structure, you're a career correctional 9 10 personnel. You came up through the ranks. I 11 appreciate the fact that you know corrections 12 and you've gotten a good job with corrections. 13

14 But I think in terms of parole, 15 something that was thrust upon you a few 16 years ago -- we discussed it very briefly at this table, if you recall, when the proposal 17 first came through, a proposal that ended up 18 19 being accepted. But it's a proposal that 20 still needs ironing out some important 21 wrinkles.

And if the public knew about these
ratios, I believe they would be extremely
concerned with public safety. And I think

1 that you -- if you would --2 (Applause from audience.) SENATOR NOZZOLIO: -- if you would 3 continue the work to address, let us know 4 5 what more resources you need to make this 6 happen. You have partners here, and I know 7 you're well-intentioned. Let's try to understand that we've got to solve this 8 9 problem. 10 Thank you, Commissioner. 11 ACTING COMMISSIONER ANNUCCI: 12 Certainly, Senator. Thank you. 13 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 14 much. I think that concludes our speakers. 15 So again, we appreciate you being here today 16 and all of the answers that you gave. Our next speaker is Superintendent 17 Joseph D'Amico, New York State Division of 18 19 State Police. 20 (Pause.) 21 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Good afternoon, 22 Superintendent. 23 Could I have some order, please. 24 Could we please have some order. Thank you

1 very much.

2	We welcome you today. I know it's
3	been a lengthy day so far, but it's always
4	difficult under Public Protection because we
5	have so many commissioners and leaders of the
6	different state agencies. And we certainly
7	are very happy to have the State Police and
8	you here today.
9	So if you'd like, we would love to
10	hear your testimony.
11	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Good
12	afternoon. Thank you.
13	Thank you, Chairwoman Young, Chairman
14	Farrell, and distinguished members of the
15	committees for this opportunity to discuss
16	with you Governor Cuomo's budget for the
17	Division of State Police.
18	I'd like to take this opportunity to
19	thank the Legislature for its past support of
20	the State Police. Because of your support,
21	the New York State Police continues to enjoy
22	its
23	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Can we have some
24	order, please, at the top of the room. Thank

1 you.

2	Sorry, Superintendent.
3	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: That's okay.
4	Because of your support, the New York
5	State Police continues to enjoy its well-
6	deserved reputation as one of the leading law
7	enforcement agencies in the nation.
8	On April 11, 1917, Governor Whitman
9	signed the Wells-Mills Bill into law,
10	establishing the State Police. As we
11	approach the agency's 100th anniversary next
12	year, our role in New York is essentially
13	unchanged to this day. The bill stated: "It
14	shall be the duty of the State Police to
15	prevent and detect crime and apprehend
16	criminals. They shall also be subject to the
17	call of the Governor and empowered to
18	cooperate with any other department of the
19	State or with local authorities."
20	And the importance of this original
21	charter is as significant now as it was back
22	then.
23	Since its inception, the State Police
24	has consistently provided public service

1 through its core missions, adapting mission 2 priorities constantly to societal changes, 3 and we have continually improved these services. Our current mission priorities 4 5 include reducing the number of deaths, 6 injuries and property damage caused by motor 7 vehicle accidents through vehicle and traffic 8 enforcement and motorist education, providing 9 professional police services to communities and investigative support to departments 10 11 around the state, engaging in emergency 12 preparedness, planning and response 13 activities and serving a crucial role in the 14 State's counterterrorism efforts through our 15 collaborative work with federal, local and other state agencies. Our mission and goals 16 17 all focus on ensuring the continued safety of 18 the people of New York State. 19 The Governor continues to dedicate

funding to Joint Task Force Empire Shield to enhance efforts to detect and deter terrorism in a time when such acts are constantly a threat to the safety of New Yorkers. As a result, New York remains one of the safest

1 large states in the nation. Using 2 intelligence-based investigative techniques 3 and targeted enforcement, state troopers have been assigned to potential target locations 4 5 and, with local partners, provide greater protection for the public through asset 6 7 integration strategies. This effort is being 8 permanently implemented in New York City with the new assignment of 55 State Police 9 10 personnel dedicated solely to this mission. 11 The State Police is unique as the only 12 law enforcement agency in New York State with the ability to deploy large numbers of 13 14 professionally trained police officers 15 anywhere in the state on short notice in 16 response to an emergency or natural disaster. The State Police is also available for 17 18 large-scale deployments to meet an immediate 19 need for law enforcement services in any 20 community. This was clearly demonstrated 21 over 23 days this past summer, during the 22 Clinton Correctional escape in Dannemora, where we deployed as many as 532 troopers and 23 24 200 investigators from around the state to

1 assist with that investigation. At its peak, 2 State Police directed 1560 personnel from 16 3 different agencies in the investigation. In addition, we continue our 4 5 partnerships with the Office of Emergency Management and the Division of Homeland 6 7 Security and Emergency Services, with a focus 8 on disaster preparedness and response readiness. 9 10 Our first and foremost priority 11 continues to be the safety of the public and 12 our troopers who protect them. Toward that 13 goal, we will continue to provide our 14 troopers with the necessary equipment and 15 other resources to ensure safety as they 16 perform their duties. The Governor recognizes this need after observing the 17 18 level of sophistication and tactics employed 19 at criminal events in the United States and 20 abroad, and has committed to new funding for 21 additional patrol rifles, rifle-resistant 22 body armor plates and ballistic helmets for State Police patrols statewide. 23 24 Illegal drug use and its impact

continues to dominate headlines in our
 country. Heroin availability and abuse
 continues. State Police will continue to
 aggressively work in partnership with local
 police agencies to investigate drug-related
 crimes and to arrest offenders.

7 Our troopers, as first responders, 8 continue to patrol with Naloxone, the opioid 9 reversal drug which we have administered 10 132 times in medical emergencies involving 11 overdoses. One hundred fourteen of those 12 administered Naloxone survived as a result of 13 troopers' efforts.

14 The use of social media to foster the 15 relationship between the agency and the citizens we serve has been successful in 16 improving cooperation with law enforcement 17 18 efforts in the communities we serve. By 19 posting safety-related and crime alert 20 information on Twitter and Facebook, the 21 State Police has generated enhanced 22 investigative capabilities that have led to successful case resolutions and shared 23 24 important public safety information.

1 This year will be the first full year 2 for the Sexual Assault Victims Unit that 3 arose from passage of the "Enough is Enough" legislation and the Governor's commitment to 4 5 combating sexual assault on college and university campuses. Fifteen State Police 6 7 personnel will work statewide to ensure 8 uniformity in the handling of campus sexual assault investigations, provide investigative 9 10 assistance and training to campus or local police investigating these cases, and to 11 12 educate individuals and campus communities regarding victims' rights and their available 13 14 resources.

15 Agency staffing remains an area of constant executive-level discussion within 16 the State Police. We continue to request and 17 18 conduct academy classes so that adequate 19 staffing levels are maintained to perform our 20 core mission priorities without sacrificing 21 the response time or the safety of our 22 troopers. We will continue to look for additional efficiencies through our 23 24 partnerships with other law enforcement

agencies throughout the state and through
 consolidation of state government services
 where practical and possible.

And as you're aware, 85 percent of the 4 5 appropriations made for State Police operations are in support of personnel 6 7 service obligations, of which approximately 93 percent supports the salaries and overtime 8 expenses of our sworn members. The vast 9 10 majority of the non-personal service 11 appropriations are best characterized as 12 non-discretionary expenditures. Expenditures 13 for vehicles, equipment, facilities and 14 communications are all essential to providing 15 the tools necessary for the men and women of the State Police to fulfill their law 16 enforcement missions. 17

New Yorkers have come to expect public
service from a stable, well-deployed and
adequately resourced State Police. I am
proud to say that New Yorkers can be
confident their expectations are being met.
It is the integrity, knowledge, dedication
and quality of our men and women that

1 distinguishes the New York State Police. I 2 am honored and privileged to be a part of 3 such a professional police agency and its 4 great traditions and to serve alongside our 5 members. I thank you for your support of the 6 7 State Police and for this opportunity today to address you. 8 9 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 10 Superintendent. 11 Our first speaker is Senator Tom 12 Croci. SENATOR CROCI: Thank you, 13 Superintendent, for your appearance here 14 15 today. I know it's been a difficult year in 16 the United States for law enforcement. And for me, who grew up in a small town, we grew 17 up thinking, you know, police were good and 18 19 drugs were bad. There's a lot of mixed 20 messages out there for young people today. 21 But at a time when we have incidents like San Bernardino, California, and the 22 heroin epidemic that you raised, it's nice to 23 24 know that we have the troopers out there

1	watching out for us. And I commend you on
2	your leadership of that organization.
3	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you.
4	SENATOR CROCI: We have previously
5	questioned the commissioner of DHSES,
6	Commissioner Melville, who just recently
7	appeared today to talk about the Article VII
8	language in Part D of the ELFA, which seeks
9	to transfer some of the counterterrorism
10	responsibilities from that organization to
11	the State Police.
12	With respect to that specific Article
13	VII language, who in your knowledge, in your
14	mind, would be responsible for
15	counterterrorism in the state should that
16	occur?
17	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: The
18	counterterrorism initiatives and
19	responsibility is really a partnership of the
20	State Police and the Division of Homeland
21	Security and Emergency Services. We've
22	shared that since that agency was formed
23	after 9/11.
24	I heard Commissioner Melville's

1 testimony this morning and if I could just 2 build on the answer that he gave. You know, 3 currently the 10 analysts who are assigned and employed in the Intelligence and Analysis 4 5 section of OCT in DHSES, the Office of Counterterrorism, work at the New York State 6 7 Intelligence Center, in the Terrorism Center and the CTC, and basically report up and are 8 managed by State Police personnel, as it's 9 10 happening right now.

11 So what happens is information comes, 12 whether it's by phone, email, phone app or 13 suspicious activity reporting by law 14 enforcement. The information is worked on 15 and analyzed and built and vetted by those 16 analysts, and the whole goal here is to develop actionable intelligence that we could 17 18 then hand off to people who could react to 19 it -- whether it's State Police or Joint 20 Terrorism Task Force partners, or just alerts 21 or information that has to go out.

22 Currently the information travels up
23 almost simultaneously through DHS management,
24 DHSES management and State Police management.

1 So by making the change from having people 2 employed by DHSES over to the State Police 3 side functionally changes nothing. And all 4 it will allow us to do, we'll be more 5 efficient in use of those people, backing up those people when people are out -- because 6 7 there's a criminal side and a terrorism side, and they complement each other. A lot of the 8 9 people are interchangeable. 10 I mean, my goal -- the information 11 that travels upward for us has to be 12 operational. For DHSES it has to be to 13 develop policy, to react, to brief the 14 Executive. Both important. That's not going 15 to change. 16 SENATOR CROCI: So on initial glance,

17 that's the appearance of what's occurring 18 here. I just want to ask you a series of 19 questions, because this is what the proposed 20 language would get rid of and not replace 21 either with the State Police or DHSES.

22 So would you agree that the following 23 in 2016 is an important function for the 24 State of New York to be engaged in: To

1 coordinate state resources for the collection 2 and analysis of information with relation to terrorist threats and terrorist activities? 3 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yes. 4 5 SENATOR CROCI: Okay. The responsibility to coordinate, facilitate 6 7 information-sharing among state, federal 8 agencies to ensure appropriate intelligence to assist in the early identification and 9 10 response to potential terrorist activities? SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yes, of 11 12 course. 13 SENATOR CROCI: The responsibility of 14 the Office of Counterterrorism to collect, 15 analyze and share information relating to terrorist threats and terrorist activities 16 throughout the State of New York? 17 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yes. 18 19 SENATOR CROCI: So part of the reason 20 that I have some concern, listening to 21 Commissioner Melville, whose understanding 22 was we're simply transferring resources, 23 we're shedding the counterterrorism language 24 in the statute so DHSES no longer has

1 statutory responsibility. I can't find 2 anywhere in the State Police authority for 3 direct counterterrorism responsibilities. And those functions that are being 4 5 transferred to you don't include the three sections that I just read to you, which I 6 7 think the genesis of these statutes post-9/11 were to ensure that the kind of information 8 sharing, the kind of fusion that should 9 10 occur, and the kind of relationships that need to be built up and down echelon existed. 11 12 So to the members of the committee and 13 to the chairperson, I just want to emphasize 14 the fact that it appears that in transferring 15 these bodies, you're also eliminating the term "counterterrorism" at the statutory 16 level in the executive branch. And then to 17 18 an agency which is now going to have the 19 responsibility, presumably, of doing the 20 work, you don't have the statutory

21 responsibility in writing, you don't have the 22 language "counterterrorism," and you also 23 don't have a reporting requirement up and 24 down chain.

1 So do you see that you're going to be 2 able to perform these functions in a time of 3 crisis, understanding that you're not going to have the statutory authority to do the 4 5 mission and that DHSES will no longer have the statutory authority? So the question is, 6 7 who has the responsibility if there's no authority? 8 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: So even 9 10 though the language may not be there, you know, in the function of NYSIC, New York 11 12 State Intelligence Center, as the state's recognized fusion center, those are the roles 13 14 of NYSIC. 15 You know, when DHS put out the 16 quidelines back in 2008 in a document called "Baseline Capabilities for State and Major 17 Urban Area Fusion Centers," they talk about 18 19 information sharing, they talk about 20 briefings. And three of the things that come 21 along with intelligence and information 22 dissemination is to develop a dissemination plan, to develop a plan for high-level 23 24 discussions up and down the chain, be able to

brief the state, local, tribal agencies on
 occurring incidents. It requires sharing of
 information with other fusion centers in
 surrounding states. It requires reporting of
 information to the federal government,
 whether it's DHS or DOJ or the FBI.

7 Now, while that's not required for funding, it's the way we operate. It's the 8 9 way the center operates. It's the function 10 of the fusion center. A number of years ago we were actually acknowledged by DHS for the 11 12 excellent way that we do carry out activities 13 there. It's an integral part of the 14 counterterrorism program for New York State.

15 So whether the language is there or 16 the language isn't there, that's the way we 17 function. That's the way the guidelines from 18 DHS are dictated, and we follow them. And I 19 think that's what would fill the gap without 20 the statutory language.

21 SENATOR CROCI: So many of the 22 recommendations that I'm told are being 23 proposed in the Governor's budget come from a 24 review that former Commissioner Ray Kelly

1 did, and I think we all acknowledge that he 2 was a pioneer in some of the most innovative 3 and effective counterterrorism policies for a police force that we've ever seen, which is 4 5 being duplicated worldwide. Have you had the opportunity to read 6 7 this report? SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: I don't 8 believe that Commissioner Kelly or former 9 10 Commissioner Kelly has issued a report. I had met with him and his staff a 11 12 number of months ago when they were going through just a review of the state's 13 14 procedures. And since that time, you know, 15 I've heard it verbally, I heard it at the 16 State of the State, but I don't know that there's a written report actually presented. 17 SENATOR CROCI: Because it would be 18 19 very interesting to know if this was fleshed 20 out in that analysis, to know whether or not 21 those three areas, which will disappear from 22 the role of New York State government -- some sound pretty important. Collection and 23 24 analysis of information related to terrorist

1 threats; sharing among state and appropriate
2 intelligence partners.

3 I think that you would agree that in law enforcement and the military that there 4 5 are those relationships, those sharing relationships. But in the weeks, months and 6 7 years before September 11, 2001, those relationships existed, yet information at the 8 FBI was stovepiped to CIA, the military 9 10 intelligence community, the Department of State. 11

12 And the post-9/11 Commission made recommendations that we have the kind of 13 executive focus on these issues to ensure 14 15 that all departments and agencies within the 16 state -- to my colleagues and to you, I don't see, without explicit statutory 17 18 responsibility by either the State Police or by DHSES -- I see seams created again. And 19 20 if those relationships as you currently have 21 aren't there -- new superintendent, new 22 commissioner, new governor; law enforcement personnel, as you know, rotate all the 23 24 time -- I'm afraid we're recreating seams

that the 9/11 commission said we specifically
 should avoid.

3 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Well, I mean,
4 just to go back to the report by former
5 Commissioner Kelly, I'm not aware of a
6 report. I don't believe a report was issued.
7 I mean, I don't know if he has intentions on
8 addressing those issues in his report.

You know, I can only tell you, as kind 9 10 of the custodian of NYSIC and a very large 11 counterterrorism function, not only at the 12 troop level but with the federal partners, 13 you know, I'm fairly confident that the 14 information will flow. Especially between us 15 and DHSES. You know, we've always had that 16 partnership, the DHSES commissioner still retains the ownership as chairman of the 17 18 state's Executive Committee on Counterterrorism, still coordinates the 19 20 activity of the 16 counterterrorism zones. 21 That really hasn't changed. He's still the 22 arbiter of Homeland Security funding, and a lot of that funding funds the New York State 23 24 Intelligence Center.

1 So I mean, you know, I would think 2 that if he wasn't satisfied with the 3 information that was flowing, you know, he controls the funding purse strings, and there 4 5 would be an issue there. I would just like to say, you know, 6 7 the law enforcement committee pre-9/11 and post-9/11 are two different worlds. 8 SENATOR CROCI: Absolutely. 9 10 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: You know, no 11 doubt about it. The same with the military 12 and the intelligence communities. 13 You know, we shared before 9/11, but since 9/11, it's so much more seamless. 14 15 We're open, we work together. You know, it's 16 about collaboration and cooperation. It's just a whole different world in law 17 18 enforcement. SENATOR CROCI: Well, as I -- and I 19 20 know I'm out of time, Madam Chair. I would 21 just close with under this construct, as I 22 read it -- and I've had a lot of very smart minds look at it as well -- if you were to 23 24 have a liaison meeting with the JTTF and they

1 were to provide you information about a 2 pending attack on New York, in this construct you don't have to share it with the 3 4 commissioner at DHSES. You would have no 5 statutory responsibility to do so. You may, of course, and I know you would. But that's 6 7 my concern, and I think my colleagues and I will have to continue to address it. 8 9 But I appreciate your testimony today, 10 and I'll turn it over to the chair. Thank 11 you. 12 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you, 13 Senator. 14 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you, 16 Senator. Our next speaker is Assemblymember 17 Duprey. 18 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Good afternoon, 19 Superintendent. 20 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Good afternoon, ma'am. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: The last time 22 that you and I saw each other was at a very 23 24 emotional day in my district, just hours

1 after the capture of Sweat. I guess more 2 than questions, I first want to extend my 3 heartfelt thanks to you as the superintendent; to certainly Major Chuck 4 5 Guess, Troop B commander; our hometown hero, Sergeant Jay Cook; and all of law 6 7 enforcement. Certainly our SORT teams who 8 put unbelievable hours tromping through the mud and the mess of some of our North Country 9 10 territory, to have a successful conclusion to 11 the escape, which none of us will soon 12 forget.

13 And I want to take a moment to extend 14 personal thanks to you because I -- you know, 15 I was -- my body was down here, my heart and 16 my mind were in my district for those 23 days. But I was surrounded every day by 17 18 some of my colleagues and friends who 19 continued to say to me: Matt and Sweat are 20 long gone, we're wasting tax dollars, we 21 shouldn't have 1500 law enforcement in such a small area. 22 23

And I thank you, on behalf of mythousands of constituents who were incredibly

1 frightened, that you stood behind Major Guess 2 in your belief and his belief that those two 3 were still there. And certainly you were proven right. And for that, I thank you, 4 5 because I can't imagine what my district would have gone through had you pulled those 6 7 troops out. So thank you, sir. SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you. 8 9 And I really need to thank your 10 constituents, your communities, who were 11 tremendously supportive of law enforcement, 12 who were out there 24 hours. They helped 13 with shelter and drink, refreshments and food 14 and everything else. They were tremendously 15 supportive, they were helpful in information, and it was really a good partnership between 16 law enforcement and community. 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: I've never been 18 more proud to represent folks than I was 19 20 during that time. So thank you for that too. 21 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you. ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: I do want to 22 mention the one -- and I don't want to really 23 24 call it a glitch, but I think it's something

1 that all of us up there have been advocating 2 for so long, for better cell towers. I think 3 that that certainly was an issue during the escape, the lack of -- what we lacked in 4 5 communication through cell towers was certainly made up for in the communication 6 7 that took place between our federal, state and local law enforcement agencies. 8

9 But in the future, we will be looking 10 to you and others to reinforce with us, as we 11 go through the process of Adirondack Park 12 Agency approval, the need to have sufficient 13 cell tower coverage throughout that district. 14 because when they're out there, and I know 15 the SORT teams were out there all by 16 themselves with no way to communicate to 17 anybody.

18 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: That's true, 19 Assemblywoman. The lack of infrastructure 20 was a tremendous detriment -- not being able 21 to communicate, not being able to track our 22 people on the ground, whether it's through 23 cell service or through radio communications. 24 And, you know, I would say, without

1 naming any companies, but the cell carriers 2 were excellent in coming in with, as best as 3 they could support us, with trailered 4 equipment. But there's a tremendous void up 5 in that part of New York State. ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Yeah, now 6 7 they're gone, so -- we need them all the 8 time. And my only other question to you, 9 10 sir, is -- and I hear it not all the time, 11 but fairly often, that the need to have newer 12 vehicles that so many of the troop cars --13 you know, the vastness of that region, of 14 Troop B, is huge. That so many of the troop 15 cars are way over 100,000 miles on their 16 odometers, that they're breaking down. And, you know, certainly a nightmare of mine is 17 18 that we will have a trooper out there alone 19 some night without cell service and with a 20 car broken down. 21 And so are you addressing that in this 22 budget and going forward? SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yes, we are. 23 24 I mean, we've been working that for at least

1 a couple of years now. It is a major 2 concern. It's one of our biggest needs in 3 the State Police, are vehicles. You know, followed by people. And probably half of our 4 5 fleet is at 100,000 miles on the odometer. So, you know, we need a tremendous 6 7 infusion in this year's budget to kind of make a leap so that at the end of the year we 8 could -- our goal is 125,000 miles on the 9 10 cars. You know, I think through our 11 maintenance program, inspection program, the 12 vehicles can certainly have that kind of 13 life. There may be a year life span also, 14 like seven years, that might be appropriate for a fleet. 15 But in this year's budget we do have 16 sufficient money that I expect at the end of 17 18 the fiscal year all of our patrol vehicles, 19 all of our investigator vehicles, and all of 20 our officer vehicles with -- that are 21 currently at 100,000 miles now will be 22 replaced. So I think we'll be in a much healthier place at the end of the fiscal 23 24 year. We'll come back next year and look to

1 find the right amount to kind of maintain that number so we don't fall back into that. 2 3 You know, for us it was a couple of years of insufficient vehicle purchases, 4 5 problems with procurement contracts, and 6 obviously just not enough funding in the 7 budget to do adequate vehicle purchases. So I think that this year we should 8 get a good place, and then we just have to 9 10 figure out what's the right maintenance 11 number to keep us at a good mileage. 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN DUPREY: Thank you. Thank you for your service. 13 14 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you. 15 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 16 Assemblywoman. Senator Gallivan. 17 18 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you, Madam 19 Chair. 20 Good afternoon, Superintendent. And 21 as always, thank you for your service and 22 that of the thousands of professional men and women who make the State Police one of the 23 24 finest agencies in the country.

1 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you. 2 SENATOR GALLIVAN: And I'm very proud 3 to have come from the State Police, as you well know. And perhaps because of that, I 4 5 have a special interest in the things that take place and the maintenance of the 6 7 professionalism, and that the State Police maintains that high level of service. 8 9 The Governor's budget, you talked 10 about it just a little bit. The Governor's budget provided \$40 million, some of it for 11 12 additional State Police personnel for 13 New York City, some National Guard for 14 permanent staffing down there as well. And the reference I think in the Governor's 15 16 presentation had to do with homeland security issues. My question has to do with, are you 17 18 sufficiently staffed to meet the needs of the 19 citizens of the rest of the state? 20 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yeah, I think 21 right now the staffing levels, we're at --22 we're about 4750 on the sworn side, is a good number. You know, a couple of dozen more, 23 I'd be much happier. I think that, you know,

389

1 we'll get back to that. We had dropped down 2 very low a couple of years ago; we've been 3 putting in consistent academy classes, and we've been able to build back that number. 4 5 And obviously we don't want to lose it. As far as the \$40 million, I believe 6 7 that's for counterterrorism. It's to extend the counterterrorism surge, if you want to 8 9 call it that, throughout the state -- you 10 know, beyond New York City. Last year we put 11 troopers down supporting MTA and other 12 agencies in the counterterrorism effort, 13 especially in the transportation 14 infrastructure. And this year's budget is --15 since we now permanently assign troopers to 16 do that in New York City, it's to take that money and spend it elsewhere in the state. 17 18 And we've done some of that already 19 after some of the terrorist attacks we've 20 seen around the world. But I would 21 anticipate you'll see additional troopers at, you know, high-profile public events, whether 22 they be sporting events or parades or 23 24 concerts or school events, college campuses,

1 things like that.

2	And, you know, I think we're all aware
3	that whether it's crime, traditional crime,
4	or terrorism, increased uniform presence has
5	a profound impact on that.
6	SENATOR GALLIVAN: What is your
7	current plan for future classes? In this
8	in the current fiscal year or the year
9	beginning April 1st.
10	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Well, in this
11	fiscal year we plan on putting in a class in
12	March, which is the end of the fiscal year.
13	We're anticipating somewhere around 200.
14	We're anticipating a second academy class in
15	next fiscal year, which will follow.
16	And as far as the numbers, you know,
17	we'll look at attrition between now and then,
18	we'll look at the people who don't make it
19	through the academy. We'll look at new
20	needs, such as Enough is Enough and casino
21	gaming, and we'll work with Budget to come up
22	with the right number when we're ready to put
23	the class in.
24	But two classes in the next 12 months,

in 12 months, the first one being probably
 200, somewhere around there.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: I'd like to 3 continue on a couple of the topics the 4 5 Assemblywoman had talked about. First, vehicles. Last year's budget, we know -- you 6 7 testified about the critical needs for -- the critical state of your fleet last year, as 8 did the Troopers PBA, State Police 9 10 Investigators Association. And your 11 testimony convinced us; we provided a 12 significant amount of money in the budget 13 for, among other things, State Police 14 vehicles and various equipment needs.

15 I am pleased to see that the Governor 16 has included some of that in this year's 17 budget that you testified to, a significantly 18 smaller amount of dollars spent on it than 19 what we allocated last year.

20 Nonetheless, though, the Governor's 21 spokesman, within the past month or so, said 22 that that \$60 million that was provided last 23 year is going to be reallocated to different 24 things in this upcoming fiscal year.

Because, they said, it was contingent on
 policy proposal acceptance of the
 Legislature, the Governor's proposals last
 year.

5 Many of us were at that table, as we talked about that. It wasn't contingent on 6 7 anything. We provided the funding for it. So I guess -- my question has to do 8 with your fleet, and I just want to make sure 9 10 that I'm hearing you okay, that you have plans to address the fleet, however you came 11 12 up with the money in last year's budget that wasn't part of the \$60 million, combined with 13 14 monies planned for this fiscal year. So 15 you're -- do you need more funding from us 16 for your fleet? SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: No, I --17 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Other than what was 18 19 proposed.

20 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: No, I don't 21 believe so. I mean, I've been working with 22 Budget on this.

23The last couple of years we've spent24about \$15 million consistently each year on

1 fleet. You know, we thought that probably 2 this year if we spend \$20 million, we'll be 3 able to bring our mileage down and get it to a healthy place. And as we get closer to 4 5 budget, we do our analysis and realized \$20 million is not going to do it. We're 6 7 currently looking at \$30 million from Budget to put into fleet purchase, which as I said 8 will have a tremendous impact and help us to 9 10 get almost completely healthy by the end of the fiscal year, and then we just need to 11 12 kind of figure out the maintenance going forward on how do we keep it at that level. 13 14 You know, as far as what you're 15 speaking about, the \$60 million or what 16 conditions or terms, I --17 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Not your area. 18 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: I wasn't part 19 of any of that discussion, so --20 SENATOR GALLIVAN: The point that I 21 wanted to make is that we had provided money 22 that was not allocated for that purpose, and I want to make sure that your fleet is being 23 24 taken care of.

1 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yes, it is. 2 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right, thanks. 3 The next area is communications. Very interesting, nearly 20 years ago during my 4 5 time with the State Police and then as Erie County sheriff, I was involved in a number of 6 7 different committees regarding statewide 8 communication system interoperability. 9 Almost 10 years ago, the Bucky 10 Phillips escape, and the after-action report identified communications problems as the 11 12 biggest problem, the most critical issue 13 facing us. 14 While I don't know if you've completed 15 your own internal after-action on the escape, 16 the Assemblywoman alluded to the problem. There was some testimony before, we hear it 17 18 time and time again. Once again, if not the 19 biggest problem issue up there, one of the 20 most significant. I don't expect you 21 necessarily to have an answer or be able to 22 write the check to fix it, but my question is, how do we solve this? I mean, money has 23 24 gotten thrown at it, at least as far as I

know, for over 20 years, and we continue to
 have the same problem.

And we look at the geography of the state, North Country is difficult, Southern Tier is difficult, Western New York is difficult. We have these dead spots across the state. We have local agencies that can't communicate with others, the interoperability issues. How do we fix it?

10 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: I mean, 11 communications obviously is a big issue. You 12 know, if you were to come back to the State 13 Police today, Senator, you could pick up a radio and -- right where you left off, 14 15 because the technology and the way we do it 16 is old. The equipment is new, you know, and it works, but it's -- you know, time has 17 18 changed and we haven't caught up to it.

19Over a year ago I charged our20communications people with looking at the21State Police system, the communications22system, with a view on upgrading. Now23obviously for a lot of years we sat back24waiting for the SWN to come on board, which

didn't happen. So there were a lot of years
 lost. And then there was narrowbanding from
 the FCC, which caused us to have to regroup
 to make deadlines.

5 But, I mean, at this time we're looking probably to go forward with a 6 7 multiyear plan to upgrade our own infrastructure to a much more modern system. 8 Whether it's digital or repeated or -- still 9 10 has yet to be told. We've met with vendors, 11 including Motorola, who made proposals to us 12 just to give us some ideas on where we might be able to go. But, you know, at this time 13 14 it's still premature to say that their 15 solution is the one we like or anything like 16 that.

So we're still looking at it. It's
one of my goals that I would like to
accomplish in the near future.

As far as the communications and interoperability issue, you know, I read the Bucky Phillips after-action as well, and it struck me that we identified it back then and we had the same type of issues this time.

1 But the issues weren't exact. So back in 2 Bucky Phillips, we had unencrypted analog 3 transmissions that everybody listened to and knew where our police were and what they were 4 5 doing. And in some cases they were helped, and in some cases they were hindered. 6 7 So since that time, you know, we've moved ahead, we've gone to digital and 8 encryption on some of our tactical 9 10 frequencies, and we get up to the northern -the Adirondack region, where, you know, you 11 12 couldn't have been in a more difficult 13 terrain to try to support communications up 14 there. And then add to that, we bring in, 15 you know, ten partner agencies who all have 16 different radio systems and everything else. And even when you were both on VHF and said, 17 Wow, this should be easy -- well, this 18 19 agency's encryption doesn't comport with this 20 agency's encryption.

21 So in the end, you know, we ended up 22 with unencrypted analog VHF like we did in 23 the Bucky Phillips days. And because of 24 that, less so that the community was

1 monitoring, but the news media was 2 monitoring. And in the case of our escapees, 3 they had a radio -- you know, a 4 transistorized radio -- and they were 5 listening to the news reports of what the police were doing. 6 7 So it certainly is in the draft after-action that we're working on right now. 8 It's something that if we could solve it in 9 10 the Adirondack region, we could take that anywhere and just -- because as I said, you 11 12 know, we sent communications trucks up there, but there's no infrastructure. There's no 13 14 towers to climb and put up an antenna or 15 anything like that. So it was as difficult 16 as it could be. It's one of our priorities not to come 17 back and see this in another after-action 18 19 report in the future, and to work with our partners on the encryption issues and the 20 21 different, you know, frequencies and things like that. 22 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right. 23 Thank 24 you, Superintendent.

1	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Sure.
2	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you,
3	Senator.
4	Our next speaker will be
5	Assemblymember Lentol.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Good afternoon.
7	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Good
8	afternoon.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: I just wanted to
10	say that in fact, I wanted to thank you,
11	by the way
12	SENATOR KRUEGER: Microphone.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Sorry. I don't
14	know how to use these technological equipment
15	things. I think this is encrypted the wrong
16	way.
17	(Laughter.)
18	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: But I wanted to
19	say how pleased I was, since the Bucky
20	Phillips incident, how well and hard you've
21	worked on equipping the State Police with the
22	modern armaments and the necessary tools in
23	order to do their job. And I saw in the
24	budget proposal that there's \$4 million to

1 provide uniformed troopers statewide with 2 rifles, body armor, and ballistic helmets. 3 And I just wanted to ask you, is that enough? SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yeah. I 4 5 mean, my goal in the equipment was to get a patrol rifle into the hands of every trooper 6 7 who's out there on patrol. You know, right now it's a -- it's going to a major effort to 8 9 train everyone and bring them up to speed, 10 get the equipment to get them into the cars, because we have a limited number right now. 11 12 We probably have 500 patrol rifles in 13 addition to shotguns, and this will increase 14 us by 425 or somewhere around there. 15 I think for this fiscal year, yeah, I 16 think it's what we can handle. It will get them into the hands of all the troopers. We 17 18 have some in the -- some of the plainclothes units have them as well. And, you know, once 19 20 we get this completed, we'll come back and 21 evaluate needs maybe for next fiscal year.

22ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL:That would be23good.

24

And I listened with great interest to

1 Senator Croci's questions about the New York 2 State Intelligence Center, and I wondered 3 whether or not it is important for us to come up with statutory language in order to make 4 5 this merger, if you will, of all of the services into a statute so that it has the 6 7 requisite authority in order to do its job. SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yeah, I would 8 9 just say that, you know, I personally can 10 assure you that during my tenure, while I'm 11 sitting here, you know, we would never have 12 an issue with information exchange. You 13 know, and as we go forward years from now, I 14 would hope that the staff that runs the 15 Intelligence Center, you know, would continue 16 on to follow the DHS rules, which would keep us in line. 17 You know, I can't tell you -- I can't 18 tell you about statutory language other than 19 20 that. 21 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you, sir. 22 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Senator Nozzolio. 23 24 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Madam

1 Chair.

2 Superintendent, welcome again to these 3 discussions. SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you, 4 5 Senator. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I would feel 6 7 confident to make the case to anyone that your efforts have, I believe, qualified you 8 to be the best superintendent in the history 9 10 of the State Police. I say that with all sincerity and directness. 11 12 We were involved from the first day of your confirmation. You have done nothing but 13 14 impress and continued to work with 15 distinction throughout your tenure, and I 16 congratulate you for that. SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you, 17 18 sir. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: The world has 19 20 certainly changed since you became a police 21 officer many years ago. That we live in a 22 much more dangerous place. And that I'm concerned certainly with -- I have no concern 23 24 with the ability of the State Police and the

record of the State Police in general law
 enforcement functions, in dealing with
 disasters, and even taking the additional
 steps that you have taken regarding drug
 addiction and the administration of a very
 difficult antidote to heroin overdoses.

7 Time and time again, the department 8 has done yeoman work in getting things done. Assemblywoman Duprey was talking about the --9 10 we all watched you work in her district 11 during those times. We also looked to a huge 12 amount of additional costs. We're glad that 13 those are being absorbed, although we know it 14 puts stress on other portions of the budget.

15 It appears, in your answers to Senator 16 Gallivan, that we are fine in terms of at least a runway for solution -- we're on the 17 18 runway for solution to the vehicle issue. 19 That we couldn't find those monies in the 20 budget, although it appears that you are 21 going to be using those deployed from 22 particular settlement funds to be able to put into additional vehicles. That's fine. 23 24 That's good. It's extending resources. And

1 at meetings like this, we've certainly heard 2 the need. So we'll be working with you and 3 monitoring that situation to see what 4 additional needs there are.

5 Senator Croci's comments, echoed by Assemblymember Lentol, you can't comment on 6 7 it, but I just need to emphasize so that you 8 understand our position. That we have every confidence that right now that communication 9 10 is taking place. Senator Croci has mentioned 11 this many times to us in conference. He**'**s 12 analyzed this. There's nobody better to do it than him, through his experience. 13

14But this isn't about one person, one15superintendent. We're looking to structure16something in the future. And we could17support the change if we had assurances that,18moving forward, there was a statutory19template for action.

20 That I asked Commissioner Melville 21 earlier today about cybersecurity and its 22 relationship to homeland security. And what 23 I'm fearful of is that we're falling through 24 the cracks on a particular area of security

1 protection. And I'd like you to address this 2 issue from the standpoint of you, as you're 3 working counterterrorism, you are certainly dealing with public protection -- but the 4 5 question of individual protection through the cyber networks, through entrusting the state 6 7 government. What role now does the State 8 Police have in this issue of cyber protection?

9

10 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Okay, so the New York State Police is involved on a number 11 12 of different levels. You know, we start kind of from the bottom up. We do retail kind of 13 14 cyber crime, whether it's theft of 15 information or social media hacking, things 16 like that which are really kind of, you know, customer-based to our New Yorkers who make 17 18 crime complaints.

19 As it moves up into kind of larger cyber crime, we have a cyber analysis unit 20 21 that we created in partnership with the 22 MS-ISAC, which is part of the center in East Greenbush that we spoke about earlier. 23 24 And what we do is MS-ISAC is responsible for

1 monitoring most of the state networks and 2 state systems. Information that comes in through the MS-ISAC -- we're part of the 3 operations center. Our analysts and our 4 5 investigators, we're at the dailies, we work with them hand in hand all day long, and 6 7 we're able to see what kind of threats are going on throughout the country to other 8 states' infrastructure. 9 10 Anything that comes in that affects a 11 state agency or a state network goes to ITS. 12 ITS has their security piece; they're 13 responsible for that. 14 Anything below that, you know, whether 15 it's local government, whether it's, you 16 know, utilities, whether it's anything less that we can address at the state level, we 17 18 do. Whether it's just getting the 19 information out, whether it's trying to, you 20 know, make criminal cases on it -- there's 21 really a tough line there, because so much of 22 what happens cyber is federal. We work very closely with the federal partners in the FBI 23 24 and Secret Service because so much of what

1 goes on, even though it seems like it's in 2 your backyard here, is coming from, you know, 3 Eastern Europe or Asian countries. And so, you know, we just don't have that reach. 4 5 We've been trying to find, since we stood up the cyber analysis unit, what really 6 7 is the niche. And we think the niche is local government, local utilities, 8 9 mom-and-pop banks, things like that which 10 fall below that federal threshold. 11 Fortunately, a lot of what comes in through MS-ISAC that we're sitting at the 12 13 table and we know it, gets funneled over to 14 ITS and they're able to react or patch or do 15 what they have to do so it doesn't become a 16 problem in New York State. I mean, a lot of what happens is kind of preemptive. You 17 18 know, we've been very fortunate here. I'm not saying it's never going to happen, it 19 20 happens to some of the best organizations at 21 some of the highest levels. But that's the 22 infrastructure that's in play here. 23 I personally think the gap is below

that, you know, for these small communities

24

1 that just don't have the support of a 2 cybersecurity team or anything like that. 3 And being that it's all part of the New York State Intelligence Center, we intentionally 4 5 collocated for this purpose, because we are concerned about cyber going into the future. 6 7 We're able to take the information, put it out as informational, put it out as 8 intelligence, refer it to the federal 9 10 partners, work with them. That's kind of 11 where we're at on the cybersecurity piece. 12 Myself, Division of Homeland Security 13 and Emergency Services, and many members of 14 the chamber sit on the Cyber Advisory Board. 15 We're part of it, either in an advisory 16 capacity or as actual members, together with Financial Services, Public Service 17 18 Commission. And we all are constantly working with the private sector to discuss 19 20 what are the emerging threats, how do we 21 target-harden. 22 And when it comes to things like utilities and finance, it's not just the 23

cyber piece, it's kind of cyber and physical

24

put together. You know, you have to be able
 to protect from both sides.

3 And, you know, we're still -- I would say we're still young at this in New York 4 5 State. But, you know, as states go I would say we're probably -- as to effectiveness, 6 7 we're one of top ones. I think we're, you know, a couple from the top maybe, but I 8 think we're doing a good job at it for the 9 10 amount of time we've been invested in it.

11 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And I have no doubt 12 that upon receipt of questionable information 13 about potential threats that have occurred, 14 about trying to isolate who did those, I 15 would imagine you and your partners are up to 16 that task.

What I fear is that the state 17 18 government itself does not have someone that 19 can tap them on the shoulder and say, You 20 aren't having appropriate protections 21 within -- protecting the data that you're 22 entrusted to hold. Whether it be the Department of Taxation and Finance, whether 23 24 it be one of our health organizations,

whether it be even the DMV, are we having -are you able to, or is it too early or are
you too thin in manpower at this stage to be
able to act as a coach, if you will, a cyber
consultant to those state government agencies
that have to protect this data?

7 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: I mean, to steal a line from Commissioner Melville, I'm 8 not a computer geek. But, you know, I think 9 10 that we've had conversations with ITS about 11 them becoming part of the operations center 12 at the Intelligence Center with the Center 13 for Internet Security and the MS-ISAC, so 14 that we're not just a pass-through on that 15 type of information -- when we hear about 16 something that's affecting a network or affecting other states or that's directly 17 18 targeted at something in New York State that we have people at the table with us who could 19 20 react to it and we don't have to be the 21 pass-through to send it over to ITS. I think that's kind of the improvement we could make, 22 just, you know, better cooperation in that 23 24 respect.

1 I don't mind being the coach to get 2 this done. You know, the whole discussion 3 about merging New York State Police, Intel Center and Center for Internet Security, you 4 5 know, it was done about three years ago and we all saw the value of it. It's just 6 7 something we've been trying to grow. And, you know, in the world of units, it's still 8 relatively young. It's probably a year --9 10 you know, a year in the making for us. We have an investigator and I think three or 11 12 four analysts who are actually assigned there full-time. 13 14 So I don't mind being a coach to drive 15 it forward, because I do agree with you that 16 no matter what you're talking about, cyber is 17 a tremendous threat to us. 18 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Superintendent, thank you very much. Thank you for your 19 20 answers, and thank you for your service. 21 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you, 22 senator. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 23 24 Senator Savino.

1 SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you, Senator 2 Young. Thank you, Superintendent. I'm not 3 4 going to go over the issues of the aging 5 fleet and the number of miles on it, because 6 I think you've addressed it. And also I 7 understand you have a class in the academy that's expected to graduate -- is it March? 8 9 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: No, we 10 graduated a class in September. 11 SENATOR SAVINO: When is the next one? SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: In March. 12 They're going in in March. 13 14 SENATOR SAVINO: They're going in in 15 March. 16 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Right. So you figure they'll be out by probably 17 18 September, and then we're hoping to follow up 19 with another class in a couple of weeks, 20 maybe October. 21 SENATOR SAVINO: So what do you think 22 the estimated new hire rate will be by the 23 time these two classes are over? 24 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: I mean, my

goal always is, you know, keep flat with
 attrition, consider new needs.

3 So, you know, our attrition yearly is probably 230, you know, average. It goes up 4 5 a little, it goes down a little. You know, you add new needs, whether they're casino 6 7 gaming or Enough is Enough or any other kind of initiatives, and that's what I need to do. 8 You know, I bill 10 percent above that for 9 10 people who don't make it through the academy. And like I said, I think we're at a healthy 11 12 place numberwise for the agency, and I don't 13 want to lose that.

14 SENATOR SAVINO: Is there some 15 concern, though, that you might see some 16 accelerated rate of retirement because of -the collective bargaining agreement does have 17 a couple of zeros in it, so there's almost no 18 19 incentive to stick around for some of the 20 members who are approaching retirement age. 21 Have you factored that in to the calculation? 22 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yeah, we anticipate -- PBA settled their contract, and 23 24 we anticipated a little rise in retirements,

1 which we did see. NYSPI is currently in 2 negotiations, and I would assume that, you 3 know, maybe they're months away from theirs. 4 We'll expect to see people going out the door 5 at an increased rate right after that. We also last year spent a lot of 6 7 overtime in New York City on counterterrorism 8 and other areas, and a lot of those people are going to see the opportunity to retire. 9 10 So yeah, I mean, we say 230. And what I like about the two academy classes is that 11 12 by the time we get to the second one, we can kind of adjust for actual retirements. So if 13 14 it's up higher, we'll have a bigger class. 15 SENATOR SAVINO: Well, hopefully we'll 16 continue. I want to turn to an issue that 17 Senator Klein has been out in front on with 18 19 respect to restricting firearm purchases for 20 people who are on the FBI's, you know, 21 terrorist screening database or the no-fly 22 list. Has the State Police had discussions 23 24 with the FBI? Do they give you access to

1 that list?

2	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Yeah, I mean,
3	we do have access to that list for
4	counterterrorism purposes. You know, it's a
5	different discussion to be able to use it
6	for, you know, denying pistol permits.
7	You know, part of the issue there is
8	you can be placed on the terrorist watch list
9	or the no-fly list for a number of reasons.
10	You know, one is you're kind of a bona fide
11	terrorist, you know, you've been identified
12	that way. But there are people who are
13	who have active investigations, you know,
14	that are not quite, you know, at the bona
15	fide terrorist level, who are placed there
16	you know, and the standards for being placed
17	there are kind of loose, you know.
18	And it gives us the ability to
19	restrict people from traveling and the safety
20	issues related to that, but I don't know that
21	it's the kind of thing that we want to
22	publicize where people would be able to know
23	they're on the no-fly list so they'll you
24	know, why am I on the no-fly list, maybe

1 they're looking at me for this or for that. 2 So I think that's a concern. Before 3 we say, well, let's take the list and make it available, you know, for denying pistol 4 5 permits, I think you have to vet out that whole situation. But that's a discussion 6 7 with the feds. It's their information. And as of now, they haven't given anyone 8 permission to use it for denying pistol 9 10 applications. SENATOR SAVINO: And finally, in the 11 12 last minute -- I think I have a minute and 13 20 -- you were instrumental in helping us 14 develop the Compassionate Care Act, the 15 medical marijuana program. It has been up 16 and running now, dispensaries are opening, the grow houses are growing. Has there been 17 any security leaks, any concerns that the 18 State Police have encountered with the 19 implementation of the program? 20 21 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: No, ma'am. 22 None at all. I guess we're, what, about three weeks maybe, now --23 24 SENATOR SAVINO: A little more.

1	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: going
2	towards four weeks? We haven't seen any
3	criminal acts, we haven't seen any
4	improprieties. Obviously we're charged with
5	the public safety aspects of it. We speak to
6	DOH and their Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement
7	all the time. And no, as of now, we haven't
8	had any issues.
9	SENATOR SAVINO: That's great. Thank
10	you.
11	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you,
12	Superintendent.
13	I wanted to ask this question on
14	behalf of Senator Golden, who had a pressing
15	district event he had to get to. And as you
16	know, we've had lengthy testimony today.
17	But the question is, what is the
18	coordination between the NYPD and the
19	Executive's proposal to permanently deploy
20	State Police and National Guard members to
21	New York City?
22	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: So I kind of
23	have an unfair advantage, because I am a
24	graduate of NYPD. And the people who are in

1 place down there at all levels are people 2 that, you know, were peers of mine. So I do 3 have the ability to have the conversations. Early on when we started bringing 4 5 troopers down on overtime, before they were 6 permanently assigned there, we had 7 discussions with NYPD, with MTA police, to make it seamless, to make sure that we're 8 9 complementing each other and not, you know, 10 doing kind of redundant work. The safety 11 issues, the safety issues of having another 12 law enforcement agency kind of planted in 13 there, to make sure we had communications and 14 everything else.

15 As we went into 55 permanent troopers 16 assigned there, we continued the discussions. We've expanded our role where we're doing 17 some commercial vehicle enforcement at the 18 19 bridges and tunnels on the East River. We 20 invited NYPD in, we did them hand in hand 21 with them, it's been joint operations, 22 standing together. You know, State Police is 7 percent of the state's law enforcement, but 23 24 we do well over 90 percent of the commercial

1 vehicle enforcement in the state. So we do 2 bring something to the table, and I think we 3 were great partners with NYPD. Same thing with MTA. We've worked 4 5 hand in hand with them in Grand Central, Penn Station, and on train patrols, both through 6 7 Metro North and Long Island railroad. 8 You know, our biggest issue here is to 9 make sure our troopers are armed with the information they need, have access to 10 11 communications, and that they're completely 12 safe while they're operating there. 13 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you for that. 14 Just one more question. You 15 referenced in your testimony that there are 16 15 troopers assigned to the Sexual Assault Victims Unit within the State Police. What 17 18 will be the coordination between this unit, local police departments, and colleges? If 19 20 you could expound on that, please. 21 SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Okay, so the 22 makeup of the Sexual Assault Victims Unit is 15 people. It's 12 members of the State 23 24 Police -- so it's 11 senior investigators,

one lieutenant who coordinates the program,
 it's an office aide, it's a press person to
 kind of work on the outreach issues.

You know, the way we see our role here 4 5 is to provide outreach and education to college campuses, whether it's the student 6 7 population, whether it's the security or 8 police force or it's college administration. 9 The way we see our role with local police is 10 to coordinate with them on the investigation to make sure that none of the victims who 11 12 need police response, you know, aren't able 13 to get what they need.

14 Whether it's a State Police response 15 or a local police response, we're looking to 16 do training for our own investigators to make 17 them better at investigating sex crimes. And 18 we'll be affording the same training to the locals. I've spoken to the Chiefs and the 19 20 Sheriffs Associations and offered those 21 services.

You know, we don't know that there's a tremendous void there, but we think that we could work together so that we're all better

1 at it.

2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you for that.
3	Anyone else?
4	Well, I think that concludes your part
5	of the testimony. We truly appreciate you
6	being with us today and for taking the time
7	and for the great work that you do on behalf
8	of the citizens of New York State to protect
9	them. Thank you, Superintendent.
10	SUPERINTENDENT D'AMICO: Thank you.
11	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speaker is
12	Margaret Miller, director and chief
13	information officer from the New York State
14	Office of Information Technology Services.
15	Welcome, Director Miller.
16	DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you.
17	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Whenever you're
18	ready, proceed.
19	DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you.
20	Good afternoon, Chairwoman Young,
21	Chairman Farrell, and distinguished members
22	of the Legislature. I'm Margaret Miller, the
23	state's chief information officer and
24	director of Information Technology Services.

1 Thank you for the opportunity to speak with 2 you today and share our request for budget 3 expenditure and our plans for ITS. The 2016-2017 Governor's Executive 4 5 Budget includes \$567 million in General Fund support to enable ITS to provide consolidated 6 7 statewide information technology services. The Executive Budget also includes 8 \$85 million in capital funds for IT 9 10 innovation in enterprise-level applications and programs. This funding will allow ITS to 11 12 continue the progress of the state's 13 multiphase, multiyear IT transformation to 14 make government work smarter for citizens, to 15 spur economic growth, and make the state more accessible to business. 16 We've encountered, and will continue 17

18to encounter, challenges in this multiyear19journey. But those challenges don't deter20us. Rather, they inspire us to be even more21creative, innovative, and dedicated to22achieving service excellence and the best23possible experience for our citizens.

24 Our transformation progresses in

1 multiple phases. First there was 2 consolidation, then stabilization, and now 3 transformation of the citizen experience. At every stage, plans have been created based on 4 5 the best information available at that time, and then we've been agile in adapting these 6 7 plans whenever we need to as we learn more about the challenges we face. 8 Each phase requires a different focus, 9 10 different capabilities, and different partners, but has built inexorably on the 11 12 previous one. 13 Having made significant progress with building a sound technology and 14 15 infrastructure foundation, we are beginning 16 to shift our focus to transforming the whole life-cycle experience of our citizens to one 17 18 that they have the right to expect in the 19 digital era. 20 We're bringing together what was once 21 a highly decentralized, inefficient IT 22 structure across more than 50 disparate agencies into a single agency that is ITS. 23

We can now work to maximize the tremendous

24

1 talent in the workforce, standardize the 2 myriad systems and applications implemented 3 in each agency, and create an environment in which ITS can leverage IT investments across 4 5 all state government, adopt industry best practices, and enhance service delivery to 6 7 our partner agencies, businesses interacting with the state, and the citizens New York 8 State serves, providing needed services more 9 10 rapidly and cost-effectively, to fuel the 11 innovation economy. 12 In the 2016-2017 fiscal year, in 13 addition to our continuing program of work to

13 addition to our continuing program of work to
 14 support the mission of the agencies, our
 15 transformation program will focus on a number
 16 of broad areas.

We'll continue to drive up the maturity continuum of operational excellence, adopting standard best practice processes and tools to deliver reliable, secure services at minimum cost to the taxpayer.

22 One of the benefits of the Governor's 23 IT transformation program which created ITS 24 is that we now have visibility to the risks

1	inherent in our whole infrastructure. During
2	the consolidation and stabilization phases of
3	the IT transformation
4	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Director, could I
5	ask a favor? Could you get a little bit
6	closer to the microphone?
7	DIRECTOR MILLER: Oh, I beg your
8	pardon.
9	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. If you
10	could pull the mike a little closer.
11	DIRECTOR MILLER: I'm short.
12	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
13	DIRECTOR MILLER: One of is that
14	better?
15	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Yes.
16	DIRECTOR MILLER: Okay, thank you.
17	One of the benefits of the Governor's
18	IT transformation program which created ITS
19	is that we now have visibility to the risks
20	inherent in our infrastructure. During the
21	consolidation and stabilization phases of the
22	IT transformation, it became clear that a
23	significant technology debt had accumulated
24	over many decades of underinvestment, across

1 the state, creating operational, legal and financial risks. During 2016-2017 we'll be 2 prioritizing a significant investment of 3 funds -- in fact approximately \$40 million --4 and resources to eliminate this debt. 5 ITS continues cybersecurity 6 7 improvements in 2016, with key programs to address cyber risk and comply with industry 8 best practice standards of the National 9 10 Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, which is part of the U.S. Department of 11 12 Commerce, and ISO standards and regulatory 13 rules for all agencies we support. 14 ITS carries over a comprehensive NIST 800.53 assessment from 2015 into 2016, and a 15 comprehensive NIST Top 20 Cyber Controls 16 Assessment. These two assessments will be 17 18 the primary baseline used to guide risk-based 19 investment and cybersecurity best practice 20 improvement through 2016 and beyond. 21 ITS is engaging key suppliers and 22 organizations, and the New York State Intelligence Center, the NYSIC, to assist in 23 24 implementation of our enterprise-wide

1 programs, close high-risk gaps, and guide the 2 deployment of cybersecurity best practices. 3 With the cybersecurity function centralized under ITS, the state can 4 5 implement the policies consistently, and react swiftly across all IT assets when we 6 7 receive intelligence about potential threats. Our current technology landscape has 8 been created over decades by more than 9 10 50 different agencies, each entirely focused 11 on their own mission without a unifying 12 vision of the citizen experience or the 13 underlying technology or data strategies. 14 The resulting environment is massively 15 complex and expensive to support reliably and 16 securely. We also have significant staffing 17 18 challenges due to this complexity. The skills of our staff are locked into skill 19 20 silos, leading to excessive spend on third 21 parties and an inability to offer the most 22 exciting career paths to our brightest and best, too many of whom are stuck supporting 23 24 legacy technologies.

1 Most importantly, this complexity 2 leads to a negative citizen experience. To 3 address these issues, we are building a set of strategic platforms comprising a portfolio 4 5 of tools and services which not just individually, but as an integrated set, will 6 7 deliver an enhanced citizen experience across all agencies. 8

Our staff are a vital asset in 9 10 delivering the best possible service to our 11 citizens, businesses, partner agencies and 12 all other digital visitors to New York State. We have much to do to ensure that all team 13 14 members have the opportunity to reach their 15 potential and make the greatest contribution 16 to our transformation program.

17 We plan, then, to focus on a number of 18 initiatives with regard to our staff. We'll increase the frequency and quality of our 19 20 team communication at all levels to ensure all team members understand the overall ITS 21 22 strategy and how their work contributes to the mission of ITS and our partner agencies. 23 24 We'll ensure our training and development

1

plans are closely aligned with our

2 transformation strategy and that team members have the skills needed to be effective and to 3 progress in their careers. We'll implement 4 5 an intensive hiring program to ensure we're bringing in sufficient new team members to 6 7 allow us to fulfill our objectives and allow 8 existing team members to progress in their careers. And we will continue to seek ways 9 10 we can reward and promote outstanding talent. 11 Thank you for the opportunity to speak 12 with you today and share our plans. I 13 welcome your questions and comments. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 14 15 Director. 16 Our first speaker is Senator Croci. SENATOR CROCI: Thank you, Madam 17 Chair. And thank you, Ms. Miller, for 18 19 joining us today. 20 The department that you head, is it 21 statutorily charged with providing the 22 protection of the state's -- our entire state government's cybersecurity infrastructure, 23 24 including but not limited to identifying --

1 identification and mitigation of
2 vulnerabilities as well as deterring and
3 responding to cyber events and promoting
4 cyber awareness? Is that the statutory
5 charge?

DIRECTOR MILLER: Well, we took over 6 7 the responsibilities that were formerly with 8 the Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Services, as you know. And they --9 10 under Section 715 of the Executive Law, the core mission of their Office of Cybersecurity 11 was to protect the state's executive 12 13 agencies' cybersecurity infrastructure and to 14 provide coordination of policies, standards 15 and programs related to cybersecurity.

16 And they did that in three different 17 ways. They had information security 18 management, managed security services, and a 19 cyber incident response team. Those were the 20 functions that we took over from them. Thev never had enforcement functions. Those were 21 22 always split between multiple agencies, and hence the creation of the fusion center. 23

24 So those are the three functions that

1 we took over, as well as the geographical 2 information services that we took. Would it be helpful if I explained how 3 the responsibility now splits? 4 5 SENATOR CROCI: I think you just answered the question. Thank you. 6 7 Could you describe for me a typical -you were talking about some staffing 8 challenges. Can you describe for me a 9 10 typical cyber team employee? Do they have delegated roles and responsibilities when 11 12 they're hired? How do they work together? Do they work in teams, do they work 13 14 independently? And do they have other roles other than their cyber roles? Are they doing 15 16 some other IT-related work that's outside of 17 the scope of cyber. DIRECTOR MILLER: Well, first of all, 18 19 I'd like to say how delighted I am that we 20 just managed to hire a new chief information 21 security officer, Jim Garrett, who's with us 22 here today. And he joins us with a very distinguished career in cybersecurity and was 23 24 formerly chief information security officer

1 with 3M and Ingram Micro; he has a great 2 pedigree. And he is currently reorganizing 3 his team and has been pleasantly surprised at the caliber of staff that we have. 4 5 In answer to your direct question, they are a dedicated team and have no other 6 7 responsibilities for other aspects of ITS. Their role is very much focused on 8 cybersecurity, which is forefront in all our 9 10 minds. SENATOR CROCI: Okay. We actually 11 have had a hearing on this last May 20th, and 12 13 you were invited to testify. Is there any 14 reason why you didn't come to testify at the 15 hearing last May 20th? I know your office was invited. And I believe Dr. Bloniarz is 16

18DIRECTOR MILLER: That's right.19SENATOR CROCI: -- I think he came20from the Governor's staff, not from yours.21DIRECTOR MILLER: That's right. In22fact, Professor Bloniarz was at that point23fulfilling multiple roles. So as you know,24he chairs the Governor's advisory committee,

the individual who was here, but --

17

1 but that was before our new chief information 2 security officer was appointed, and he was 3 interim in that role also. So that's why we felt that he was probably the best person to 4 5 come and testify. SENATOR CROCI: Okay. But you were 6 7 aware that you were invited to testify? DIRECTOR MILLER: I'm sure I was at 8 the time. I don't remember, to be honest. 9 10 But we honestly felt, out of respect for your time, that we should send the person best 11 12 capable to answer your questions. SENATOR CROCI: Is Dr. Bloniarz here 13 14 today? 15 DIRECTOR MILLER: I'm not sure if he's 16 physically in the room, but I know he's 17 watching. SENATOR CROCI: Okay, very good. 18 19 What if anything has been done in the 20 past year, since we've seen now, over a 21 process of about two years, the integration from DHSES into ITS -- and it's an 22 interesting case study, since the Executive 23 24 Budget proposes a similar consolidation or

transfer of individuals from DHSES now to the State Police, of course in a different function. So I'm curious as to the success -- if anything, what has been done in the past year? Do you have success stories in response to any cyber attacks that have occurred?

And based on what's transpired with 8 9 the attacks on the federal government, OPM, 10 and then, of course, in the commercial 11 industry, what have we done as a state to 12 protect our infrastructure? Do you have any 13 success stories that you can discuss about how this transfer of responsibilities has 14 been -- I've been cut off. That means it's 15 16 time for me to stop talking.

17 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Keep going. Keep18 going, Senator. Finish your question.

19DIRECTOR MILLER: So first of all, I'd20like to speak to the role of ITS versus the21Department of Homeland Security and Emergency22Services previously. It would have been very23difficult previously, because DHSES would24only have sight of a small piece of the life

1 cycle, if you will, of cybersecurity.

2 ITS manages the infrastructure that 3 houses the data that we're trying to protect, of course. So we are able to look across the 4 5 whole NIST life cycle of identify, protect, detect, respond and recover. We can see 6 7 across the whole piece. And so it's far easier for us both to make sure that the 8 9 systems that we're building are built to a 10 high standard of security so we can build 11 that in from the get-go, for us to be able to 12 see potential threats, for us to protect our environment to make sure that it's fully 13 14 hardened, that we're up to speed with 15 patching and that we've implemented the best 16 possible protections, and then to detect any attempted intrusions and then to help recover 17 18 when they do happen.

19What I would say is that I guess the20success is that we haven't had -- touching21wood; I hope I'm not tempting fate -- any22major intrusion events. We monitor on a23daily basis for attempts, and we do record a24high number of attempts to penetrate our

1 security. But we have not had any very 2 significant intrusion exposures. 3 SENATOR CROCI: One final question. Are you aware if your department is fully 4 5 compliant with the statutory set-asides for 6 minority-owned, women-owned and service-7 disabled veteran businesses? DIRECTOR MILLER: Yes. I'm afraid I 8 don't have the number at the tip of my 9 10 fingers, but actually we exceed the number by a significant amount. 11 12 SENATOR CROCI: Okay. Very good. And you mentioned staffing silos. So could you 13 14 please explain to me how you're overcoming 15 those challenges? 16 DIRECTOR MILLER: Right. We have a staffing crisis looming with a huge number of 17 18 retirements, which will see a great many very 19 experienced staff lost from state service. 20 SENATOR CROCI: Specifically with 21 regard to cyber --22 DIRECTOR MILLER: No, with regard to 23 the overall IT environment. 24 And one of the ways we will address

1 this is to focus and standardize on a smaller 2 number of technologies, which will make it 3 far easier for us to share expertise across all agencies. At the moment we have staff 4 5 who are specialists in a large -- small numbers of staff who are specialists in a 6 7 huge number of different technologies. Which 8 isn't good for their career paths, and it isn't good for providing the best, most 9 cost-effective service. 10 11 So by standardizing on a smaller 12 number of key technologies, we can both 13 provide a better career path for them and 14 provide a better service. 15 SENATOR CROCI: Very good. Thank you, 16 Madam Chair. And thank you very much. DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you. 17 18 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 19 Assemblyman? 20 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Director, thank 21 you for being here. I too wanted to actually pick up where Senator Croci had left off in 22 regards to -- I was struck by your comments 23 24 about the skills of our staff are locked into

1 silos. It sounded as if there was a 2 resistance to change, but I don't think 3 that's what you meant. Is that correct? DIRECTOR MILLER: No. No. I 4 5 apologize if that's how it sounded. No, indeed, it's not a resistance to change, 6 7 quite the opposite. It has to do with the fact that we have this huge complexity in our 8 environment, which we are addressing through 9 10 standardizing. 11 But we also have a problem with 12 experience. As I said, we will lose -- in 13 the next few years we'll lose 25 percent of 14 our staff through retirements. And that 15 means that the average experience level will 16 go -- at the most senior levels will go from 40 years to 11 years. 17 18 Now, expertise, of course, is a 19 mixture of training plus experience. Just as 20 you wouldn't take a doctor straight out of 21 med school and make him head of brain 22 surgery, we need a combination of training plus experience. And because we see that 23 24 huge skills gap, it results in us having to

1 rely very heavily on contract staff. We 2 currently have 1200 contract staff that cost 3 the state \$245 million a year, because we rely on them for that mid-level of expertise 4 5 that includes the required experience. And that means that the more junior folk aren't 6 7 able to progress.

I would love to find a way of 8 9 increasing the permanent staff in those 10 middle levels, maybe through insourcing that 11 we were able to do some years ago, or other 12 initiatives that we might agree with the unions and the Civil Service that would allow 13 14 us to inject expertise into the middle ranks 15 and reduce our dependence on very expensive 16 contractors. So we would really look to find 17 a way of doing that.

18 And by that means, we would be able to 19 release those more junior staff from those 20 silos and be able to give the best 21 opportunities to our brightest and best 22 staff, which is something I very passionately believe in. 23 24

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: I think that

speaks to your final comments about staff
 development.

3 And I will say, particularly being a member from the Capital Region, I represent 4 5 many great, fine people who have been part of those silos for years that do want to advance 6 7 their skills and want to be given the opportunity. And I also respect the 8 complexity of technology, that there are 9 10 going to be times when you do need the specialists. But we don't want the 11 12 specialists the norm at all costs possible. I think one of the great things about 13 14 experience that you talk about is there are 15 many people who can say, Oh, yeah, we've done that before, and here's why it didn't work. 16 Or here's how it may work. 17 18 DIRECTOR MILLER: Right. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: So I am encouraged by your comments about increasing 20 development and training. I would think that 21 22 would mean particularly for our current workforce -- that is in place, that has the 23

24 opportunity -- but also recruitment, which

1 indicates to me that we will be hiring more 2 staff to help move things along. Is that a 3 correct assessment? And does this budget proposal support that in regards to positions 4 5 and also training and development dollars? DIRECTOR MILLER: I believe we have 6 7 the appropriate budget to hire the staff that we're in a position to hire. Of course they 8 have to be entry level. The skills gap is in 9 10 the middle and at the senior levels. That's 11 what's the problem. 12 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: So to address the skills gap, is the funding for 13 14 development and training going to help address some of that? 15 16 DIRECTOR MILLER: To address the training part. It's the experience that's 17 18 the problem. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you. 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Our 21 next speaker is Senator Nozzolio. 22 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Madam Chair. 23 24 Good after -- good evening. I guess

1 we're getting into the evening.

2	I must admit I believe you've been
3	before the general finance committees in the
4	past, I believe you've testified before us.
5	Is that not correct?
6	DIRECTOR MILLER: Last year, yes.
7	That's shortly after I joined, yes.
8	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Last year I didn't
9	pay much attention to what you said at all.
10	This year I've listened to every word.
11	It is a different day in this nation
12	and in the world. Senator Croci began this
13	discussion; the cyber attacks to agencies of
14	the federal government that are generally
15	well protected show that they weren't so well
16	protected.
17	I don't I don't doubt for a second
18	that you've had managerial issues. It sounds
19	as though you have addressed a number of
20	those issues during your tenure. But I want
21	to probe, in the time I have, on
22	cybersecurity and what role that is playing
23	within the information technology that you
24	manage. And that you casually indicated that

1	there have been a high-level number of
2	attempts to develop security breaches in our
3	area. Any particular aspect of that data?
4	DIRECTOR MILLER: No, I
5	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: For instance, the
6	Department of Motor Vehicles, the Parks
7	system, Taxation and Finance? What levels of
8	attack and what type of data are you
9	referring to?
10	DIRECTOR MILLER: We experience the
11	same sort of attacks and the same categories
12	of attacks as the general business
13	population. In fact, we work with the
14	Multistate ISAC, as do DHSES and State
15	Police, to garner intelligence about what's
16	happening in the broader world, and we see
17	exactly the same level of attack and same
18	nature of attack as the general business
19	community. And
20	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And the general
21	business community has, over the last
22	12 months, as you know, in New York State
23	experienced a huge amount of data breaches.
24	DIRECTOR MILLER: Indeed. Indeed. So

1 we adopt a stance at --

2 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: So you've achieved, 3 then, a huge amount of data breaches, is that 4 what you're telling us? 5 DIRECTOR MILLER: No, not at all. No, we experience a huge number of attempts. 6 So 7 there are a large number of attempted attacks on our environment. 8 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you for 9 10 clarifying that. Where are the attempts 11 being made? Where are they centered? 12 DIRECTOR MILLER: They vary very 13 widely. I wouldn't single out any one 14 source. In fact, our posture is to be 15 vigilant whatever the source. And we remain, I would say, confidently paranoid --16 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: That's good. Do 17 you have a priority, though? You've said in 18 19 your testimony that you're understaffed and 20 basically overworked. What, then, are we 21 establishing as priorities within your 22 department? DIRECTOR MILLER: Right. The biggest 23 24 priority we have is cybersecurity. And as

1 you will see, we've increased the budget very 2 significantly in cybersecurity over the last 3 few years. And the Governor himself and members of the Governor's staff have 4 5 repeatedly asked whether we are spending enough. Our judgment is that we have the 6 7 right budget for this year, but it's been made very clear to us that should we require 8 additional funding, we should ask for it. 9 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Well, you indicate 10 11 that 2016, the improvements you've made --12 and your testimony says that you've 13 established key programs to address cyber risk and comply with industry best practices. 14 15 What steps have been taken to achieve that 16 objective? DIRECTOR MILLER: Let me list out some 17 of it. So first of all, we're aggressively 18 remediating all out-of-date hardware and 19 20 software that could pose a risk to our 21 environment. 22 We've engaged third-party experts to assess our cyber control risk related to 23 24 regulated data and third-party-managed data.

1 And then we focus on the most 2 sensitive citizen data and data regulated by law, to ensure that these NIST controls are 3 4 in place for that data as a priority. 5 We also make sure that the legal contractual language for any third parties we 6 7 use reflects the best standards of regulatory control and best practice. 8 9 And we also are implementing a 10 comprehensive risk-management program to raise the visibility and track mitigation of 11 12 high-risk areas of weakness. 13 And we're also making significant 14 process improvements in areas such as the 15 enterprise cyber command center, enterprise 16 risk assessments, enterprise identity management, and so forth, which are the 17 cornerstones of a best-practice cybersecurity 18 19 program. 20 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Are you a 21 cybersecurity expert yourself? 22 DIRECTOR MILLER: I am not, sir. 23 That's why --24 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Have you had any

1	cybersecurity experience in other positions
2	prior to your becoming IT head?
3	DIRECTOR MILLER: No. I have
4	experience extensively as a chief information
5	officer, and that's why I'm very pleased that
6	we've hired Jim Garrett, as I mentioned
7	earlier, as our chief information security
8	officer. He's a
9	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: What experts you
10	said you've deployed experts. Does that mean
11	your agency has contracted with experts in
12	the field
13	DIRECTOR MILLER: Yes.
14	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: for consultant
15	services?
16	DIRECTOR MILLER: We're currently
17	working with Deloitte.
18	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: With pardon me.
19	Stewart? I couldn't hear.
20	SENATOR KRUEGER: Repeat the name?
21	DIRECTOR MILLER: With Deloitte.
22	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Oh, Deloitte.
23	What additional steps have you
24	suggested to the agencies that hold the most

1 private of information, particularly the Tax 2 Department, the Health Department? What have 3 your technology people done with the technology people from those departments to 4 5 establish appropriate firewall safeguards? Industry best practices, certainly. But is 6 7 Deloitte -- are they giving your agency 8 consulting expertise and suggestions with additional infrastructure to establish within 9 10 the IT systems? DIRECTOR MILLER: Well, we have 11 12 information security experts embedded in 13 every agency. And they are part of the chief information security office's team. And they 14 15 are experts in the particular challenges of 16 that agency, whether it be HIPAA, whether it be federal law related to tax, and so on and 17 18 so forth. So that we have experts embedded 19 in each team.

20 And we are working with every agency 21 to educate them in the risks of cybersecurity 22 and to undertake steps such as classification 23 of their data, to make sure that every 24 agency, every agency head understands the

vulnerabilities of their data and what needs
 to be protected when.

3 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I guess what I --I'm doubly concerned about the fact we're 4 5 relying on each agency, which primarily has had a workforce that has not been exposed to 6 7 cyber attacks, are not expert in those 8 fields, yet you're indicating they're the centerpiece of reliance on protecting this 9 10 data. And what type of real-world 11 experience, particularly from the private 12 sector, is being brought into the public 13 sector to provide the real-life experience --I mean government, thank God, has not been 14 15 the recipient of major attacks yet at the 16 state level, although you're indicating that the breaches are pretty uniform and 17 18 broad-based -- or the attacks, not breaches. 19 DIRECTOR MILLER: Right. 20 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: The attacks are 21 broad-based. What I -- I'm just trying to 22 probe -- and this is what the subject of Senator Croci's hearing was about last year 23 24 that you couldn't attend. But this is the

1 kind of thing that we're trying to probe. 2 What type of protections are being provided 3 to New Yorkers that their data is being held in a secure way with the most appropriate 4 5 cyber protections available? DIRECTOR MILLER: Let me clarify. 6 7 Cybersecurity is a centralized function within ITS. It's not devolved to the 8 agencies, although we have representatives of 9 10 the cyber team embedded with each agency to make sure that we're mindful of any 11 12 particular requirements in each agency. 13 It's a very highly skilled, very 14 specialized team. And we do rely on 15 third-party experts wherever we deem it 16 necessary. So as I said before, we are -- we remain paranoid rather than complacent, and 17 18 at every occasion we ask ourselves do we have 19 the expertise in-house for a particular aspect of cybersecurity or do we need to rely 20 21 on a third party. 22 And in fact as part of the arrangement

with the Multistate ISAC and the Center for
Internet Security, we have access to external

1 experts through those relationships.

SENATOR NOZZOLIO: That this is a 2 3 subject that I believe the Senate should probe further, and that we definitely will be 4 5 back to you. We appreciate your discussions today in this budgetary context. You have a 6 7 very important responsibility, and we need to make sure that you have the resources 8 available to you to conduct that protection 9 10 of our data, particularly in light of the rest of the world and what's happening out 11 12 there. So thank you very much for your time 13 14 and your answering our questions. 15 DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you. 16 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. Our next speaker is Senator Krueger. 17 SENATOR KRUEGER: Good afternoon, or 18 19 close to evening. 20 Many of us sat through a double hearing yesterday, and one of the hearings 21 22 was on workforce development for the state. And there was testimony that in the last two 23

24 years your department lost 6 percent of your

state workforce but you've increased the
 number of consultants by five times, from 164
 to 849.

4 So you just testified about the 5 exacerbation of significant retirement. So 6 I'm just curious, even as you're seeing some 7 shrinkage already in the workforce, how can 8 you explain such a radical growth in the 9 number of consultants in your department?

10 DIRECTOR MILLER: It's -- it's a 11 challenge. And as I just said, we can hire 12 at the entry level very aggressively, which 13 we are doing. But we don't just need skill, 14 we need experience as well as skill. And of 15 course what we're losing is experience. So 16 that's a huge challenge for us.

17 And we had hoped in this budget cycle to repeat the insourcing initiative, whereby 18 some years ago we were allowed to actually 19 20 hire a large number of those contractors as 21 state staff and bring them into the 22 workforce, bring them into the union workforce. And that would provide an 23 24 injection of expertise, experience and skill

1 to plug the gap and reduce the spend on 2 contractors.

3 We were very much hoping to do that. Unfortunately, our local PEF colleagues 4 5 weren't prepared to work with us on that. But we're very optimistic that the senior PEF 6 7 leadership will work with us on that in the future. That seems to be the most obvious 8 and most -- the quickest way of plugging that 9 10 gap.

Otherwise, you know, I'm open to
 suggestions as to how to fill that gap.
 Given the restrictions we work within, it's
 very difficult.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So I'm a little
confused. So what presents you from hiring
new more senior people? You said you can
only hire junior people. Is there some rule
that prevents you from hiring --

20DIRECTOR MILLER: Under civil service21law, we can only hire at entry level from the22external world.

23 SENATOR KRUEGER: Only at entry level.
24 Okay. And do you agree with PEF's analysis

1 that the cost for consultants is 2 significantly higher per person than state 3 employees? 4 DIRECTOR MILLER: I do. That's why we 5 would very much like to turn some of those consultants into state employees. We'd love 6 7 to. SENATOR KRUEGER: Certain agencies are 8 desperately in need of modernization for 9 10 their technology and computerization. The Department of Housing and Development, HDS --11 12 HCR, excuse me. I'm getting my letters 13 confused -- Housing and Community 14 Development, thank you, has literally -- I'm 15 not even going to say it's computers, maybe 16 ancient DOS computers, but in a number of its divisions, just huge piles of paper records. 17 18 They were promised to somehow be on a 19 priority list of computerization, I think 20 when Governor Cuomo first got in. 21 Can you update me at all about where 22 computerization of that agency is? DIRECTOR MILLER: Yes, certainly. 23 24 That particular initiative is something I've

1 been personally involved in over the past 2 year. There's been certain delays, but what 3 I would say is that the RFP for that work is just about ready to issue. And we look 4 5 forward to implementing a 21st-century system for them as soon as we practically can. 6 7 SENATOR KRUEGER: Can you give me an estimated time? 8 DIRECTOR MILLER: I don't want to do 9 10 that quite yet until we have the responses from the RFP. But we haven't --11 12 SENATOR KRUEGER: And you've only been 13 here two years or --14 DIRECTOR MILLER: A year and a bit. 15 Year and two months, I think. 16 SENATOR KRUEGER: So it was my 17 understanding they were like in the top list 18 of priority agencies. Are there other 19 agencies that are also in queue and haven't gotten to even the RFP process yet? 20 21 DIRECTOR MILLER: Well, we've just 22 been through a very rigorous process of prioritizing initiatives in the budget for 23 24 the new year. So we asked every agency to

1 put forward their proposals for the projects 2 that they wanted to pursue in the new year, 3 and for them to choose what was most important. And we're about to publish, I 4 5 think maybe next week, the final list of projects that have been requested by the 6 7 agencies and that DOB have verified there is funding for. So it really is entirely up to 8 9 the agencies what they prioritize. 10 SENATOR KRUEGER: We passed a law, 11 often just nicknamed the SAFE Act, that 12 required the state to develop a database for 13 ammunition. What's the process and what 14 stage are you at in preparing a request for 15 software development for this database, or do 16 we already have that done? DIRECTOR MILLER: Well, the budget was 17 18 provided, as you know, in 2013-2014, and 19 there was some \$27 million in capital funds, 20 I think, at that point for the SAFE Act. 21 We've spent \$9.3 million already, and

we're ready with the pistol permitting
process. That is pretty much ready to be
rolled out. Because as you know, we need to

begin that process in January 2017. So we're 1 2 confident that that piece of the program will 3 be rolled out in time so that we don't end up with a huge workload for the county clerks. 4 5 The ammunition sales database is -that's something that's been a little 6 7 problematic. We've been doing a great deal of research on that, and we've offered 8 Superintendent D'Amico three different 9 10 solutions. But unfortunately, to date, we haven't come up with a solution that is 11 12 acceptable to him, either for cost or usability reasons. So we're continuing to 13 14 research to see if we can find a solution 15 that's acceptable to State Police. SENATOR KRUEGER: So you believe you 16 came up with three alternatives to model that 17 database, but the State Police have not 18 19 approved any of the three? 20 DIRECTOR MILLER: Not to date. As I 21 say, either for cost or usability reasons. 22 So we'll keep working on it until we can find something that they believe is workable. 23 24 SENATOR KRUEGER: Do you know what the

1 current obstacles are that we still cannot 2 overcome? DIRECTOR MILLER: Not in detail, I'm 3 4 afraid. Not in detail. 5 SENATOR KRUEGER: And was your office involved in the I-STOP technology? The 6 7 I-STOP -- I, dash, STOP -- that was for opioid prescription tracking. 8 9 DIRECTOR MILLER: Oh. No, sorry. No. 10 SENATOR KRUEGER: So questions about 11 that aren't relevant for your office. 12 Thank you. 13 DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you. (Discussion off the record at 14 committee table.) 15 16 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Senator Croci. SENATOR CROCI: Thank you, Madam 17 18 Chair. 19 One additional question, ma'am. 20 You said 1200 contract staff. What's 21 the total cost? 22 DIRECTOR MILLER: It's approximately \$245 million a year. 23 24 SENATOR CROCI: \$245 million. And

1 these are individuals who have to have 2 specialized skill sets, I'm assuming some 3 sort of a thorough vetting process before they're given access to sensitive information 4 5 procedures. DIRECTOR MILLER: Oh, indeed. Yes. 6 7 SENATOR CROCI: What kind of vetting goes on for these individuals? Does the 8 contract agent -- are they required to 9 10 provide employees who are properly vetted, or is there additional vetting done by your 11 12 agency? 13 DIRECTOR MILLER: We apply the same 14 vetting as we do to our permanent staff, 15 including fingerprinting. 16 SENATOR CROCI: And 1200 -- is it one agency that's providing these individuals, or 17 18 is it multiple companies? 19 DIRECTOR MILLER: No. No, it's a 20 range. A great many of them are HBITS staff 21 and sourced from minority- and women-owned businesses. 22 SENATOR CROCI: Okay. And with regard 23 24 to that, since you raised it, OGS has a

1 conflict with your data on veterans, 2 disabled-veteran-owned businesses --3 DIRECTOR MILLER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear. 4 5 SENATOR CROCI: OGS, who did a report on the minority-, women-, and service-6 7 disabled-owned businesses, differs -- there's 8 a disparity in their accounting of your agency's compliance with the service-disabled 9 veteran set-aside. So I'd ask for -- at some 10 point for you to get that information back to 11 12 us --13 DIRECTOR MILLER: Oh, sure. 14 SENATOR CROCI: -- just to ensure that 15 there's not a disparity. DIRECTOR MILLER: Yeah. 16 SENATOR CROCI: And with regard to 17 your staffing issues, the great expertise 18 that's been developed over the years started 19 in the Department of Defense, I believe, 20 21 certainly within the services. And there are 22 a lot of veterans who have this skill set and 23 are eager to be employed. So perhaps that's 24 a potential answer for us that would satisfy

Senator Krueger's desire to bring some of
 this in-house, and certainly our desire to
 hire veterans in New York.

DIRECTOR MILLER: I'm glad you raised 4 5 that, sir. There is a particular initiative 6 that I'm associated with out of Columbia 7 University, called Workforce Opportunity Services that actually looks to specifically 8 train veterans in IT skills and place them 9 10 with employers. We are actively looking at making use of that initiative if we can find 11 12 the right procurement vehicle.

SENATOR CROCI: Well, I'm happy to be
of assistance in any way. Thank you, ma'am.
DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you. Thank
you.

17 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

18 Any other legislator want to ask

19 questions?

20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.

I believe that you made a statement a little while ago saying that there was over \$27 million allocated in the 2013-2014 budget specifically for the SAFE Act that was

1 capital. That is not a true settlement. 2 There was no lining out in the state budget 3 regarding those funds. 4 So I just want to point that out, 5 because that was not a correct statement, 6 number one. 7 DIRECTOR MILLER: I apologize. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Number two, you 8 said that you've actually used \$9 million 9 10 toward the ammunition database. And when was 11 that? 12 DIRECTOR MILLER: Not for the ammunition database, no. This is for the 13 14 pistol research part of the work. We 15 haven't -- we have not yet spent money on the 16 ammunition database. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: You have not spent 17 18 money on the ammunition database. 19 DIRECTOR MILLER: That's correct. 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: And you're aware of 21 the MOU that's in place. 22 DIRECTOR MILLER: I'm sorry? 23 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: You're aware of the 24 memorandum of understanding that's in place

1 right now not to develop the database.

2 DIRECTOR MILLER: I am indeed. As I 3 testified earlier, we have done research, but that's all we've done with regard to the 4 5 ammunition database. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 6 7 That concludes the testimony, so thank you for being here. 8 9 DIRECTOR MILLER: Thank you. 10 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: So this is where 11 we're at, just to let the speakers know. We 12 have 26 speakers in the queue now. A few of 13 those are multiperson panels. And the time 14 is late, obviously; it's 5:30. We had five 15 state agencies on Public Protection testify 16 today, the judiciary testified today. And so I just want to ask of the 17 18 speakers, if you have written testimony 19 that's lengthy, we would prefer that you did 20 not read the whole thing. And if you could 21 try to come down and hit the most salient 22 points, maybe do your presentation in five minutes, just so we can get all the speakers 23 24 in before midnight. And then based from

<ul> <li>questions or may not. So let's start this</li> <li>portion of the hearing.</li> <li>And first we have Bill Leahy, director</li> <li>of the New York State Office of Indigent</li> <li>Legal Services.</li> <li>And if speakers would prefer to submit</li> <li>their testimony, they may do that also if</li> <li>they don't want to stay.</li> <li>Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy,</li> <li>we will have the administrator of the New</li> <li>York State Commission on Judicial Conduct.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>And first we have Bill Leahy, director</li> <li>of the New York State Office of Indigent</li> <li>Legal Services.</li> <li>And if speakers would prefer to submit</li> <li>their testimony, they may do that also if</li> <li>they don't want to stay.</li> <li>Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy,</li> <li>we will have the administrator of the New</li> </ul>	
5 of the New York State Office of Indigent 6 Legal Services. 7 And if speakers would prefer to submit 8 their testimony, they may do that also if 9 they don't want to stay. 10 Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy, 11 we will have the administrator of the New	
<ul> <li>6 Legal Services.</li> <li>7 And if speakers would prefer to submit</li> <li>8 their testimony, they may do that also if</li> <li>9 they don't want to stay.</li> <li>10 Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy,</li> <li>11 we will have the administrator of the New</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>And if speakers would prefer to submit</li> <li>their testimony, they may do that also if</li> <li>they don't want to stay.</li> <li>Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy,</li> <li>we will have the administrator of the New</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 their testimony, they may do that also if</li> <li>9 they don't want to stay.</li> <li>10 Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy,</li> <li>11 we will have the administrator of the New</li> </ul>	
9 they don't want to stay. 10 Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy, 11 we will have the administrator of the New	
10Following Mr. Leahy, Director Leahy,11we will have the administrator of the New	
11 we will have the administrator of the New	
12 York State Commission on Judicial Conduct	
13 Welcome, Director.	
14 DIRECTOR LEAHY: Thank you, Madam	
15 Chairwoman.	
16 And congratulations on your position,	
17 even though at this hour you might be	
18 regretting it. And greetings to all the	
19 Senators and Assemblymembers who are here.	
20 Let me begin and I will try to	
21 address the salient points. I'm here to talk	
22 about the current situation with respect to	
23 the provision of counsel in the State of	

1 And I come here at a time when we are 2 just a couple of weeks away from the fifth 3 anniversary of the creation of my office, the 4 Office of Indigent Legal Services. And 5 before the legislative session is over, we 6 will have hit the 10th anniversary of the 7 Kaye Commission report.

And for those of who you don't 8 remember, that Kaye Commission report in 2006 9 10 described the state of the provision of counsel for people who cannot afford to 11 12 retain counsel in the State of New York as a 13 "fragmented system of county-operated and 14 largely county-financed indigent defense 15 services that fails to satisfy the state's 16 constitutional and statutory obligations to protect the rights of the indigent accused." 17 Quite a serious indictment of the 18 19 State of New York's compliance with one of 20 its basic governmental responsibilities. 21 Partly as a result of that Kaye 22 Commission report, my agency was created and I came in as director. As I mentioned 23

24 earlier, it's five years that we've been

1 here. I happen to have a five-year term, 2 which is also shortly to expire. Thanks to 3 the unanimous recommendation of my board -one of whose members, Senator John Dunne, is 4 5 here today -- and thanks to the cooperation of Governor Cuomo, I am happy to say that I 6 7 am embarking on a new five-year term in about three weeks. And I'm glad I can, because 8 there's an awful lot of work yet to be done. 9 10 We've made some great strides. We've 11 made it with the cooperation of this 12 Legislature. We're very grateful to you. 13 Let me tell you where we are today in 14 the wake of the Executive Budget. A year 15 after the Kaye Commission report was filed, the New York Civil Liberties Union filed the 16 Hurrell-Harring lawsuit that has been 17 18 referenced a few times by earlier speakers today, and by members. That lawsuit came to 19 20 a negotiated settlement in October 2014 between the State of New York, five counties 21 22 of Ontario, Onondaga, Schuyler, Suffolk and Washington, and my agency was chosen as the 23 24 implementing agency.

1 So that happened in October 2014. And 2 what I said at that time were two things that 3 are still very important today. One, the State of New York, the Governor deserved an 4 5 enormous amount of credit for acknowledging for the very first time since County Law 18-B 6 7 was enacted in 1965 that it is the state's 8 responsibility, not an individual county's responsibility, to make sure that the 9 10 Constitution and the laws are complied with 11 and to make sure, to cite one of my favorite 12 quotes from one of my favorite Attorneys General of the nation, Janet Reno, "the best 13 14 protection against wrongful convictions is 15 the presence of a good lawyer." 16 And so at that time the two things I

said were, one, that the Governor was right 17 18 to acknowledge that it is the state's 19 responsibility. He was right to vest the 20 implementation in an independent professional 21 agency that, just as the superintendent of 22 State Police who testified so impressively, knows what it's about, knows what it is 23 24 doing, knows how to make things right.

1 And then the second thing, of course, 2 was I pointed out there's one big problem. 3 And I wasn't the only one who pointed it out. Mark Williams, the Cattaraugus County public 4 5 defender and the president-elect of the Chief Defenders Association of New York -- you'll 6 7 be hearing from him I hope shortly -- he said it at the time as well, that it's just simply 8 unfair that five counties receive the 9 10 benefits of appropriate representation, state-funded representation, and all the rest 11 12 of the upstate counties do not. Of course New York City, 2009, this 13 14 Legislature acted to reduce caseloads, with 15 ample state funding that goes to New York 16 City now to the tune of about \$55 million a year. 17 18 So flash-forward now to the Executive 19 Budget. First I want to say the 20 implementation in those five counties --21 because there were skeptics who said, Well, 22 yeah, the Governor entered into this settlement, but are he and his people really 23 24 going to support it, are they really going to

comply with its provisions, are they really 1 2 going to fund it? Yes, yes, and yes. 3 The Governor has cooperated at every step. His first assistant legal counsel, 4 5 Sandi Toll, has shepherded and honored our independent implementation. She and his 6 7 office have supported us at every turn. So 8 there are no worries on that score, and I want to be clear about that. 9 10 The second thing is I want to 11 congratulate and thank the Governor with 12 respect to the Hurrell-Harring portion of the 13 Executive Budget, because we have been given 14 all the tools, all the staff, all the funding 15 that we need to implement that settlement 16 effectively. That's a big deal. Because for once, New York is going to get it right with 17 18 respect to indigent defense. And that's big 19 news. 20 Now the other big news is the Tale of

Two Cities or the Tale of Two Counties or the Tale of Two States, however you want to characterize it. I put in my written testimony, you know, Clinton in the northeast

1 and Chautauqua in the southwest and Niagara 2 in the northwest and all of that. 3 But really the best way to graphically illustrate it, I think, is just to take the 4 5 two counties on Long Island, the two most populous counties in the state outside of New 6 7 York City. And they both have huge needs, they've both made great efforts as counties. 8 They have both partnered with us over five 9 10 years very effectively, but with minimal funding. Now Suffolk will get a big chunk of 11 12 the \$10.4 million in this Executive Budget, 13 should you approve it -- and I urge you to 14 approve it -- to reduce caseloads to 15 appropriate levels, New York City-type 16 levels. Nassau County, under fiscal control, doing its best, working hard with a terrific 17 public defender, Kent Moston, one of the 18 19 smartest, wisest, best public defenders in 20 the state -- they're left behind. 21 And if you want to take another look, 22 go a little more traditional upstate, you can

23 go to the two cities of Syracuse and

24 Rochester. Very similar cities, they have

1 their struggles, they're trying hard.

Syracuse is getting very significant assistance under this settlement. We've had terrific cooperation from the county attorney's office in Syracuse. I'm going to be going out to see Bob Durr, the new county attorney, next week to continue the path forward.

9 And then you have Rochester. 10 Rochester has another great public defender, 11 Tim Donaher. They've had terrific county 12 leadership. What they don't have is state 13 funding. And so the city court caseloads are 14 wildly in excess of any rational maximum in 15 the City of Rochester.

And on the appellate side, we have a great appellate unit -- there's a three-year delay before someone gets his or her right to appeal. And they're sitting in prison or jail.

21 So what can be done? Well, we have 22 \$34 million that we requested in our budget 23 request, and the final two pages of our 24 handout tells the whole story as far as the

1 numbers are concerned. One page is our 2 request, \$139.26 million. The second page is 3 the Executive Budget. And yes, there's an 4 over \$12 million increase. It's big, we're 5 very grateful for it. It's the biggest increase we've ever seen. It pales in 6 7 comparison to a lot of the numbers that have been thrown around here earlier today, but 8 it's a big number to us, and we're deeply 9 10 grateful to the Governor for it. 11 The problem is New York cannot 12 tolerate -- Senator DeFrancisco said this recently better than I ever could. He said: 13 14 Who could be against this idea that there 15 should be one standard of justice in this 16 state? There can't be two. And right now that's what we have. 17 18 So we're coming to you and we're 19 asking you to do what we tried unsuccessfully 20 to get the Executive to do, which is to 21 provide significant funding in the 22 legislative budget for the non-Hurrell-Harring counties. 23 24 For what reasons? Primarily two. We

1 start to reduce the caseloads, number one. 2 And number two, eliminate this intolerable 3 lack of compliance with the most fundamental 4 legal obligation, to have a lawyer at a 5 defendant's side when that magistrate or judge is considering whether to leave the 6 7 person at liberty or put them into pretrial detention. That is just intolerable. 8 At the Court of Appeals, it's been six 9 10 years since the Court of Appeals has said so. 11 And the fact that we still have large swaths 12 of upstate in which there is no counsel at arraignment is just -- just should not be 13 14 tolerated a minute longer. 15 That's probably a little bit more than 16 you wanted, but I'm open for questions. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 17 18 The Assembly? 19 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: We will hear from Member Lentol. 20 21 ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Thank you very 22 much, Mr. Chairman. 23 Is my mic on? No. 24 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: How many years

1 have you been here?

-	
2	(Laughter.)
3	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Too long.
4	First of all, Bill, I want to thank
5	you for the five wonderful years that you've
6	given us. You've really lifted this office
7	to where none of us ever would have thought
8	it could have gone. And you've been just
9	tremendous in changing the whole landscape of
10	providing legal defense services for the
11	indigent.
12	DIRECTOR LEAHY: Thank you.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: And so I couldn't
14	agree with you more about the Hurrell-Harring
15	problem, that we need to have all of the
16	counties on an equal footing. This is a
17	disservice to all of the counties. This is
18	really what some of my colleagues can call an
19	unfunded mandate. And it's an unfunded
20	mandate for legal services that are required
21	by the Constitution of the United States of
22	America.
23	So I just wanted to talk to you a
24	little bit about the bill that I introduced

1 last year that OCA -- a program bill to 2 transfer authority to approve bar association 3 plans for the operation of an assigned counsel program of conflict defender, from 4 5 the chief administrator of the courts to your office, to the Office of Indigent Defense 6 7 Services, with the statutory mission to make sure that we have quality 18-B, as we call 8 it, services provided for indigent 9 10 defendants. 11 And I think I know the answer, but do 12 you support this legislation? DIRECTOR LEAHY: Oh, certainly we do. 13 And really this has been, you know, kind of 14 15 an understanding with OCA since our probably 16 first year. The OCA responsibility goes back to the day when there was no state agency 17 18 with the expertise or the resources to undertake this responsibility. And I know 19 there is a big backlog of county conflict 20 21 defender plans that have been sitting with 22 OCA, essentially waiting for the day when we can take over that responsibility. We're 23 24 ready, willing and able.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: Okay. And I
2	guess you would agree that that would enhance
3	your ability to provide quality 18-B services
4	to indigent defendants.
5	DIRECTOR LEAHY: Yes, absolutely, in
6	continuation of our partnership with the
7	counties and the providers.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: That would be
9	great. Thank you, sir.
10	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
11	Our next speaker is Senator Ruth
12	Hassell-Thompson.
13	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you,
14	Madam Chair.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN LENTOL: And by the way,
16	before I finish, I just want to congratulate
17	Assemblywoman Fahy and Assemblyman McDonald
18	for introducing that bill in the Assembly to
19	actually bring us into the 21st century in
20	providing legal services for indigents
21	throughout the State of New York.
22	DIRECTOR LEAHY: I join you in that.
23	I just had the pleasure of reading
24	Assemblyman McDonald's I think it was the

1	blog in the Times Union. That was very
2	eloquent.
3	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
4	Senator?
5	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you.
6	I was afraid you'd moved into my time.
7	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: We know better than
8	that.
9	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: No, I don't
10	have a lot of questions. Most of them you
11	answered. And as I was trying to read
12	quickly through your presentation, some of
13	the answers are there.
14	You know, I too would like to
15	congratulate you, Mr. Leahy, for an
16	extraordinary five years. It was a struggle,
17	and we got a lot of pushback. But I
18	appreciate your tenacity and certainly the
19	fact that you were one of the first ones here
20	today, and still here to give your testimony,
21	is just a statement of how tenacious you are
22	about something that you really care about
23	and believe in. And so I just want you to
24	know that I appreciate that.

1	As we began to talk before
2	Hurrell-Harring was settled, we had an idea
3	of what the five counties' issues were in
4	terms of their backlog. What's your sense of
5	the backlog for the 52 counties that we're
6	now going to that will be Phase 2 of our
7	next struggle, I suppose?
8	DIRECTOR LEAHY: Well, I think in
9	general you can say that the average
10	situation in the 52 counties is slightly
11	worse than the situation was in New York City
12	when this Legislature came to the rescue of
13	New York City in 2009. In other words, the
14	average weighted caseload in our most recent
15	upstate caseload report, 616 cases among
16	institutional providers. It was around 582,
17	I believe, in New York City back in 2009.
18	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Two years
19	ago we went to Washington, D.C., for the
20	anniversary of Gideon, and we were deeply
21	concerned about civil legal services as well.
22	But just making sure that people who come to
23	court are represented. But we came back
24	really looking at this thing and saying it's

1 wonderful to have all these attorneys and 2 have all these laws on the books, but without 3 the case caps and some of the other pieces that we've added to it, most of the attorneys 4 5 were showing up in court with a folder and saying, "Plead out, because I don't have time 6 7 to study it. You know, I just have a caseload that's unbelievable." 8 Are you telling me that that's what's 9 10 going on now in the 52 counties? DIRECTOR LEAHY: Back when I was 11 12 serving in Massachusetts, I was quoted as 13 saying that control of caseloads is a sine 14 qua non of good representation. You can't 15 have good representation without controlled 16 caseloads, no matter how good of a lawyer you are, no matter how much you care. 17 18 So your point is an excellent one. 19 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Right. 20 Well, again, I just -- I would like to be 21 sure that the fact that this budget is flat 22 is going to give you, number one, what you need to satisfy Hurrell-Harring and, number 23

24 two, that this level budget will not have a

1 negative impact on your goals for 2015-2016. DIRECTOR LEAHY: Well, as I say, we 2 3 need help from the Legislature and we will need help from the Governor at the table to 4 5 achieve some progress for the upstate counties. I mean, all that we have right 6 7 now -- in fact, we have the threat where some counties -- we have 25 counties right now who 8 are participating in our Counsel at First 9 10 Appearance Grant Program. The three years of 11 that program comes due at about the end of 12 this year. So we will be putting out a new RFP. 13 14 Now, there is \$800,000 in the 15 Governor's budget to protect the four out of 16 the five lawsuit counties, to hold them harmless so that they don't -- they're 17 18 participating in that, among the 25 counties, 19 in that Counsel at Arraignment Program. So 20 if they were to be unsuccessful in their 21 effort. 22 But the point is there's only \$4 million in that fund. And without support 23 24 from the Legislature, we know that now -- now

1 that all counties do understand -- they 2 didn't five years ago -- that there is a 3 legal right to representation. This is not just some liberal idea, this is the law, and 4 5 everybody knows it now. And so we expect the other 32 counties will be coming in. So, you 6 7 know, the \$4 million that's being used now, not only does it only cover 25 counties, but 8 it only covers portions of those counties. 9

10 So the need is great. I mean, we requested \$8 million additional. We know 11 12 that economies can be made, and we're working 13 with OCA to come up with a potential 14 legislative solution that would allow for 15 centralizing arraignments maybe in one or two 16 locations in rural counties, rather than 30 or 40, as at present. Which I think 17 18 everybody could get behind, and I think 19 everybody would be enthusiastic about it. 20 It's -- and I think it is underway.

21 We hope to have it here in this session. But 22 still, there's an undeniable cost to 23 providing a lawyer at arraignment, just as 24 there is with providing a lawyer anywhere.

1 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you. 2 Thank you, Madam Chair. 3 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. And thank you, Director, for being 4 5 here today. We truly appreciate it. 6 DIRECTOR LEAHY: Thank you. 7 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speaker is Robert Tembeckjian, the administrator of the 8 New York City office of the New York State 9 10 Commission on Judicial Conduct. 11 Welcome, Administrator. And my first 12 question is, how badly did I butcher your name? 13 14 ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Yes, you 15 pronounced it correctly. You got it exactly 16 right. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Exactly right, wow. 17 18 I'm happy to hear that. 19 ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Yes, thank 20 you. My mother would be pleased if you'd 21 come to dinner. 22 I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the budget committee here about the 23 24 Executive recommendation for the Commission

1 on Judicial Conduct.

2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Could you pull your
3	mic a little bit closer, please? Thank you.
4	ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Yes, happy
5	to.
6	As you know, the commission is created
7	in the State Constitution. We are the entity
8	of government that is responsible for
9	enforcing judicial ethics on the 3500 members
10	of the state judiciary. We are not an
11	executive agency, but our budget is submitted
12	to the Legislature in the Executive Budget
13	with a recommendation by the Governor so that
14	the Judiciary would not be in a position to
15	control the commission's budget. That
16	decision was made at the commission's
17	inception about 40 years ago.
18	For the sixth year in a row, the
19	Executive Budget is recommending a flat
20	budget for the commission, not one penny
21	more. Over the last six or seven years, the
22	economies that we have been required to
23	initiate in order to live within the
24	constraints of the budget that has been

recommended by the Governor, has resulted in
 a reduction of our staff by about 18 percent,
 from 55 authorized full-time employees to 45
 actual full-time employees.

5 Now, unlike any other Executive Budget recommendation -- certainly if we're thinking 6 7 or talking about executive agency heads -- I would not be in a position to come before you 8 and disagree with the Executive Budget 9 10 recommendation. But because the commission 11 is an independent entity in the State Constitution, I can and I have in the past 12 13 asked the Legislature for help where the Executive Budget has tended to treat us with 14 15 some benign neglect.

16 And the Legislature has come through. Three times since 2007, I have asked for help 17 from the Legislature, and you have come 18 through each time. This will be the fourth 19 20 time that I'm doing it. I'm asking for an 21 additional \$186,000 so that we can maintain 22 the status quo -- not have to reduce staff any further, not have to reduce our services 23 24 any further in order to stay where we are

1 now.

2	That number, it seems to me, pales in
3	significance to the overall State Budget,
4	certainly. And it pales in significance
5	compared to what we have heard other agencies
6	testify as to what the Division of Budget is
7	able to do when they determine that agencies
8	ought to be helped in the Executive Budget to
9	fulfill their mission.
10	The reduction in staff, the reduction
11	is services has meant that it takes longer to
12	discipline judges who are found guilty of
13	misconduct, which is a disservice to the
14	public interest, and it means that it takes
15	longer for us to exonerate those judges who
16	have been wrongly accused, which is
17	disrespectful to the independence of the
18	Judiciary and to the individual judges who
19	have to endure investigation for longer
20	periods than is right or fair.
21	We're not asking for much. And in an
22	era when enhanced public interest has been

24 commission that is arguably the most

1 effective ethics enforcer in the state -- in 2 40 years the commission has handled over 3 52,000 complaints of misconduct, we have initiated 10,000 preliminary inquiries, we 4 5 have conducted 8,000 full-fledged investigations, and we have publicly 6 7 disciplined 801 judges, including 224 who have been removed from office or publicly 8 stipulated to permanent resignation because 9 10 of misconduct. That is an exemplary record 11 that is being threatened or challenged by 12 inappropriately low levels of funding. As I said, I'm not asking for much 13 14 help. \$186,000, which would bring our overall budget up to \$5.77 million, is really 15 16 a drop in the bucket Compared to the 140-some-odd billion State Budget. And in a 17 18 time when revenue expenditures or revenue 19 projections are going up, when executive 20 agencies have been asked to limit their 21 growth to 2 percent, the fact that we're not 22 getting one penny more from the Executive Budget seems to me to be unfair, unnecessary, 23 24 and unduly inhibiting our ability to fulfill

1 our mission.

2	So again, as I have in the past
3	with success asked for your help, I'm
4	asking for it again here. I don't think it
5	is too much or should be too difficult. But
6	I am aware that there is a lot of competition
7	for, as high as it is, a relatively finite
8	amount of money. And I'm hoping that the
9	Legislature will, as it has before, consider
10	judicial ethics enforcement to be an
11	important priority for the state. And to
12	augment with relatively little what we need
13	to just keep the status quo and stop the
14	growing backlog and the decline of our
15	services.
16	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you,
17	Administrator Tembeckjian. I said it right
18	again, right
19	ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: You're
20	very welcome, Senator Young. Thank you.
21	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: so two?
22	Senator Krueger.
23	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you again for
24	your testimony this year.

1	You're right, your ask seems so
2	minimal it's actually a little shocking that
3	you don't get the same formula percentage
4	increase that we're seeing for other
5	agencies. So I empathize with your being
6	the, I guess, the orphan child
7	ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: The orphan
8	child, yes. Exactly right.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: Exactly.
10	I'm just curious that we do keep
11	increasing the number of judges in New York
12	State, and many people who participate on
13	these panels would argue we don't have enough
14	of them yet. If you were listening earlier
15	today, there was much discussion about
16	backlogs. So it seems to me, by definition
17	of having busier courts and more judges, on
18	some formula there would be more complaints
19	brought to you not necessarily because of
20	the quality of our judges per se, but just
21	statistically based on the potential for
22	problems that need to be investigated and
23	addressed.
24	Con you tall me part of whore you are

Can you tell me sort of where you are

1 in relationship to a growth in the judiciary
2 over the last few years?

ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Yes. Last 3 year we received 1958 new complaints. That 4 5 is the second highest in our history. And at the same time, our backlog grew at year end 6 7 by about 25 percent. We went from 171 at the end of 2014 to 204 at the end of last year. 8 We have reduced our staff by one, 9 10 again last year, as we had for the previous 11 four years. So that the number of judges is 12 increasing, as you say, the number of 13 complaints that we're receiving is 14 increasing, but the resources are staying

15 static.

16 As you know, a flat budget is really a cut. If we need \$186,000 just to meet our 17 18 additional rent expenses and other 19 contractual obligations, and don't get it, it 20 means that we have to reduce our current 21 budget, which is just a little under 22 \$5.6 million, by that \$186,000. Somehow I've got to find it. And the only way we've been 23 24 able to do that in the last five years has

1 been through the attrition of staff, not 2 replacing some people who have left, or --3 and this is good budgeting -- when someone at 4 a senior level leaves, if we can replace them 5 with someone more junior and save some money that way, we have always done that. 6 7 But our workload is increasing, and the time it's taking us to do that job is 8 also increasing because the budget is not 9 10 proportionately increasing. 11 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much 12 for your work. ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Thank you, 13 14 Senator. 15 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 16 much. I don't believe the Assembly has any questions for you. So you did a very 17 18 thorough job, Administrator Tembeckjian. 19 ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Thank you 20 very much. 21 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Now, I said it 22 correctly I believe three times. ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Three for 23 24 three, Senator, yeah.

1 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Does that qualify 2 me for a movie with that dinner? ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Breakfast, 3 4 lunch, and dinner. One apiece. 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Okay, thank you very much. 6 7 ADMINISTRATOR TEMBECKJIAN: Thank you 8 very much. 9 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: And thank you for 10 being here today. 11 Our next speaker -- and again, I'd 12 like to remind people, just for the sake of time -- and I apologize, it's 6 o'clock 13 14 now -- but we would welcome President Tom 15 Mungeer, of the Police Benevolent Association 16 of the New York State Troopers. So thank you very much, and we look 17 forward to what you have to say. And we also 18 19 appreciate you sticking with us for so long. 20 PRESIDENT MUNGEER: Thank you, Madam 21 Chair. 22 Distinguished members of the Legislature, it's an honor; this is my 23 24 seventh year in a row addressing you. I'm

1 just going to hit some very quick points; I'm
2 sure you're relieved to hear that.

Listening to my superintendent, I'm
not privy to some of the stuff -- recent
conversations he had with Budget, but I am
relying on the Governor's Executive Budget in
regards to rifles and cars.

This past year we've been through a 8 lot. We went over it before with the Clinton 9 10 County Dannemora prison break, the ratcheting 11 up of terrorist threats. There's never any 12 lack of missions for my troopers to do. On 13 top of that, in the last 10 years I've 14 suffered 18 line-of-duty deaths. So it is a 15 dangerous job. And I appreciate everybody's 16 support up here in the Legislature, giving us 17 the necessary tools.

18Those tools, number one, are vehicles.19The superintendent indicated that he should20be fine with the replacement of the vehicles.21Currently we have 50 percent of the vehicles22that are over 100,000 miles; I do agree with23him on that. But in the Governor's Executive24Budget, only \$15 million was allocated to

1 replace those vehicles.

2	In my math, anyway, we're going to
3	need another \$20 million. I know that's kind
4	of shocking compared to the last guy, who
5	wanted \$186,000. But, you know, we're
6	looking for \$20 million to bring it up and
7	replace these vehicles. We're going from
8	high speeds of zero to 100, back down to
9	zero, all day. And they do it's a lot of
10	wear and tear.
11	Other than that, manpower. The last
12	seven years I've harped that we need more
13	manpower. It's getting a lot better. In the
14	Governor's budget, there are allocation for
15	210 bodies. There is an academy class
16	they're planning for next month. But there
17	is not enough for two classes. Again, I'm
18	not privy to the conversation the
19	superintendent has had.
20	But, you know, it's absolutely
21	necessary that we have two classes of at
22	least 150 troopers to take care of the
23	attrition and also the expanded duties that
24	we're given every day.

1 So thank you. 2 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 3 much. 4 Senator Gallivan. 5 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you, Madam 6 Chair. 7 Mr. President, welcome again. Thanks for the work that you and your members do. 8 9 PRESIDENT MUNGEER: Thank you, 10 Senator. SENATOR GALLIVAN: You touched -- the 11 12 superintendent -- a number of us spoke with 13 the superintendent, and his testimony spoke 14 of the rifles and vehicles. I would just ask 15 that if you have follow-up with the 16 superintendent, there appears to be a little bit of difference. He did mention 17 \$30 million. I don't know if that's from 18 19 money that's in this year's budget somewhere 20 else --21 PRESIDENT MUNGEER: Yeah, I --SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- which is the 15 22 you just mentioned. But just -- if we need 23 24 to do work on it, let's just be sure to

1 follow up over the course of the next several 2 weeks as we go through the process. 3 PRESIDENT MUNGEER: I do have many conversations with the superintendent in any 4 5 given week. And again, what's black and white is the \$15 million. Whatever 6 7 conversations he's had with budget, it is not reflected in the Governor's Executive Budget. 8 So we have to, you know --9 10 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Understood. But he 11 spoke fairly confidently that it was going to 12 get done. But we just want to make sure that 13 it is done before we vote on a budget. 14 PRESIDENT MUNGEER: Absolutely. 15 Absolutely. 16 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: All set? Well, I 17 18 think we're all set. But on behalf of me, I 19 just want to say -- and my colleagues, I want to say how much we appreciate the jobs that 20 21 your members do every single day, standing up 22 and protecting the public. They have very difficult circumstances sometimes, but 23 24 they're professional, and we truly value what

1 they do.

2	So thank you for being here.
3	PRESIDENT MUNGEER: Thank you, Madam
4	Chair.
5	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speaker is
6	Christopher Quick, New York State Police
7	Investigators Association.
8	And behind President Quick is
9	President Mike Powers from NYSCOPBA.
10	So good evening. Welcome.
11	PRESIDENT QUICK: Good evening. Thank
12	you.
13	Good evening, Senators and
14	Assemblymembers. I am Christopher Quick, an
15	investigator with the New York State Police,
16	and I also serve as president of the New York
17	State Police Investigators Association,
18	otherwise known as NYSPIA. NYSPIA is the
19	employee union that represents 1,086 State
20	Police senior investigators and investigators
21	throughout the state.
22	State Police investigators are
23	assigned to stations or special details that
24	are referred to as the Bureau of Criminal

1 Investigation or BCI. Our investigators work 2 on everything from larcenies, robberies, 3 burglaries, identity theft, sex crimes, and homicides. We also have investigators 4 5 assigned to special details, including computer crimes, forensics, 6 7 narcotics, auto theft, dignitary protection, special investigations, gaming, and 8 9 counterterrorism. 10 The most public example of some of the 11 work we do was our investigation into the escape of the two inmates from Clinton 12

Correctional Facility this past June. Our investigators worked around the clock for 22 days, gathering and analyzing evidence that would ultimately lead to an end to the manhunt without a member of the public being harmed.

19Demand on the resources of the State20Police, particularly investigators, has21increased, whether it's to keep up with the22background checks for casinos being built in23New York State or keeping the public safe in24the face of the changing world we live in,

involving terrorism and mass attacks on the
 public. To ensure the safety of New Yorkers
 and its visitors, we must have the proper
 equipment and manpower.

One area in particular that is of 5 utmost importance is our aging fleet, as 6 7 you've heard earlier today, of our unmarked vehicles. The BCI fleet is currently 8 numbered at 1,177 vehicles. There are 688 9 10 vehicles with more 100,000 miles; that's 58 percent of the BCI fleet. There are 755 11 12 vehicles that are seven years or older, and 13 165 of them are 10 years or older.

14 Due to the age of our fleet, we have 15 experienced a number of mechanical, 16 electrical, and structural damages to the vehicles, including brake lines rusting 17 18 through, causing loss of brakes; loss of 19 headlights due to electrical wiring that's 20 become corroded; and rusting of integral 21 structural components that make up the body 22 or unibody of the vehicle. The results could 23 have been catastrophic to the member or the 24 public or both. We are lucky no one was

injured, but it is a risk we should not have
 to take.

3 Many of our investigators perform undercover operations. In these cases, our 4 5 investigators need to blend in with the community, both in disguise and with their 6 7 vehicles. These undercover operations can range from drug surveillance to 8 9 counterterrorism investigations. The 10 criminal element does its homework, and many are aware of the type of undercover vehicles 11 12 we typically use.

For that reason, we propose a pilot program to allow for the leasing of vehicles for these special details. A leased vehicle will allow our investigators many more choices of diverse makes and models and, most importantly, non-police-type vehicles for undercover work.

20 Leasing vehicles will also help reduce
21 the maintenance costs we currently
22 experience.

In addition to the desperate need formore unmarked vehicles, the Division of State

Police must be made whole again in terms of
 manpower in order to meet today's security
 threats.

4 Terrorism in the United States is on 5 the rise. The Governor recognizes this and 6 has dedicated a significant uniform trooper 7 presence in New York City as a result.

8 Superintendent D'Amico has repeatedly 9 stressed and fought for the need to have 10 recruit basic school classes at our academy 11 to bolster the needs of the division. We 12 have not been able to keep up with the 13 attrition.

14 We strongly urge this Legislature to 15 ensure our investigators are safe, as well as 16 the public, by adequately funding the Division of State Police to allow for the 17 18 purchase of unmarked vehicles and other 19 necessary safety equipment as well as funding 20 new and regular academy classes so we can 21 accomplish our core mission of protecting and 22 serving the people of this great state.

I appreciate your time in allowing meto give testimony, and I'm happy to answer

1 any questions you may have.

2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
3	Any questions? Senator Gallivan.
4	SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you, Madam
5	Chair.
6	Mr. President, thanks for your
7	testimony, for the work you do, and your
8	members as well.
9	I want to focus on the cars. We
10	understand the message on manpower; it's been
11	a consistent message along with the PBA and
12	the superintendent.
13	When the superintendent testified, the
14	talk was about vehicles in general, without a
15	breakdown between marked cars and unmarked
16	vehicles. Is it your understanding if you
17	know at all when the superintendent was
18	talking about the plan to replace cars, that
19	that included all vehicles? Or was he just
20	talking marked vehicles?
21	PRESIDENT QUICK: No, he included
22	officers' vehicles. And once the officer
23	vehicles that are unmarked, that would be the
24	remedy to push the cars down the line into

1 the back rooms and special details.

-	the back roomb and spectal details.
2	SENATOR GALLIVAN: Have you had
3	conversations with him as the plan that he
4	put forward, is it adequate to meet the needs
5	of your members?
6	PRESIDENT QUICK: Can you repeat that
7	again?
8	SENATOR GALLIVAN: When the
9	superintendent testified about his plan over
10	the next year or two to replace those
11	vehicles, does that satisfy the needs of your
12	investigators? The plan that he put forward.
13	PRESIDENT QUICK: It does. And the
14	consideration of leasing the unmarked cars,
15	that would give a more diverse choice, would
16	be an instant remedy to get more cars into
17	the field right away, versus ordering a fleet
18	of cars and waiting six months down the road.
19	SENATOR GALLIVAN: Understood. Thank
20	you.
21	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
22	The Assembly?
23	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: We're good.
24	Thank you.

1 PRESIDENT QUICK: Thank you. 2 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Well, thank you, 3 President, again. Please extend our 4 gratitude to your members. 5 PRESIDENT QUICK: Thank you. 6 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: And thank you for 7 being here today. Next up we have President Mike Powers, 8 New York State Correctional Officers And 9 10 Police Benevolent Association. 11 Welcome, President. 12 PRESIDENT POWERS: Thank you, Madam Chair. 13 14 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Could you introduce 15 the people joining you today? 16 PRESIDENT POWERS: I will. To my left is Executive Vice President Tammy Sawchuck. 17 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Welcome. 18 19 PRESIDENT POWERS: To my right is the 20 Northern Region Vice President Chris Hansen. 21 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Great. Thank you 22 for being here. PRESIDENT POWERS: And in the interest 23 24 of time and your lengthy agenda here, we'll

1 be quick.

2	Good afternoon, Assemblyman Farrell,
3	Senator Young, and esteemed members of the
4	fiscal committees. Thank you for allowing me
5	the opportunity to speak today on behalf of
6	my entire membership regarding the Governor's
7	proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year.
8	My name is Michael Powers, and I have
9	the privilege of serving as president of the
10	New York State Correctional Officers & Police
11	Benevolent Association, known as NYSCOPBA.
12	Among other titles, NYSCOPBA
13	represents approximately 20,000 dedicated
14	correctional officers and sergeants who are
15	charged with maintaining the care, custody
16	and control of our state's prison population,
17	a thankless job that is becoming more
18	dangerous each year.
19	I'll begin by stating the obvious.
20	Since we visited with you a year ago, the
21	correctional system in New York State has
22	faced the greatest challenge in its recent
23	history. Of course I'm talking about the
24	escape at the Clinton Correctional Facility

1 last June. We are all waiting for the 2 inspector general to complete her 3 investigation -- an investigation, we trust, that will not only reveal the specific facts 4 5 associated with the escape, but will also address the root causes of such a breakdown 6 7 in one of the most critical institutions in our society, namely our correctional 8 facilities. 9

10 When that investigation is complete 11 and we have had time to thoroughly digest its 12 findings and conclusions, I can assure you 13 that NYSCOPBA will clearly, forcefully and 14 frequently share its recommendations for how 15 New York's correctional system can be 16 improved.

NYSCOPBA can do this because of the 17 18 working knowledge its members have of our correctional system. We have shared these 19 20 recommendations with this administration and 21 with prior administrations, and we will 22 continue to do so until the one goal of every corrections advocate, regardless of political 23 24 or ideological persuasion, has been achieved.

1 That goal is the dramatic reduction in violence that afflicts inmates and staff 2 alike within the walls of New York's 3 correctional facilities. 4 5 Some of you may remember our testimony from last year. For the first time, we 6 7 presented visual displays of the amount of violence that afflicts New York's 8 correctional system. Sadly, I am duty bound 9 10 to share an even more troubling display than we provided last year. 11 12 According to data gathered by the Department of Corrections and Community 13 14 Supervision, inmate-on-inmate assaults grew 15 by 6 percent in 2015 and are up 47 percent from their recent low-water-mark of 2009. 16 Inmate-on-staff assaults grew by 20 17 percent last year, and are up more than 70 18 19 percent from the recent low in 2012. 20 There's also an explosion in the amount of contraband in the correctional 21 22 system, up nearly 24 percent from just the prior year. 23 24 Unfortunately, we are not aware of any

1 data on the amount of K2 or other drugs 2 possessed by inmates. But anecdotal evidence 3 and the contraband data suggest that they are rampant in most, if not all, facilities. 4 5 Let me remind you that this alarming rise in assaults and confiscation of 6 7 contraband have been occurring while the 8 inmate population has been falling by more than 5 percent. 9 10 Let me also repeat that it is our 11 belief that no one supports the more violent 12 system depicted by these graphs. We just do not agree on the root causes of this epidemic 13 14 or how to reverse it. 15 I would like to clearly and concisely 16 state what the dedicated professionals of NYSCOPBA believe. We believe it takes 17 18 resources to effectively provide care, custody and control of inmates. This is 19 20 especially true because a larger percentage 21 of the inmates inhabiting correctional 22 facilities -- nearly 2 out of 3 -- have been convicted of violent felonies. 23 24 It is also the case that inmates that

1 were originally assigned to maximum-security 2 facilities based on the nature of their conviction have been reshuffled to 3 medium-security facilities to address 4 5 overcrowding at the maximum-security prisons -- overcrowding, I should mention, 6 7 that still exists today. 8 The necessary resources I just mentioned come in the form of a sufficient 9 10 number of regularly and uniformly trained corrections officers outfitted with equipment 11 12 that enables them to both do their job and 13 return home safely to their family each 14 night. 15 While we are encouraged by the increase in correctional officer positions 16 that have been filled in the current fiscal 17 18 year, we have not yet reached a staffing 19 ratio that allows posts critical to the safety of inmates and staff to remain open as 20 21 their security plan dictates. 22 Meaningful training is not regularly available once a corrections officer leaves 23 24 the academy. All too often what is provided

1 does not focus on the tools and techniques 2 corrections officers need to provide security 3 to a facility. While we are encouraged by the 4 5 additional money proposed in this budget for better equipment at Clinton and certain other 6 7 facilities, in many cases the equipment correction officers rely on is embarrassingly 8 9 outdated and inadequate. And we are not 10 talking about high-tech devices you may see 11 in the movies; we're talking about basic 12 needs such as flashlights, batons, radios, vehicles and the like. 13 14 NYSCOPBA has articulated its stance on 15 these critical issues frequently and 16 consistently at hearings like this and through official channels like 17 18 labor-management meetings at both the state 19 and facility levels. All too often, the 20 response has been a polite acknowledgement 21 but no meaningful follow-through by the 22 department. NYSCOPBA hopes that the release of the 23 24 inspector general's report will spur

1 meaningful and concerted action to reform a 2 correctional system that had already been in crisis prior to June of 2015 -- a crisis that 3 4 no one can now deny. 5 The men and women of NYSCOPBA, each of whom walks the toughest beat in law 6 7 enforcement, as Senator Nozzolio often states, remain committed to such reform. 8 Thank you again for the opportunity to 9 10 share our views. We'll do our best to answer 11 any questions you may have. 12 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, President Powers. 13 14 Senator Gallivan. 15 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you, Madam 16 Chair. Mr. President, thanks for your 17 18 testimony, the work that you and of course 19 all of your members do. We all acknowledge that this past year 20 has been a challenging year. I sense some of 21 22 the frustration in your voice that we share while we all wait for that inspector general 23 24 report.

1 I know that you sat through 2 Commissioner Annucci's testimony. There was 3 talk about resources, there was talk about -certainly an emphasis on safety and security 4 5 in facilities. I actually talked with him about the same data that you made reference 6 7 to in your testimony here, and he acknowledged that, and that something has to 8 be done. 9 10 But nonetheless, he outlined some 11 things in his testimony, focusing on 12 technological enhancements, training 13 improvements and policy changes. The one 14 thing that we did not talk about, we did not 15 talk about the proper classification of 16 inmates. And I recognize that, point noted, and I share that concern. 17 But nonetheless, as he talked about 18 the technological enhancements, training 19 improvements, policy changes, he mentioned a 20 21 number of different things, like expanded use of canine units, elimination of metal 22 containers and such. What other things do 23 24 you think need to be done that he did not

1 mention, to ensure that our facilities are
2 safe and secure for everybody?

3 PRESIDENT POWERS: Through much of our communication with the department and the 4 5 administration, much of our concerns are actual posts. While we recognize a rise in 6 7 our staffing levels -- which still has quite 8 a ways to go to balance out and to be effective in the field -- what we're lacking 9 are actual posts in our facilities. We have 10 11 an issue with post closings and actual posts 12 in the facilities and the staff to staff it. 13 That's just one of many things. 14 You know, he mentioned new technology

15 and --

16 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Can we stay with 17 the posts for a minute? So post closings I 18 understand. When you say posts, do you mean 19 that there are posts that you believe should 20 exist that do not?

21 PRESIDENT POWERS: Yes. And with -22 the post closings, as you're familiar with,
23 create breaches in security in the facility.
24 If I can give you an example real

1 quick here, and for something for you to 2 understand, as you look outside of this hall 3 and you recognize the men's room on the other side of this wall over here, and the angle at 4 5 which that hall juts and comes down -- if the men's room or the hallway down at the end of 6 7 the hall was an area of recreation, and that post was closed and we didn't have a staff 8 9 member in there, you can see the blind spot 10 from the front of this, the entrance of this 11 hall. And then as we come down the hall, we 12 don't have security staff there. 13 And that could be a viable post. I 14 mean, and sometimes those posts get closed. 15 And that's where the staff comes in to be 16 able to allow us to staff those positions in some of the blind spots in our facilities. 17 EX. VICE PRES. SAWCHUCK: What 18 19 President Powers is saying is that you could 20 give us a hundred new correction officers, 21 but if you close a hundred posts, we've 22 gained nothing.

23 SENATOR GALLIVAN: No, I understand24 about the post closings. What I wanted to

1 understand better was the existence of --2 your belief that additional posts should 3 exist. Now, I'm assuming that -- I think I 4 5 understand correctly that that becomes part of the staffing security analysis that you 6 7 have the opportunity to weigh in on? PRESIDENT POWERS: We do. We do. 8 We've -- and as Tammy was alluding, we've 9 10 seen an increase in items, officers, but we're not seeing the posts that are critical 11 12 in our facilities. 13 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Would you be able 14 to follow up and be more specific for the various facilities? I mean -- I don't mean 15 today, but --16 PRESIDENT POWERS: Absolutely. 17 SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- like going 18 through the facilities --19 20 PRESIDENT POWERS: Be happy to share 21 that with you. With anybody, of course. 22 SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- the things that you think should exist that don't. 23 24 There was some discussion with the

- 1
- commissioner about the renaming,

2 restructuring of the Office of Special
3 Investigations. What are your thoughts about
4 that?

5 PRESIDENT POWERS: I know they had 6 their issues a while back. I believe those 7 issues still exist. We have our own concerns 8 with OSI. We realize that it's new and they 9 may be feeling their way, but that doesn't 10 stop the day-to-day operations that we have.

You know, they talk of new plans and 11 12 implementation, yet they discipline us towards the old style, so to speak. We're 13 14 coming in, thanks to a lot of our 15 intervention and a lot of our barking, if you 16 will, to the department to implement new changes, and we're starting to see some of 17 18 that. But we're being treated as if we're 19 the old guard, so to speak, and it's becoming 20 an issue for us. And it's coming through 21 timeliness, through disciplines towards 22 staff, and towards the lack of discipline, sometimes, to deter criminal activity in our 23 24 correctional settings.

1 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Is it your opinion 2 or do you have any thoughts on whether or not 3 the so-called internal affairs, for lack of a 4 better way of saying it, should be run by the 5 department? Or should there be separate 6 outside oversight, as some have proposed? If 7 you have thoughts.

PRESIDENT POWERS: We provide care, 8 9 custody and control. You know, we're charged 10 with providing that. We have our issues, we 11 share them with the department. And in the 12 interim, until we either get the fair shake 13 that we just rightly deserve, then we'll 14 decide whether or not we proceed forward with 15 any of our concerns. 16 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Fair enough. Thank 17 you. 18 PRESIDENT POWERS: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 19 20 Anyone on the Assembly side? 21 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: We're good. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Senator Nozzolio. 22 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you very 23 24 much, Madam Chair.

1 President Powers, always good to see 2 you. Thank you for the work that your 3 members do each and every day to keep us 4 safe. 5 PRESIDENT POWERS: Thank you. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: That's not said 6 7 enough. I appreciate you quoting me in the -- I hope those words live forever. 8 The fact is, you do walk the toughest law 9 10 enforcement beat in America. Your members are put in harm's way each and every day, 11 12 each and every hour of every day, with 13 nothing much to protect them other than their 14 wits and your abilities. 15 There's \$47 million of capital money 16 in the State Budget proposal by Governor Cuomo to reflect the settlement with the 17 special housing -- the SHU settlement, the 18 19 special housing. That NYSCOPBA and I worked 20 very closely when I had Senator Gallivan's responsibilities, closely on the issue of 21 22 establishing different special housing for those mentally ill inmates. 23 24

And I must say, NYSCOPBA was terrific

in ensuring the seamless transition of that
 very major program in our state correctional
 facilities. It wasn't easy, but major
 expenditures -- down at Auburn, down at even
 Five Points, who didn't have that type of
 facility constructed.

7 Tell us what types of anticipated concerns or protocols, procedures, safety 8 9 issues that you see in the development of 10 this new settlement. And just to preface 11 that question with a statement, that I 12 understand what special housing has been. 13 It's been to, in many cases -- certainly in 14 some cases to discipline, but in many cases 15 to ensure the protection of the inmate, so an 16 inmate who may have needed special housing.

17 Tell me what this new settlement looks18 to develop.

19PRESIDENT POWERS: Well, thank you for20the acknowledgment. We consider ourselves21the best in the nation in this line of law22enforcement. And it's a good question, and23I'm glad you asked, because quite frankly24you're the only one that's asked us.

1 And with that being said, you know, 2 minus the mental health aspect -- and the 3 commissioner mentioned, I believe, 18 percent of the population has mental health issues. 4 5 And the NYCLU settlement addresses that quite well. But from a disciplinary standpoint, 6 7 when you take out the mental health issue, from a disciplinary standpoint and an 8 operational standpoint in the Department of 9 10 Corrections and Community Supervision, to 11 keep the facilities operating in a timely 12 fashion, these -- these -- this new settlement has -- doesn't have a deterrent to 13 14 criminal activity. 15 And there's plenty of criminal 16 activity inside the walls and fences of our correctional facilities. And I'm not to say 17 18 that -- you know, a majority of them go to program, go to -- you know, they're looking 19 20 for their rehabilitation process. But we 21 have a small factor, and that factor that 22 comes into play, that acts out criminally, doesn't have the deterrent anymore after a 23 24 short SHU sentence or a -- or a longer one,

1 to come back out and modify his behavior or
2 her behavior from that aspect.

3 I believe Tammy could speak a bit on it as well, as she was a supervisor in a SHU 4 5 for many years and we -- you know, I mean, we have our concerns with it, but we implement 6 7 it, we'll roll it out, because we are the best at what we do. And, you know, we'll 8 work with it. We'll have to wait and see. 9 10 I mean, in 2014 the interim 11 stipulation settlement that was agreed to in 12 the NYCLU case didn't significantly drop the

numbers of acts of violence in our 13 14 facilities. I mean, with the reintroduction 15 of heroin and the introduction of K2 and the 16 epidemic of K2, that the -- even the commissioner acknowledges has created a very 17 violent workplace. And it's created a --18 19 a -- a mode of behavior that doesn't have a deterrent to bad behavior. 20

21 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Do you think 22 that -- this proposal, are you suggesting, 23 will basically eliminate, significantly 24 reduce, at best, the deterrent factor in

1	terms of inmate discipline?
2	PRESIDENT POWERS: I'm sorry, could
3	you repeat that?
4	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: This settlement,
5	this proposal to construct additional to
6	retrofit the housing, taking you believe
7	it takes away the deterrent tool of that
8	exists today for deterrence
9	PRESIDENT POWERS: Yes.
10	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: with special
11	housing?
12	PRESIDENT POWERS: Yes.
13	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: So that how
14	to those who haven't worked in our
15	correctional facilities, what does that mean?
16	PRESIDENT POWERS: If there's a
17	criminal act that takes place in the
18	correctional setting I'll give you an
19	example. If we suspect somebody of using a
20	narcotic inside the facility, and we test
21	them for that narcotic, there's usually a
22	you know, there could be a confinement, they
23	could be confined from their programs,
24	confined from recreation, confined from

1 certain privileges that they get. Not 2 necessarily visitation or anything 3 family-related; they still have correspondence and everything with that. But 4 5 from a privilege inside the facility, they could lose that. 6 7 That's being modified significantly at this point with this settlement. And that is 8 not -- we'll continue to see the action. If 9 10 an individual didn't submit to the urine 11 sample and the urinalysis, then the penalty's 12 not there anymore. So, you know, is there a deterrent for drug use? No. 13 14 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Very difficult 15 situation going to be made worse. 16 PRESIDENT POWERS: Makes it extremely difficult for our front-line staff. 17 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: My time is long 18 19 since up. Thank you very, very much for your 20 work and your testimony. 21 PRESIDENT POWERS: Thank you. Thank 22 you for your service to the people of the State of New York. And best wishes. 23 24 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator.

1 And thank you, President Powers and 2 all of you for what you do for us on behalf 3 of the people of New York State to keep us 4 safe every single day. We appreciate you 5 very much. So thank you. 6 PRESIDENT POWERS: Thank you for your 7 time. ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you. 8 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speaker is 9 10 President Patrick J. Lynch, New York City 11 Patrolmen's Benevolent Association. 12 Welcome, President Lynch. It's great to see you again. 13 14 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you. Good to 15 be with you. 16 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: So happy you can join us. I'm sorry this is a marathon, not a 17 18 sprint today, but we're getting there. 19 Could you please introduce the 20 gentlemen at the table with you? 21 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure. To my left is Mubarak Abdul-Jabbar, he's our second vice 22 president in the PBA. And our counsel, 23 24 Michael Murray.

1 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 2 much. 3 PRESIDENT LYNCH: And also the people that do the work, actually -- behind me is 4 5 John Nutholtz {ph} and Valerie Dabas in the 6 gallery. 7 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Great. Welcome to each and every one of you, and we look 8 forward to your testimony today. 9 10 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thanks very much. 11 Good evening, Senators and 12 Assemblymembers. Thank you for the 13 opportunity to testify. 14 In the interests of time, I will summarize the written remarks that I've 15 16 submitted on to the record, and I know it's been a long day of testimony for all of you. 17 18 As many of you may know, New York City 19 police officers have made extraordinary gains 20 in restoring our city's public safety over 21 the past 25 years. This renaissance has been 22 tremendously important to New York City's economic vitality, to its fiscal health, and 23 24 by extension to the health of New York State

1 as a whole.

2	Unfortunately, we're not currently
3	receiving the support we need to maintain
4	these public safety gains. To help remedy
5	this situation, we respectfully request your
6	support for the following initiatives in the
7	budget process and also in the legislative
8	session.
9	One priority is the three-year
10	extension of the Taylor Law's interest
11	arbitration provisions, which is included in
12	the Governor's Executive Budget. As you may
13	know, the Taylor Law's impasse resolution
14	process represents New York City police
15	officers' only recourse in the face of the
16	city's long-standing refusal to pay us at a
17	rate even approaching our local and national
18	counterparts. Our salaries have fallen
19	30 percent or more behind our counterparts in
20	comparable local jurisdictions, largely due
21	to the one-sided bargaining environment and
22	skewed impasse resolution process that we
23	faced throughout the 1990s.
24	This Legislature attempted to help

close that gap when it granted the PBA the
 right to resolve impasses under the Taylor
 Law in 1998. Nearly two decades later,
 however, we remain in virtually the same
 uncompetitive position as we were under the
 previous administration's regime, for several
 reasons.

One glaring issue is the complete lack 8 of codified ethical standards for neutral 9 10 arbitrators. Given the current scrutiny on public officials and police officers at all 11 12 levels of government, it is especially 13 important for taxpayers and public employees 14 to be able to trust that the arbitration 15 process is unbiased. We are therefore 16 seeking legislation to establish a code of conduct for arbitrators in Taylor Law 17 18 proceedings, modeled on the ethical codes 19 already in widespread use in other private-20 and public-sector arbitrations.

21 The second item of concern: Our 22 current lack of training and equipment 23 necessary to counter the type of 24 active-shooter style and terrorist attacks

1 that we've recently witnessed, unfortunately, 2 in Paris, San Bernardino, and other places. 3 Law enforcement best practices now dictate that the first police officers on the 4 5 scene of an active-shooter incident, usually a police officer on routine patrol, must 6 7 immediately engage the attacker to minimize 8 any further casualties. According to a report by the Public Executive Research 9 10 Forum, PERF, one-third of police officers who 11 attempt to stop an active shooter alone are 12 shot by that attacker. 13 New York City police officers on 14 patrol are currently equipped with only a 15 .9mm handgun and basic ballistic restraint 16 vests that provide no protection from a high-powered rifle round. In this respect, 17 18 the NYPD lags behind many other law enforcement agencies nationwide, which 19 20 already train and equip their patrol officers 21 with long guns, ballistic helmets and 22 enhanced body armor. The Governor has also requested 23 24 funding for similar equipment and training

1 for all New York State troopers in his 2 Executive Budget. We believe that the police 3 officers who patrol our nation's top terror target must be similarly trained and 4 5 equipped. We will therefore be asking and seeking legislation that will provide a 6 7 mandate for the NYPD to equip every New York 8 City police officer with an Anti-Terrorism 9 Response Kit of the type I have just 10 outlined, and provide training in advanced counterterrorism tactics. 11

12 The third item of concern: Our city 13 and our state's moral obligation to provide 14 for police officers who are disabled in the 15 line of duty. That obligation is not being 16 met for New York City police officers hired after July 1, 2009, under the Tier 3 pension 17 18 plan. Although they face the same dangers as their more senior colleagues, they are 19 20 subject to a reduced accident disability benefit that would not allow them to feed or 21 22 care for their families if they are disabled 23 on the job. They are the only police 24 officers in the state who face this unjust

1 situation.

2	Simply put, it is not in the public
3	interest for police officers to ask
4	themselves whether they can risk their
5	families' financial future by going into
6	harms way. We are therefore calling upon
7	the Legislature to establish a statewide
8	minimum standard for police officers'
9	accident disability benefits that will
10	equalize those benefits for New York City
11	police officers in Tier 3.
12	The issues I've just outlined
13	represent our members' top concerns heading
14	into the budget cycle, but there are many
15	other issues that we'll want to address as
16	the legislative session moves forward.
17	I thank you once again for your time
18	and your consideration of my testimony. A
19	longer version has been submitted. I
20	appreciate the opportunity to testify here
21	today.
22	SENATOR KRUEGER: Senator Diane
23	Savino.
24	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you, Senator

1 Krueger.

2	Good afternoon, President Lynch.
3	As you know, I was the sponsor of the
4	bill that was unfortunately vetoed by
5	Governor Paterson in 2009, I think it is now.
6	Last year we attempted to resolve the
7	situation, but we ran into a roadblock with
8	the City Council of the City of New York who
9	decided that they couldn't provide us a home
10	rule message.
11	Are we making any progress with the
12	council with respect to that?
13	PRESIDENT LYNCH: No, we've made no
14	progress whatsoever with both sides of City
15	Hall, whether the City Council or the Mayor's
16	Office as well.
17	SENATOR SAVINO: So they still remain
18	obstinate about this issue?
19	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Absolutely, every
20	step of the way.
21	SENATOR SAVINO: And since the veto of
22	the Tier 2 extender, can you tell me how many
23	New York City police and firefighters are
24	currently affected by that veto?

1 PRESIDENT LYNCH: We have, just in the 2 NYPD, we have upwards of 10,000 younger New York City police officers on patrol who are 3 covered under Tier 3. 4 5 SENATOR SAVINO: How many of them have been injured on the job since then? 6 7 PRESIDENT LYNCH: That exact number I can get you. But as we go through that 8 number, just the risk itself has an effect on 9 10 every police officer. 11 SENATOR SAVINO: Right. 12 PRESIDENT LYNCH: If you have a more 13 senior police officer like myself in a radio car who's covered by Tier 3, and my partner 14 15 sitting next to me is Tier 3, it's unfair 16 that we both go into the same job, face the same risk, but unfortunately, if we're 17 disabled together, I'll be able to take care 18 of my family on into the future but my 19 20 partner won't be able to do that, under Tier 3. 21 22 SENATOR SAVINO: I really would be interested in finding out the number of 23 24 officers that have been injured that are now

1 facing this financial burden.

PRESIDENT LYNCH: I've heard that --2 SENATOR SAVINO: You don't have to 3 4 give it to me today, but it will be helpful 5 in us pushing this -- what is really an unfair situation. 6 7 PRESIDENT LYNCH: I'm looking forward to getting you that information. 8 9 SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you. 10 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you, Senator. SENATOR KRUEGER: Evening. 11 12 Assembly? 13 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you, 14 Senator. We will hear from Assemblymember 15 O'Donnell. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Thank you for 17 staying around. PRESIDENT LYNCH: Good evening. 18 19 Thanks. 20 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: You sound like 21 a true New Yorker, may I say, and you spoke 22 very quickly. So I wanted to just ask one 23 quick question. 24 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure.

1 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: You said in 2 the beginning that you are compensated at 3 less of a level than comparable other officers, so I'm curious to know what you 4 5 meant by comparable. Do you mean compared to Boston or Philadelphia? Do you mean compared 6 7 to Westchester or Nassau? What did you mean? PRESIDENT LYNCH: Actually, both. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Okay. 9 10 PRESIDENT LYNCH: When you compare us across the country, both locally and 11 12 nationally, we're 30 percent behind. All those --13 14 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: So you're 15 30 percent behind what they pay in 16 Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia and Boston? 17 PRESIDENT LYNCH: The exact numbers I 18 can get you. But when you average it 19 20 nationally across the country as well as locally, we're 30 percent behind. 21 22 Absolutely. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: But there's 23 24 nothing really we can do about that, right?

1 That's a negotiation between you folks and 2 the City of New York --PRESIDENT LYNCH: Yeah. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: -- and whoever 4 5 the mayor and City Council happen to be at the time, right? 6 7 PRESIDENT LYNCH: What's important, though, in what we're asking, is that be a 8 code within the arbitration process. First, 9 10 that we --ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I understood 11 12 you very clearly. I'm just trying to get to 13 the money part. 14 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: The money part 16 is -- there's nothing here in the State Capitol that can really be done to address 17 18 the money part. It's your own negotiation 19 with the collective bargaining agreement with 20 the City of New York; correct? 21 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Right. And what we 22 can do is encourage the city to reasonably negotiate, which they haven't. They rely on 23 24 a negotiation that says pattern bargaining,

1 one size fits all. And as we know, whether 2 it's a pair of gloves or it's negotiation, one size never fits all. 3 4 So what you should do at the 5 bargaining table is negotiate to solve problems on both sides. 6 7 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Right. 8 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Pattern bargaining doesn't do that. So our only recourse is to 9 10 go to the Taylor Law, to go to arbitration in 11 that process. 12 So first we need to make sure that law 13 gets re-signed, and then we want to add some 14 fairness and ethics into that process as 15 well. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I didn't mean for you to slow down. I heard you the first 17 18 time. 19 (Laughter.) 20 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Speak as slow 21 or as quickly as you want. 22 I just want to say that I have extraordinarily good working relationships 23 24 with the 2-4 and 2-6 in my district, and I

1 thank you for being here and for your 2 service. PRESIDENT LYNCH: And thank you for 3 4 being a voice for us. 5 SENATOR KRUEGER: Senator Michael 6 Nozzolio. 7 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Senator. 8 President Lynch, it's good to see you 9 10 again. 11 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you, Senator. 12 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you for your cogent testimony. 13 14 A big surprise that for all that we 15 have been through as a city, a state -- all 16 our cities are going through today, with New York City being blessed with the most 17 professional police force possible -- but 18 it's a shock to hear of the lack of tools 19 20 that you have on the front lines. 21 Tell us, is the administration doing 22 anything to heighten the awareness of -- this 23 is a serious homeland security issue. It's 24 one that the federal government should be

invested in. Tell us about any discussions
 you've had on that score.

3 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure. Our concern is this. In any active shooter-style 4 5 incident -- and we see from the attacks that 6 we've had, they can happen anyplace, at any 7 time. It can happen in a cafe, it can happen in a mall in one of our boroughs, or the 8 subway system as well. So the first police 9 10 officer that will respond to that attack or that 911 call will be a local police officer 11 12 on patrol, what we call our sector police 13 officers. When they respond, they're going 14 to respond with bullet-resistant vests that 15 are basic, and a .9-millimeter weapon.

What we need to do is have an 16 anti-terrorism kit. Now, what the department 17 18 has done is grown those different departments 19 within our agency, but they're not the first 20 ones to respond. We need to be able to 21 respond and neutralize that attack 22 immediately, the first police officer on the 23 scene.

24

For instance, if you looked in the

1 films of San Bernardino tragedy, when the 2 attack happened, you had police officers 3 respond. The local sector cars, police 4 officers on patrol, responded. They had long 5 guns, ballistic helmets, and ballistic vests. And then the specialized units -- what we 6 7 call emergency service, many know as SWAT -they responded. But we were able to protect 8 ourselves as we went in to stop that attack 9 10 right from the get-go. In New York City, the local police 11 12 officer in your precinct, in your 13 neighborhood, will respond and unfortunately 14 most likely will be shot, because we're not equipped to be able to hold off that -- the 15 16 specialized unit, they come later, they're -minutes, in an attack like this, are 17 18 important. It takes time for them to get 19 there. But the local police officer in your 20 neighborhood that gets that radio run, as we 21 call it, they'll be there within minutes and 22 get shot. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: You'd certainly 23

24 expect units to be developed. It makes

1 sense. But it appears that the terrorist 2 threat is a moving target, in the sense that 3 it's -- they're changing tactics all the time. It is much more of almost a guerilla 4 5 on-scene situation --PRESIDENT LYNCH: That's correct. 6 7 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: -- as opposed to 8 major events. I mean, who knows, but the fact is we need to be equipped for 9 10 everything. And this appears that yes, the 11 unit makes sense. However, we seem to be 12 equipping the unit, but not those on the front lines -- in Times Square, or where 13 14 people gather, or in one of the stadiums or 15 wherever. 16 Is that the basic concern of our PD? 17 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Yes, absolutely. 18 And we have to be concerned with multiple 19 things happening at once, as we've seen in 20 Paris, where you may have one of our 21 boroughs, an incident happen, and 22 simultaneously in Times Square or in one of our neighborhoods -- I live in Queens -- out 23 24 in Queens, and one of our malls -- it all

1 goes on at the same time.

2	So then those specialized units will
3	be stretched. But if our local police
4	officers are equipped and trained in those
5	techniques, we'll be able to respond and hold
6	it off and save folks' lives. And that's
7	something that
8	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And this is not a
9	hypothetical situation.
10	PRESIDENT LYNCH: No.
11	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Just look at what
12	happened in Paris. In Paris, if that's a
13	template.
14	So keep us informed, let us know what
15	this group can do. Particularly our areas of
16	public protection, the requests we need to
17	make from Washington as well. You raise
18	excellent points, and we'd be glad to be
19	supportive.
20	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Senator, I
21	appreciate that.
22	SENATOR KRUEGER: Assembly?
23	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Our next
24	speaker is Assemblymember Malliotakis.

1	ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: Thank you.
2	Thank you for being here.
3	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you,
4	Assemblymember.
5	ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: I want to
6	say first off, well, thank you to the men and
7	women of the NYPD, thank you for what you do
8	each and every day. I want to say that I
9	support the initiatives that you outlined
10	here today
11	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you.
12	ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: and
13	especially when it comes to the parity issue
14	and disability. Certainly they all take the
15	same risk, and one shouldn't be treated
16	differently than the other. And so I support
17	you and I lend my voice to you to use as you
18	continue to fight this fight.
19	I just had three relatively quick
20	questions. In October, we had a terrible
21	tragedy with the shooting of Police Officer
22	Randolph Holder. I believe that there is a
23	tremendous problem with the drug diversion
24	laws that we have currently in the State of

1 New York.

2	I wanted to get just your opinion, if
3	you could just talk a little bit about this.
4	Someone who had four felony drug convictions,
5	in my view, should never have been released
6	from prison and put into a diversion program.
7	And had he been kept in jail where he
8	belonged, I believe that Police Officer
9	Holder would be alive today. And so I'd like
10	to just get your perspective on this. And
11	what are your concerns about the drug
12	diversion law, and should it be changed?
13	PRESIDENT LYNCH: I think that when
14	you have someone with such a violent history
15	that's there, when they go before the judge,
16	he or she needs to have all the information
17	in front of them to make that decision.
18	Someone that goes into a diversion program
19	should be someone that's nonviolent, that
20	shows a proclivity to do better, to get
21	better, and maybe they've made a mistake.
22	But what we've seen is that that's
23	been bastardized, where you go in, it's just
24	they clear the calendar, they clear the

docket to let's just put them in the
 diversionary program for drug treatment,
 alcohol treatment, and all those different
 types of things -- which are fine for certain
 folks.

When you have a violent repeat 6 7 offender, I don't believe they should be 8 allowed to go in that program. Because what will happen is we will face them while we're 9 10 riding the subway and our members, the New York City police officers, will have to 11 12 face them on the street. And we had that 13 with Randolph Holder, that police officer who 14 stopped a bicycle robbery and he spun around 15 and shot that police officer and killed him, 16 a police officer from a family of police officers. Why? Because that perp was 17 18 allowed to go back on the street through a 19 diversionary program which he never, ever 20 should have been included in.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: Has the City of New York or anyone else in the state asked you your opinion on this, or to work with them in changing the law?

1 Senator Marty Golden and I are 2 actually working on legislation now. I was 3 wondering if anyone else has talked to you about this. Or has the mayor had any 4 5 discussions with you? PRESIDENT LYNCH: No, just the public 6 7 discussion that happened after Officer Holder's assassination that day. But no. 8 But we look forward to working with 9 10 you and to get that accomplished to make all of us, quite frankly, all of us safe. But if 11 12 the first-line police officers aren't safe, there's not a chance for the rest of us. 13 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: Sure. 15 On that note, we are one of three 16 states that does not consider the danger level of defendants when setting bail. I was 17 18 just curious if you would comment on that as 19 well and if you have any proposals to change 20 that. 21 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Yes, traditionally 22 now it's -- bail is used, will that person

come back to court. So we have cases where

they don't and they still get bail. But

23

24

1 obviously you should look and say what 2 condition are they in, what crimes that they 3 have, and will they commit a violent crime. Even if they have the funds to be able to get 4 5 out on bail and whether they'll come back or not, what will they do while they're out? 6 7 So I think it's very important that you look at the background of each defendant 8 in that case and make an educated decision on 9 10 the information. So I believe that if you have a violent background, you should not be 11 12 out. 13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. So 14 you would support, obviously, changing that 15 law, then. 16 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Yes. 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. PRESIDENT LYNCH: Yes. 18 19 ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: One last 20 question. The 2014 sanctuary law prohibits 21 NYPD from cooperating with Immigration and 22 Customs Enforcement. In fact, there was a report that was issued by the criminal 23 24 bureau, justice bureau of the NYPD that says

474 of the 504 immigration detainers received
 from the feds were not honored.

I find this to be a little shocking. I mean, I think these sanctuary laws that were put in place by the City Council are really misguided. Do you have an opinion on this? I just want to know what -- what are your thoughts on this as well? Because -well, I'll let you speak first.

10 PRESIDENT LYNCH: So we have -- we should be allowed to use every tool on the 11 12 street as police officers to take someone 13 that committed a crime. Look, police 14 officers don't want to go out and go after 15 undocumented folks, it's not what we're 16 looking to do. We're out looking to keep everyone safe and do the job. But 17 18 unfortunately, sometimes those same folks are committing crimes, just like a person that's 19 20 legally here in this country may commit a 21 crime.

22 So in both of those cases, we should 23 be allowed to look at and use every aspect. 24 Sometimes that aspect may be deportation. So

1 we shouldn't be too quick to close doors on 2 what we can use to make the streets safe. ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: There was 3 an incident where someone who was 4 5 undocumented on Staten Island was arrested 6 for trespassing, was released back on the 7 street, then later on was accused of rape. 8 Then they were brought back in. But the issue I find with some of 9 10 these laws and the bail laws is that some of these individuals won't come back for their 11 12 court dates. 13 PRESIDENT LYNCH: That's right. ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: So I think 14 15 that's a major issue that we need to address 16 as well. Do you have any suggestions on that 17 front? 18 PRESIDENT LYNCH: I think, again, part of the tools -- and I'll begin to research it 19 20 some more for you, and with you. But I think all those tools should be allowed. But if 21 22 there's a violent history there or there's a 23 chance they're not coming back, they 24 shouldn't be allowed out on bail. It's as

1 simple as that.

2	We think it should be a fair system in
3	court, we think it should be a system where
4	they're before the judge. But in order to
5	make sure that happens, we have to make sure
6	they show up. So if there's a violent
7	history or they're illegal, then they may not
8	come back.
9	ASSEMBLYWOMAN MALLIOTAKIS: It seems
10	some of these policies, they don't have
11	common sense behind them.
12	But I thank you so much for sharing
13	your opinions. Thank you so much for what
14	you do.
15	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you.
16	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
17	Senator Krueger.
18	SENATOR KRUEGER: Evening. Hi.
19	So my district is the 19th, 17th, and
20	13th Precincts, and happily I think we
21	sometimes have more arguments about bikes on
22	the sidewalks, and the irritation of
23	hovercraft bumping old people over, than
24	organized crime.

1	PRESIDENT LYNCH: We hope that's
2	everyone's problem to deal with.
3	SENATOR KRUEGER: Exactly. Just for
4	the record, you don't support electric bikes
5	or hovercrafts, do you?
6	PRESIDENT LYNCH: No.
7	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much.
8	PRESIDENT LYNCH: I think I'd probably
9	fall off it, but
10	(Laughter.)
11	SENATOR KRUEGER: It's just it's
12	creating too much chaos.
13	But more seriously, although that is
14	an issue in my district
15	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Of course, of
16	course.
17	SENATOR KRUEGER: my understanding
18	is every NYPD officer is going to be given
19	some kind of Apple phone that gives you
20	direct access to records of anyone you're
21	picking up. So partly as follow-up to that
22	question, you will or now have more direct
23	data about the people that you are stopping
24	on our streets. Can you talk to me about

1 that program?

2 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Yeah, sure. The new 3 Apple phones that the department is providing for all out police officers on patrol is 4 5 basically like a minicomputer in your hand where you can more quickly run the names of 6 7 the folks to find out if they have warrants, what's their background, the location you're 8 9 going to, has there been other incidents in 10 that apartment or that building. So it's a safety factor for the member, as well as 11 12 knowing what you're walking into as a police officer. 13

14 And it's more extensive than that. 15 It's a huge amount of information at your 16 fingertips literally in that radio car where, when I came on the job in 1984, there was no 17 computer in the car, you'd have to possibly 18 19 take that person in, run the name at the stationhouse. Sometimes they popped a 20 21 warrant, sometimes they didn't, but it was 22 consuming of time.

23This is -- for a safety reason, it24works. To make sure we're dealing with the

right folks and not the wrong folks, it
 works. So it's a good tool to get the job
 done.

And it's more extensive than that. 4 5 You can even see what other 911 calls are 6 going on in your area, a patrol in your 7 sector, in your foot post, so it educates the police officer on exactly what she or he is 8 dealing with on their post. So I think it's 9 10 a good tool that helps us get the job done. SENATOR KRUEGER: And is it rolled out 11 12 completely now, or is it rolling out? PRESIDENT LYNCH: It's not rolled out 13 14 completely, but it's well on the way to doing 15 that, to make sure every police officer on 16 patrol -- so I would venture to say it's more a question of the department -- but I would 17 18 definitely say by midyear, the end of the 19 year, that every police officer will have 20 them.

21 SENATOR KRUEGER: Great. And then 22 just one more question, I know it's so late. 23 Following up, I think, on Senator 24 Nozzolio's questions about your proposal for

1 an anti-terrorism package for each police 2 officer, so would you actually propose that 3 patrol officers who are walking a beat are carrying long guns? 4 5 PRESIDENT LYNCH: No, we would have the -- what we call the radio car in your 6 7 neighborhood, the patrol -- that'd be equipped, it would be in their trunk, 8 safeguarded, so when they're going to an 9 10 incident like that they can equip themselves and take it out. 11 12 Now, if you're on a foot post, 13 obviously it wouldn't be practical to be 14 standing at a foot post with a rifle slung 15 over your shoulder. But in an incident like 16 that, that you'd be able to have each stationhouse equipped with that equipment, 17 that when it's an all-hands-on-deck kind of 18 19 call, that those police officers on foot can 20 respond to the stationhouse, get prepared, 21 and then respond out to the scene and help 22 get that job done. So we're not proposing that our police 23

24 officers be walking around with a rifle on

1 their back. We're not suggesting that. But 2 we should have access to them no matter what 3 our assignment is, and the training to use 4 them properly and the techniques in 5 anti-terrorism, so, quite frankly, we don't have to use them. But our techniques will 6 7 help stop it. SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much. 8 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you, Senator. 9 10 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 11 Senator Hassell-Thompson. 12 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you. Just very briefly, I just -- somewhere 13 14 in there, my ears got pricked up because I 15 just -- it almost sounded as though you did 16 not feel that bail was a tool that should be used at all. 17 18 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Say again, I'm 19 sorry? 20 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: My ears heard, I didn't say you said --21 22 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Fair enough. Well 23 put. 24 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: -- my ears

1	heard you expound on bail. Have you taken a
2	look very closely at what the bail reform is
3	that is being proposed?
4	PRESIDENT LYNCH: We're looking at it
5	and will continue to look at it to better
6	educate ourselves on those opinions. But
7	what our concern
8	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Okay, wait,
9	wait
10	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure. Go ahead.
11	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Don't go
12	ahead of me.
13	PRESIDENT LYNCH: That's quite fine.
14	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you.
15	Because this is your area of expertise, so
16	you have to take it slow with me.
17	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure.
18	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: I asked
19	you know, I asked you that question very
20	specifically because bail is, as I earlier
21	stated to one of the other presenters, is
22	supposed to be administered or recommended
23	before the presumption of guilt has been
24	established. So therefore when you start to

1 talk about who should and shouldn't get bail, 2 that's where I want you to enter. 3 PRESIDENT LYNCH: What I'm saying, in a process that -- and the legislation, we'll 4 5 continue to review and make our opinions as we get educated on it more -- right now, as I 6 7 understand it, the process is will that person that's accused come back to court. 8 What we've found is many times that's 9 10 not the case, those that may have been 11 released on bail have a violent past and, 12 while they're out on bail, continue to follow 13 through on that violence as well. 14 So what I think should happen is you 15 should have the judge have all the information in front of her or in front of 16 him that can make an educated decision on 17 18 what kind of threat is this person if we do 19 release them on bail. It's just purely a 20 safety issue for our members and for the 21 public we serve. 22 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Okay. 23 Because I asked the question that way very 24 deliberately, because again, when you look at

1 it, you know, one of the things that we have to determine -- and we're not clear that it's 2 3 really the best way to go -- is that we should be legislating that for the judges. 4 5 Because then we'll end up with nobody getting 6 out. 7 And so we want to be very -- but we want to be able to give, in any of our 8 legislative initiatives, the greatest 9 10 latitude of discretion with the greatest 11 amount of information. 12 PRESIDENT LYNCH: That's right. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: And so we 13 14 kind of agree on that part. 15 PRESIDENT LYNCH: We're kind of on the 16 same page. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Yes. So 17 that the decision that's made is made in such 18 19 a manner that fairness occurs. 20 Our problem is, and as we have discussed sometimes -- most times it's 21 budgetarily, sometimes it's case caps -- and 22 if you listened, if you sat through all this 23 24 today, so you understand why those of us who

1 continue to push for bail are cognizant of 2 the fact that there are so many cases, and 3 that you know when you come before the bench, neither the judge has had the opportunity to 4 5 kind of read the disposition --PRESIDENT LYNCH: That's right. 6 7 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: -- nor has 8 the attorney that's representing the client had the proper amount of time to be able to 9 10 understand this, to instruct their client in order for them to get the best chance for 11 12 justice. PRESIDENT LYNCH: And that should be 13 14 all of our mission. That judge should have 15 every bit of information. And quite frankly, 16 at the end of the day you want fair justice. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: But timing. 17 18 But timing. Some of these cases -- we talked about backlog, we talked about all of those 19 20 things today. 21 PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure, sure. Yeah. 22 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: And I think that when we really push for justice -- I'm 23

just interjecting this because I want people

24

1	who think I'm soft on crime to understand
2	that I'm not at all soft on crime
3	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Look, justice should
4	never be rushed.
5	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: but
6	rather, I do want to be sure that the process
7	is as just as we can make it.
8	PRESIDENT LYNCH: Sure. And
9	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Because
10	those are the cases we don't want to get
11	thrown out.
12	PRESIDENT LYNCH: That's right. No,
13	we agree there should always be justice,
14	that's what we work on as police officers.
15	We want to be fair to everyone, and justice
16	should never be rushed.
17	So whatever and there may be others
18	that can testify more cogently on this issue
19	in the courts. What do we need to make sure
20	is that it's not rushed but also, because
21	we're not rushing, they're not behind bars
22	longer they should be because there may be
23	someone innocent that's there. We want to
24	get to the right answer, the right result.

1 So whatever we need to do to keep the 2 folks safe, that's what we should be looking 3 at, that's what we should be legislating in 4 all cases. You should be deliberate in your 5 deliberations, absolutely. 6 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you. 7 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. PRESIDENT LYNCH: Thank you, Senator. 8 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Because my 9 10 time ran out. I had a great question --11 PRESIDENT LYNCH: I understand. 12 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: -- but my time ran out. 13 14 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 15 And we want to thank you, President 16 Lynch, and all your members for all that you do on behalf of the people of New York City 17 and the people of New York State. We 18 19 appreciate you being here. 20 PRESIDENT LYNCH: I thank all the 21 Senators, the Assemblymembers as well. And any other information you need, we'll gladly 22 provide it to you. 23 24 Good evening, everyone.

CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very

2 much.

1

Next we have the New York State Public
Employees Federation. And representing the
New York State Department of Corrections and
Community Supervision, we have Steve Drake
and Paul Rigby. And also, from the New York
State Office of Technology Services, Penny
Howanski.
I see you'ye got a book with you.

I see you've got a book with you. 11 Welcome. I was hoping that we could 12 maybe summarize the highlights of your testimony. We do have this, we will read it, 13 14 but just in the interests of it being 15 7 o'clock -- what you have to say is very 16 important, and we will take it to heart, but if we could maybe streamline this a bit, it 17 would be helpful. 18 19 So welcome. MS. BRATE: Absolutely. And thank you 20

21 for the opportunity to speak before you
22 today.
23 My name is Nikki Brate. I am a PEF

24 vice president. Penny Howanski is that local

council leader that you heard of earlier
today. She has submitted her testimony, but
I wanted to just speak about a couple of
points that came up during the course of the
day and just to clarify some concerns that we
had.

7 Ms. Miller clearly does not understand the workforce, the current workforce. She 8 did in fact reach out to PEF 24 hours prior 9 10 to the budget being printed to ask PEF to 11 accept her plan. She really wasn't willing 12 to work with us, collaborate or communicate, 13 or even allow us positions, it was a yes or 14 no for that.

15 What we found most intriguing and 16 incredible is that, you know, Ms. Miller says 17 that we can't hire mid-level. We have 18 promotional exams, correct? And we even went 19 so far as to have in the 23s, which are some 20 of the mid-levels, actually can come off of 21 open competitive.

That said, when you're looking at wanting to outsource your help desk, your Layer 1 and 2, that's where that expertise

starts to be learned, right? So if you're
going to outsource that, later on down the
road you are not going to have that expertise
that they're claiming that we don't have
right now.

6 And that is a huge concern when you 7 look at the stability of the workforce that 8 you have in place today. If you have that 9 aging workforce that's going out, you're not 10 bringing in them at that beginning level so 11 that the mid-level can down-train, that is an 12 absolutely huge problem.

13 Ms. Miller talked about wanting to 14 have a strong permanent workforce. But the 15 hiring of contracting shows the opposite. 16 Her words were much different than the 17 actions that have been experienced, and the 18 misinformation quite frankly is troublesome.

19It appears that a lot of thought went20into the planning for the RFP outsourcing.21Not planning on investing in the existing22employees, not allowing for the knowledge23transfer, and not allowing the opportunities24that Ms. Miller quite frankly gave lip

service on. The way that the OITS has been
 progressing, that is what has begun the
 creation of the silos.

Again, the succession plan for OITS 4 5 simply is privatization. A little example: New York City did a lot of outsourcing and 6 7 contracting at one point. What New York City did, and other jurisdictions, they determined 8 that those jobs need to be insourced. Not 9 10 only for cost savings, but for the security and protection of the data and the network 11 12 and the infrastructure.

13 Ms. Miller's plan fails the workforce, it fails the State of New York. Ms. Miller's 14 15 plan quite frankly is a recipe for disaster. 16 One other thing I wanted to say that's a little bit off of that was I heard a lot 17 18 about the cybersecurity today. The cybersecurity that ITS really provides is 19 20 fundamental security over our networks and 21 our data. It requires a specific skill set. 22 The other part of the security that you really need is security against cyberwarfare. 23 24 This is a different skill set that is needed.

1	So when we talk about yes, we're
2	throwing off some of the threats, those are
3	some of the tools that they have on that they
4	can do it, but cyberwarfare is certainly a
5	scare, and it's a whole different skill set
6	than you need for those that are providing
7	cybersecurity at the level in ITS.
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
10	Next speaker?
11	MR. DRAKE: Good evening,
12	distinguished committee members. My name is
13	Steve Drake. I'm a vocational instructor at
14	Mohawk Correctional Facility, and I've worked
15	for the department for over 23 years.
16	The New York State Public Employees
17	Federation represents thousands of members
18	within the Department of Corrections and
19	Community Supervision. These include those
20	who work in the prison health system,
21	rehabilitative services, education,
22	vocational training, and drug treatments.
23	These are all areas critical to help DOCCS
24	maintain their mission, which is preparing

1 and ensuring an inmate's ability to become a 2 productive member of our communities upon their release. 3 I'm going to consolidate some of this 4 5 for you. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 6 7 much. MR. DRAKE: I would like to bring an 8 9 issue of urgency to your attention. Our members rely on personal alarms for their 10 safety in the prisons, commonly called a 11 12 personal alarm system, or PAS. These are 13 small devices similar to a pager that our members activate during an inmate assault or 14 15 potential danger. The current PAS system is, in some instances, 20 years old or older. 16 Technology has advanced greatly during this 17 18 time period, and there are now PAS systems that can pinpoint locations, which we would 19 20 request, for quicker response times by 21 security. 22 There was a plan in place to update the PAS system, but with budget cuts in 23 24 recent years, this very important item has

been pushed to the back burner. As a
 priority, and for everyone's safety, I am
 requesting that you help us make this
 lifeline possible.

5 Next, PEF represents numerous licensed 6 medical professionals within DOCCS. These 7 medical professionals provide vital health 8 care 24 hours a day, every day, for all of 9 the inmates in the facility and any staff who 10 get hurt or have other medical emergencies at 11 work.

12 DOCCS, as many state agencies, suffers from recruitment and retention problem of 13 14 licensed professionals, which PEF represents, 15 such as nurses, doctors, pharmacists, and 16 nurse practitioners within its facilities. The nurse vacancy rate has increased from 17 18 10 percent in January 2015 to 15.85 percent in November 2015 -- an increase of nearly 19 6 percent in less than one year -- and this 20 21 situation is not improving.

22 These vacancies are attributed to, in 23 part, salary disparities between what is 24 offered by New York State compared to similar

1	jobs in the community, resulting in the
2	inability to attract and maintain a
3	sufficient number of staff.
4	Salary disparities are further
5	exacerbated by the workplace conditions for
6	these professionals. Recruitment and
7	retention problems result in frequent
8	scheduling and assignment changes, as well as
9	a high volume of voluntary and mandatory
10	overtime. Medical professionals represented
11	by PEF are unsung, undervalued, and
12	needlessly overstretched.
13	Two points that I'd like to make to
14	you, and our key point thing is DOCCS has the
15	most "no mandatory overtime" violations of
16	all state agencies. And with that, DOCCS has
17	violated this law 2,729 times between July 1,
18	2009, and November 2015, forcing nurses to
19	work beyond their regular shift, repeatedly
20	and unethically, in violation of the New York
21	State Labor Law 167, Part 177.
22	I would like to say at this point that
23	it is imperative that we begin to look at
24	increasing the base pay of nurses from a

1 Grade 16 to a Grade 18 to help in the 2 recruitment and retention of qualified 3 nurses. With Tier 6 in place, and stagnant salaries, there is no incentive for qualified 4 5 nurses to come to the state for employment or remain with the state for a career. 6 7 At this time, I'll let Paul speak. 8 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Mr. Rigby? MR. RIGBY: Good evening. Thank you 9 10 for allowing me to come today --11 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Good evening. 12 MR. RIGBY: -- and testify on the 13 Executive Budget for fiscal year 2016-2017 14 and to provide testimony at the Public 15 Protection hearing. 16 My name is Paul Rigby. I'm employed as a senior parole officer for the State of 17 New York. I worked as a corrections officer, 18 19 a parole officer, and a senior parole officer 20 for the last 17 years. I am the council 21 leader for all the parole officers and the 22 senior parole officers for the entire state. We've heard testimony today by Acting 23 24 Commissioner Annucci, we've heard testimony

1 from the commissioner for DCJS, and I wanted
2 to give some stats and clarify some of the
3 positions that they didn't have earlier for
4 you guys to consider.

5 Right now, let me give you some facts. You heard Acting Commissioner Annucci give 6 7 you the prison population. There's 52,000 8 inmates in the Department of Corrections right now. And there's about 24,000 9 10 corrections officers that supervise them, and it's a tough job. I know, because I was one 11 12 of those officers.

But there are 36,000 parolees in the 13 State of New York, and right now 650 parole 14 15 officers are responsible for supervising 16 those 36,000 parolees. I've heard many of the Senators testify and ask Acting 17 18 Commissioner Annucci questions about the rising crime. A lot of local municipalities 19 20 have been asking what's going on with 21 parolees in the community, why are they 22 committing so many crimes nowadays.

23Well, I can tell you, since I've been24around through the transition, that, you

1 know, we also heard about the risk and needs 2 tools. We heard about the COMPAS tools. I 3 heard Assemblyman O'Donnell talk about the Parole Board was not used in this. What is 4 5 that designed to do? It's designed to give 6 an inmate a questionnaire and, based upon 7 their responses, it determines the risks and 8 needs that a person has on there.

9 And I would agree that some parolees 10 come out with more risks, they come out with more needs. Some are undomiciled. We heard 11 12 about the shelter system in New York City and how it's overcrowded. We hear about these 13 14 young kids who are coming out, you know, 15 without the skill sets. We heard so much from the commissioner when he testified about 16 what they're doing inside the facilities to 17 18 help these kids get along and come out 19 better, these inmates.

20 But we did not hear the 21 commissioner -- what's disturbing to me is 22 that during his direct testimony he never 23 testified about anything in Community 24 Supervision. I would tell you there was

1 definitely a disconnect between what happens 2 in the facilities and what happens out here. 3 Prior to our merger, and prior to the old parole supervision, a parole officer 4 5 would supervise up to 40 parolees when he first came out for the first year. That was 6 7 called intensive supervision. It allowed the 8 parole officer to meet with these people two, three, four times a month inside the office, 9 10 allowed them to meet with them two, three, 11 four times a month in the community. You 12 made sure they're doing well, because the 13 parole officer has to wear two different hats. We wear the hat as law enforcement, 14 15 but we also wear the hat as a counselor to 16 help these guys out. 17 Nowadays the new COMPAS system allows,

17 Nowaddy's the new common system different lives, 18 you know, four different levels, you know, 19 where a parolee can be supervised on 25 to 20 1 -- one parole office for 25 people -- 40 to 21 1. Where it gets disturbing nowadays is that 22 there's Levels 3s and 4s which they consider 23 being low risk, where one parole officer is 24 supervising 80 people and a Level 3 caseload,

and then the Level 4 caseload, one parole
 officer is supervising 160 people. And
 they're considered low risk.

And how COMPAS determines -- you know, 4 5 weighs it, a lot of it deals with age. A lot of these low-risk parolees for COMPAS, 6 7 they're a guy who has a murder, he has double homicide, robbery first, just did 30 years 8 inside the facility, and he's coming out as a 9 10 low-risk parolee. Now, you can't imagine the face on these parolees. And they're low risk 11 because the standard at a Level 4 is that you 12 13 see them once every four months. For the 14 first two months you see them, you know, 15 pretty much weekly, but then after your first 16 two months, you know, where you're telling them "I need you to go to treatment, this is 17 18 a job, where you can find a job, " you tell 19 the parolee "I'll see you in four months," 20 and they look at you like you're crazy. 21 Because they're like, What do you mean, four 22 months? You don't want to see me for four months? No, that's how the science says we 23 24 have to supervise you.

1 And I can tell you right now, we're 2 failing these people dramatically. Because 3 not seeing them in four months, not seeing them in three months, we're losing out. The 4 5 reason why I supervise a sex offender 6 caseload as a supervisor, the reason why the 7 sex offenders recidivate at such a low rate, is that we see them all the time. We are on 8 top of them. We know if they miss one 9 10 treatment program. We know as soon as 11 they're positive for drugs. 12 The new COMPAS system right now was a 13 cost-effective tool to eliminate parole officers, and it's a rise to crimes, 14 15 unfortunately. And I apologize for that. 16 I would also like to clarify a couple of things that they talked about. You heard 17 18 about the two different warrant sweeps, the absconders. And you heard about -- I think 19 20 Assemblyman Oaks talked about police officers 21 doing our jobs. And I think it's wonderful 22 to have the information come our way, but you

also hear about the absconder -- excuse me -the absconder thing in which they did -- OSI

is the Office of Special Investigation. It's
 run by the Department of Corrections. It's
 the former Inspector General's office. They
 led two different warrant sweeps on
 absconders.

Senator Nozzolio told you that the 6 7 department talks about one to 200, one parole officer for 200 absconders. OSI ran a 8 warrant sweep in Rochester in December, the 9 10 22nd through -- I think the 19th through the 22nd. They brought 100 different correction 11 12 officers, CERT officers, and a few different parole officers. They focused on 36 parole 13 14 absconder warrants. During that time, they 15 caught 13 people. It cost the state, to pay 16 their overtime, their regular salary and lodging, approximately \$250,000 to run that 17 18 one operation. That was a net rate of 19 \$19,000 per one absconder.

20The one in Brooklyn cost the state I21believe it was around \$450,000. They caught2250 absconders, I think 59, running the state23\$8,000 per absconder.

24 I can tell you in Syracuse, during

that same three-day period they did the warrant attempt in Rochester, I had my regular parole officers who were still seeing their parolees for the office in their home, we did our own warrant sweep without paying any overtime. I caught nine, costing the state no money extra.

We have problems also with OSI running 8 9 the operations. Due to many different 10 reasons right now -- Assemblyman O'Donnell heard from the Corrections Institute, and 11 12 they talked about reform for OSI and the 13 problems that have plaqued OSI across the 14 state. We heard Assistant Commissioner 15 Annucci talk about reforms which they're 16 trying to put forward with OSI. We have a 17 lot of problems with that. I can tell you 18 right now, the Rochester sweep -- we're 19 effective public, you know, safety right now. 20 We were always told, you know, your 21 relationship with your parolee is what's 22 going to save you as a parole officer. You need to build that relationship, you build 23 24 that trust, you build their care, you build

1 the family's trust, and that's how you get
2 by.

3 What they did when they ran these warrant sweeps, instead of talking your way 4 5 in, they introduced CERT canine units, they had CERT officers there with assault rifles. 6 7 They answered the door with a ballistic shield in their hand and someone pointing a 8 gun behind there when grandma and grandpa and 9 10 mom and dad and the loved ones answered the door. 11

12 So what they did there is that they 13 trampled over our relationship, because we 14 understand, we violate that guy's parole, 15 he's coming back in 90 days. We've got to 16 work with them. We got to make them succeed. We want him to succeed, we want him to be 17 productive. And what they did, they trampled 18 19 over that whole relationship.

20 And we question the motive on which 21 they're doing that, because the day that they 22 announced the warrant sweep and that OSI was 23 going to take over our warrants was a day 24 after the Corrections Association made their I think 107-page testimony to Crime and
 Corrections. So we question the motive
 behind there.

We heard a lot of different things 4 5 about vehicles. Mr. Annucci -- before I go back, let me revert back real quick. They 6 7 said that these warrant sweeps are not going to stop. And that's problematic for us, 8 because it was \$700,000 for two warrant 9 10 sweeps. If they continue those warrant sweeps the rest of the year, it would cost 11 12 \$4,350,000 for one year.

New York City has a high number of 13 14 absconders down there, and the reason why the 15 high number of absconders is down there is 16 that prior to the merger we used to have seven different warrant teams down there, 17 18 with a senior parole officer and six parole 19 officers. Now it's down to only two teams, 20 trying to find all those absconders.

21 So just to talk real quick about the 22 vehicles, and I'll be done, I promise --23 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Okay, because we do 24 have a lot of people waiting.

1 MR. RIGBY: All right. Yes. 2 The vehicles -- Commissioner Annucci 3 talked about 37 new vehicles, and I've heard the State Police talk about their vehicle 4 5 fleet. I can tell you, our vehicle fleet right now for Community Supervision, it's 6 7 219. Out of those, only 186 are assigned to parole officers that supervise 36,000 8 parolees. And we have right now 57 vehicles 9 10 that have over 125,000 miles on them. A lot of them have over 200,000 miles on them. 11 12 We are asking for that to be changed 13 and for more money to be put into the budget 14 to add more vehicles for our fleet as a resource in which we need to do -- because if 15 there's not a vehicle available for the state 16 vehicle, we're forced to use our own personal 17 18 vehicle in which we take our family members 19 in, we have our kids traveling in, and it's a 20 danger to my officers' safety. 21 Thank you. 22 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Thank 23 you, Mr. Rigby. 24 Senator Nozzolio.

1 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Good evening. 2 MR. RIGBY: Good evening, sir. SENATOR NOZZOLIO: This is important 3 4 stuff. I'm in no hurry. We've been at this 5 for 10 hours. And I think the fact of the 6 matter is --7 (Applause from audience.) -- when your job -- when your job is 8 not being done to the standards that you have 9 10 just described, people die. It is life and 11 death. So this -- many, many important 12 issues. Let's start with, maybe, from my left 13 14 to right, is it Howanski? 15 MS. BRATE: My name is Nikki Brate. 16 Penny gave the written testimony. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Nikki, what's your 17 18 last name again? MS. BRATE: It's Nikki Brate. 19 B-R-A-T-E. And I'm a vice president with 20 21 PEF. 22 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Great. Thank you. 23 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you. 24 I won't belabor the testimony. I

1 think it's important that we recognize that I 2 do not subscribe to the director's testimony here and the rosy picture that was put 3 4 forward. 5 I am very fearful that the data of New Yorkers is not being properly kept. That I 6 7 don't think you're suggesting that we eliminate people with knowledge and 8 appropriate expertise to come in and help, 9 10 but you're just saying as a replacement for those workers, you're objecting to. 11 12 So I think -- is that -- do I have 13 that message correct? 14 MS. BRATE: Can you repeat what you 15 just said? 16 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Yeah. What I gather from your message was that you 17 18 objected to certain consultants taking over 19 the workload of otherwise state employees 20 that are entrusted with taking an oath of 21 office and ensuring that they protected the 22 data, the information, that's existing. Is that not correct? 23 24 MS. BRATE: So what I was saying is

1 that we have various -- we have a very 2 talented workforce, and absolutely sometimes 3 you will need to augment some of that with a consultant. But outsourcing all of that is 4 5 taking out a lot of that institutional knowledge that will provide that future 6 7 protection and the institutional knowledge that we have and the members that built those 8 9 systems, know those systems. And that is why 10 we need to keep this workforce in play. 11 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And I'm not going 12 to go overboard with that, because frankly 13 the world is changing rapidly, and that the 14 state has an obligation to come in to provide 15 the best minds with the most experience in 16 the quickest possible time. So my recommendation is you don't 17

18 fight that, you work with it. And if it 19 comes to the point where you have suggested, 20 that the security is jeopardized because of 21 privateers coming in and doing all the work 22 or a substantial amount of the work or an 23 amount of the work that is detrimental to the 24 safety and security of the data, then we need

1 to know about it.

2	But don't fight those that are
3	trying and I guess that's the sense that I
4	have, is that the technology department
5	suggests it uses a major consultant, but I'm
6	not sure to what extent. And maybe you could
7	give us an offline, off-this-testimony report
8	on exactly what is being provided. Because I
9	left that testimony shaking my head not
10	your testimony, but the testimony of the IT
11	director, shaking my head because I don't
12	have a clear picture, I don't believe any
13	member of the panel has a clear picture of
14	what she is describing.
15	Going to
16	MR. DRAKE: Steve Drake.
17	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: To Steve?
18	MR. DRAKE: Yes.
19	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I've been around a
20	long time. I worked with Dave Stallone many
21	years ago do you remember, does that name
22	sound familiar to you?
23	MR. DRAKE: Absolutely.
24	SENATOR NOZZOLIO: That we got those

antique pagers -- except they were high-tech, 1 2 cutting edge at the time. Twenty years ago is a long time in the technical world. Those 3 4 things are necessary to the teachers in our 5 correctional system, absolutely. I'm shocked 6 they haven't been upgraded in all this period 7 of time. Do you have specific proposals 8 relative to upgrading and the protecting? 9 10 MR. DRAKE: We can provide you that 11 information. 12 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Would you do that? MR. DRAKE: Yes. 13 14 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: And do it quickly? 15 That's what Dave Stallone did 20 years ago. 16 I hope you'll follow up in that path. MR. DRAKE: Absolutely. 17 18 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I don't know if you 19 heard any of the comments I made during the 20 questioning of Commissioner Annucci. 21 MR. DRAKE: I did, sir. 22 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: That the staffing ratios are the structural problem that is 23 24 creating a dangerous situation. I think

1 that's the bottom line. That's your bottom 2 line. Certainly there are people who are 3 trying to do the best in changing protocols and providing additional infrastructure and 4 5 equipment. But with these kind of ratios, I don't know how effective that will be. 6 7 Please comment. MR. RIGBY: Yes, sir. The ratios 8 9 nowadays are unacceptable, and I think that's 10 where the system is failing nowadays. I 11 mean, it's failing the community because 12 community safety is being jeopardized, it's 13 failing the parolee because the parolee's not 14 getting the service which they used to 15 receive. 16 I mean, the relationship and the bond between the parole officer and the parolee 17 cannot be undermined, and when you don't see 18 19 a person for three, four months at a time and 20 you don't get to meet mom -- you know, when I

21 used to visit my parolees when I was a parole 22 officer, I'd be out there two, three, four 23 times a month. The parents knew me. The 24 sisters knew me. The kids knew me. "Hey,

Mr. Rigby, how are you?" You built that
 bond, you built that relationship, because
 they tell you, "Hey, Johnny's doing right,
 Mr. Rigby."

5 And when you don't see these people, we've got a disconnect nowadays, and it's 6 7 causing the problems. And if the parolee does relapse and he starts using drugs, we 8 don't know about it sometimes three, four 9 10 months down the road. And then we're losing them by that time, because it's going too far 11 12 along.

13 If you dropped the numbers back down 14 to something that was manageable and a parole 15 officer could have an active contact with the 16 parolee in the community, we'd be much safer 17 and we'd be much more successful.

18 Commissioner Annucci only gave you the 19 rate of recidivism for a person committing a 20 felony. Right now, our rate of recidivism 21 for a parole violator is about 49 percent. 22 And we have many different alternative 23 programs they have in there.

24 And another problem they have is they

1 have us doing a lot of duties which we never 2 did before. I know, you know, I think --3 you know, everybody in here because -- about five years ago, one of our parole officers 4 5 was shot and killed in -- shot and injured in Manhattan, at the office. We put metal 6 7 detectors in there. And then the state 8 developed an ISO item to guard our metal 9 detectors.

10 But what happens right now is that when that ISO officer is no longer able to 11 12 man that metal detector, the department has 13 parole officers, Grade 21s, doing Grade 9 14 work. They will not run the academy until 15 they have five empty items. We waste tens of 16 thousands of hours, parole officers taken out of the community to work a Grade 9 metal 17 18 detector because they refuse to run the 19 academies. And it's not acceptable.

20Those parole officers need to be in21the community. They need to be having22contact with these parolees to help them23succeed.

24 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: I'm out of time,

1 so -- in terms of the clock, I know others 2 want to speak. But thank you very much for 3 the focus on this, and please continue to 4 provide us the input we need to help change 5 these policies. 6 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Senator. 7 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: We'll now hear from Assemblymember O'Donnell. 8 9 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Thank you very 10 much, Mr. Rigby. You're not from New York City, but you speak as fast as Mr. Lynch. 11 12 (Laughter.) ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Which is quite 13 14 an accomplishment. And the way you say 15 Manhattan, I know you're not from New York 16 City. So one of the problems is you have a 17 18 huge amount of information with a lot of 19 acronyms and letters that I've come to know 20 what a lot of them are, but many people 21 don't. Okay? So I want to start first with the definition section. 22 In the day, 20 years ago, no one got 23 24 out of prison until the Parole Board said

"You can go." So everyone had a sentence 1 with two numbers -- it was two-to-six or 2 3 one-to-three, whatever else it was -- and at some point they say, "Oh, you're a good guy 4 5 to go home." We changed that system, and now we 6 7 have a system where we have a solid number, one number -- five -- and then five years of 8 9 community supervision. So when someone says 10 someone was, quote, paroled, in a lot of people's minds that means someone decided to 11 12 let them go, which may not be the case. But 13 they're under supervision. 14 So you're not even really parole 15 officers anymore, you're technically 16 community supervision officers. Is that 17 right? 18 MR. RIGBY: That's the new term, sir. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Okay, yeah. 20 So I want to make sure that you understood my 21 criticism earlier about the COMPAS system was 22 not directed at you or anybody who does your job. It was entirely directed at the 23 24 Parole Board, which, when getting that

1 instrument, is not following the law that we 2 wrote about how to use it. It had nothing to 3 do with the way that you hardworking men and women do your job. So I'll be very clear 4 5 about that. Okay? MR. RIGBY: Okay. 6 7 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Now, you seem 8 to have new presidents on a regular basis at the PEF. I just want to share that with you, 9 10 you seem to roll through them -- I don't 11 criticize you for that, but I've met with the 12 previous ones and now your new one has asked 13 for a meeting with me with, I believe, people 14 in the Parole Department. Are you on the list of --15 16 MR. RIGBY: I will see you next week, 17 sir. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: See? Now who 18 knows my schedule better than me? 19 I'm very happy, because you clearly 20 21 know quite a bit about the way that works. 22 And I want to assure you that I have the utmost respect for the people who do your 23 24 job, and I will do everything I can to help

1 you do your job better. 2 MR. RIGBY: Thank you, sir. I 3 appreciate it. 4 (Applause from audience.) 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Senator Gallivan. 6 7 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you. And thanks to all of you for your 8 work, your members' work, and your testimony. 9 10 Senator Nozzolio covered much of what I wanted to cover, so I'll spare two of you. 11 12 But, Officer Rigby, if I can follow through 13 on the discussion regarding the caseload 14 ratios. 15 So first, tell me -- so a parole officer. An individual is released from the 16 prison and is assigned to your caseload. 17 18 What is your responsibility? 19 MR. RIGBY: Well, prior to the 20 individual being released from the facility, 21 he has that COMPAS risk-and-needs-assessment tool done to him. 22 SENATOR GALLIVAN: No, let me ask -- I 23 24 just want to know -- I'll get into COMPAS.

1 But I just want to know what is the

2 responsibility -- what does it mean when
3 you're supervising a parolee?

4 MR. RIGBY: Well, when they're first 5 initially released, they come to your office, 6 you go over the rules and regulations, you 7 talk about their housing, you talk about 8 their needs, you talk about their goals. You 9 take a look at what they need to have happen. 10 We want to refer them to DSS.

I I know the department's been working tirelessly trying to get Medicaid on board, but each county's a little different in trying to have those services available.

15 So we take a look at, you know, their 16 history. They might have a substance abuse history; we'll refer them to get substance 17 18 abuse treatment. They might be a domestic violence quy, we refer them to treatment. So 19 20 after we get our first initial referral set 21 up, we'll say, "Hey, come back and see us 22 next week, this is my report date." We go -- we visit them in the 23 24 community, we make sure they're staying where

1 they're supposed to be staying, we meet with 2 the family to make sure they're transitioned 3 and they head home where they're supposed to be. If they're homeless, we're working with 4 5 them, "Hey, who do you know" -- because a lot of times they don't know someone, they might 6 7 run into somebody on the street and say, 8 "Hey, Johnny says you can take me in. He's my friend." Then we go take a look at that 9 10 house. We refer them to a lot of different 11

12 programs, the Department of Labor, so they 13 get help finding work. 14 So we're trying to prioritize with 15 them and meet with them to address their

16 needs and to help them to stabilize
17 themselves, because those first eight weeks
18 are crucial.

So the initial first eight weeks depends on the COMPAS score. We meet them weekly. But then where the disconnect comes through, Senator, is after that. Because then COMPAS kicks in, and then that determines when we got to see them again.

1 The Level 1s and 2s are high risk, 2 maybe not so much the high needs, I would 3 argue sometimes, and we still see them on a monthly basis. But where we're losing the 4 5 battles, and I cannot stress enough, are the 3s and 4s who are being supervised by one 6 7 parole officer to 80 parolees on the 3s, one parole officer to 160 -- because I can't tell 8 you, the look on their face when we say "Come 9 10 back and see me in three months, come back and see me in four months." We were their 11 12 crutch, and now you just took that crutch 13 away from them.

14 And that's the difference between 15 nowadays, with the COMPAS, and prior. 16 Because they can rely on us for one full year, and after one full year, if they did 17 18 well, they earned their way back down to 19 lower-level supervision. Because we all want 20 them to have a lower level of supervision, we 21 all want then to succeed.

22 SENATOR GALLIVAN: So now we get to 23 the Level 4s that have the 160-to-1 ratio. 24 Over the course of a four-month period,

1 you're seeing them once every four months? MR. RIGBY: Twice. 2 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Twice? 3 MR. RIGBY: You see them once in the 4 5 office, and once at home. SENATOR GALLIVAN: And how much time 6 7 does that involve? MR. RIGBY: Well, I can tell you, the 8 ones in the office visit might be five, 9 10 10 minutes. The ones at the home visit might 11 take an officer five, six, seven days. 12 And here's the problem. Because when 13 you have this disconnect -- and the parolee's 14 not supposed to change his residence unless 15 we know about it -- the parole officer might 16 go to his house two months from now, knock on the door, the guy's not there. He tries then 17 two weeks later, goes there, he's not there. 18 19 Goes up again next week, he's still not 20 there. We talk to mom, mom says: "No, he moved last week. He didn't tell you?" 21 And so there's a lot of wasted time 22 23 trying to catch back up with these guys. And 24 a lot of times they're trying to hide from us

1 because they know they relapsed on drugs, 2 they know they did something wrong. 3 And we're no longer proactively supervising these people. The parole 4 5 officers are making their standards, but I 6 can tell you they're not being supervised, 7 based upon the new COMPAS system. SENATOR GALLIVAN: Let me, for the 8 sake of time -- and I agree with Senator 9 10 Nozzolio that I wish we had much more time today to talk about this, but of course 11 12 there's other speakers, and we can follow up 13 separately. 14 What I want to get to is -- so you're 15 five, 10 minutes once or twice a month with 16 an individual that has committed what types of crime? 17 MR. RIGBY: The COMPAS Level 4 --18 19 because COMPAS uses age as a primary factor 20 in weighing out stuff. A lot of those guys 21 are guys who committed murder, homicide, 22 robbery first, because they're the guy that just did 25, 30 years in the facility. 23 24 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Okay. Thanks.

1 MR. RIGBY: They're a little bit 2 older. SENATOR GALLIVAN: Now --3 4 MR. RIGBY: Here's the problem, 5 though, is the guy --6 SENATOR GALLIVAN: No, no. Timewise, 7 I'm sorry. MR. RIGBY: Sorry. 8 9 SENATOR GALLIVAN: And then I will let 10 you finish. 11 Is the COMPAS instrument the only 12 thing that determines those caseload ratios? 13 MR. RIGBY: Yes. COMPAS is the 14 primary driver for that. 15 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right. Thanks. 16 And then, finally, you mentioned two different areas, which I believe is why 17 everybody should care. And it doesn't matter 18 19 where you start. You could start with the 20 community that I care about and talk very 21 briefly why this is wrong and we're failing 22 the community in helping to ensure community safety, public safety. And we all also care, 23 24 I believe, about rehabilitation and reducing

1 recidivism. And you mentioned that we're 2 failing the inmate. 3 Finish with commenting on both of them, please. 4 5 MR. RIGBY: I will. It's kind of plain and obvious to see 6 7 that communities' safety is jeopardized when we're not seeing these people on a regular 8 basis. If we can catch them when they first 9 10 relapse to drugs, when they first start violating their curfew -- I always believe in 11 12 the mantra that I always sweated the small 13 things and the small conditions because if we 14 took care of all the small things, we never 15 had big things. You know, so if I kept them, 16 you know, for the first year doing the right things, they'd relapse, I'd talk to them, I'd 17 18 get them to a little more treatment -- it 19 kind of corrected itself, you know. 20 So by keeping these people involved in 21 programs, helping them find the jobs, helping 22 them become productive, they're less likely

24 heard the commissioner talk about all these

23

to engage in new criminal behavior. You

educational programs? We try to also send
 them to educational programs, vocational
 programs in the community.

4 Now, on the flip side, that's about 5 the parolee. The community supervision and safety part is hand in hand there. Parolees 6 7 are committing crimes because they're not being supervised the same way they used to be 8 supervised, Senator. We do not have an 9 10 adequate amount of parole staff supervising these people. Our ratio is at an all-time 11 12 high right now. And if that COMPAS risk and 13 needs assessment was so perfect, why do I 14 always have to override all the sex 15 offenders? They come up as 3 or 4, as low 16 risk. I've always got to override them. Why am I always overriding the domestic violence 17 18 cases to make them a higher level? Because it does not ask the right questions and does 19 20 not assign the right amount of supervision. 21 And that's the problem we're having today, 22 sir.

23 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Okay. It sounds24 like you have an impossible task, and that's

1 very troublesome. None of it falls on the 2 shoulders of your officers, but we recognize 3 the problems. Thank you. 4 MR. RIGBY: Thank you. 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 6 Assembly? 7 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: So I have a couple of questions, and I'm going to start 8 at the left and work through to the right. 9 10 And I'll be as quick possible. First of all, Nikki, you heard my 11 12 comments earlier when the director was speaking. I do want to continue to follow up 13 14 on that. I have a great challenge when we're spending hundreds of millions of dollars in 15 overtime on consultants, because I don't know 16 if the supervision is there. We all agree, 17 18 and you admitted it yourself, there's going 19 to be a time and place. But it shouldn't be 20 the practice all the time, and I do agree 21 that middle level is a great opportunity to 22 grow committed employees in this department. Steven, in regards to the salary 23 24 disparity you're talking about with the

1 professionals -- the nurses, the pharmacists, 2 whatever it may be -- what is the disparity 3 percentage-wise between what the market is bearing and where they're being compensated 4 5 at? MR. DRAKE: I mean, it varies across 6 7 the board, you know, across the state. But like in Central New York, where I work, you 8 know, our biggest competitor is SUNY Upstate. 9 10 And they offer thousands -- \$8,000 to \$10,000 11 more than the salaries that we can pay in the 12 local facilities. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Right. 14 MR. DRAKE: And we compete against, 15 you know, local hospitals as well, who 16 offer -- they may offer different programs for them that we can't offer. And we start, 17 18 you know -- nurses are way underpaid. We 19 can't compete. We can't even -- honestly, we 20 can't even get extra service or outside services to come into a lot of our facilities 21 22 as well. ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: All right, 23 24 thank you.

1 And Paul, as a gentleman who was 2 privileged to be mayor of a small city for 3 13 years and one who represents five cities now, the coverage criteria that you were 4 5 telling me absolutely scares the life out of me. I appreciate all the work that all of 6 7 you do. I would like to know at a follow-up -- and Nikki knows how to get hold 8 of me, she sees me regularly -- a little more 9 10 detail on the coverage here, particularly 11 here in the Capital Region. 12 You guys play a very interesting role. 13 Yes, you're enforcement, to a degree, but 14 you're guidance and you're support. And 15 let's face it, when individuals are released 16 from facilities, they're getting their feet back on the ground and they need the support 17 18 as much as possible. 19 And at the same token, I can tell you 20 that I have mayors calling me regularly 21 saying -- because the cities, naturally, will 22 attract many people being released. They usually return to where they came from, and 23

that's where most of the crime tends to be,

24

1 unfortunately -- right, wrong, or indifferent. And there's a frustration at 2 the local law enforcement level, which -- I 3 4 know you guys work well together, but still 5 it's a challenge. 6 So I am very interested in greater 7 detail, particularly with here in the Capital Region. Thanks for all the work that 8 all of you do. 9 10 MR. DRAKE: Thank you. 11 MR. RIGBY: Thank you, sir. 12 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Senator Savino. 13 14 SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you, Senator Young. I will be brief. 15 16 You know, last night your president was here. We were with him, the vice 17 president, and you during the workforce 18 19 hearing, and a lot of discussion was around 20 the shortage of staff in all of these 21 agencies and the difficulty that your members 22 now face meeting the demands of these agencies, whether it's Parole or DOCCS or 23 24 OCFS or OMH, OPWDD -- the list goes on and

1 on.

2	We heard earlier tonight from the
3	DOCCS earlier today from the DOCCS
4	commissioner that overtime is a little bit
5	less than last year, and that everything
6	seems to be okay. But I get the sense that's
7	not necessarily the case. I understand that
8	there's a real problem with attracting and
9	recruiting and retaining medical
10	professionals in DOCCS; is that correct?
11	MR. DRAKE: That's correct.
12	SENATOR SAVINO: I mean, I think
13	there used to be this poor nurse, I'm not
14	going to name her name, but she would always
15	list the highest overtime in the state at
16	Bedford Correctional Facility. I think she
17	finally retired, thank God. But, you know,
18	seriously, thank God for her.
19	But I'm seriously concerned about the
20	ability of your members to deliver medical
21	care in our facilities, to be able to track
22	parolees, to be able to deal with the
23	developmentally disabled, to plan or to
24	handle engineering, and this is so agency

1 by agency, we're seeing this. But this is a 2 real problem. It's the number of staff and 3 the number of -- and the ability to recruit and retain quality staff. 4 5 I mean, do you guys have -- can you give us any sense of how short-staffed you 6 7 are in these three divisions? MR. RIGBY: I'll start. 8 Right now, if you look at our BIFL, 9 10 when you look at the warrant sweep they did 11 in Brooklyn and they caught the 59 parole 12 absconders -- they were short 37 parole officers prior to the last recruit class 13 14 coming out. So when you wonder why, you know, they caught 59 out of 200, it's because 15 16 no one was looking for them for a while because they were down 37 items. 17 SENATOR SAVINO: Mm-hmm. 18 19 MR. RIGBY: You know, the problem is 20 right now, using the new parole math, when 21 you say one officer can supervise 160 22 people -- prior to COMPAS, that was four officers supervising those people. So if you 23 24 use their new math, their math is going to

1	say that we might be down 10 percent, but if
2	you use the old math, we're probably down
3	about 45 percent.
4	SENATOR SAVINO: Mm-hmm.
5	MR. RIGBY: I mean, our ratio right
6	now is one parole officer per 55 parolees,
7	where before it was right around one per 38.
8	You know?
9	SENATOR SAVINO: Mm-hmm.
10	MR. RIGBY: So our staffing levels are
11	down dramatically, and the commissioner
12	alluded to two academy classes this year. I
13	did not see that in the budget. I'm not sure
14	where he's getting that from, but I did not
15	see the two academy classes for parole
16	officers in the budget.
17	SENATOR SAVINO: Mm-hmm. I mean,
18	conceivably there are some positions that can
19	be contracted out. Some things can't. You
20	cannot contract out parole supervision,
21	right?
22	MR. RIGBY: Correct.
23	SENATOR SAVINO: Exactly. So there is
24	a case to be made that this budget doesn't

really reflect the needs of the agency or the
 responsibilities that have to be delivered by
 these agencies and your members.

4 MR. DRAKE: From our standpoint in the 5 facilities, I can't give you the actual 6 number, but I know that there's 200-some-plus 7 new full-time employees that they're adding, 8 and a large portion of them are medical 9 services.

10 But the ability to recruit and bring those people in to fill those is nearly 11 12 impossible. I mean, our facility just underwent a \$30 million renovation, with the 13 14 plan hopefully sometime in the next couple of 15 months to open that new wing for inmate care. 16 And we're going to be looking for -- well, right now we're short 12 nurses, and with the 17 new increase, we'll be looking for almost 18 19 21 nurses in our facility. 20 SENATOR SAVINO: Unbelievable. 21 Thanks. I just want to -- I 22 constantly want to get it on the record that

the agencies are drastically understaffed andthat hiring has got to be a consideration,

1	not just for the administration of the
2	mission of the agencies but for the safety of
3	the staff as well. Thank you.
4	MR. DRAKE: Thank you.
5	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
6	I have a comment and a question. I
7	share Senator Savino's concern about
8	understaffing, and especially about the
9	medical understaffing. And in the 2016
10	budget, this year's budget, the Legislature
11	felt so strongly about mental health services
12	in the prison system because, as you know,
13	we've seen real-life tragedies where people
14	have been severely injured and killed by
15	inmates who have left the system without the
16	supports that they need within the system and
17	outside.
18	And so apparently \$18 million of that
19	funding has been expended to treat the
20	psychiatric prisoners who have violent
21	tendencies. Have you seen that happen?
22	Because it's concerning to me to see that
23	there was an MOU between OMH and DOCCS which
24	expired in 1999 that's incredible to me

1 that outlines the duties of the nurses 2 between psychiatric nurses and regular 3 nurses. Could you expound on that? And my question, also, if you've seen 4 5 any changes over the past year regarding that issue and are there additional measures being 6 7 taken or is there additional attention to the psychiatric prisoners, and how does it affect 8 9 your members? 10 MR. DRAKE: From my standpoint, 11 there's definitely been an increase in 12 training for all staff, I will say, from the 13 initiative from the department to educate us 14 on handling mental health inmates. Our 15 facility earlier on, prior to when we first 16 started taking mental health inmates in or dealing with them, there was basically -- you 17 18 were a normal correctional facility one day 19 and then you became a mental health facility 20 the next day, with no real training to the staff. 21

Over the last three years there's been an initiative with the department and ourselves from the union standpoint to train

1 staff in informing them how to deal with 2 that. They're still looking at developing 3 some of that training and including correction officers to deal with, you know, 4 5 some of that. Because some of the correction officers are not getting that same training 6 7 that the civilian staff are getting. As far as the MOU goes, there's a lot 8 9 to be said. Supposedly, that we heard today 10 that they are almost done with revising the 11 MOU between the two departments. But there 12 is still -- is nothing that distinguishes 13 between the psychiatric nurse and a regular 14 nurse in the facilities. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: So it's taken since 15

1999 to get the MOU done. Thank you for 16 that. And I want to sincerely thank you for 17 being here today, and all of your members. 18 19 And, you know -- does the Assembly 20 have any more? 21 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: We're good. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Oh, you're good. 22 23 Okay. 24 Well, what I was going to recommend is

1 that PEF continue to be in touch with the 2 Senators and the Assemblymembers. We 3 appreciate the work that you do. We're 4 concerned about the issues you raised 5 tonight; we would like to hear more about 6 those issues so that they can be addressed. 7 So again, thank you for being here tonight. We really appreciate it. 8 9 (Applause from audience.) 10 MR. DRAKE: Thank you. MS. BRATE: Thank you. 11 12 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next group is from the New York State Defenders 13 14 Association. We have Executive Director 15 Jonathan Gradess and Legal Director of 16 Veterans Defense Programs Art Cody. Glad to have you here. 17 MR. GRADESS: Thank you. And thank 18 19 you for your patience. 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you for your 21 patience. 22 MR. GRADESS: Well, mutual admiration. 23 As you noted, I am joined by Captain 24 Art Cody, U.S. Navy, retired. I want to

apologize for Gary Horton, the director of
 the Veterans Defense Program; he had to be
 back in Batavia in about 10 minutes, so he
 left here a bit ago, disappointed.

5 I want to talk about four things. Art 6 will help me with VDP. But I want to talk to 7 you about the Backup Center, a part of which 8 is the Veterans Defense Program. I want to 9 talk about the IPP program, the indigent 10 legal services budget, and the Fahy bill --11 the Fahy-DeFrancisco bill, forgive me.

12 Before I do that, I'd like to sort of 13 paint a little bit of a picture because I 14 think, for the first time in many years --15 and I have been coming before you for many 16 years -- we have a watershed moment in New York, and it is a watershed moment in which I 17 18 think we may all be on the same page, which 19 is a wonderful thing. And that page is 20 mandate relief.

21 And everything I want to talk to you 22 about actually can be viewed as mandate 23 relief. And in recent years, I have talked 24 to you about my efforts to create a global

settlement for the Hurrell-Harring lawsuit.
 They were uniquely unsuccessful. And then
 there came the settlement last year, and that
 has created a real opportunity for
 conversation in New York unlike anything I
 have seen since 1978 when I started with the
 Backup Center.

Sometimes I've come before you 8 9 whining, sometimes thanking you, thanking you 10 particularly last year for the Veterans 11 Defense Program and always saving the Backup 12 Center from what is this year a 58 percent 13 cut by the Governor that I hope will be restored by you. But right now, we have 57 14 15 counties in the State of New York who are up 16 in arms about the nature of the settlement.

17 One of the reasons we urged a global 18 settlement in Hurrell-Harring was because we 19 thought that would empower the state to move 20 incrementally and do what is right for all 21 the counties. Recall, please, that when the 22 New York Civil Liberties Union sued the State of New York, it sued the State of New York. 23 24 It didn't sue the five counties that were

1 named in the suit eventually. Those were 2 added by the judge. This was a lawsuit on 3 behalf of counties against the State of New York to say the State of New York is 4 5 responsible for funding public defense services -- not the responsibility of 6 7 Onondaga and Schuyler and the other 8 defendants, but also not the responsibility of Seneca or Albany or anywhere else. 9 10 And that reality, I think, has now come home to roost, because the settlement 11

12 called on ILS to engage in quality 13 development in each jurisdiction to develop 14 Counsel at First Arraignment programs, to 15 develop eligibility standards and caseload 16 relief.

17 And so as Bill Leahy so eloquently 18 said before, you have this situation of Suffolk County getting a present and 19 20 Nassau County feeling coal in their stocking. You have two assigned-counsel programs that 21 22 surround Onondaga, one to the north, one to 23 the west. They're both in the same kind of 24 problem. And it's true on the Southern Tier,

1 where Schuyler sits, that the surrounding 2 counties all need the help, as I think you'll hear when Mark Williams testifies. 3 So what I want to say is that all of 4 5 what I am asking you to look at is part of that mosaic that puts us together for the 6 7 first time in history to recognize that the state has an obligation to fund and care and 8 take care of the constitutional right to 9 10 counsel. So when Bill Leahy talks about the 11 12 \$34 million of local assistance that is in 13 the ILS budget, it shouldn't be passed over, 14 because it begins to repair the kind of 15 things in the other 57 counties that the settlement did for the five. 16 I would hope that each of you -- I 17 18 know Assemblyman McDonald is on the bill, I don't think anybody else is -- get on the 19 20 DeFrancisco bill. He's on the Fahy bill, but there's now consensus in both houses that 21 that bill that would call for the 22 reimbursement of localities for the 23 24 expenditure of public defense services. That bill makes tremendously good sense, it allows for the incremental repair of the state, and it reverses what's happening with the five down, 57 to go, as we call it, that has resulted from the settlement.

The Backup Center, which you have 6 7 helped for every year that I have been in Albany, is in need of your assistance once 8 again. It is in need of your assistance 9 10 because last year we came to you for \$3.5 million; this year is for \$4.25 million. 11 12 The difference really is the incremental 13 increase for the Veterans Defense Program 14 that I'd like to speak about in a second.

15 But the Backup Center is really the 16 poster child for the original mandate relief. When we were housed with NYSAC, it was 17 18 recognized that if in one single place you 19 could put the expertise that would help 20 localities and public defenders, you could 21 bring up the boats in the state. And we now have a case management system in 67 offices 22 in 45 counties, we are doing 35 to 40 23 24 training programs a year for defenders, we do

1 thousands of cases a year where lawyers can 2 call us, there are 6,000 lawyers that we're under contract to serve in 120 defender 3 plans. And they need us. 4 5 So all of these things create a mosaic. We need the Local Assistance budget, 6 7 we need the Fahy bill, we need the Backup Center to be funded, we need the IPP 8 program and -- I'm sorry Senator Gallivan 9 10 isn't here -- we need that to be restored by the Senate. 11 12 And we very much need to increase the 13 Veterans Defense Program. Last year you were kind enough to put \$500,000 into the budget. 14 15 That program has exploded and is doing 16 wonderful work across the state. You should each have a copy of this report, which is our 17 18 activities report, which I think will show 19 you that you ought to be proud of what you 20 did. We asked the Governor to pick it up at 21 \$1.1 million this year, because we thought it 22 would be a natural. Apparently it was a little unnatural; he did not pick it up. 23 24 We're asking for \$1.1 million for VDP.

That's within the \$4.25 million total we're
 asking.

3 I'd like to ask Captain Cody to talk
4 about what he's been doing, because he's been
5 working like a dog. And we're very proud of
6 the work of the program, and I think he
7 should be too.

MR. CODY: Thank you, Jonathan. 8 What I want to talk to you about 9 10 tonight, quickly, is the scope and the urgency of the catastrophe that our veterans 11 12 are suffering in New York State courts every 13 day. Myself and Gary Horton, our director, 14 are on the ground every day assisting these 15 cases. We hear the horrific stories of what 16 our veterans have been through. We see the resulting post-traumatic stress disorder and 17 traumatic brain injury. We see the military 18 19 combat trauma. Without our help, their 20 stories are often never told to the judges, 21 the prosecutors, and the juries that will 22 pass judgement on them.

We have assisted, in the past year,
over 1,000 veterans and defense attorneys.

1 Our requests, however, have grown 2 exponentially. We've assisted veterans 3 literally from Montauk to Niagara, from Canton to New York City. Each attorney we 4 5 train, each veteran we help generates new referrals with the success that we've had 6 7 that are discussed in the report that you have. The VDP has a staff of three, only two 8 of which are attorneys. 9

10 You can be assured we will never turn 11 a veteran away who needs our help. But we 12 desperately need help. We cannot cover as much as is the need. The requested increase 13 14 in our appropriation will make possible 15 additional staff members and permit us to 16 carry on this much-needed work that our veterans need and deserve. 17 18 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Thank you. 19 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Points well made. 20 Thank you very much for your input. 21 MR. CODY: Thank you. 22 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: No comment? Gentlemen, thank you very much. We 23 24 have no other comment.

1	MR. GRADESS: Thank you very much.
2	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. We
3	appreciate you being here tonight.
4	MR. CODY: Thank you.
5	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you for all
6	that you do for veterans.
7	Our next speaker is from the
8	Chief Defenders Association of New York, Mark
9	Williams, president-elect and public defender
10	in Cattaraugus County, my home district.
11	Welcome, President-Elect Williams.
12	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator
13	Young. It's my pleasure to be here.
14	I was going to start off by letting
15	you all know that I forgot to bring
16	certificates for you, but you all qualify or
17	are getting pretty close to qualifying as
18	honorary public defenders because, from what
19	I hear last night, you were here until
20	10 p.m. Tonight you'll probably be here
21	until 10 p.m.
22	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: At least.
23	MR. WILLIAMS: And that's the typical
24	day of an upstate public defender. We start

1 at 8 o'clock or 8:30 in the morning, and we 2 go until 10 o'clock at night. And usually 3 without breaks for dinner or sometimes even 4 lunch. So I just want to welcome you to my 5 world.

I have my prepared comments; I'm not 6 7 going to read those to you. But what I want 8 to point out is that right now in New York 9 State, as Jonathan Gradess has stated, it's a 10 united world for indigent defense. We are 11 all on the same side. Whether you're a 12 public defender on Long Island or in the City 13 or anywhere upstate, we all are of one mind, 14 and that is that it's time for reform, it's 15 time for change. It's time for the state to 16 recognize its obligation to provide indigent defense. Not the counties. 17

And this point is being brought home to us now from the standpoint of the grants that ILS has sent out in the last couple of -- last three years, actually, the grant that 25 counties applied for and were accepted for Counsel at First Appearance. The grant for caseload reduction that, again,

it was 46 counties applied for and were
 awarded. Those grants are going to expire

3 later this year.

Cattaraugus County is the beneficiary 4 5 of both of those grants, and what has happened is my office has added staff, we've 6 7 added two attorneys, we've added an investigator, we've added clerical help. All 8 9 of those people are working to allow us to 10 have more time or try to find the time to do Counsel at First Appearance, and also for 11 12 caseload reduction.

13 You know, one thing I mentioned in my testimony that I submitted is that in my 14 15 county last year we had a trial that ended 16 with a not-quilty verdict on four felonies, three of which were violent felonies. My 17 client was facing 20 years or longer in 18 prison. She was found not guilty of those 19 20 felonies, and it's directly attributable to 21 the fact that we had the money from ILS to 22 start on that case from the moment she was first arraigned in the local court. Now, we 23 24 weren't successful in keeping her from going

1 to jail on bail that she could not afford. 2 It was in the amount of about -- I think it was \$25,000 cash, \$50,000 bond. She was a 3 single mother, 23 years old, she had no job, 4 5 she was taking care of her child and another child. She had never been arrested for 6 7 anything, not even a parking ticket. 8 Nothing. She went to jail for a year for this case to work through the court system 9 10 and have the trial, when she was acquitted and she was released. 11 12 Now, the reason why I bring that up is

13 that the Counsel at First Appearance money, 14 if that ends, Cattaraugus County will get rid 15 of that attorney and that investigator that 16 were so critical in helping us defend this 17 young woman.

18 When I look to see the five counties 19 in the Hurrell-Harring settlement, those 20 counties are going to be able to continue 21 their program, to have counsel at first 22 appearance. We will not be able to do that 23 if this grant money ends. And under the 24 Executive Budget that has been presented to

1 you, that will happen.

2	We're asking you to not let that
3	happen. The ILS budget needs to be fully
4	funded. The \$139.26 million or \$139.27
5	million that ILS has requested is going to
6	start to make a dent in the rest of upstate
7	New York so that we can have caseload
8	standards.
9	My attorneys and myself, because I
10	carry a full caseload, we are handling cases
11	that it would take a staff of probably
12	15 attorneys to handle. Caseload reduction,
13	if we lose that grant, if we lose the Counsel
14	of First Assignment, we're going to go down
15	to five attorneys handling those cases. The
16	number of cases are not going to go down. So
17	what's going to happen? Less justice.
18	You know, when I think about my client
19	and her 3-year-old daughter, Avery who
20	I've now seen two or three times, and every
21	time I see her, she thanks me for freeing her
22	mother when I think about that, I don't
23	sleep at night at times. And it's because we
24	have to prioritize, we are like triage nurses

1 in an emergency room. There's not enough 2 people to treat everyone that comes through 3 the doors. And so you've got to decide, do 4 we take care of this person, do we take care 5 of that person. And so for everybody like Avery's mom who we are able to successfully 6 7 represent, there's probably five to 10 people that their cases aren't getting the attention 8 that they deserve. 9

10 You know, one great myth that's out there is that -- well, it's actually people 11 12 believe that when somebody gets arrested, 13 they must have done something wrong. It's 14 not always that way. A lot of people that 15 get arrested are innocent, and they need to 16 have that right to counsel and have an attorney that's there with a support staff 17 18 fighting for them nonstop. 19 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Williams. 20 21 I know Senator Hassell-Thompson has a 22 question for you.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Senator?24 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Just one.

1Thank you. Well, I had several, but I'll ask2one.

3 What is your opinion regarding the Governor's bail reform proposal, which is to 4 5 include in statute consideration of public safety as a factor determining bail? 6 7 MR. WILLIAMS: As a public defender representing indigent folks, it scares me. 8 And it scares me because so far New York 9 10 State hasn't lived up to what they should be 11 doing when the determination of bail is set. 12 And that is, number one, a whole lot of 13 people are being arraigned still without 14 having counsel even there when that decision 15 is being made. So if we're going to do that, if 16 you're going to have any kind of reform, 17 18 let's have counsel at every arraignment. 19 The second is that the public 20 defenders -- and it's been an issue that 21 NYSDA has talked about for several years 22 now -- but we are not gualified agencies to get criminal histories of our clients when 23 24 they're done through the eJustice system.

1 And what that means is that in the old 2 days -- and I used to be a town judge back in 3 the 1980s -- I would get the rap sheets and I would get two of them, one for me and one to 4 5 give to the defense attorney. That no longer 6 happens. The rap sheets are produced that 7 way. So the statute that says that the defense attorney is entitled to that -- it 8 9 doesn't happen. Because the judges are in 10 the eJustice system, we are deemed not to be a qualified agency, so we don't get access to 11 12 it.

13 Now we've made arrangements with OCA 14 that during the business day we can send them 15 an email and they will send us the criminal 16 history for our clients, maybe in six to eight hours. It doesn't work that way at 17 18 arraignments. So we're not getting that 19 information. Whether the judges run that 20 eJustice report or not, I don't know.

21 But that brings up the next point I 22 want to make about it. And that is that if 23 you are a prior felon with two felony 24 convictions at any time in your prior

1 history, local judges cannot set bail. It 2 has to be done by a county or supreme court. 3 It's got to be done by a superior court. So 4 a whole lot of those people that you've heard 5 talk about that, well, they're a danger to society, you know, for public protection, 6 7 public safety -- well, if those people have two prior felony convictions, bail isn't 8 being set when they're arraigned in the local 9 10 court anyways. And in upstate New York, 85 to 90 11 12 percent of the arraignments are done by local 13 judges who are, most of the time, not 14 lawyers. It scares me to think that we're 15 going to say to those folks, well, you've got to take into -- a public safety 16 consideration, a concern whether this person 17 18 is going to go out and commit more crimes. 19 They're going to lock up everybody. 20 They're already trying to lock up a whole lot 21 of people. They will change that, and they 22 will start locking up everybody if that reform is done without taking into 23

24 consideration these other factors.

1 So with that, I also want to add that 2 how are they going to make that 3 determination? They're going to use a COMPAS-based, computer-based assessment, 4 5 right? I've sat through and watched as probation officers ask my clients those 6 7 questions when it's somebody that might be 8 released under supervision. A computer is making the ultimate decision. Is that what 9 10 we've come to? Are we going to turn over 11 these important issues to a computer program 12 that's going to say yes, this person has got 13 a propensity for violence?

14I sit at times and read to the court15those COMPAS assessments, because they make16no sense. And the judge sits and looks at me17and is like, "That says that? Where did you18get that term from? Where did you get that19information from?" It's scary to me to do20that.

21 If we start working the system the way 22 that it should be, by having counsel at every 23 arraignment, by having criminal histories 24 given to the attorneys or letting us have

1 access to it through eJustice at that time, 2 and maybe not having local judges who aren't 3 attorneys making that decision, then after we 4 do that, then let's talk about the rest of 5 that reform. 6 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you 7 very much. MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Assemblyman 10 McDonald. ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: We will hear 11 12 from Assemblymember O'Donnell. ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: I walked in in 13 14 the middle, but I have a solution to one of 15 your problems. I have a bill currently in 16 bill drafting that would allow non-lawyer judges to arraign someone but deprive them of 17 18 the ability to put them in. 19 MR. WILLIAMS: The ability to put them 20 in jail? 21 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: That's 22 correct. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. 23 24 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: So you can

apprise them of what they've been accused of,
you can do all those other things -- serve
their notices, if that's what you want to do.
But if you're not a lawyer and you're the
judge who's sitting in that town justice
part, you don't have the authority to put
them in jail.

Maybe that'll change the way the town 8 justice system works. I originally had a 9 10 bill that I thought was going to just sail 11 through here, because it came from Judge 12 Kaye's report, that would have simply said 13 that if a defendant in a town or village 14 justice court system wanted to, they could 15 request or require that they be only heard by 16 a lawyer who's a judge. But the Magistrates Association, which apparently has immense 17 18 amount of power in this building, said no, we're not going to have any of that. 19

20 But that's a solution I've come up 21 with to try to address some of what you're 22 talking about here. And thank you.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: As a member of the24 State Magistrates Association, they should be

1 supporting that bill.

2 ASSEMBLYMAN O'DONNELL: Yeah, well --3 MR. WILLIAMS: They should be letting their -- you know, allowing that decision to 4 5 be made because it's too critical of a decision that's happening. 6 7 A last thing that I want to just add, if I can quickly. The Backup Center, NYSDA, 8 we need to have them fully funded. An office 9 10 like mine, with seven attorneys and two 11 investigators, two legal secretaries and 12 three clerical positions, we don't have the time to do what we need to do without the 13 14 Backup Center. I refer to them as my back 15 office. They're so critical, again, to the 16 upstate offices, where we don't have the resources available to us to present and to 17 18 get the information that we need at times to defend our clients. 19

20 Whether it's finding experts for us, 21 whether it's coming up with an argument, I 22 call them during trials, they know I'm on 23 trial, two minutes later I have an answer 24 texted to me in court that may save the day

1 for a client. So we need them fully funded. 2 And the very last thing is the 3 Veterans Defense Program. As a retired Navy commander, as a two-time county commander of 4 5 the American Legion in Cattaraugus County and commander of my post, our veterans need your 6 7 attention. And there's no reason -- when the 8 largest veteran population in the state lives in New York City, we need to have that office 9 10 in New York City. So we need to have that program fully funded at the \$1.1 million that 11 12 they requested. 13 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, 14 Mr. Williams, for your valuable testimony. 15 Glad to have you here tonight. We appreciate 16 you coming all the way from Cattaraugus County. 17 18 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My 19 pleasure. 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: I'm sure we'll be 21 talking soon. Thank you very much. 22 Our next speaker is President Patrick Cullen, New York State Supreme Court Officers 23 24 Association.

1 Hi, President Cullen. 2 PRESIDENT CULLEN: Thank you, Madam 3 Chair. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Look 4 5 forward to your testimony. 6 PRESIDENT CULLEN: Thank you. 7 Good evening, members of the Legislative Budget Committee. I am once 8 again thankful for the privilege to address 9 10 you all, and it's an honor to appear in front 11 of you on behalf of the men and women I 12 represent. They are New Yorkers who put service first and bravely protect their 13 14 fellow citizens. They are also New Yorkers 15 who have consistently continued to do our 16 best as the engine of the judicial branch, under adverse financial circumstances and 17 extraordinarily lean personnel conditions. 18 19 So today I thank you as we can --20 well, tonight I thank you as we can, with one 21 voice, express our concerns about how the 22 Unified Court System budget affects both the professional and personal aspects of our 23 24 lives.

1 As Judge Marks outlines in this year's 2 budget, the last five judiciary budgets have 3 left the court system "unable to fill the positions left void by attrition." Perhaps 4 5 the most glaring problem of that sentiment is the inability, through the oversight, to 6 7 maintain the standards of safety and security that this system has proudly enjoyed for 8 9 years.

10 The depth of our losses can not be 11 simply stated in a sentence or two. Our 12 court officers are, quite candidly, spread 13 too thin. There are just not enough of us to 14 get the job done in the tremendous fashion we 15 have become known for. We are working with 16 13.3 percent less security staffing than in 2009 while absorbing more work, done by more 17 18 judges, in shorter periods of time. It is 19 unacceptable to put at risk the safety and 20 well-being of all court employees, court users, and jurors. 21

22 Court parts formerly staffed by four
23 or five officers are now staffed by two or
24 three. Supervisors normally in charge of one

1 part are now in charge of managing three or 2 four. All of this occurs while we see an 3 annual increase in the amount of cases handled. The need for full staffing in our 4 5 facilities prevents our officers from being 6 sent for yearly training for equipment and 7 CPR. Many officers cannot spend their accrued vacation time with their families 8 9 because managers cannot afford to grant them 10 the time.

11 The system is not recovering and our 12 employees are suffering. In fact, the system 13 itself is staying above water on the already 14 overburdened backs of its employees. In a 15 preventative health initiative introduced by 16 our union, we found our membership to be 19 percent higher than the national average 17 18 for hypertension. The dearth of staffing and the administration's failure to restore our 19 20 losses will have a profound effect and a 21 long-lasting effect on these men and women --22 not only at work, but as husbands and wives and mothers and fathers. 23

24 Furthermore, these austerity budgets

1 have actualized deficiencies in our 2 courthouse infrastructure. Early closures 3 and the cessation of overtime have left our buildings empty at a much earlier hour than 4 5 in the past. We have found homeless people living in the bowels of our courthouses and 6 7 discover people in unauthorized areas on a 8 very regular basis. These are avoidable 9 security breaches that in the past, at full 10 staffing, would be unheard of, a time when the emphasis was on people and not the bottom 11 12 line.

13These landmarks of justice are14targets, and we will see catastrophic events15take place if we do not restore staffing and16overtime to its proper levels, levels which17protect New York.

18 Our bargaining unit will be without a 19 contract for five years come March 31st. Our 20 members want a fair contract; they deserve 21 one. What they cannot afford to do is accept 22 a contract that sets them back and gives back 23 provisions they have earned. Many 24 non-security personnel in our system have

1 done that, and we are expected to follow 2 suit. We cannot support or accept working 3 under a restructured pay scale which negatively alters these employees' earnings. 4 5 Additionally, this budget calls for funds in excess of \$100 million to be spent 6 7 on steering business into the judicial 8 system. A budgetary item to ensure court 9 engagement is improper when the very same 10 budget begs so many shortcomings. The system 11 must stand on its own two feet again before 12 it can use its own funds to escort people into the system. Our members remain those 13 14 who keep our system on its feet. 15 Judge Marks has also been on the 16 record at the Commission on Judicial Compensation, as well as in the media, 17 18 espousing the financial woes of the 19 judiciary. What is interesting to note is 20 that much of what he says applies to our 21 members as well. He says that the state "has 22 the ability to pay the increase advocated" in reference to a \$27,000 increase in salary for 23 24 each of the state's judges. My members are

certainly not seeking such a wage hike, just
 a fair and equitable wage over the last five
 years.

Judge Marks also states that New York 4 5 is historically the most expensive state to live in. Well, 99 percent of our members 6 7 live in this great state. He goes on to say that inflation has gone up 42 percent since 8 1999. If so, it has gone up for all of us, 9 10 including members of this committee and the 11 workers I represent.

Finally, Judge Marks advocates the introduction of an automatic cost-of-living adjustment into the judicial pay package. I too support this for our members, because it is the only way to keep up with the ever-rising costs associated with living and working in New York.

19I applaud Judge Marks for bringing to20light important financial issues, but they21must apply to everyone within the framework22of the system. I fully understand the role23of the judiciary. However, if these24principles are not addressed to include all

1

2

3

4

5

under its banner, then the Unified Court System is widening an already existing double standard. The judiciary is the face of fairness and equity, and it must practice what it preaches.

I have continued to advocate for new, 6 7 innovative and useful projects to enhance security at all court facilities. I renew 8 9 the call for budgeted funds to create a K9 10 program for which studies have already been 11 done. This program was green-lighted, only 12 to be derailed at the last minute because an 13 administrator did not like dogs. All of 14 New York will like dogs when they prevent an 15 explosive device from being planted or deter 16 the plans of a potential active shooter and the damage these types of events could 17 18 inflict.

19The fact is this is a program that20this system should have implemented 20 years21ago. Archaic thinking and an inability to22install advanced training procedures have23left us in the last century. A real and24mandatory active-shooter protocol is sorely

1 needed. We must be prepared for its near 2 inevitability, based on recent national 3 events, including one in our very own Middletown City Court. We need practical, 4 5 experienced training from the top experts in the field. This is not a program you want to 6 7 have to install after a mass carnage event. A real endeavor must be made to 8 9 upgrade our magnetometers, our x-ray 10 machines, radios and cameras to the latest 11 technologies used in federal facilities and 12 by thousands of police departments 13 nationwide. These programs and ideas will 14 also help us not only do our jobs the way 15 they should be done, but with an eye toward 16 the future. Law enforcement has become a dynamic field, and we must embrace that with 17 18 personnel, philosophy and financial support. 19 This is a brief synopsis of some of 20 the most conspicuous problems facing our 21 workforce in the court system of New York.

22 These things must be met with certitude that 23 our system needs to be brought up to speed. 24 Our court officers cannot be left behind

1 again. We are playing catch-up, and it is 2 only a matter of time before calamitous 3 circumstances result. We are a proud and patient group of the state workforce, but our 4 5 patience is eroding and our pride is being destroyed by a continued neglect to the 6 7 things we need to properly execute the duties we have nobly sworn. 8

I ask this committee to pass the 9 10 judicial budget as it is constituted and not to make further cuts. It is critical to the 11 12 system's recovery and frankly to our survival within the workforce. The time has come to 13 14 make a stand and aid in the restoration of 15 the system and those of us who protect it and 16 all it stands for. I want to thank everybody here and for 17 18 your time and for your hard work.

19 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

20 Assembly?

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: No questions
from the Assembly, but thank you for your
testimony.

24 PRESIDENT CULLEN: Thanks.

1	SENATOR KRUEGER: We thank you very
2	much for your testimony.
3	Next up is
4	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: Pamela Browne.
5	SENATOR KRUEGER: Pamela Browne,
6	thank you, Court Clerk Association.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: And on deck is
8	Billy Imandt, from the Court Officers
9	Benevolent Association of Nassau County.
10	PRESIDENT BROWNE: Good evening,
11	esteemed Senators and Assemblypeople. My
12	name is Pamela Browne, and I'm the president
13	of the New York State Court Clerks
14	Association.
15	Thank you for the opportunity to
16	discuss Governor Andrew Cuomo's Executive
17	Budget. I represent about 1,550 court clerks
18	in the City of New York. We support
19	increased money to the courts as you
20	legislators examine the courts and approve a
21	budget.
22	The budget crunch in 2010 left my
23	union with 250 fewer court clerks to make the
24	courts work. There was a freeze on hiring,

1 but there was no retirement freeze. The 2 workload did not decrease, however, but it 3 increased with each new program, initiative, task, and system. When anything new is 4 5 introduced and when you pass any new laws, it falls upon the clerks to carry it out, which 6 7 we do, as we are consummate professionals. The staffing shortage continues, but 8 the number of clerks and other court 9 10 personnel is severely depleted. There are court clerks working off the clock because 11 12 they are diligent and conscientious and do 13 not want to see unfinished work the next day. 14 They want to start off clean. 15 Working at a manic pace should not and

16 cannot be sustained. Additionally, working 17 off the clock is illegal. Not all courtrooms 18 can be staffed. We have clerks covering 19 multiple parts, and we have had judges 20 sitting in chambers for lack of staff. All 21 parts must be adequately staffed.

22 The courts are closing earlier, and 23 special permission is mandated before 24 overtime can be approved. A woman went to

family court seeking an order of protection,
and she was told to go to criminal court as
it was past the hour that family court was in
operation. There was a strict closing time
to not yield overtime, and the directive
indicated that such cases were to be referred
to criminal court.

8 Previously she would have been allowed 9 to file in family court. Criminal court sent 10 her back to family court, as they were 11 probably unaware of family court's closing at 12 that the hour. Dejected, she obviously gave 13 up and left. She was subsequently killed by 14 her husband.

15 If she were a DuPont or a Carnegie, 16 this case would have received a lot of attention. But she was an ordinary 17 18 New Yorker with no name recognition or fame. 19 This was the ultimate. Someone lost their life so the courts would not incur overtime 20 21 costs. What price is a life? Lack of 22 funding has life and death consequences.

Not all insufficient funding has suchimmediate egregious outcomes. Most are

1 smaller, but harmful nonetheless, and affect 2 people's well-being. The shortage of funds for court clerks has created tremendous 3 backlogs in every court in many areas --4 5 i.e., warrants and housing court, small claims are backed up for months, and 6 7 judgments that are yet to be entered, to name 8 a few.

Not everyone is so middle class that 9 10 they can easily miss work to come to court. 11 There must be adequate staff, in particular 12 court clerks, to minimize the time the public 13 spends away from their jobs. People cannot 14 and should not have to spend all day in 15 court. Many people have such little vacation 16 or sick time that a day in court is a day 17 without pay.

18 The public is suffering and receiving 19 short shrift. Justice delayed is justice 20 denied. And family court, in the referee 21 parts, there is the referee and the court 22 clerk. The court clerk is a receptionist, 23 security, court attorney, and court clerk all 24 in one. These parts handle orders of

1 protection, custody, visitation, and foster 2 care. Previously these cases were handled in 3 a courtroom with a judge, a court clerk, security, and a law assistant. 4 5 The staffing in these referee parts was created legislatively, and it must be 6 7 corrected legislatively. Each of these parts 8 must be required to have two court clerks. 9 You must make this right. 10 Over the years there has been the 11 realignment of lines and titles, and 12 negotiation and talks have failed to correct 13 a classification system that is severely out of balance. We have been told that these 14 15 issues would be addressed, but this has not come to fruition. Court officers have been 16 reclassified for a third time, and the clerks 17 18 have not been reclassified once in 38 years. 19 The court officers deserve their 20 reclassification. But as their supervisors, 21 we also deserve this. This has upset the 22 hierarchy. How can you not upgrade the 23 supervisors? You cannot promote up only to

24 lose ground. This is against the natural

1 order.

2	The courts are in the business of
3	dispensing justice and equitable relief, and
4	it is the court clerks who facilitate this.
5	We are the backbone of the court system.
6	During the years of the budget crunch, court
7	clerks were number one on the wish list of
8	chief clerks. Seasoned judges tell new
9	judges, If you don't listen to the clerk,
10	you're crazy.
11	(Laughter.)
12	PRESIDENT BROWNE: Clerks are retiring
13	in unprecedented numbers for a non-buyout
14	year. The hiring freeze and zeroes have
15	erased the career path. The clerks are not
16	receiving the credit, acknowledgement, or
17	appreciation we have earned. We want, need,
18	deserve, and have earned reclassification.
19	It is the clerks who move the
20	paperwork and allow the courts to function.
21	Whenever any new change is invoked, the task
22	of the court clerk changes as well. Our jobs
23	as court clerks have become convoluted,
24	complex, and all-encompassing. Court clerks

1 supervise court officers, and they promote 2 into our ranks. With their third 3 reclassification, the salary gap between us has shortened. There are newly promoted 4 5 court clerks who have chosen to go back to the ranks of officers. The job of a court 6 7 clerk has become so challenging, and with such a small pay difference, that officers 8 would prefer to roll around on the floor with 9 10 defendants and litigants. This never happened before, and is due to a lack of 11 12 reclassification for court clerks which has 13 turned everything upside down. 14 To become a court clerk, you must pass

15a test which some attorneys could not pass.16You give up months of your life and forgo17numerous activities for the sake of studying.18Some court officers sacrifice so much to19become clerks, and despite their forfeiting20so many endeavors, they're going back to21uniform.

In order to stay competitive, we must be reclassified, which would reflect the changes in our function and value and allow

1 us to reestablish our rightful place. There 2 must be sufficient funding for the courts, 3 the judiciary, and court clerks. The budget must have sufficient funding which would 4 5 allow us to be reclassified. Equilibrium must be restored, the rank structure must be 6 7 preserved. The financial consequences of the underfunding of the court budget, and its 8 effect on court clerks and consequently the 9 10 courts, must be reversed. The loss of 250 court clerks saved 11 12 \$22.5 million annually for the last six 13 years, a total of \$135 million. We have more 14 than paid for our own reclassification. We 15 who made the biggest effort and sacrifice in 16 keeping the courts functioning smoothly must reap our just reward. 17 18 Are there any questions? 19 SENATOR KRUEGER: Any questions? 20 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: No questions 21 here. 22 ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you. SENATOR KRUEGER: We appreciate your 23 24 coming and testifying tonight.

1 Thank you very much. 2 ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: My wife is a clerk in a justice court, but she would agree 3 4 you're crazy if you don't listen to the 5 clerk. 6 (Laughter.) 7 PRESIDENT BROWNE: Thank you. SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much. 8 And our next testifier is Billy 9 10 Imandt, president, Court Officers 11 Bevenolent -- Court Officers Benevolent 12 Association of Nassau County. I can't speak 13 anymore. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: That's getting 15 there. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: That's easy enough for you to say. That's a mouthful. 17 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONALD: And up next is 18 19 Bill Dobbins, from the Suffolk County Court 20 Employees Association. 21 PRESIDENT IMANDT: As you've been here for about 11 hours, so have I. And my 22 mouth -- of course, I had dry mouth, so --23 24 indulge me just a minute.

1	SENATOR KRUEGER: So did I.
2	PRESIDENT IMANDT: (Pausing to drink
3	water.) Thank you.
4	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.
5	Welcome.
6	PRESIDENT IMANDT: Thank you very
7	much, Madam Chairperson. My name is Billy
8	Imandt, and I'm a 32-year court employee and
9	I am the president of COBANC, the Court
10	Officers Benevolent Association of Nassau
11	County, representing not only court officers
12	but approximately 65 different job titles
13	including court clerks, court attorneys,
14	reporters, interpreters, analysts, judge's
15	secretaries, judge's law clerks, and what we
16	call the back office workers, who really
17	should be called the backbone-of-the-system
18	office workers, just to name a few of the
19	titles.
0.0	

I asked to speak to you today to give you a report from the trenches and let you know how well my members are equipped and supported to handle the business of serving the public in their vital role as the support

staff in the administration of justice to the
 citizens of Nassau County and, of course,
 New York State.

My message to you is we're just barely 4 5 holding on. For over seven years, with layoffs and an attrition-based budget -- that 6 7 being when someone retires, no one is hired to replace them, and the responsibilities of 8 their job are spread out to the remaining 9 10 workforce -- we have been getting the job done, as I said, for years now. In my 11 12 bargaining unit, COBANC, we have 20 percent 13 less workers then seven years ago, and we're still getting the job done. 14

15 We have been spread thin, working 16 harder than ever, without a decent compensation package offer to any of the 17 court unions. In fact, we have been offered 18 19 the worst compensation package of any 20 municipality in New York State that I know 21 of, and that's after taking 20 percent 22 layoffs. Over the past five years, inflation has increased by almost exactly 10 percent. 23 24 Our -- and all court union workers --

compensation package has been zero, zero,
 zero, 2 percent and 2 percent, or 4 percent
 over those same five years. And again, with
 20 percent less workers. And the job is
 still getting done.

In 2011 when our contract expired, the 6 7 state was just beginning to come out of the 8 worst period of the worldwide recession. And 9 when it came time to discuss a new contract, we knew that it would probably be less then 10 11 we deserved, and we understood it. Working 12 with no contract and the prospects of zero 13 compensation, we forged on, still getting the 14 job done. Even as desk after desk became 15 vacant and more and more work was put on our 16 desks, again we understood. We are extremely 17 professional and prideful, and our work ethic 18 wouldn't allow us to have work backlog or to slide the window closed at exactly 5 o'clock, 19 20 leaving members of the public to go home and 21 try again tomorrow because the members 22 weren't getting compensated past that time. 23 Many of my members, unsanctioned by 24 their union, are actually coming in earlier,

1 working through all or part of their lunch 2 hour, and leaving well after 5 o'clock. Off 3 the clock. This was, and is, virtually --I'm sorry, there was and is virtually no 4 5 overtime, and my members -- and I say God love them -- refused to let that demoralizing 6 7 condition affect their work product. They 8 were, and are, doing this to make it work. To make it work until the cavalry comes to 9 10 the rescue. 11 Well, it's been five years since we

12 had a contract, and it's time. We cannot hold our breath underwater for too much 13 14 longer. Sick leave usage is up, disciplines 15 are up, grievances are up, and morale is way 16 down. Senator Savino said at Justice DiFiore's confirmation hearings not to be 17 afraid to ask for more money for the budget, 18 and said "We want to help." Committee 19 20 members, we need your help.

I'm hoping you can help now, because
COBANC is at the impasse stage of
negotiations with the Office of Court
Administration and, unless something changes

dramatically, we will be back to you in
Albany to settle our contract. We don't have
binding arbitration, as do many of our police
and sister and brother peace officer
organizations, and our remedy to resolving
our contract, when all else fails, is you
here in Albany.

8 It doesn't have to come to that. 9 Being that the court system had three flat 10 budgets, or zero percent increases, while the 11 Governor was calling for a 2 percent cap, we 12 feel that this vital segment of society, the 13 court system, is owed more than the 14 2.4 percent increase it is now asking for.

15 As you know, the courts are not a 16 discretionary agency. We are included in the U.S. and New York State Constitution as an 17 18 absolute right that society is entitled to, 19 an important part of life, liberty and the 20 pursuit of happiness. How would we function 21 if the criminal courts didn't have funding to 22 complete their task? There would be a real potential for anarchy. Wouldn't society soon 23 24 be crippled if, due to lack of funding, there

1 were not enough court workers and judges on 2 staff to interpret and enforce contracts? 3 They wouldn't be worth the paper they are written on. What about the havoc that would 4 5 rain down if our matrimonial courts are not funded to the point where there could be 6 7 swift resolution to one of the more volatile divisions of what the court system handles? 8 Over the past half a decade, our 9 10 courts have been funded at an average of 11 approximately 1.4 percent when the Governor 12 has capped everybody else at 2 percent. And by the way, that's again with 20 percent 13 14 layoffs and still getting the job done. It's 15 time to put the proper amount needed back in 16 the system. I not only ask you to grant the requested 2.4 percent increase, but to 17 18 determine how much funding the court actually needs to get back on its feet, be it an 19 20 increase of 3 percent, 4 percent, or whatever 21 is needed to properly serve the citizens of New York State. 22

23During contract negotiations we were24told that the Office of Court Administration

1 had no money at all to increase the 2 compensation for a respectable, somewhat 3 close to cost-of-living offer, so we started digging to see how the budget was spent. And 4 5 you don't have to dig too far to see that there's a whopping \$85 million budgeted for 6 7 fiscal 2016-2017 for a program that is known 8 as Civil Legal Services. And as you know, 9 this is a program to help the public that 10 cannot afford counsel for important civil 11 legal matters -- foreclosures, family court 12 matters, and landlord-tenant matters, just to 13 name a few.

14 A noble and worthy program, no doubt. 15 However, we feel it has no business being 16 funded through the court budget. The Office of Court Administration budget is 90 percent 17 18 paychecks to people. We don't have tractors 19 and trucks like the DOT. Ninety percent of that budget money goes to workers' paychecks, 20 21 which then of course gets circulated back 22 into the communities and into paying taxes. We can't afford to fund a program of this 23 24 magnitude through the court budget. It even

has a sense of impropriety that the court budget money is going to attorneys that appear before the same organization that funded them to represent people of need.

5 We have been reading that the state is so flush with money now that we feel this 6 7 should be a program that is financed through the executive branch and not the Office of 8 Court Administration. We can't afford it. 9 10 Our buildings are in horrendous condition, 11 our staffing needs to be reinforced, and our 12 workers, who are the foundation of the court 13 system, need to be treated with the respect 14 they have earned by being compensated fairly 15 and equitably.

We are the middle class. We fuel the 16 economy. If we do well, history has shown 17 that society does well. You can't fund 18 19 programs from money intended to make the 20 courts work, on all levels, on the backs of 21 middle-class workers in that system. In 22 fact, ironically, the Civil Legal Services program was formally created and expanded at 23 24 the same time we were being laid off and

1

offered zero compensation.

2 If the Civil Legal Service program was 3 picked up by the executive branch, we could fund the judges' raises and fair and 4 5 equitable compensation for my members and members of the other court unions. And with 6 7 all the surplus money that New York State has, I think they should expand the Civil 8 Legal Services program -- under the executive 9 10 branch, though. That would most probably instantly 11 12 resolve the contracts of the remaining one-third of the unions without a contract. 13 14 Three of the four without a contract are 15 speaking today. It would not burden future 16 budgets with recurring monies, and it would show appreciation and recognition for how 17 18 hard and long all state court employees have 19 been working and sacrificing. 20 I believe that Justice DiFiore --Chief Justice DiFiore, excuse me -- could 21 22 also require that the approximately 60,000 non-municipal New York State Bar Association 23 24 attorneys donate 14 hours pro bono a year, or half a day per quarter, to keep this program
 operating as it has been. Or she can caucus
 with the legislature, her OCA experts, bar
 association representatives, and union
 leaders to figure out how to take this
 program out of the court budget.

7 Honorable members of this committee, please don't kick the can down the street. 8 Because as I said, if we don't resolve this 9 10 situation now, very soon we will be back in a number of months asking you to impose what 11 12 would be a fair contract on us and the Office of Court Administration. We don't want to 13 14 give you more work, but we may have no 15 choice. We are willing to roll the dice as to what you think is fair, because we don't 16 think anyone would fathom, with a 20 percent 17 18 reduction in workforce and the job still 19 getting done every day in every courthouse in 20 every county, that reasonable people such as 21 you would think that the fair number is zero.

22 Due to low-paying salaries, I've been 23 told by human resources that the courts are 24 having a retention problem. Now couple that

1 with the fact that the state has the ability 2 to pay. With the inadequate budgets that 3 they've been given, OCA keeps cutting and cutting to the point now where we have 4 5 retention problems, staffing problems, contract problems, people working out of 6 7 title, and very serious morale problems and 8 extreme security issues.

Although OCA's own security staffing 9 10 guidelines say that there should be a minimum of three court officers in a court -- in a 11 12 criminal court -- and two officers on 13 perimeter patrol, they're actually down to 14 one now. We didn't squawk when it was two, 15 although we didn't think it was safe -- but 16 again, we tried to make it work.

17 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you for that
18 testimony, and we appreciate it,
19 President Imandt. And we would like for you
20 to keep in touch with us and let us know how
21 things are going.

You heard a lot of concern today from
legislative members about the court system
and making sure that they're adequately

1 staffed and up to speed, so I think you have 2 a lot of people here who are concerned about the courts. And we appreciate the jobs that 3 4 you do, especially in difficult circumstances -- that's what it sounds like. 5 6 Do we have any members who have any 7 questions? Okay. So thank you very much. Did you have 8 anything else that you wanted to add? 9 10 PRESIDENT IMANDT: Well, I just did have to say that --11 12 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Because we do have 13 your testimony in writing, so --14 PRESIDENT IMANDT: Right. 15 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Your --16 PRESIDENT IMANDT: Well, I just want to say that I'm the president of COBANC, once 17 again, and we're the proud members of the 18 19 court system. 20 Thank you very much for your time. I 21 appreciate it. 22 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: We appreciate it so much. And we appreciate you being here. 23 24 Thank you.

1 I would remind our speakers that 2 there's five minutes on the clock. 3 And our next speaker is President Bill Dobbins, Suffolk County Court Employees 4 5 Association. Welcome, President Dobbins. 6 7 PRESIDENT DOBBINS: Good evening, Madam Chairperson. Thank you all for having 8 me come here to speak today -- tonight. 9 10 I just want to express to you -- the 11 reason I'm here is to express a major concern 12 that we have. I want to convey to you problems that our courts in Suffolk County 13 14 are facing. And the best way to say it is 15 the state of our courts are extremely poor. 16 Morale is suffering, people are doing more work with less help, and it's been happening 17 18 for a period of over six years. And it seems 19 like there's no end in sight. 20 The budget cuts from several years ago 21 have really disabled our court system. The 22 hardworking members of our union, the very heart and soul of the court system, are 23 24 working with lack of appreciation, lack of

help, and any sense of hope. Staffing levels
have been so diminished that our courts are
no longer operated in the manner that they
should be. Public safety is deteriorating as
a result. We are in crisis, and it seems as
though we are spinning out of control.

7 One of the major concerns in our courts is security. As a previous speaker 8 spoke of, the court officer staffing in 9 10 courtrooms -- in district court, we currently 11 are using one court officer in a courtroom. 12 It's unconscionable that that is happening. 13 In a criminal court courtroom, one court 14 officer. And what surprises me is that, God 15 forbid, something happens. In the sense of 16 saving money, in the sense of not spending a little bit more, we're waiting for something 17 18 to happen. Are we waiting for the next 19 headline? Are we waiting for the next mass 20 shooting because we didn't have enough money 21 to put more court officers in a courtroom? 22 There's more sophistication out there today. Weapons can be secreted into our 23

24 buildings despite the magnetometers, despite

1 the line of defense at the front doors of the 2 courthouse. We have titanium knives that are 3 undetected by metal detectors. We have guns made out of plastic that can come into our 4 5 courthouse and be used. There were speakers earlier today that spoke of the criminal 6 7 activity in prisons. Well, there's no doubt 8 that there's criminal activity happening in 9 our courts every single day, and it seems 10 like the administration just wants to ignore 11 the problem.

12It's time that we wake up. We don't13need another situation like San Bernardino.14We don't need another situation like what15happened in Paris. Unfortunately, the sense16is it's not going happen to here, it's not17going to happen here. But what if it does?18What are we going to do?

19We need more money to hire more staff.20We need more money to hire more court21officers. That would solve so many of the22problems.

23Judge Marks spoke earlier about the24shortage and he said -- he spoke to us, and

1 he said there's a class coming in February 2 29th, 150 brand new court officers, that will 3 help with the staffing problems. Well, you know what, they're coming out in June and 4 5 Suffolk County has been promised to get maybe 15 out of those 150. The problem is that by 6 7 June, we're going to lose 15 officers. So 8 that 15-officer gain will not even help us.

The hiring is not moving fast enough, 9 the retirements are going quicker and 10 11 quicker. We are losing staff. The courts 12 are definitely not safe. And unfortunately, 13 the judges in our courts are under the 14 misconception that they are safe with just 15 one court officer, because they're being 16 misinformed by superior officers. Misinformed. God forbid something happens, 17 18 and I hope it never does.

19In the meantime, the courts throughout20New York and especially in Suffolk County are21foundering. Our back-office staff is working22exhaustively without any help. We have boxes23and boxes of files in our records room on the24floors, on the tables, just waiting to be

1 filed or waiting to be worked on. Our 2 foreclosure courts in Riverhead -- I was out 3 there two weeks ago, there are motions for summary judgements on those foreclosures 4 5 dating back to 2011 and 2012 not even touched. They're sitting on windowsills in 6 7 the courthouse on Griffing Avenue in Riverhead. 8

We're supposed to be public servants, 9 10 and it seems that we're more and more public 11 disservice. We're not doing anything to help 12 the public anymore. It's about just getting 13 by, what can we do to save money, what can we 14 do to get to a calendar. If we want to bring 15 a prisoner up from the cell block to come to 16 a courtroom, we have to wait until other courtrooms close before we can properly staff 17 18 a team to bring prisoners up to a courtroom. 19 Sometimes attorneys -- Assemblyman Al 20 Graf spoke earlier, he said he waited three, 21 four, five hours, sometimes, for a 22 prisoner -- ultimately they get frustrated 23 because they have cases in other parts or 24 cases in other jurisdictions that they have

1 to handle. Inevitably, they waive their 2 client's appearance. So now this poor 3 defendant, transported 33 miles from Riverhead Jail, sits in a holding cell in 4 5 Central Islip hoping, waiting for his case to come up so that he can be brought to the 6 7 courtroom. And it doesn't happen. It doesn't happen. 8

Talk about a waste of resources. What 9 10 did it cost to bring that defendant from 11 Riverhead Jail to the Central Islip Courthouse? What did it cost? We're talking 12 13 about saving money, and we're wasting money left and right. We're wasting it. But 14 15 nobody looks at that. The Judiciary Budget 16 talks about Civil Legal Services, which is a great thing, we don't think it's bad -- but 17 we don't think it should come from our 18 budget. We think it should come from the 19 20 executive branch budget. It just doesn't 21 seem right that the judiciary is paying for attorneys that have to argue before them. 22 Ιt just gives that sense of impropriety -- it 23 24 doesn't mean that there is, but it just gives

1 that sense that there is something amiss. It 2 doesn't seem right. And again, we advocate 3 for it. We think these people need help when they're dealing with their civil issues. 4 5 They're poor people. But we think it should be paid by somebody else. 6 7 I urge you to pass the budget that was submitted by the Office of Court 8 Administration. I urge you to pass it 9 10 because we need the funding so that we can 11 hire people, so that we can staff our courts, 12 so that we can make sure that our courts are 13 safe. We had a gang fight outside the court 14 building. We have court officers, trained 15 peace officers with the ability to arrest, 16 they carry firearms. They couldn't even go outside to attend to the problem. They had 17 18 to call local police. A problem that could 19 have taken care of right then and there, it 20 took ten minutes for police to arrive. What 21 did that delay have to cause? Did anybody 22 get hurt? Who knows. Could anybody have 23 gotten hurt? Who knows. The money has to be 24 spent properly. I implore you to pass the

1 budget, pass more so that everything can be 2 paid for. Everything could be paid for. 3 Because we've been neglected far too long. Thank you. 4 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Thank you very much, President Dobbins, for that 6 7 testimony. And as I said previously, we're very 8 concerned about the condition in our courts 9 10 right now, and it's very helpful for you and 11 all the people from the court system who have 12 been here tonight to hear firsthand your testimony and real-life cases and how that 13 14 affects the people of New York State. 15 So we appreciate what all the people 16 who work in the courts do every single day. It sounds like a very difficult job, and we 17 18 truly appreciate you staying so late tonight. 19 PRESIDENT DOBBINS: Thank you, 20 Senator. 21 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Our next speaker is Colonel Jack Ozer, 22 New York Wing of the Civil Air Patrol. 23 24 And again, speakers are allotted five

1 minutes of time. And if you could summarize, 2 if you have a lengthy testimony especially, 3 if you could just please summarize the 4 highlights and the high points, because we 5 still have other people waiting. Thank you. 6 Good to see you, Colonel. 7 COLONEL OZER: Good evening. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Good evening. 8 9 COLONEL OZER: And thank you very 10 much. I noticed we have one member, Senator 11 Young, who's a member of our legislative 12 squadron. 13 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: That's correct. 14 COLONEL OZER: And Senator Hassell-Thompson, who is a Civil Air Patrol 15 16 cadet. That's great. I will make it very brief. For those 17 18 of you don't know, the Civil Air Patrol is 19 the auxiliary of the United States Air Force. 20 It has been called upon for numerous things 21 in New York State, which I'll get on to in a 22 minute. It has three functions: emergency service, cadet programs, and aerospace 23 24 education.

1 Our emergency service includes 2 homeland security, it includes disaster 3 relief, it includes counterdrug operations, missing person searches, et cetera. Our 4 5 cadet program is a unique program that teaches cadets things like self-discipline, 6 7 honor, integrity, and respect. And our aerospace education program teaches people 8 about science, math, engineering, and 9 10 technology in how the future will be. 11 We are very unique in one respect. 12 Although we come to you for money, we have saved the State of New York 10 times the 13 14 money they've given us. In the last several 15 years, we've saved New York State in excess 16 of \$2 million for our people through Hurricane Sandy, Hurricane Irene, programs of 17 18 fire watchers, Department of Transportation overflights, missing person searches, 19 20 sheltering of people during disasters. And 21 this has worked out very well. 22 Two years ago we came and asked for

funding, \$200,000, and that was because we realized after Hurricane Sandy we were not --

1 although we did the job, we had problems too. 2 We didn't have electricity in a lot of our 3 bases. We didn't have enough cameras, we didn't have enough support. That money went 4 5 to put in -- for example, Long Island, our mission base, received a new heating system, 6 7 a permanent generator system. Our base in Rome received a permanent generator system. 8 9 We've purchased more cameras. We've 10 purchased more equipment, more training 11 funds, and that's gone a long way. 12 One of the things we did with our 13 cadet program, which was great, is we 14 started a "Depressed Area Initiative," we 15 called it, for areas of the state where the 16 cadet programs are really needed for our youth but they can't afford it because the 17 18 funding is not there. The parents can't afford the registration, they can't afford 19 20 uniforms, so part of this money went to, in 21 fact, buy uniforms, fund people that couldn't 22 afford the program to get into our program. The program is so important to them, and to 23 24 help them in the future, that money should

not be the object. That's what we've done.
 We continue to do it.

3 With the added money we are asking, we will continue to build our infrastructure, 4 5 put more money into the cadet program, more science kits for our cadets, more cameras, 6 7 computers -- so that every time the State of New York calls us or any of the 8 municipalities within the State of New York 9 10 calls us up, we're ready and willing to help. 11 As you can see, the paperwork that was 12 given out -- I don't want to go and lengthen 13 this with questions -- we are a very 14 professional organization that actually is 15 the cheapest game in town, and the amount of 16 money we save is tremendous. So we're asking the state to just give us our budget this 17 18 year so we can continue our work. 19 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 20 much, and it's an excellent program. I've 21 seen the results firsthand with the cadets, and I appreciate all that you do. So thank 22

23 you for being with us tonight.

24 COLONEL OZER: Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: You want -- okay, 2 all set. Thank you. Thank you so much. 3 COLONEL OZER: Thank you. SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 4 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speaker is Executive Director Charlotte Carter, from the 6 7 New York State Dispute Resolution 8 Association, and she is joined by Julie Loesch, director of the Center for Resolution 9 10 and Justice at Child & Family Services. Welcome. I know it's been an 11 12 extremely long day, and we appreciate your 13 tenacity. 14 MS. CARTER: Thank you, Madam 15 Chairwoman, and thank you all for this 16 opportunity to speak. We're here on behalf of a statewide 17 network called CDRCs, the Community Dispute 18 19 Resolution Centers. And thank you for that introduction. 20 21 The New York State Dispute Resolution 22 Association is a bit of a hybrid. We're a statewide contract program administrator, and 23 24 we also are a professional association. The

1 CDRCs are among our members. Together we 2 provide access to justice and tools like 3 mediation to help people to address conflict 4 productively and quickly, and those services 5 are provided in every county in New York.

6 We're here to request \$3 million as a 7 legislative add to stabilize our network and 8 to allow us to respond to emerging community 9 needs.

10 In 1981, the New York Legislature was the first in the country to pass legislation 11 12 to create the CDRC network, and the funding and oversight was provided by OCA. The 13 14 budget grew from an initial \$529,000 for 17 counties to a little over \$9 million in 15 16 2010. In 2011, that funding was slashed by nearly 50 percent, and it has not increased 17 18 significantly since then.

19Despite the dramatically reduced20funding, the CDRCs have continued to provide21free or low-cost mediation and conflict22resolution services to your constituents.23They help ensure that people do not lose24their homes, their jobs, or basic human

1 services. Mediation solves disputes between 2 neighbors, family members, business owners 3 and customers, and they're resolved often before those disputes escalate to require 4 5 intervention by police or the court system. In addition to this low-cost, 6 7 high-yield conflict management process, there's a very high compliance rate. Also, 8 92 percent of the participants are very 9 10 satisfied with their mediation. Everyone 11 benefits from the restoration of important 12 personal and business relationships. 13 Last year the network served over 14 70,000 individuals and handled over 28,000 cases. Mediation saves the state and the 15 16 court system money and resources. From start to finish, the average mediation costs \$336, 17 which is far less than court costs for even 18 19 minor criminal or civil matters. 20 CDRCs match state funding dollar for 21 dollar. They use professionally trained 22 community volunteers to mediate cases, with donated time valued at over \$2.3 million 23 24 annually. Over 75 percent of mediations

1 conclude with a written agreement, usually 2 within a few weeks of the initial intake. The CDRC offers access to efficient 3 and effective justice for all New Yorkers, 4 5 especially for our most vulnerable 6 populations. 7 MS. LOESCH: The demand for the work 8 mentioned by Charlotte continues to grow, but so do the costs of providing services. 9 10 My CDRC covers Allegany, Cattaraugus, 11 Chautauqua, Erie, Genesee, Niagara, Orleans, 12 and Wyoming counties, and yet we have only six staff providing services across this vast 13 14 eight-county region in which one of my 15 offices can be nearly two hours from the 16 other. We have slowed our expansion of elder 17 and veterans mediation, and all but stopped 18 19 our conflict education and peer mediation 20 programs in local schools, despite increasing 21 requests for these services. 22 My story is not unique. Each of you here today has a CDRC in your community with 23

a similar story of unfortunate realities and

24

1 difficult choices about who to serve and who 2 must wait for mediation and other services. 3 Given the many ways in which CDRC services benefit communities beyond the court system, 4 5 we come to ask you to help diversify and stabilize our base funding. We have been 6 7 meeting with legislators in districts and here in Albany, and we're pleased that we've 8 had a great response on the ground. 9 10 The \$3 million legislative add will make it possible for the CDRC network to 11 12 continue to provide responsive, effective, 13 and acceptable dispute resolution services to 14 all of your constituents. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very much. And thank you for covering such a wide 17 18 territory. We appreciate it. 19 But we appreciate you being here 20 tonight and staying so long, and your 21 testimony was very helpful, so thank you. 22 MS. LOESCH: Thank you. 23 MS. CARTER: Thank you. 24 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you.

1	Our next speaker is Connie Neal,
2	executive director of the New York State
3	Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
4	Thank you for being here.
5	MS. NEAL: Well, good evening,
6	everyone. I really appreciate this
7	opportunity to speak with you tonight.
8	I'm Connie Neal, executive director of
9	the New York State Coalition Against Domestic
10	Violence. We are a statewide membership
11	organization of local domestic violence
12	programs located throughout the State of
13	New York. Currently there are 249
14	residential and non-residential programs with
15	a shared commitment to create and support
16	social change necessary to prevent and end
17	domestic violence.
18	Each year, the National Network to End
19	Domestic Violence coordinates a National
20	Census of Domestic Violence Services. This
21	census recently took place on September 16,
22	2015, and provides a one-day, unduplicated
23	count of adults and children seeking services
24	from domestic violence programs in all states

and U.S. territories. Later this month, the
 National Network to End Domestic Violence
 will provide a briefing to Congress on the
 results of the 2015 survey. The information
 in that briefing will include some staggering
 information about New York State.

7 According to the census, New York has the highest demand for domestic violence 8 services in the country. From this census 9 10 this past fall, on one day in New York nearly 7,000 victims of domestic violence received 11 12 services. Also on that same day, almost 1,000 requests for domestic violence services 13 14 went unmet because programs did not have 15 funding or the staff to respond to those 16 requests for service.

We also know that domestic violence 17 18 programs reduced 148 individual domestic violence service options for survivors and/or 19 20 eliminated them during 2015. And finally, 21 domestic violence programs reported that 115 22 staff positions -- mostly direct service advocates -- were reduced or eliminated 23 24 during the same time frame.

1 We have an incredible demand for 2 domestic violence services here in New York, 3 as you can see, and I believe this is a call to action for the State of New York. We have 4 5 the opportunity in front of us now to create the strongest network of domestic violence 6 7 services in the country and, equally 8 important, to provide a clear message that a meaningful investment in domestic violence 9 10 services and primary prevention is a top 11 priority for public protection in our state. 12 Currently the New York State Executive 13 Budget contains little state-originating dollars to support domestic violence services 14 15 and relies heavily on federal funding 16 sources. Clearly that federal funding is not 17 enough. 18 Lessons from an August 2014 report on domestic violence programs and practices in 19 20 other states indicates it is important to insure that services are stable and available 21 22 for victims throughout a state. Victims,

23 their communities, and states are best served 24 by the presence of a network of local

1 programs whose sole purpose is to ensure that 2 services and support for victims and their 3 children exist, and that gaps and needs are 4 identified and met. Frequently that includes 5 the need for victims to flee their homes and 6 communities in order to remain safe.

7 It is difficult to achieve these goals 8 when programs are competing with one another for limited funds, are constantly facing the 9 10 threat of losing funding, and grant administrators view local programs as vendors 11 12 instead of as experts that offer 13 comprehensive solutions to a serious social 14 problems.

15 So today, we're asking that you ensure 16 the following items are prioritized in the final budget. First, address some 17 18 long-standing gaps in funding for local 19 domestic violence programs across the state 20 that have resulted due to several years of flat or reduced investments. And that 21 includes \$6 million in TANF funding for 22 non-residential domestic violence programs, 23 24 providing at least a 3 percent increase in

1 the domestic violence shelter per diem rate 2 as well.

3 Secondly, stabilize and increase civil 4 legal services for domestic violence victims 5 statewide. I ask that you review the funding 6 levels in last year's budget, restore and 7 increase it in order to meet the demands for 8 services that are just so critical for 9 domestic violence survivors.

10 Third, provide \$4.5 million in funding 11 for local domestic violence programs to 12 collaborate with colleges and universities in 13 implementing the recent "Enough Is Enough" 14 campus policy mandates that also include 15 dating violence, domestic violence, and 16 stalking services. This support for domestic violence programs is intended to complement 17 18 the 4.5 million that's already provided in 19 support for rape crisis programs and their 20 work to prevent sexual assault.

21 We know that this was incredibly 22 groundbreaking legislation that was passed 23 during the last legislative session, and I 24 encourage you to provide the funding for

1 domestic violence programs so that they can 2 adequately support this legislation by 3 addressing dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking in conjunction with 4 5 colleges and universities across the state. And then, fourth, create a primary 6 7 prevention funding stream for domestic violence programs in New York by establishing 8 a \$17.25 million fund in the public 9 10 protection budget that will be dispersed through coordinated support to the coalition 11 12 and local programs statewide. We know that the consequences of homicides are 13 14 significant, not only for those immediate individuals involved but also communities and 15 16 neighborhoods and our larger society. The average cost per homicide can exceed 17 18 \$17.25 million when considering medical 19 costs, lost future earnings, public program 20 costs, property damage and losses, and 21 quality of life losses. We know that innovations are critical 22 in the work to end domestic violence, and a 23 24 lot of those innovations have come from

1 states with reliable, noncompetitive funding 2 practices and strong state coalitions. 3 Also, just a couple of notes about primary prevention. This is a relatively new 4 5 concept for many working to end domestic violence, whose main focus has been 6 7 responding to victims. However, it is clear that a shift is at hand here for us and to 8 include looking at programs and services that 9 10 promote social change through activities, programs, and policies that change the 11 12 attitudes, behaviors, and social norms that allow domestic violence to thrive. 13 14 Again, because the cost of a single homicide can be well over \$17.25 million, we 15 16 are requesting funds at this level to demonstrate New York State's commitment to 17 18 preventing domestic violence before it 19 occurs. That's the crux and the basis of 20 primary prevention services, to shift it to 21 the front end. 22 So New York has a long history of being a leader across the nation, and we 23

certainly should not want to be the

24

1 number-one state in the country regarding 2 demand for domestic violence services. The time is now for us to move forward. It's a 3 time for us to confirm our collective 4 5 commitment to ending domestic violence by increasing these investments in vital 6 7 programs, and it's a time for us to look at ways that we can really shift the process, 8 shift the focus, shift the services so that 9 10 we can prevent domestic violence from 11 occurring in the first place. 12 I look forward to working with you and 13 your colleagues with the goal in mind of 14 creating the strongest statewide domestic violence coalition, network of domestic 15 violence services, and primary prevention 16 initiatives in the country. And I want to 17 18 thank you again for this opportunity to speak 19 with you tonight. 20 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 21 much. Senator Nozzolio. 22 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: Thank you, Madam 23 24 Chair.

1 I certainly agree with the points you 2 raised, particularly the issue of preventing domestic violence before it occurs. That 3 you're asking for a sea change in our 4 5 society; that's a good thing to ask for. I think one of the first steps could 6 7 be the establishment of Brittany's Law, which the Senate has passed a number of years, 8 which you and I have talked about and you've 9 10 failed to really support. 11 You're talking about prevention, you 12 highlight prevention. Well, Brittany's law, otherwise known as the Domestic Violence 13 14 Prevention Act, is a step in that direction. 15 And it's been a step in that direction for a 16 number of years now. There were two homicides that resulted 17 18 in the development of this statute, a double 19 homicide of a daughter and a granddaughter. 20 I wish you would relook at that, or at least 21 look at it again -- I'm not sure if you've 22 ever looked at it. But it's one thing to talk about prevention, it's another thing to 23 24 ask for money for prevention, it's another

1 thing to work to positive steps to establish 2 a way that citizens could be forewarned about violent behavior from the people that they 3 4 associate with. 5 I believe you know what I'm talking 6 about. I would hope that you would put your 7 action where your comments are and in fact support this measure. 8 9 Thank you. 10 MS. NEAL: Thank you very much. 11 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Anyone 12 else? 13 Thank you for being here tonight. 14 Appreciate it. 15 Our next speaker is Executive Director 16 Soffiya Elijah, Correctional Association of New York. 17 18 Following Executive Director Elijah, 19 we will have people from Prisoners' Legal 20 Services. So if you want to move closer to 21 the front, that might be helpful. 22 Good evening. 23 MS. ELIJAH: Hi. Good evening. I'm 24 glad I'm not saying good morning.

1 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Yeah, I know --2 well, that may happen. 3 Okay. This is quite an extensive 4 amount of testimony. Would you be able to 5 streamline that and hit the highlights, 6 please? MS. ELIJAH: I have definitely 7 summarized it. Do you have the --8 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: You're the best. 9 10 Thank you. MS. ELIJAH: I'm going to hit some 11 12 highlights, and you can ask questions, of course, if you want. 13 14 I'm going to focus first on Raise the 15 Age. Some specific things, of course: We 16 are asking that the Legislature this year raise the age of criminal responsibility and 17 18 get all of our children out of adult jails 19 and prisons. 20 As we know, raising the age is good for public safety. When Connecticut moved 21 22 the majority of the cases for 16-and-17-year-olds out of adult court, their 23 24 arrests plummeted, including those for

violent crime. We believe that New York can
 experience the same.

3 Children prosecuted as adults can carry permanent criminal records, forever 4 5 impacting their ability to obtain stable housing, employment, and education, each of 6 7 which are key to successful community reentry. And all of these harms are 8 disproportionately experienced by black and 9 10 Latino children. 11 So we ask that you support seven key 12 elements. First, raise the age overall for all offenses for juveniles to age 18. 13 14 Raise the lower age of juvenile 15 delinquency from age 7 to 12. 16 Ensure that no youth are held in adult jails or prisons, but are instead placed in 17 youth facilities, and create youth facilities 18 19 that utilize evidence-based therapeutic youth 20 development models in small residential 21 settings that have been proven to be most effective. 22 Originate as many cases of 23 24 16-and-17-year-olds in Family Court as

1 possible, and create Youth Court parts in the 2 adult court system for the remaining cases. 3 Ensure parental notification upon the arrest of any 16- or 17-year-old, and ensure 4 5 that all youth under 18 are interviewed using best practices. 6 7 Expand opportunities for diversion 8 from the system, reducing the unnecessary and ineffective confinement of low-risk youth 9 10 while increasing access to community-based interventions, which is good for children and 11 12 good for the public. 13 And last, allow for the sealing of records for crimes committed by those under 14 15 age 21, to provide relief from collateral 16 consequences of an adult conviction. Now I want to focus just briefly on 17 18 another very central issue for the Correctional Association, and that is the 19 20 issue of violence and abuse in our prisons. 21 And specifically we're talking about the 22 violence and abuse that is experienced by the people who are incarcerated at the hands of 23 24 people who are public employees, paid with

our tax dollars -- to wit, correctional
 officers.

3 As most of you know, there's been quite a bit in the media over the past 4 5 12 months about violence and abuse and the beating to death of people who are 6 7 incarcerated by corrections officers. That information was brought to light through the 8 media by the work of the Correctional 9 10 Association.

11 Mr. Harrell was killed in April of last year, as was Mr. Taylor, both at the 12 13 hands of corrections officers. Mr. George 14 Williams was beaten within an inch of his life at Attica back in 2011 and still, the 15 16 guards who did that, although they pled guilty, were allowed to keep their pensions 17 18 and are still resisting civil penalties. At Clinton, Mr. Strickland was beaten to death, 19 20 and unfortunately we saw the beating on video 21 camera, and still no one was held accountable. And the atrocities that 22 happened at Attica continue throughout the 23 24 system on a regular basis, and no one is held

1 accountable.

2	We must address the underlying culture
3	and environment of abuse and violence. This
4	is not a case of a few bad apples.
5	Unfortunately, it is a system that is fueled
6	by racism, dehumanization, and an overly
7	punitive approach.
8	We could start this process by closing
9	Attica Prison and bringing an end to the
10	abusive culture that exists within our prison
11	system. Related to that, we must expand
12	public oversight. We must provide for media
13	access and public reporting, support for the
14	Department of Justice to investigate and
15	expand the oversight abilities of the
16	Correctional Association.
17	We must also closely examine the
18	abusive use of solitary confinement. We feel
19	that the settlement brought about by the
20	NYCLU suit is an important first step, but
21	there are still hundreds of people
22	languishing in solitary confinement in our
23	prisons.
24	I will stop there. The bulk of my

testimony, as you have it, is in writing. If
you have any questions, I'm happy to address
them. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very
much.
Senator Hassell-Thompson would like to
speak.
MS. ELIJAH: Good evening.
SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Good
evening. Thank you.
I obviously have not had a chance to
read your testimony, but what I looked for
was to see if you had included in here any of
the discussion I know that you've been a
part of a coalition of prison reform groups
who have looked at aging out in the
correctional facilities, and those as you
heard earlier, because I know you've been
here for several hours, and so I know you
heard the conversation that I had with
Commissioner Annucci talking about release
for those who are medically indigent.
Can you just elaborate for a minute,
because of the amount of money that is stated

1 in that report that's really involved -- and 2 I just want to go on the record again as 3 talking about, just very quickly, about the fact that the numbers of people who are very, 4 5 very ill and whose conditions are exacerbated by being in prison, just by virtue of the 6 7 facilities themselves and the lack of the 8 ability to get the kind of timely care that's 9 necessary.

10 MS. ELIJAH: Yes, thank you. We did 11 focus on that issue in our written testimony. 12 Just in the interests of time, I didn't go 13 into it in my summary. But we have, and I 14 did address this last year, a growing and 15 increasing number of people over 50 years old 16 who are requiring more and more medical care.

It costs approximately \$60,000 a year 17 18 to maintain someone under 40 in the DOCCS system, but as they get older that cost, 19 20 because of medical expense, goes up as high 21 as \$240,000 to \$260,000 a year. We have not 22 enough medical beds available for those people who are in need of significant 23 24 cognitive medical care. And we know that

those people by and large do not present any concern for public safety, and therefore the more humane and economically intelligent thing to do would be to move them out of the DOCCS system. They could be paroled and maintained in the community.

7 We have approximately 9,000 people in the current system who are over 50 years of 8 age, and that number is growing faster than 9 10 any other segment of our prison population. SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Somewhere 11 12 in the report, that I think I read that it's 13 over 78 percent of the people incarcerated 14 are over the age of 50. That's a tremendous 15 number.

MS. ELIJAH: It is.

16

SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: And the 17 18 other quick thing that I wanted, before my 19 time runs out, is to talk about the fact that 20 the evaluation, when they come up for parole, 21 they're denied release, time and again, due to the immutable fact of the nature of 22 offense for which the person has been 23 24 convicted.

1

MS. ELIJAH: Yes.

2 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Help me3 with that one as well.

MS. ELIJAH: Many of the people who we 4 5 find in our system who are 50 years of age and older are serving long sentences. And 6 7 when they become parole-eligible, and having completed all the programming that's been 8 required of them, they're being denied parole 9 10 even though they have a low risk assessment 11 score, over and over again, because of the 12 nature of their crime. It's one thing that 13 they can't change, any more than any of us 14 can change our date of birth.

And so you find people who've been denied seven, eight, nine, and 10 times from being released on parole, despite the fact that they've had no disciplinary problems for many, many years and their risk assessment score is very low.

21 SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: I just want 22 to take my couple of seconds to thank you, 23 number one, for your diligence and the work 24 that you've done on behalf of our corrections 1 system.

2	And, you know, there's always this
3	sense that we care more about the prisoners
4	than we do the people who work there, but
5	it's absolutely not true. I think it's as
6	important for us to distinguish at this
7	budgetary time the importance of both and how
8	the care of if we want to be considered a
9	humane society, that our prisons is the place
10	to begin.
11	MS. ELIJAH: I couldn't agree with you
12	more.
13	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: And I thank
14	you again.
15	MS. ELIJAH: Thank you.
16	SENATOR HASSELL-THOMPSON: Thank you,
17	Madam Chair.
18	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very
19	much.
20	MS. ELIJAH: Okay. Thank you.
21	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Our next speakers
22	are from Prisoners' Legal Services. And we
23	have Karen Murtagh, executive director;
24	Thomas Curran, member of the board of

1 directors; and John Dunne, also a member of 2 the board of directors. Except we're missing 3 one. 4 MR. CURRAN: John escaped. 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Okay. He escaped. 6 (Laughter.) 7 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Well, thank you for sticking it out, and welcome tonight. We 8 look forward to your testimony. 9 10 MS. MURTAGH: Thank you. I think --11 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Again, it is quite 12 thick, so if you could summarize, that would be helpful. 13 14 MS. MURTAGH: Oh, no problem at all. 15 That's our plan. 16 John did apologize for not being able to be here this evening. He was here until 17 about 5:30. 18 19 MR. CURRAN: His wife summoned him 20 home. 21 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: We saw -- we did 22 see that. 23 MR. CURRAN: Mine has summoned me 24 home, but yet I remain.

1 MS. MURTAGH: He told me he was under 2 house arrest. MR. CURRAN: I'm hoping she's asleep 3 by the time --4 5 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Yes. Well, he was sighted in the building. And we did see 6 7 John Dunne, so thank you very much. MS. MURTAGH: So my board member, 8 Tom Curran, is going to begin. 9 10 MR. CURRAN: The basic mission of Prisoners' Legal Services is to assure, or to 11 12 try to assure, that New York's prisons are as humane as they can and should be. There's 13 14 not a frivolous thing about it. This is not 15 a starry-eyed lot. The Prisoners' Legal Services board, PLS's board, consists of 16 former prosecutors, judges, defense lawyers, 17 general practitioners, mental health 18 19 professionals, and former legislators. 20 PLS is dedicated and extremely 21 hardworking. I've seen this staff and its board. The board votes with its wallet. We 22 actually actively support this organization. 23 24 We don't believe in the abolition of prisons,

1 but we believe in making them better.

2 And the fundamental belief is that it 3 is incongruous for the criminal justice 4 system to take away a person's liberty for 5 violating perceived and acceptable norms of conduct, only to incarcerate them in settings 6 7 that themselves don't fully uphold basic 8 social norms and standards of justice. Among other ills, we believe that such 9 10 a systemic failure contributes to the scourge of recidivism and represents an ongoing 11 12 threat to the safety of our communities. Also PLS works, we believe, with DOCCS 13 14 in order to make our prisons better and make 15 them better places for the DOCCS personnel to 16 work, and I think that Karen's going to educate you on that too. 17 And I'm out. 18 19 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 20 MS. MURTAGH: Thank you. Thank you, 21 Madam Chairman. 22 As all of you know, the five of you that are left, PLS was created in 1976 as the 23 24 number-one post-Attica reform. Fast-forward

1 to today, we have four offices across the 2 state when we used to have seven. We have 3 15 attorneys when we used to have 50. Our attorneys have to provide civil legal 4 5 services to over 52,000 prisoners in 54 prisons located across the state. 6 7 Tom mentioned that we are a partner with the Department of Corrections. We are a 8 critical partner with not only DOCCS but with 9 10 the Executive, the Judiciary, and the 11 Legislature. With DOCCS, over the past 12 several years we've created the Albion 13 telephone program, so women prisoners can 14 call PLS for assistance. We have worked with 15 them to create a reentry video, which is 16 shown at reception to all incoming prisoners. We have worked with the Executive and DOB on 17 18 both encouraging prisoners to apply for 19 Medicaid and on the Executive's clemency 20 efforts.

21 We also work with the Judiciary. The 22 Court of Appeals reaches out to us, time and 23 time again, to take cases that it has granted 24 leave to appeal in. Last year we accepted at

1 least three cases.

2	And we work closely with the
3	Legislature. A number of you send us letters
4	that you've received from your constituents
5	concerned about loved ones in prison, and we
6	follow up on those letters and help to
7	resolve those issues.
8	But the most telling about PLS' role,
9	partnership role, is what happened this past
10	summer with the Clinton escape. After the
11	escape happened, family members contacted
12	PLS, frantic because they could not find what
13	happened to their loved ones at Clinton.
14	They called Clinton, they tried to visit,
15	there was a lockdown, nobody could get in.
16	Nobody was giving them any information.
17	I contacted both the Executive and
18	Tony Annucci. We worked together for PLS to
19	put together a notice that we put on our
20	Facebook page and our webpage, telling all
21	the family members what was going on when
22	the lockdown was going to be lifted, what
23	meals were being served, letting them know
24	that medical care was being given. So many

1 things that they were worried about that we
2 were able to calm their fears about, which in
3 turn results in calming the tension of the
4 prison.

5 And if you look back at what happened 6 at Attica, and you look back at what we were 7 able to do this summer to calm those 8 tensions, it is like night and day. That is 9 why PLS is so important.

10 We also were asked to go to Clinton 11 with Assemblyman O'Donnell and Assemblywoman 12 Duprey and meet with the inmate liaison 13 committee to discuss their complaints about 14 what was going at Clinton. We met with them, 15 and then we met with the superintendent, and 16 we shared those complaints and we worked 17 through many of those issues.

18 In the interests of time I just want 19 to say I'm here today to ask the Legislature 20 to add money to the appropriation in the 21 Executive Budget. Governor Cuomo put us in 22 the budget for \$2.2 million. I'm asking the 23 Legislature to add \$1.3 million. Last year, 24 you added \$1.2 million.

1 I'm asking for that add because we 2 have been grossly underfunded for the past 3 16 years, and even though we do a fabulous 4 job, we cannot do the job the state has 5 tasked us to do without additional funding. 6 Thank you very much. 7 MR. CURRAN: You won't regret funding this organization. 8 9 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you very 10 much. We really appreciate you staying so 11 late, and thank you for your valuable 12 testimony. 13 MR. CURRAN: Thanks for the 14 opportunity. 15 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 16 MS. MURTAGH: Thank you. 17 MR. CURRAN: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Next, Executive 18 19 Director Paige Pierce, Families Together in 20 New York State, Inc. 21 And following Executive Director Pierce there's Terry O'Neill, director of the 22 23 Constantine Institute. So if you could get 24 ready.

1	MS. PIERCE: Hi. Thank you so much
2	for staying. I know it's been a long day for
3	you. I appreciate it.
4	CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: It's been a long
5	day for you. So we appreciate you too.
6	MS. PIERCE: As CEO of Families
7	Together in New York State, a nonprofit,
8	parent-run organization serving families of
9	youth with social, emotional, and behavioral
10	challenges, I have dedicated my career to
11	serving our state's most vulnerable citizens,
12	connecting them with community-based
13	supports, and advancing sound social welfare
14	policies in response to family identified
15	needs.
16	As such, we have been advocating for
17	juvenile justice reforms, specifically
18	legislation to raise the age of criminal
19	responsibility from 16 to 18.
20	As you are well aware, New York State
21	continues to be only one of two states that
22	automatically prosecutes and incarcerates
23	16- and 17-year-olds as adults. Upon arrest,
24	they are interrogated without so much as a

1

call to their parents, charged and

2 incarcerated with the adult population in the 3 local jail while awaiting trial.

Should they be found guilty, they are 4 5 incarcerated with the adult prison population where they are five times more likely to be 6 7 sexually assaulted, two times more likely to be injured by prison staff, and five times 8 more likely to complete suicide than if they 9 10 were in a juvenile facility. They are also more likely to recidivate upon release, do so 11 12 at a higher level, and perpetuate public safety concerns. 13

14While the Governor recently issued an15interim-measure executive order that will no16longer allow for incarceration of youth in17adult facilities, the measure does not reach18out to county jails.

19For the last two years, I've shared20stories of our children whose lives have been21destroyed or even ended. I have them in my22written testimony, and I won't read them all23now, but I would really encourage you to read24them.

1 They're stories like Ben Van Zandt and 2 Kalief Browder, who are no longer with us. 3 They were both teenagers and arrested and 4 imprisoned with the adult population, and 5 both took their own lives.

Throughout the time span of these 6 7 horror stories, I along with other advocates have been here in Albany attempting to 8 advance systemic reforms. Given the fact 9 10 that I am here before you yet again this year, it leads one to beg the question, how 11 12 many more children will be irrevocably harmed or lost before we implement reforms? 13

14 As you are aware, the Governor again 15 included in his Executive Budget proposal a 16 comprehensive Smart on Crime initiative that allows us to keep intact a strong response to 17 violent offenses and cost-effective 18 evidence-based diversion reforms that will 19 20 result in a higher level of public 21 protection.

Over the course of the past several
weeks, we have met with several legislators,
and similar to last year, the response has

1 been positive regarding Raise the Age -- with 2 some concerns raised as well, related mostly 3 to the violent offenses and a misguided notion that we are suggesting youth convicted 4 5 of crimes such as murder or rape will be slapped on the wrist and forgiven. That is 6 7 not now, nor has it ever been, the position of the Raise the Age advocates. Nor has it 8 9 ever been reflected in the many bills 10 drafted.

11 Under the current proposed language, 12 these youth would still be processed through 13 the adult court system with stiff sentencing. 14 The difference is that they would not be 15 remanded to an adult facility until they are 16 indeed an adult. And they would be given the 17 appropriate services while incarcerated.

18 It is, however, important to remember 19 that such heinous crimes are an 20 infinitesimally small percentage of the 21 crimes committed by youth. The majority of 22 initial crimes committed by youth are much 23 less serious -- but despite evidence to the 24 contrary, we continue to prosecute and in

1 many instances incarcerate them as adults. 2 In one study, the MacArthur Foundation 3 Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice examined the 4 5 effectiveness of prosecuting teens as adults by comparing New York teens with teens in 6 7 New Jersey. In New York, juveniles as young as 13 can be charged in an adult court, while 8 in New Jersey most juvenile offenders under 9 10 the age of 18 are processed in juvenile 11 court. 12 When comparing youth arrested for the 13 same felony offenses in New York City and New Jersey, data showed that adolescents 14 15 processed in New York adult courts were more 16 likely to be rearrested, they were rearrested 17 more often and more quickly and for more serious offenses, and they were 18 reincarcerated at higher rates than those in 19 20 the New Jersey juvenile courts. This is not 21 a smart on crime approach, nor is it one that 22 takes public safety into consideration.

We heard earlier stories of violentcrime committed by recent parolees. We are

producing these adult criminals by sending
 our children to adult prisons.

3 We've also heard concerns about costs. While there is a modest up-front capital cost 4 5 associated with imprisonment, the overall results are expected to decrease costs. As 6 7 Soffiya Elijah stated earlier, Connecticut 8 was a recent state to implement Raise the Age, and they've seen costs go down 9 10 significantly. And I talk about that more in 11 my written testimony.

12 So again, we contend that the fears 13 are unlikely to be realized. The evidence 14 overwhelmingly demonstrates our current model 15 in New York State is archaic in its design, 16 ineffective as a deterrent model, and exorbitantly costly. Renowned 17 18 neuroscientists, respected researchers, and even our nation's Supreme Court have all 19 20 registered concerns and recommended that we utilize the wide breadth of evidence to build 21 22 a better system. It's time we heeded this advice. 23

- 24
- I urge you to lead New York down a

path of reform in 2016. Last year I left you with a quote from Maya Angelou that says "When we know better, we do better." As I noted then, we know better and as a result, we need to do better.

6 This year I will suggest we ponder the 7 words of Mahatma Gandhi: "There is a higher court than courts of justice, and that is the 8 court of conscience. It supersedes all other 9 10 courts." We cannot in good conscience leave 11 this issue unattended again this session. 12 Thanks for your time. 13 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you. 14 Our next speaker is Director Terry 15 O'Neill, from the Constantine Institute, Inc. 16 And then our final speaker will be Anne Erickson, CEO of the Empire Justice 17 18 Center. 19 Welcome. 20 MR. O'NEILL: Thank you for your kind 21 welcome, and thank you for your patience and 22 forbearance this evening. I've been

so I know what you're going through. And

attending these meetings for over 30 years,

23

obviously the prepared statement that I gave
 you is not something I'm going to attempt,
 even though I'd like to dazzle Mr. O'Donnell
 with some real speed reading.

5 So what I'm going to do, I'm just going over about three items that are in our 6 7 program. The one that is most timely and important is -- you know, we're all aware, 8 across the nation, and notwithstanding, as 9 10 Mr. Green said today, that crime continues to 11 go down in New York and, as Commissioner 12 Annucci told us, our prison population has 13 been steadily shrinking -- but out in the 14 streets and neighborhoods in this state and 15 all over the nation, there's been an eruption 16 of public dissatisfaction with the kind of policing services that people are getting. 17

And we all know the stories that have been in the news in the last couple of years. So our prescription for dealing with this is the concept of community policing, which has been around for over 25 years, and which was derailed here in New York in 1994 when Bill Bratton took over the New York City Police

1 Department and started American policing down 2 the road of data-driven policing. So now, 3 all across the nation, police chiefs and mayors are pointing to their downward-4 5 trending statistics as evidence that everything is just fine when we're hearing 6 7 from people who have to live under these policing tactics that they don't like being 8 treated like dots on one of Bill Bratton's 9 10 crime maps. 11 So I'm not saying that we shouldn't 12 have this kind of management tool, but it has 13 to be balanced by some investment in 14 restarting the community policing movement 15 that's been -- we've lost total momentum on that. And I think that Mr. McDonald here and 16 Pat Fahy can tell you that here in Albany, 17 18 our police department over the past six years 19 or so has gone down the road of recovering 20 that community policing spirit many miles. 21 And all you have to do is introduce yourself 22 to how police is being provided in our neighborhoods, with neighborhood engagement 23

24 units and a citizen organization that

interacts with the police on these issues on
 a continuing basis.

3 So you may have heard last week that our mayor got shouted down by people from the 4 5 Black Lives Matter movement, and they've called for our police chief to be fired. 6 7 They're mistaken. Things are going better here in Albany than anywhere else, although 8 last year we had an incident that upset many 9 10 people.

11 Now, I was reading the other day the 12 report that the Assembly minority put out on a heroin-addiction tour of hearings. And one 13 14 thing that jumped out at me, and Mr. Giglio 15 tells me he heard this at every venue they 16 went to in their seven-hearing tour, is that there is a big hole in our prevention 17 18 program. We do not have a program that 19 credibly reaches an audience of high school-20 aged kids. The whole philosophy behind the 21 DARE program is just inappropriate for their 22 way of thinking and accepting things.

23 So what experts are telling us is that 24 what will work is a peer-to-peer approach

1 where you enlist kids in school bodies to 2 take on the responsibility of carrying the 3 message to their schoolmates. And I have found a program that is doing exactly that. 4 5 It's called Mentor International. It was founded by the Queen of Sweden in 1994, and 6 7 six years ago Mentor opened an office in Washington, D.C., and started networking 8 schools in the D.C. metropolitan area. 9 10 And I've been determined to introduce 11 this program to New York, and I was very 12 happy in November when a foundation 13 headquartered in Columbia County came up with 14 the money to offer this program in three 15 public schools in Columbia County. I attended two of them, and I can tell you that 16 it went over very, very well with the kids. 17 18 And what happens is they come in and do 19 workshops and identify kids that have been 20 pre-selected by teachers who would be likely 21 to participate well in this program. They 22 develop a program that's offered at a school-wide rally the next day, and after the 23 24 rally on the third day, the mentor starts

sitting down with these kids and giving them training so that they can replicate this program on their own in their schools and in their community, because it also involves a linkage with the business community to create mentoring opportunities for kids in the community.

So there was one other thing that's in 8 there in my written testimony. There's 9 10 appended a draft of a bill that I've been 11 promoting for quite a number of years. The 12 bill would create a new program at the State 13 University focusing on transnational 14 organized crime. It doesn't interfere or 15 conflict with anything else that the 16 University is doing on homeland security or management or emergency disaster 17 18 preparedness. It's something quite 19 different, and it comes uniquely out of the 20 history of the State Police and its 21 pioneering exposure of the existence of the Mafia back in 1957. 22 They had quite a record of 23 24 achievement, and their late superintendent

1 Tom Constantine is credited with having 2 brought down -- from the time he was a field 3 commander in 1985 through his years at the DEA -- the Cali cartel, the largest drug 4 5 conspiracy in history. And then he went on to Northern Ireland and helped end three 6 7 decades of terrorist violence there. So this is a whole story that comes 8 9 out of the very personality and character of 10 our State Police. And as their anniversary 11 is next year, I'd like to bring this proposal 12 out into the open and make it a gift to the men and women of the State Police. 13 14 So with that being said, thank you 15 again for your time and attention. 16 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Director O'Neill. Thank you for your perseverance. 17 18 And our final speaker of the night, 19 last but not least, is Anne Erickson, CEO of 20 the Empire Justice Center. 21 Thank you for joining us. 22 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you so much. And 23 as usual, I admire the stamina. I'm not sure 24 if I was quite last last year, but close to

1 it.

2	So thank you very much. My name is
3	Anne Erickson; I'm president and CEO of the
4	Empire Justice Center. We are a statewide
5	organization that provides training, support,
6	and technical assistance for basically the
7	back up center for the civil legal services
8	side. We engage in legislative and
9	administrative advocacy, and we provide
10	direct representation in one of our four
11	offices around the state in Rochester,
12	Albany, Westchester, and out on Long Island.
13	So again, thank you. You've heard a
14	lot today about the judicial investment in
15	civil legal services, and I just wanted to
16	provide a little bit of context. You have my
17	testimony; I'm not going to go through that.
18	But when the task force to expand
19	access to legal services, which is now the
20	Judicial Commission on Access to Justice,
21	first started operating in 2009, one of the
22	things they did was take a look at where are
23	we in New York State in terms of access to
24	justice on the civil side.

1 And what we found was that for those 2 households on incomes at or below 200 percent 3 of poverty, nearly half of them, 3 million 4 people, experienced at least one civil legal 5 need each year, and 1.2 million of them had 6 three or more incidents where they needed 7 civil legal assistance.

And what are these kinds of needs? 8 We're talking about housing, we're talking 9 10 about evictions, we're talking about foreclosures, we're talking about income 11 12 supports, we're talking about healthcare, 13 disability -- we're looking at families, at 14 the elderly, at the disabled, at veterans, at 15 low-income homeowners. All of our 16 constituents across the state, low- and 17 moderate-income households who come up 18 against the civil legal services system in 19 ways that many of us do not. You know, they 20 just confront issues that are driven by their 21 poverty and by their economic fragility.

At that point we were meeting about
20 percent of the legal need of the poor and
low-income households. The investment by the

Judiciary in civil legal service has made a tremendous difference. We are now meeting, as we heard earlier today from Judge Marks, about 30 percent of the civil legal needs of low- and moderate-income households in this state.

7 We've made progress, but 70 percent of 8 the civil legal needs of our constituents are 9 still not being met. We have a long way to 10 go. So this is really -- we are making 11 inroads, but we are nowhere near where we 12 need to be.

13I also wanted to touch on the impact14on the courts. We heard very powerful15testimony earlier today and this evening from16the court clerks and from the court officers17about the impact, from their perspective, on18the courts, and I am with them.

19But when we first looked at what was20happening on the civil side of the court21system, 2.3 million litigants were coming22into civil court unrepresented on an annual23basis. Two-point-three million people24walking into civil court without the benefit

1 of counsel, about to lose their homes, having 2 lost their health care, having been denied 3 unemployment, having had any array of issues that come at them. 4 5 We again have made some inroads: 1.8 million people are now in front of our 6 7 civil courts unrepresented, down from 2.3 million. Still a long way to go. 8 So as you deliberate this budget --9 10 and I know there's a lot of pressure from a lot of different areas -- this is an 11 12 investment we need to make, and we need to 13 continue and hold strong to that commitment. 14 It's the first time that New York State has 15 really looked at this civil legal needs side 16 of the equation in any systemic way since I've been around, and I've been doing this, I 17 hate to say, for 26 years. 18 19 So we can't stand still, we can't walk 20 backwards. We're finally where we need -- on 21 the path that we should be on. 22 I also just wanted to mention the distribution of the funding. I have to 23 24 really give the court, the OCA, a lot of

1 credit, because what they did is they 2 distributed the funding based on judicial 3 department, based on the number of households 4 under 200 percent of the poverty. Very 5 equitable distribution across the state. I represent programs outside of New York City; 6 7 I'm always afraid, you know, it's all going to go to the City. That has not happened. 8 It has really gone where the need is. 9 10 And then I would also just say on the economic impact in my testimony, you have 11 12 information drawn from the most recent 13 commission report, and they're estimating 14 that every dollar invested in civil legal 15 services draws back in about \$10 into the 16 New York State economy. So it's a good investment, it's a just 17 18 investment. I would urge you to keep working 19 with us, as we're finally on the path we need to be on in New York State. 20 21 And with that, I thank you very much. 22 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: Any questions? 23 Thank you. 24 SENATOR NOZZOLIO: We've gone full

1 circle. We started with this subject today, 2 now we're finishing with it. Thank you very 3 much. 4 MS. ERICKSON: See? Clean-up hitter. 5 Thank you guys very much. 6 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you, Anne. 7 CHAIRWOMAN YOUNG: So thank you, Anne. That concludes our public hearing, 8 9 joint public hearing on Public Protection and 10 the New York State budget proposal, and I 11 want to thank all of my diehard colleagues 12 for staying so late yet again tonight. 13 And I'd also like to thank all of the 14 participants for hanging in there with us, 15 so -- and the staff, too. So thank you very 16 much. 17 \_ \_ \_ (Whereupon, the budget hearing 18 19 concluded at 9:42 p.m.) 20 \_ \_ 21 22 23 24