CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

----X

June 12, 2012 Start: 1:11 pm Recess: 2:07 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

PETER F. VALLONE, JR.

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Erik Martin Dilan Helen D. Foster Daniel R. Garodnick James F. Gennaro Vincent J. Gentile Daniel J. Halloran III

Eric A. Ulrich

David G. Greenfield

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)

Lance Ogiste Counsel Brooklyn District Attorney's Office

Steven Banks Attorney-in-Chief Legal Aid Society

Mark Fliedner Executive Assistant District Attorney Major Narcotics Investigation Bureau Brooklyn District Attorney's Office

Evan Goldstein
Policy Coordinator
Drug Police Alliance

Harry Levine Professor of Sociology Queen's College, the City University of New York

Scott Levy Staff Attorney The Bronx Defenders

Brian Pearson Leader VOCAL New York 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Welcome to
3	this Public Safety Committee hearing. I ask that
4	if you are going to testify, please fill out a
5	form, and our first panel will be the Brooklyn
б	DA's Office represented by Lancenot even
7	close-okay, and Steven Banks. Before we get to
8	that, I have a brief opening statement.

We will be discussing today a resolution, which supports Governor Cuomo's proposal to amend the penal law to make possession of a small quantity of marijuana in public view a violation and applauds the Speaker of the Assembly for her support of the proposal and calls upon the Senate to pass legislation enacting the same. Under the current law, the penalty for unlawful possession depends on the amount of marijuana possessed. In 1977, the state legislature determined that possession of 25 grams or less of marijuana should be decriminalized. Since then, possession of 25 grams or less is only a violation. Although the 1977 was a radical change, the legislature created certain aggravating circumstances, which increased penalty for possession of less than 25 grams from a

2	violation to a misdemeanor. One of these
3	circumstances is to possess marijuana in public
4	view. Under this circumstance, police officers
5	are still able to charge the individual of
6	criminal possession of marijuana in the fifth
7	degree, which is a Class B misdemeanor punishable
8	by three months in jail or up to \$500. On June
9	4 th , Governor Cuomo announced a proposal that would
10	amend the penal law, so the possession of small
11	amounts of marijuana would be in violation, not a
12	B misdemeanor, even if possessed in public view.
13	Let's hope that this change would standardize the
14	penalties associated with small amounts of
15	marijuana and allow our officers to focus on more
16	important crimes. We will have a conversation on
17	this. I actually am looking forward to hearing
18	some of the testimony because I personally support
19	the intent of this bill, which is to prevent
20	people from being arrested by the police after
21	they're asking to empty their pockets, which is
22	clearly unfair as the Mayor believes and the
23	Police Commissioner, who issued an order banning
24	exactly that. I do have some concerns though that
25	this bill may go too far. If the goal is to

prevent this type of unfair arrest, then perhaps,

the bill should just prevent that type of unfair

arrest. I also have some concerns as to the

amounts of marijuana involved here-25 grams is a

[laughter]

lot. It's ten joints I'm informed.

why someone would need to carry that much in public view; however, the intent as I said is a good one. I want to commend the people involved in moving this forward, and I look forward to the compromise bill that is being discussed in Albany right now. We do have a quorum. Alex, do we have a quorum. We need two minutes, so we are going to start then with the Brooklyn DA's testimony, and we may have to interrupt you in a few seconds, but why not? Thanks for coming down today by the way.

LANCE OGISTE: Good afternoon,
Chairman Vallone, Councilman Gentile, one of our
Brooklyn Councilman and all the other members of
the Public Safety Committee. My name is Lance
Ogiste. I am counsel to Brooklyn District
Attorney Charles J. Hynes. I know there are many
people still to testify, so I'll keep my remarks

2	brief. I am joined today by my colleague, Mark
3	Fliedner, who is the executive assistant district
4	attorney in charge of the Major Narcotics
5	Investigation Bureau. It is our honor and
6	privilege to come before you on behalf of District
7	Attorney Hynes to voice his unequivocal support
8	for City Council resolution 986-A, supporting
9	Governor Cuomo's proposal to amend New York State
10	Penal Law Section 22110 sub 1, making possession
11	of 25 grams or less of marijuana in public view a
12	violation and calling upon the New York State
13	Senate to follow the Governor's lead to pass
14	legislation enacting the same. In 2010, 11,772
15	top count [phonetic] were filed in Brooklyn,
16	charging Penal Law Section 22110 sub 1. In 2011,
17	that number decreased to 11,315 complaints. Even
18	with the reduction in the number of complaints
19	filed for this crime, the financial costs of
20	processing these arrests was substantial. Using
21	numbers cited in City Council Resolution 986-A of
22	between \$1000 to \$2000 to process marijuana
23	arrests-
24	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]

Mr. Ogiste, can I ask you - - one second. Council

22

23

24

25

2	Member Gennaro does need to go home and deal with
3	an emergency in his district. If I could ask that
4	the roll be called just for his vote at this
5	moment
6	COMMITTEE CLERK: Kevin Pin,
7	Committee Clerk. Roll call in the Committee on
8	Public Safety. Council Member Gennaro?
9	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Yes, I
10	vote yes on this matter and I thank the Chair for
11	his accommodation and indulgence. It's greatly
12	appreciated, and I vote yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,
14	Council Member. Mr. Ogiste, I apologize.
15	LANCE OGISTE: No, no problem.
16	Thank you very much, Chairman. Using numbers
17	cited in City Council Resolution 986-A of between
18	1000 and 2000 dollars to process marijuana
19	arrests, it costs the city between 11 million to
20	22.5 million dollars to process these cases in

Brooklyn alone. As is stated in your proposed

Resolution, these taxpayer dollars could be better

spent on much needed human services and combatting

more serious criminal activity. Let me give you

an example of how that money might be spent. In

1999, DA Hynes created ComALERT, Community and Law
Enforcement Resources Together, the first
prosecutor run reentry program into the united
States. ComALERT helps the formerly incarcerated
to successfully reintegrate into their communities
by providing wraparound services, such as
substance abuse treatment, mental health
counseling , anger management, transitional
employment, housing assistance and other services
that help keep the formerly incarcerated drug and
crime free. In 2007, professor Bruce Western, now
Harvard University, released his study of
ComALERT, finding that the program reduced
recidivism among its graduated by more than half
in comparison to a mass control group of parolees
who did not receive such services. The possible
savings from Brooklyn alone from this small change
in the penal law is enough to provide ComALERT
services to returning ex-offenders citywide, and
can help to further reduce crime. Apart from
financial costs reducing the crime to a violation
from a misdemeanor can help alleviate some of the
collateral consequences of a conviction that could
affect possible employment and educational

2.

opportunities. As District Attorney Hynes has
said, Governor Cuomo's proposal will go a long way
toward a more balanced approach to drug related
offenses and compliment other progressive
initiatives already serving our community. It
will lead to a more efficient use of law
enforcement resources. That is our statement from
the Brooklyn District Attorney Charles J. Hynes,
and I thank you for your

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Steven, why don't we go to you first and then we'll go to some questions?

opportunity to testify. Steven Banks, Attorney-in-Chief of the Legal Aid Society. I'm here with Bill Gibney, who is the director of our special litigation unit, criminal defense area. I saw Council Member Halloran had a camera. I don't know if you're recording this first ever moment where all of the district attorneys, the Legal Aid Society, the mayor, the police commissioner all agree on one thing-pass the resolution and the Governor's legislation to pass. I'm not sure that there's anything in our testimony that is as

2.

important as that fact. You see broad range of
perspectives, broad range of viewpoints,
understand what the problem that is trying to be
addressed here through law enforcement and what is
trying to be addressed here in terms of protecting
the rights of residents of the city. We have
detailed testimony for the record. We're not
going to read it, but I want to just highlight a
few points and read one sentence from the
testimony, which I think you'll find interesting.

On Page 2, you'll see a quote that says, "The legislature finds that arrests, criminal prosecutions, and criminal penalties are inappropriate for people who possess small quantities or marijuana for personal use. Every year this process needlessly scars thousands of lives and wastes millions of dollars, law enforcement resources, while detracting from the prosecution of serious crimes." That is not a statement from the legislature in 2012. That's a statement from the legislature in 1977.

Immediately prior to passage of what's known as the Marijuana Reform Law, which decriminalized personal possession of 25 grams, made it a

ticketable [phonetic] offense violation with a
fine, not a crime, not a finger printable offense,
not a photographed offense, not something for
which you have to say, have you ever been
arrested? Yes. This is not a crime. Immediately
before then, there were about 25,000 arrests a
year before the '77 reform. Within a decade or so
after the '77 reform there were about 1,000
arrests a year. In the decades since, that number
has creeped [phonetic] up to 30,000 to now 50,000
and in 2011, 50,680. Now no study says that
marijuana use has increased 50 fold since it
appeared immediately following the marijuana
reform law that the 1977 legislature passed. In
fact, there's a problem that happens on the street
corners and the parks of the city and then a
counter between New Yorkers and police in which
people are asked to empty their pockets and that
results in an arrest. The reason why the Senate
compromised however will not solve this problem is
that the police commissioner tried exactly that
solution in September when he issued a patrol
directive that's described in our testimony making
it clear that arrests are not to happen when the

public view is caused by the empty your pockets
command. In the month of August before this
directive, there were 4189 arrests in connection
with the provision of law that the Governor's
amendment would address. Immediately after the
Commissioner's directive in November/December, the
number came down to 2,974. Not a tremendous drop,
but of greater concern is that the figured in
March of 2012 are now 4,186, so within three
arrests it's the same as before the directive, and
these are not statistics that come from Legal Aid
Society's caseload. These statistics come from
the state division of criminal justice services,
although our caseload certain bears this out and
every day in criminal court and to the credit of
the district attorneys, I appreciate their
perspective on this that's its taking precious law
enforcement dollars and diverting it from more
serious things to this particular area, but it's
leaving people just as the legislature said in
1977 scarred. As I said, you now have to say,
I've been arrested, has an employment consequence,
city employees can lose their jobs, you can lose
your housing, evictions from the Housing Authority

occur. There are problems with getting
educational loans. You can be deported. There's
a record of who you are now as a criminal, rather
than someone who committed a violation and the
legislature intended to give you a ticket or a
fine. So this legislation as proposed by the
Governor is critically important, and amendments
compromises that essentially would be what the
police commissioner tried to do in September 2011
isn't going to change the waste of resources that
law enforcement currently pours into this and
isn't going to change the scars that are left on
New Yorkers as a result of this, so we would urge
the Council to support the Governor's proposal and
we would urge that the Senate embrace the
Governor's proposal in the way that the Speaker
has.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay. Thank
you. We have with us today Council Members
Halloran, Ulrich, Gentile, Foster, Garodnick,
Greenfield and the sponsor of this measure,
Melissa Mark-Viverito. To say she has been in the
forefront of this issue is like saying Eli Manning
is in the forefront of the Giant's victory in the

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Super Bowl. She has been a leader throughout, and
I'd like to just turn it over to her for a brief
statement.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Thank you, Mr. Chair and I think you were present obviously in the budget hearing last year when we did question Commissioner Kelly [phonetic] about this very issue, and he told us at that point that we should change the law, and that's what we're looking to do and so I'm glad that we're having this reso in support of the efforts at the state level to close that loophole in the marijuana law from 1977, which has decriminalized marijuana possession in small amounts. Also, the other factor here that I think hasn't been-I'm sorry I'm late, but maybe it has been mentioned—I mean, you kind of alluded to it a little bit is really the concern with regards to now the implementation of secure communities in New York City when in fact we know that a lot of these arrests that are happening right now for marijuana possession is after someone has been asked to expose it. Obviously, these are false arrests, so a false arrest then leading to the possible deportation of

into police custody is of great concern. So this is really just common sense for all the reasons cited. It's been—I really have to say that the advocates Vocal New York and Drug Policy Alliance have been really instrumental in bringing this issue to the forefront and to light and to getting the level of support that has gotten us to this point. So with that, thank you all. Thank you, Mr. Chair for your support as well, and I look forward to us passing this resolution.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,

Council Member. I'm going to ask a few brief

questions. As I said before you got in, I do have

some concerns otherwise support the intent of

this. I just want to clarify—both of you

mentioned convictions. I'm a former DA, and you

know for a fact that you have to be arrested at

least three times for this before you're even

discussing a conviction. If you're that dumb, you

deserve one, so there's rarely a conviction, but

there are problems with just the arrest as was

alluded to, but convictions aren't really

happening here. Is it Ogiste? Is that how you

MARK FLIEDNER: You're saying - that we did not see money change hands? We're talking... In the scenario that you describe we're several steps away from a prosecution in effect a prosecution for sale of a significant amount of

23

24

25

marijuana. The other thing-I kept reading the
materials—when I was asked to look at this issue
because I focus on major narcotics, I testified
before you a short time ago about the prescription
drug problem which is a new focus and the fairness
and consistency argument that is made in the
materials that are being provided by the City
Council in support of this bill are what struck me
because I think the largest challenge as
prosecutors of major narcotics offenses in this
day and age is the perception that the system is
set up fundamentally unfair, and if a fact
pattern-meaning the communication between the
police officer and somebody that is arrested-
begins with a fundamental unfairness and a lack of
consistency in how it plays out from neighborhood
to neighborhood-

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: We went through that. I had a specific question about prosecution. You said you're a few steps away from an arrest there. If somebody hands a bag to somebody else, but you don't see the money being transferred now you can't make an arrest, but you could if it was public view allowed that to

2 happen?

MARK FLIEDNER: I'm not saying that we couldn't make an arrest if there are a lot of other factors in place, but when we're talking about isolating the factor of the public view, I don't know the fact pattern where this legislation as put into place would have a chilling effect on our ability to prosecute a sound sale case. I just don't see it. Maybe you can offer me one that has not raised my concern to date.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I haven't done this in a long time, but to prosecute a sale, you have to see the money change hands.

MARK FLIEDNER: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: You have a known dealer on a corner, who you see handing a bag to somebody else, but you don't see the money change hands, which happens, police officers aren't staring at the entire process all the time, can you still prosecute that as a crime in any way?

MARK FLIEDNER: I think that there are ways that we can go about prosecuting it, but—

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]

2 Tell me, tell me.

MARK FLIEDNER: For all intents and purposes, realistically, we proceed with cases where we can see all of the elements of the offense - - .

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: You don't get a conviction though.

mark fliedner: That's absolutely right. I mean, that's what I think that is so critical about this legislation is we're talking about the reality of the way that the system is working in a fair context.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I'm not saying that this is a reason not to pass the bill. I'm just saying there's an effect there on not getting that dealer off the street if you can't prosecute for seeing it in his hand in open view. You didn't do anything to dissuade me of that notion, but again, that may not rise to the level or making this a bad bill. We have questions from Council Member Halloran.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually, you prefaced one of those questions that I had already had, but I'm

going to start with Mr. Banks because I think
that's the best place to start is the consequences
and where we wind up. Are there any things that
you've seen in the bill as it's drafted that
understanding as an officer of the court you have
to balance? Of course, advocate for your
client. You're looking at the big picture of
everything that goes on and the caseload that we
have, the cost that it incurs to the city. Is
there anything in the bill as it's drafted now or
in the compromise bill that the Senate is
proposing that needs to be changed? What needs to
be changed? Why does it need to be changed? What
suggestions do you have? I understand that the
Legal Aid Society more than any other entity in
the city probably understands the consequences of
convictions and simply arrests better than most,
but there is a public safety element that we have
to be concerned with in this Committee in
particular. So can you take that question, and
just run a little bit for me?
CERTIFIED DANKS. El. C. /

STEVEN BANKS: The Governor's proposal balances all of the interests. It's really tailored to the problem that's occurring.

It doesn't address other concerns that might have,
but it might be balanced against law enforcement
concerns. For example, it doesn't prevent someone
from being stopped and questioned and then the
police evaluating the quantity, so in the
potential sale situation, there isn't anything
that would stop someone consistent with all the
constitutional limitations, which could be
separate to its own hearing, to stop somebody and
then to evaluate that the quantity is not 25
grams, but in fact a quantity that's high enough
to lead to other potential issues in the case.
The problem with the compromise bill as I
articulated is it creates this problem that's
playing out on the street corner. I think again
the Commissioner Kelly's order was in response to
complaints about the problem, and as he said in
prior testimony, the law is going to have to be
changed, and so I think-I can't speak for him-
that's one of the reasons-
CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]
Nobody wants you to I'm sure.
STEVEN BANKS: On this he might

though. The proposal is to actually address what

2	the problem that his directive was meant to
3	address, which is that if you leave it in the
4	hands of every individual encounter, people are
5	going to be arrested where they should not be
6	arrested, and his order didn't solve that problem
7	versus having a change in law that would then make
8	it impossible to prosecute someone for that basis.
9	There's no sense in using police resources to
10	bring people down who can't be actually prosecuted
11	for something, so it would stop the problem, and
12	it would address the collateral consequences, but
13	it wouldn't limit the law enforcement interests,
14	which although we may disagree
15	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]
16	Can I ask you a question though?
17	STEVEN BANKS: Sure.
18	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: With
19	permission to Council Member Halloran. How would
20	a law that says you can't arrest someone if you
21	ask them to open their pockets for having
22	marijuana in plain view not solve the problem?
23	STEVEN BANKS: I have to take the-
24	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]
25	the problem with the compromise bill

б

STEVEN BANKS: No, no, no, no. I
understand what you're asking. I think I have to
take the Commissioner's position for what it is,
which he tried the Senate compromise actually, and
it didn't work, so now you're eliminating the
arrest for-under the Senate compromise, you're
going to have disputes whether or not it came into
public view as a result of the police citizen
encounter or whether it was in public view. That
is why-again, I don't want to speak for the
Governor either-but I believe that's why the
Governor took the broader perspective that we have
to deal with eliminating the dispute about how it
came into view, and that's what the change in the
law does.
CITATEDED CON MALI ONE: The black of a second

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: That's a good point.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Mr.

Chairman, I was just looking at some notes as well, and again, there has always been that issue of police officers having to fill out those forms the right way with the right information of how they came upon those objects and we don't want to put our police officers in positions where they

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are less than accurate in any way, shape or form when they're filling out that paperwork and that would create that parade of - - of having defense attorneys asking for these map hearings on certainly very interesting grounds, I'm sure. Looking just to the numbers because one of the things I think that is incredible about what we're talking about is the number of these arrests and what it does to the system as a whole. Now we've cut back arraignment times. We've cut back weekends in some boroughs. Of course, Staten Island keeps getting short shifted at every turn with special programs and the ability to process its prisoners. What is the Legal Aid Society's perspective on the overall impact on the criminal justice processing system by taking this out of the equation.

STEVEN BANKS: When you're talking about one out of seven arrests just looking at the Legal Aid Society's caseload, it's about 30,000 cases a year out of a caseload of about 220,000 or so cases, so it's a significant impact. It has an impact on the ability of the system, whether it's the courts, the prosecution or the defense to

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consequence.

focus on more serious cases because it just simply
takes up time and space, but it takes up time and
space with human beings for whom there is a

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Let me justand I hate to pull more time into this, but I really do want us to understand long term implications. We'll now have C summonses [phonetic]. Summons parts will need to handle the overflow and I know the Legal Aid Society has been in summons parts, but so have I, and those aren't pretty parts to begin with. Even attorneys who are there on a regular basis will tell you you can just be in that part for the whole morning and half of the afternoon before your case gets called, unlike the ap parts, which at least usually by 11 o'clock, if you have shown up at a reasonable enough time, you're able to get out of. Do we need to start considering once this has passed devoting resources to a special part because you can't just throw them in to ap/ar 2 [phonetic] in Queens for example, and say, good luck, Judge Demaccus [phonetic], a retired judge who is barely able to get through the calendar on

a normal day. You now have 500 extra cases.

STEVEN BANKS: I think you raised a good point in terms of the processing of these violations is going to have to change, but in the end, you're going to be using less time and effort, but you're absolutely right in terms of the planning and the implementation.

that's what I'm concerned about 'cause you know, this body in Albany frequently passes laws and then says, oh, now we got to do something else, and I'd like us to have that dialogue before the floodgate opens because if we don't do that, we'll wind up overwhelmed in another place, and not that it's not a better place for a debate, but the point is, it's not prepared to be right now, at least as far as this criminal practitioner who has been on both sides of the aisle is concerned.

STEVEN BANKS: I think in the end there are substantial deployment of resources to the current 30,000 cases for us and larger for the overall city, there is a lot of resources being deployed there that could be redeployed more effectively as opposed to saying, okay, we need a

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

whole new allocation of recourse, it's much more a question of making better use of the existing resources to have a better outcome for the courts, for the communities and ultimately for the New Yorkers who are caught up in this, free the police up to do other things. We may not agree with what those things are, but free them up.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Again, I appreciate your testimony. I appreciate that the district attorneys have weighed in on this. have run into these issues of how do we deal with this low level offense. I just would hope that the city and the state is cognizant of the fact that you're taking one out of seven arrests and you're not eliminating the arrest, you're simply making it a desk appearance ticket and a violation and not a crime, which is important-or a summons, which is important and I understand that, but are desk appearance ticket and summons part to my knowledge unless things have radically changed in the two years I've been not practicing criminal, we're always overwhelmed. I just would like us to make sure somebody's saying--I know our district attorneys are always hurting for money—that we

2	have assistance who are shuffled off to those
3	appropriate locations.

on the summons parts, we're not dealing with that, at least not in Brooklyn, so that won't affect us. It might affect the police 'cause they're drafting more summonses in terms of their time in doing this.

we're going to have to just look at that, and
Chairman Vallone, I would suggest that we ask that
if this law does get passed, that at least for the
city, I mean, I don't know what the rest of the
state is going to do, but the city of New York has
always had issues with regards to these parts, and
if there is something we can do in advance to
solve the problem, we should look at that.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: That is a very good point, Council Member. Council Member Mark-Viverito?

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Thank you, Mr. Chair and good to see our colleague, Council Member Halloran, back. You know, I just want to make one quick statement, and

I have a question for the rep from the DA's
office. I just don't want us to also-there's a
direct connection between these marijuana arrests
and the whole stop and frisk policy, which has
been under debate as well are a subset of the
stop and frisk. This is resulting out of a stop
and a frisk potentially. So and more summonses is
going to happen obviously, but less arrests is the
end result here, so putting people through that
process and criminalizing them unnecessarily.
There was a four part NPR series that was done on
this issue, and it looked particularly at the
Bronx DA's office, where some of the ADAs were
testifying in the report that they were throwing
out a lot of cases, a lot of the marijuana arrest
cases, because as they were investigating it, they
were finding out that the marijuana in public view
it had become in public view because officer was
asking the individual to empty their pockets, so I
think it's just talking about that false arrest.
Could you speak to that in terms of your
experience whether that is the same-I'm not sure
if that was provided in your testimony, I did come
in late. So if you're repeating yourself, I

б

2 apologize. I'm not sure if you're familiar with
3 that report that was done.

LANCE OGISTE: No, I'm not familiar with the report, Councilwoman Viverito, but in terms of Brooklyn, what we do is when we have DAT cases we don't look at the summonses - - we don't get the summonses or what we call the EAPs [phonetic] cases, which are expedited affidavit program cases. Those are filled out and done by the police department. The DAT cases, desk appearance tickets, we do examine very carefully, and if we find that there's such a situation, then we're going to move to throw that case out.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: But you're not able to talk about the numbers in this case?

LANCE OGISTE: No, I just do not know.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Okay, so I know that that is an issue that has emerged, and then, just in terms of our resolution, it's strongly in support of the Governor's proposal. I know the Senate republicans are talking about a compromise and

2	whittling it down further and I'm glad to hear
3	that the Governor is standing firm, and I hope
4	that that's the case because the proposal I think
5	that republicans are bringing been great
6	concern. I mean, I just wanted to ask about that
7	question. I appreciate it, and again, this is a
8	policy that unfortunately is impacting adversely
9	communities of color and that also is something
10	that has to be mentioned here that especially when
11	we're talking about false arrests that we're
12	really potentially harming the future of many
13	young people, and that's something that definitely
14	you should not be a part of. So thank you all for
15	your testimony. Thank you for service.
16	LANCE OGISTE: You're quite
17	welcome.
18	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay. Thank
19	you. We don't have any more questions of you so
20	you can leave. Thank you for spending time with
21	us.
22	LANCE OGISTE: It was our pleasure.
23	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: We're going
24	to vote and then we're going to hear from one last
25	panel. Let me call you guys up, so you can-while

2	we get ready to vote. Also, I've been given a
3	statement in favor of this by Cyrus Vance
4	[phonetic]. Next panel is Scott Levy [phonetic],
5	Harry Levine[phonetic], Evan Goldstein [phonetic],
6	and Brian Pearson [phonetic]. If you can all take
7	your spots, while we do a vote here.
8	[long pause]
9	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I'd like to
10	ask the clerk to call the roll.
11	COMMITTEE CLERK: Kevin Pin,
12	Committee Clerk. Roll call in the Committee on
13	Public Safety Reso 986-A. Council Member Vallone?
14	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: As I've said
15	earlier, I support the intent of this bill. I
16	absolutely believe that it's unfair to arrest
17	people after asking them to empty their pockets.
18	I do though want to see the results of the
19	negotiations in Albany when it comes to a
20	compromise and see what they come up with before
21	making a final decision on this, so at this point,
22	I'm going to abstain and make no recommendations
23	to my colleagues.
24	COMMITTEE CLERK: Dilan?
25	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: I vote aye.

33
t
s the
s
d the
or
ere
etely
do
2
) I

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 33
2	COMMITTEE CLERK: Foster?
3	COUNCIL MEMBER FOSTER: Yes.
4	COMMITTEE CLERK: Gentile?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: May I
6	explain my vote, Mr. Chairman?
7	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Yes.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I'm not
9	sure from a public safety viewpoint if this is the
10	right thing to do, but this resolution and this
11	bill in Albany has the of people that I
12	respect; the law enforcement, the five Das and the
13	police commissioner, and as a former prosecutor
14	myself, I know of some of the problems that were
15	discussed here today. So while I'm not completely
16	convinced that this is the right way to go, I do
17	lean on the law enforcement entities that have
18	endorsed this proposal and this resolution, so I
19	in that regard I will vote yes.
20	COMMITTEE CLERK: Garodnick?
21	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Aye.
22	COMMITTEE CLERK: Greenfield?
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENDFIELD: Aye.
24	COMMITTEE CLERK: Halloran?
25	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Mr.

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Chairman, may I be excused to explain my vote?

3 CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: I think that this is a necessary change in the law. think that we need to make it clear as the Police Commissioner indicated in his testimony last year where we need to be on this issue. I'm going to abstain at this time for the same reasons you are to see the outcome of the discussion. I would hope that the majority of what the Governor's proposal is remains intact, but I'm not comfortable with all the changes that all my colleagues on my side of the aisle have proposed on the Senate bill, but I would also like to say this; last night I had the honor of being in the presence of Mayor Giuliani, and we had a long discussion about what has happened in New York in the years since he has left office, and we agreed on something and I just want to point it out. are at the verge of now almost in a sense criminalizing sugar and legalizing marijuana and while I don't think there is anything wrong either per se, I just find it hard to understand sometimes where our priorities are and where the

20 COMMITTEE CLERK: Ulrich?

21 COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: No.

COMMITTEE CLERK: By a vote of six in the affirmative, one in the negative and two abstentions, the item has been adopted. Members, please sign the Committee Report.

2.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,
members. We have been joined there by Council
Member Dilan who is now leaving. I think I
mentioned everyone else. Why don't we start on
one end and go across and hit the button on the
microphone, identify yourself and please keep your
testimony between two and five minutes because I'd
like to have as many Council Members hear all the
testimony as I can.

EVAN GOLDSTEIN: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Council Members on the Public Safety Committee. My name is Evan Goldstein and I'm a policy coordinator the Drug Police Alliance. The Drug Policy Alliance is a national organization that promotes health alternatives to the war on drugs and focuses drug use and abuse as health issues rather than criminal justice issues. For the past—first and foremost I want to thank Council Member Mark—Viverito for her leadership on this issue. She has really been a champion when discussing how the issue around marijuana arrest practices in New York City has impacted communities of color and has really dissolved a lot of the relationship

that young men of color have with the police and
the trust in the police, and that actually we
found through doing a lot of interviews and
discussions in those communities have really bled
out to the communities in general where young
men's mothers and grandmothers are afraid that
when their grandsons and sons go out to go get
some milk that they won't come back for a day or
two, and so we've been for the past year and a
half educating staff members and Council Members
about this issue using marijuana arrests not as
marijuana per se as an issue, but the way to talk
about some of the adverse consequences that
certain police practices have in communities of
color. So I very much thank the Council for
voting in the affirmative supporting the
legislation the Public Safety Committee. A
lot of my remarks and details are in my testimony
and so I defer to any questions you may have.
CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you. I
appreciate you summing up your testimony as it is
very lengthy, but it is important, so thank you.
HARRY LEVINE: My name is Harry

Levine. I'm a professor of sociology at Queen's

College in the graduate center in the City
University of New York. For most of my career,
I've been researching drug policy and alcohol
policy and problems, and for the last five years,
I have been focusing on the question of marijuana
arrests in New York. I did an 100 page report
with colleagues for the new York Civil Liberties
Union, which released in 2008 called the Marijuana
Arrest Crusade. I have testimony. I actually
came here to bring my testimony. We've done a
series of other reports, not just about marijuana
arrests in New York, but also about California and
other places. I came here today to thank the City
Council for considering this resolution and for
members of the City Council for playing really a
leadership role I think in moving the question of
the unfair and racially biased marijuana arrests
to the forefront of public and political
consciousness in New York City. In some ways,
people have been heroic about this, and I think
that the Governor, the Assembly and the support of
the five District Attorneys and the Mayor and the
Police Commissioner speak to the effectiveness of
the work that people have done to inform and

educate people about what has been going on in the
streets of New York. The testimony I brought with
me today addresses some of the history of how we
got into this situation and also talks about some
of the things that I think will happen if or when
the legislation passes and additional problems
that the summons system will face and I really
will sort of let the written testimony speak for
itself. There's a graph and some pictures in
there. I think I'd like to-if you have the
written testimony—I'd like to just point you to a
couple of things in the written testimony. Do you
have it? On the second page, there's a graph that
basically divides up the marijuana arrests in New
York City between two periods, between 1978 and
1997 when marijuana arrests averaged about 3,300
arrests a year and the period from 1998 to 2011
when marijuana arrests have averaged 39,000
arrests a year. It seems to me that what at least
some of us have been talking about and what I
would like to propose that the City Council at
least in the long term consider is seriously
moving back to a much earlier and I think saner
approach to this whole question. We can talk

about it. The second thing I wanted to show you
is a series of photographs and that's on page 5.
One of the things that I discovered in my search
is a couple of different ways in which marijuana
is obtained from people's possession, but one of
the ways, which is a sort of secret of policing,
not just in New York, but in other places is the
police actually simply put their hands in people's
pockets. In the last couple of years there has
been a growing number of media reports that talk
about this, both public defender attorneys and
people who have been stopped and frisked and have
the people put their hands in their pockets.
Recently some people have been taking photographs
of this and there are three photographs of police
officers on page 6, putting hands in pockets of
people who did not get arrested. This is much
more common than the three pictures that I'm
showing you and it seems to me that it both
underlies this and problem. The third thing
is a picture on page 8, which is a picture of
people lined up in the morning to go to the
summons courts in Manhattan and Brooklyn. And
like the arrests for marijuana, the people in the

summons court are overwhelmingly blacks and
Latinos young people and that when or if the
city moves from making great numbers of marijuana
arrests to making many summonses, they are going
to be written by the same police in the same
neighborhoods and given to the same population
that the arrests are now, and the striking
thing about marijuana, which has been reported by
others, but is really important is that every
national study and the study by the New York City
Public Health Department finds that young whites
use marijuana at higher rates than young blacks,
so in my neighborhood of Columbia University,
there are people walking around with marijuana in
their pocket, but they do not get stopped and
frisked, and they do not get hands put in their
pockets, and they will not be getting the
summonses in the same numbers that the people in
other neighborhoods will.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Professor,

Harry, wait, you're Harry. - - . Also - - single

spaced, so please take a—see what Evan did? Try

to do the same. Thanks.

SCOTT LEVY: Thank you. I did

write a lengthy written testimony, but I will make
it brief. My name is Scott Levy. I'm a staff
attorney at The Bronx Defenders and the director
of the Marijuana Arrest Project there. We're a
public defender office in the south Bronx. I
represent about 28,000 clients a year, and I want
to thank everyone for allowing me the opportunity
to come here and voice my support for the
resolution. I just want to tell a brief story.
Over the past year, I've personally represented
literally hundreds of clients arrested for low
level marijuana possession, and in February of
this year, I represented a young, 24 year old man,
who was arrested as he walked out of a bodega in
his neighborhood. He had no prior criminal
history whatsoever. As he walked out of the
bodega, he was approached by two police officers,
who immediately made him assume the search
position, put their hands in his pockets and
recovered a very small bag of marijuana. Despite
the fact that he had never possessed that
marijuana in public view, he was taken to central
booking. He spent more than 30 hours incarcerated
before he was able to see a judge. He ultimately

received an adjournment and contemplation of
dismissal and was able to catch the last few
minutes of the Super Bowl, but not before telling
me how unfairly he believed he had been treated
and unjustly he felt he had been treated and how
disrespectfully he felt he had been treated. When
we're talking about marijuana arrests, I think
that is really the issue here is that each and
every one of these arrests is an encounter that
leaves a bad taste in the mouth of usually a
young, black or Latino young man, and I have
represented literally hundreds and hundreds of
cases of clients with virtually identical stories.
The problem with these arrests is that they reveal
a policing strategy that disproportionately
affects young people of color and also one that
encourages and even relies on a casual disregard
for civil rights. Last year about this time, The
Bronx Defenders decided to look in a more
systematic way at this issue. We started the
Marijuana Arrest Project and began systematically
interviewing clients who has been arrested for low
level marijuana possession. We focused on two
salient features of the NYPD's marijuana arrest

practices—the first was the unjustified initial
stop by the police and the second was what we
started calling manufactured misdemeanors where
the clients were being charged with misdemeanors
despite the fact that they never actually
possessed marijuana in public view. Our research
suggests pretty strongly that the NYPD actually
manufactures thousands of misdemeanors every year
and that after Commissioner Kelly's order in
September of 2011, the rate at which they were
manufacturing misdemeanors actually increased
despite an explicit command not to continue this
practice. Our data collection effort resulted in
518 comprehensive interviews with clients arrested
between May and October of last year and every New
York NYPD precinct in the Bronx and at every
command and the results are truly disquieting.
The data shows that the percentage of illegal
detentions and manufactured misdemeanors actually
as I said increased in the month immediately
following Ray Kelly's order commanding that this
practice stop. From 31% to 40% of the arrests
were unjustified stops and from 33% to 44% for
manufactured misdemeanors. In addition overall,

we found that the police lack sufficient legal
basis to justify the initial contract with our
clients in 34% of each and every case we looked
at. In 36% of these cases, police officers
manufactured misdemeanor charges by arresting
clients for misdemeanors despite that the
marijuana had only come into public view as a
result of police action and strikingly in 79% of
those cases, the marijuana came into public view
only as a result of a police search. Our clients
were not actually revealing marijuana on their
own, and I should note that in each and every one
of these complaints, the police alleged that they
viewed the marijuana in public view and neglected
to say how it had gotten there in the first place.
Taken together, the cases in which the police had
no legal cause for the initial detention and
manufactured the misdemeanor charges account for
41% of all the cases that we looked at, and as
these findings demonstrate, this manufacturing
misdemeanors is not an aberrational occurrence.
It is a widespread and systematic practice and one
that would undermine up to 20,000 arrests in New
York City alone. It's truly a staggering number.

I will try to wrap this up very quickly, but I do
think it merits attention just to talk about what
the collateral consequences are. We've touched on
that briefly in this hearing, but each arrest
usually leads to 24 hours or more in
incarceration. Each one of those days is a lost
day of school, a lost day of work, a suspension at
work, often termination. Marijuana arrests can
lead to deportation, loss of federal financial
aid, loss of public housing, termination of
parental rights. There are really Draconian
collateral consequences that stem from these
arrests and what I think is absolutely crucial for
this Committee to understand and I thank you for
the opportunity is that most of these collateral
consequences attach regardless of whether the
client is charged with a violation or a
misdemeanor, particularly when the federal
government is in charge. For immigration
purposes, it matters little to the federal
government whether or not a client is charged with
a violation or a misdemeanor, and going to
Councilman Halloran's point our fear is that a lot
of these cases will end up in the summons part

without proper oversight and a lot of these
collateral consequences may continue to pile up
without any representation or oversight from
offices like ours. The other thing I just think
is important to note is that the recent research
has shown one that these arrests and these
encounters have devastating consequences for each
and every person who goes through it, but that
these encounters are highly concentrated in a
small number of neighborhoods around the city and
when you start multiplying the effects block by
block and community by community, you can see how
these marijuana arrests are really undermining the
ability of communities and certain neighborhoods
to really regulate themselves and police
themselves and it has done a great disservice for
relationships between those communities and the
NYPD.
CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay, finish
it un

SCOTT LEVY: Yes. What I will finish and say is that I hope that this resolution and the Governor's proposal represents what is

just a first step towards what we see is the need

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for wholesale criminal justice reform and a reevaluation of the stop and frisk policy city wide, so thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay, well you know I agree with the part about the manufactured stops, but not the rest of it. Mr. Pearson, if you would please be relatively quick and finish the hearing for us please.

BRIAN PEARSON: My name is Brian Pearson. First and foremost I want to thank the Public Safety Committee for hearing my statement today. Again, my name is Brian Pearson. leader with VOCAL New York, Voices of Community Active Leaders in New York. I'm here today to tell my own experience with wrongful marijuana arrest for low level marijuana possession that I believe illustrates while the resolution you are discussing today needs to be passed, I also want to offer my support to Governor Cuomo, Assembly Member Jeffries [phonetic] and Senator Asante [phonetic] in their efforts to end these arrests which are racially biased, economically wasteful and illegal under the 1977 New York State law. My story shows the collateral consequences of these

arrests that Mayor Bloomberg and Police
Commissioner Kelly have repeatedly try to brush
under the rug. Last fall, I was on parole, but my
life was improving. I was up for early release.
I was working on the construction of subway
tunnels and on my way toward getting a
position. I had moved from a ¾ house for parolees
and was renting a room in Crown Heights. On
Wednesday, my cousin drove me to the train at
Eastern Parkway and Utica Avenue, so I could get
to work for the 3 to 11 shift. Before I could
exit the car, we were surrounded by officers who
came out of nowhere. They claimed we fit the
description of bank robbery suspects. My cousin
to assert his right not to be searched, but we
were pulled from the car and frisked anyway. The
officer found an remainder of a joint about the
length of a thumbnail after searching my cousin.
He said they had no right to conduct this search
and argued that it was a tiny amount of marijuana.
Most importantly, he told them that everything he
had on him and in the car was his and asked that I
be let go to go to work. They refused. All of
this was illegal search in violation of our

rights, but as common for people in African
American, Latino communities, I was eventually
arrested and held in central booking for about
72 hours before I finally saw a judge. When I was
released I was given another court date. In all,
I had three court dates before the charges were
dropped. For three days I was without a lawyer,
forced to miss work because of the wrongful
arrest. Upon release, I found out there were even
further collateral damages, collateral
consequences, damages. I was able to convince my
job to keep me on, but I was set back in the
competitive process to get a union book needed for
the union membership. This meant that after my
temporary construction work ended in the tunnels,
I was left without employment or union membership.
Next I had to my parole officer so I would not
be violated and sent back to prison despite a
negative urine test for drugs and a statement by
my cousin, I was not violated; however, my early
release for parole was terminated and I had to
spend an additional four months on parole. Today
I live in Woodhaven Queens, a community with a lot
of hardworking immigrants, but not a lot of

African Americans and Latinos, who make up 87% of			
the roughly 50,000 marijuana arrests in New York			
City. I do not see police officers rolling up on			
people there like they do in Crown Heights, where			
I recently lived at or any black or Latino			
community for that matter. The NYPD are not			
trying to create safe and healthy communities for			
people who look like me. They are using this			
unjust policy to harass us, to intimidate us and			
to drive us into the criminal justice system			
because they believe that blacks and Latinos are			
likely to be criminals. While I believe that the			
underlying institutional and racism of New York			
City Department would not end with this passage of			
this one law; however, it will remove the number			
one method they have used to criminalize an entire			
generation of black and Latino men and pump them			
into this criminal justice system. Again, I would			
like to thank the Public Safety Committee for			
hearing my statement today.			
CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,			

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,
Brian. Thank you all. I want to especially thank
Council Member Viverito, who—I was here when she
complained first to the Police Commissioner about

this and he said to her, change the law, which he
was absolutely right. He was obeying the law at
that point, and other than the manufactured part
where they shouldn't be asked to take out, that
was never the law. Although, I guess you could
interpret it that way, but it should never have
been interpreted that way, and she went about and
did what she could to get Albany to change the
law, and it looks like it's going to be happening
one way or another, so congratulations to you. I
know you want to make a statement, but I'm not
going to allow you because I have to be at an
event at 2 o'clock. Really quick?

just want to thank especially Dr. Levine 'cause I didn't thank you before for all your work and Mr. Pearson, thank you because it's testimony, personal testimony that really helps make the case and understand why these policies need to change and I'm sorry that you went through all of that, but I thank you very much for your advocacy and for being here today.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Yes, thank you all. This meeting is adjourned.

1	COMMITTEE	ON	PUBLIC	SAFETY	53
2	[gavel]				

I, Kimberley Uhlig certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature	Kimberley	Uhlig
Date	7/3/12	