CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

JOINT COMMITTEES ON FIRE & CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

-----X

February 23, 2009 Start: 10:22 am Recess: 12:52 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

MIGUEL MARTINEZ

Chairperson, Fire and Criminal

Justice

SARA GONZALEZ

Chairperson, Juvenile Justice

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Tony Avella

Maria de Carmen Arroyo

Mathieu Eugene

Vincent J. Gentile

Alan J. Gerson Eric N. Gioia Letitia James Eric Gioia

Darlene Mealy Helen Sears

A P P E A R A N C E S [CONTINUED]

Lisette Camilio Counsel Committee on Juvenile Justice

Robert Calendra Counsel Committee on Fire and Criminal Justice Services

William Hongach
Policy Analyst
Committees on Fire and Criminal Justice Services and
Juvenile Justice

Council Member Letitia James New York City Council

Martin F. Horn Commissioner Department of Correction and Probation

Kathleen Coughlin
Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Discharge
Planning
Department of Correction

Edmund Duffy Warden Robert N. Davoren Center

Nancy Ginsberg Adult Intervention and Diversion Team The Legal Aid Society

Mary Dougherty Rights for Imprisoned Persons

Lisa Ortega Rights for Imprisoned Persons

A P P E A R A N C E S [CONTINUED]

Mishi Faruqee Director Youth Justice Program Children's Defense Fund, New York

Mary Lynne Werlwas Prisoner's Rights Project The Legal Aid Society

2.0

2.3

2	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: I'm going to
3	call the Oversight Hearing of the Joint Hearing of
4	the Fire and Criminal Justice Services and the
5	Juvenile Justice Committee to order. Before I do
6	that I want to recognize my colleagues who are
7	here with me, member of the Committee, Council
8	Member Jimmy Vacca from the Bronx and Council
9	Member Letitia James who is the prime sponsor of
10	several pieces of legislation that we will be
11	going over today.

Good morning, my name is Miguel
Martinez. I am the Chair of the Fire and Criminal
Justice Committee. I want to thank Chair Gonzalez
and our staff for putting together this important
hearing and for co-sponsoring legislation that we
are going to be hearing today. I also want to
thank Council Member James, as I mentioned
earlier, for being the prime sponsor of these
pieces of legislation.

Although the State law considers

16, 17 and 18-year olds who are accused of

committing crime as adult, they are in fact

children who still, who are still developing and

learning and whom will have a better chance of

2.0

2.3

2	preventing	recidivism	than	those	who	are	older.
---	------------	------------	------	-------	-----	-----	--------

While 754 adolescents are currently being housed at Rikers Island and make up a small portion of the City's jail population which had 107,516 admission and an average daily population of 13,850 in the last Fiscal Year, they are

particularly impressionable, vulnerable and in
need of guidance and protection.

On October 20, 2008 Christopher

Robinson, an 18-year old being detained at Rikers

Island was found dead in his jail cell. I want to

express my condolences to his family and to let

them know that we are committed to ensuring that

this tragic death will bring about a chance will

prevent others from jail violence and suffering.

On January 2009, January 22, 2009,
Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson and the New
York City Department of Investigation Commissioner
Rose Jill Hearn, announced a grand jury had
indicted three of New York City Correction
Officers and 12 adolescent inmates on charges
including manslaughter, conspiracy and corruption
and other offenses from the investigation into the
death of Mr. Robinson. The four month

2	investigation	into	the	fatal	beating	of	Mr.
---	---------------	------	-----	-------	---------	----	-----

Robinson uncovered numerous other alleged criminal acts against adolescent inmates including assault, acts of coherence (sic) and larceny and extortion. The crimes charged in the indictment involved nine different victims on nine separate occasions between July 10th, 2008 and October 18th, 2008.

Officers acted as managers for an organized, organization referred as The Program, that operate within the facility in which Mr. Robinson was killed. These officers allegedly gave inmates known as The Team who they personally selected, responsibly for maintaining older, maintaining order in the jail unit. The exchange for maintaining order of these officers allegedly authorized The Team to extort personal property from their victims and in a variety of ways.

Other reports...

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Oh okay.

Other reports indicate that as far as February

2008, other Correction Officers were, was accused

of using Team inmates to target other inmates in

the City jails. While many indicators of violence and other jail data regarding the City's correctional facility continue to reflect decreases, such as report of reduction in serious injuries to inmates from 209 in 2007 to 177 in 2008, and the fact that there were only 19 stabbing and slashing reported in the last Fiscal Year, some indicators have increased and are a concern to this Committee.

Before I continue I just need to acknowledge several of my colleagues who need to go back to other hearings that we're having at the same time. I need to acknowledge Council Member Avella, Council Member Sears and Council Member Eric Joya who has joined us. And I know that there are several hearings happening at the same time which members will be going in and out.

Commissioner Hearn, excuse me,

Commissioner Horn recently reported that there was
a steady growth in what are called B use of force
from 2004 to 2007. In an increase of 13,000 in
2007, excuse me, 1,300 in 2007 to approximately
1,600 in 2008. I also understand that while A use
of force was dramatically decreased over the past

2.0

several years, as early of 2008 the Department of

Corrections was reporting a rate of A use of force

was 55% higher than the prior year.

5 While I leave it to the

Commissioner to describe the difference between a B and an A use of force, it is the simplest term, A use of force is when an officer use force that results in serious injury to inmate or staff, and B use of force are those that result in less serious or no injury.

The Commissioner also reported that inmate assault on staff increased from 406 in 2007 to 458 in 2008. And that the rate of adolescents being seriously injured during fights is 4 times higher than the rate of adults while others have calculated that the rate as being 5 times higher. I also understand that the Commissioner reported that the Department of Corrections did not have a historical data by which to determine whether the much higher rate among adolescent inmates was a recent development.

Finally the Commissioner also indicated that from August 2008 to January 2009 there have been 722 lockdowns with an average

2.0

2.3

duration of 2 hours and 3 minutes. I understand the Commissioner has noted many reasons for these increases. I look forward to the discussion on these reasons with him in this hearing.

The Committee has been in, and remains concerned with the safety and the well being of adolescents at Rikers Island. The Department, the death of Christopher Robinson and the ensuing indictment of the Correction Officers and adolescents in jail inmates, as well as a prior indictment of violence are deeply troubling to the Committee.

The Committee wants to ensure that there are systems in place to quickly identify any increase in violence. That all allegations of violence are thoroughly investigated, that the Correction Officers are appropriately screened, trained and supervised, and held to the highest standards of conduct and that all appropriate measures to reduce violence are being undertaken. The Committees are concerned with the rate of fights resulting in serious injuries among adolescents when compared to the rest of the jail population and want to have a better understanding

2.0

of why the disparity exists and what is being done to address it.

The Committees want to have specific data on violence and other indicators regarding adolescent jail population on a regular basis so that we can better monitor any notable changes and again I want to thank Council Member James and Gonzalez for proposing legislation which I'm co-sponsoring that will require this data to be reported monthly.

While I understand the Commissioner is limited in what he can say about the death of Mr. Robinson and the pending cases as a result of the investigation of his death, I want to have a better understanding as to whether there were—where there were opportunities if any allegation is proven true, to have uncovered these type of activities and more importantly I know that the changes have been and will be made to prevent incidents like those alleged from reoccurring in the future.

There are several items from our

Joint Oversight Hearing in November regarding the special needs for adolescents in New York City's

2.0

2.3

on. It is my understanding that there have been some recent changes to the ratio of Correction Officers to adolescent inmates which the Committee, along with many advocates, have long called for at the, I believe is a step in the right direction. And I want to make sure that those changes are in fact in place and permanent.

I also want to make sure that the Correction Officers responsible for working with adolescents have been receiving additional training and want to know the nature of the training, as well as how many officers have received it. Finally I want to ensure that the additional training becomes a permanent requirement for all Correction Officers working with adolescents.

I want to thank the Commissioner and his staff for addressing the adolescent jail violence. I will also ask the Commissioner to make an opening remark momentarily. But first I want to call on Co-Chair Sara Gonzalez for her opening remarks. And I believe that following her, Council Member James has some opening remarks

2.0

as regards to the legislation that's being proposed today.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Thank you

Chair Martinez. Good morning ladies and gentlemen

and welcome to today's Oversight Hearing on

violence against adolescents at Rikers Island. My

name is Sara M. Gonzalez and I'm the Chair of the

Juvenile Justice Committee. I would like to thank

everyone for attending today's hearing to discuss

this very important issue facing the City's youth

population within the Department of Corrections.

As previously stated by Chair
Martinez, our Committees, along with the Committee
on Youth Services, held an Oversight Hearing in
November regarding special needs of adolescents in
New York City correctional facilities. We
discussed many issues during that hearing
including the issue of safety. We heard from
advocates and former inmates who testified about
the dangerous conditions that they or their
clients experienced at Rikers.

Our concern today is to learn from their experience and move forward. As today's hearing is a follow-up from our November hearing,

we would like to hear from the Administration about what steps they have taken to make sure that the violent events do not happen again at Rikers.

As someone who has worked with this population for many years, I am greatly concerned for youth involved in the Justice System. I have a responsibility to ensure that our adolescents are safe and that their needs are properly taken care of when they fall into the hands of the Criminal Justice System. Today we will be hearing a bill that I am cosponsoring along with Council Member Tish James and Miguel Martinez, Council Member Martinez.

I would like to thank both of them, especially Tish James in respect to her leadership and in exploring and in having the insight to move forward a bill that will improve the services that are provided in our prisons and to this population. This bill pertains to DOC regularly reporting information to the Council regarding census data. Violent incidents and restricted placement involving adolescents in City jails. I believe that this bill will allow greater transparency of DOC to the Council and will

enhance the effectiveness of our oversight.

3 Currently the DOC does not

regularly report to the Council regarding violence and other related jail indicators pertaining to adolescents under their jurisdiction. This bill requires that Department of Correction give us information concerning how many adolescents are admitted into their facility, specifically how many are girls, how many are boys and how old they are. Furthermore this bill requires information concerning whether or not these adolescents have been previously admitted to a facility run by DOC or the Department of Juvenile Justice.

The Council needs to know this basic information. Who are these kids? Who and where, in order to perform effective oversight and to make sure that they are getting their needs met. This bill helps us to do that.

I also would like to thank our Council staff, Lisette Camilio, Rob and also, am I missing someone? Will. Thank you.

Through the DOC reports, information regarding violent incidents at Rikers, this information for adolescents is not dis-

2.0

aggregated from that data. I understand that numbers are low overall but this population is different than the general population at large.

Our bill requires that the

Department of Correction to regularly report on

the number of violent incidents that occur within

the adolescent units, including the number of

stabbings, slashings, fights, incidents involving

gang members and any physical injuries that result

from these occurrences. Furthermore the bill

requires information concerning assaults on staff,

as well as use of force by staff against an

inmate.

This information is extremely important because it will allow the Council to get a better sense of what is going on in these jails and to help identify any trends or problems. This bill will help us exercise our oversight jurisdiction to keep our children safe when they are incarcerated in an adult facility.

Finally this bill requires information regarding a child placed in restrictive placement. Currently the DOC is not requires to provide the Council with any

2.0

2.3

information concerning these occurrences. As the
name implies, such placement further limits a
child's freedom. And regardless of why they were
placed there, whether for their own safety or for
the safety of others, the Council needs to see
this information in order to be fully apprised of
what's going on in our jails.

Again I would like to thank you all for being here today. And I would now like to turn the floor back to my colleague, Chair Martinez. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Council
14 Member James.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Thank you.

Thank you Chair Martinez and Chair Gonzalez for this opportunity and to the Committee and to Commissioner Horn and to your staff. Good morning. First to the Robinson family, and to his friends, my hearts and prayers are with your family at this point in time. May he rest in peace and may his death not go in vain.

The Committees and myself have been, and remain, very concerned as well as with the Department, with the safety and wellbeing of

2.0

adolescents at Rikers Island. The death of

Christopher and the ensuing indictments of

Correction Officers and adolescent inmates as well

as prior incidents of violence are deeply

troubling to me and to this Committee, as well as

to the Commissioner.

This Committee and I are very much concerned about the rate of fighting among adolescents when compared to the rest of the population and want to have a better understanding of why the disparity exists and what is being done to address it. The Committees would like to have specific data on violence and other indicators regarding the adolescent populations so that they can better monitor any notable changes.

Let me also go on to say that this was prompted by the November 2008 hearing of the Council's Fire and Criminal Justice Services

Committee and the Juvenile Justice, Youth Services

Committee, where I was deeply concerned about the evidence that I heard and particularly regarding the special needs of the adolescents in our City jails. It became apparent that not only was information pertaining to adolescents in City

2.0

jails being collected by the Department, but that the Committees would benefit, but the Committees could and should benefit from having it.

The Committees, in fact, cannot develop any accurate understanding of the conditions in which adolescents in City jails are being—are living in without having that information. The Committees therefore determined that it would be beneficial to modify and expand the indicators on which DOC's reports; two, require reports to be submitted to the Council on a monthly basis; and three, require their percentage change for each indicator from the prior month and prior years' average being included in the monthly reports.

The hearing also revealed that information regarding an adolescent's gender and previous history of incarceration was being collected and collated but not included in any public reporting. And it is my opinion that we really need to have disclosure and more transparency. In accordance with that, I've drafted three pieces of legislation which we will hear this morning.

2	One, it would require the
3	Department of Corrections to develop a discharge
4	plan for adolescents leaving City jails. Two, it
5	would require the Commissioner of the Department
6	of Corrections to give a monthly report to the
7	council regarding census data and violent
8	incidents involving adolescents in City jail. And
9	three is a resolution calling upon the State
LO	legislature to sign legislation amending the
11	Family Court Act by changing the juvenile status
L2	age to include 16, 17 and 18-year olds, and this
L3	was an attempt to treat 16 and 17 and 18-year olds
L4	as the juveniles that they are.
15	I look forward to the testimony and
L6	I thank the two Chairs for this opportunity.
L7	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Thank you
L8	Council Member. At this time we'll hear testimony
19	from the Commissioner.
20	COMMISSIONER MARTIN F. HORN: Thank
21	you Chairman Martinez, Chair Gonzalez and members
22	of the Council.
23	When I appeared before you three
24	months ago it was against the tragic backdrop of

the death of Christopher Robinson, and I testified

in detail about the challenges presented by adolescents in our jails and the numerous steps we had already taken to keep them safe.

These included: launching the

Institute for Inner Development; video camera
installation; classification procedures; creating
a variety of new housing areas to enhance our
ability to separate vulnerable from predatory
inmates; gaining the authority to listen to inmate
phone calls; requiring all people in custody to
wear department-issued sneakers; enhancing
supervision of commissary, and the use of
telephones and television; investigating all
fights and serious injuries; and investigating any
and every allegation of staff wrongdoing.

I also told you that we encourage inmates and family and friends to report concerns and provide numerous avenues for them to do so, and that we hold monthly meetings with the Department of Investigation to review incidents and discern patterns. I described some of the programs we provide to address the special needs of adolescents, and I reviewed, as well, some of the newest efforts that are underway.

Members of the Council, it should be clear that we have been moving aggressively to improve operations and safety at RNDC. But we have never sat idly by. Telephone and correspondence controls are tools we sought, and won, to help us identify staff misconduct as well as inmate on inmate violence. As early as 2005 we sought amendments to the City's Minimum Standards in order to listen to outgoing phone calls to obtain critically needed intelligence information and evidence, and the Board of Correction amended

their standards last year.

As I stated to the Board of
Correction in April 2007, "Most of the time, the
victim of a fight won't testify against his or her
assailant." Phone monitoring helps us "to learn
who is smuggling contraband and how; to prove,
often after the fact, who among our staff might
have compromised the safety of their brother and
sister staff by smuggling contraband or have
engaged in prohibited contact." And I might add
that it was this capacity that gave the
prosecutors one of the leads they followed in
making the case to indict the alleged Christopher

Robinson killers.

Since we last met, we have made considerable progress, and I will report on that today. Also since then, and with the full cooperation and participation of this Administration, the Bronx District Attorney announced on January 22nd the indictment of 12 inmates and 3 members of service in the October 18, 2008 homicide of Christopher Robinson.

Never before in my almost 40 years in this field have I seen allegations like these, where Correction Officers are charged with going to such extraordinary lengths to violate their oaths, abrogate their duties, corrupt inmates and prevent detection of their actions.

When faced with misconduct by our own staff, we have always taken aggressive action. Indeed, in 2007 an officer at RNDC was indicted as a result of suspicion of complicity in inmate extortion. The Deputy Warden at RNDC brought this case to the attention of the Department of Investigation. Moreover three other officers were terminated as a result of our investigations into their performance on the job in a separate though

2.0

2.3

similar incident.

In each of these cases the

Department and its management staff have

demonstrated zero tolerance for these kinds of

behaviors. We do not hesitate to bring criminal

wrongdoing to DOI when we suspect it, and we bring

departmental charges and prosecute them vigorously

at the Office of Administrative Trials and

Hearings when the charges do not rise to the level

of criminal activity.

The Department's record at oath clearly reflects the efforts we make to hold our staff accountable for their performance. We work hard to train our officers; we impress upon them the importance of maintaining their integrity and being prepared for the ways in which inmates will try to compromise them. We prepare them for the difficult work they do and the countless important decisions they have to make during every shift. We also supervise them, to teach them to be better at their jobs, to detect improper behavior or corruption, and to investigate every hint of such behavior.

We continue to reevaluate our

2.0

delivered.

policies, procedures, training and supervision
protocols to build upon what we have learned from
our analysis and the District Attorney's
investigation of the Robinson homicide.
Recognizing the challenges we face, we have
revised the training curriculum at our Academy to
ensure that the issue of integrity is fully and
adequately addressed, both separately and as a
component of every training program being

ensure that our staff consistently meets our standards for job skills, judgment and integrity. New lesson plans on bullying and intimidation and on intelligence gathering have been developed and added to our recruit training, starting with the class currently in our Academy, and this information has been incorporated into in-service block training and pre-promotional curricula for staff already on the job. By July 1st, an expanded adolescent specific lesson plan will be introduced to all officers at RNDC.

While legal settlements had mandated the installation of approximately 800

2.0

surveillance cameras in our jails, we have installed nearly 3,000 cameras throughout our system, including adolescent areas of RNDC. We also have expanded our use of a watch tour program, which uses electronic systems to verify that officers are making their required rounds of inspections.

We are implementing an operational change that will distinguish us from any other jail in the State and probably in the nation, since we are one of the only States that incarcerate adolescents as adults. We have created a new housing and security classification system for adolescents based on two factors: age and security risk.

Whereas in the past, like other jails, we grouped 16 to 18-year olds together without regard to age, we will effectively create six new classifications for adolescents: high and low security classes for 16-year olds, 17-year olds and 18-year olds. Given the vast differences in maturity levels between a recently turned 16-year old and a young man about to turn 19, we think this change will significantly reduce

2.0

2.3

violence and bullying.

We continue to work with the

Department of Juvenile Justice in order to obtain

information to classify those adolescents who have

been in their custody. A recent data match

revealed that 19% of 16 to 19-year old admissions

over the past year had a history with the

Department of Juvenile Justice.

Younger or older, those in custody make constant efforts to circumvent our control.

We learned in the Christopher Robinson investigation that as a result of our ordering physical examinations any time we observed injuries, inmates began to attack their victims in the midsection of their bodies, where their clothing would hide telltale bruises. So we began to require all adolescents to stand for a visual no-shirt inspection of their torsos during every major change of shifts. Signs of suspected injury are immediately investigated.

We have also assigned officers of our Intelligence Unit specifically to monitor the adolescent population. They will employ an ongoing series of random inmate interviews and

2.0

other intelligence strategies.

In this time of austerity it is difficult to find ways to add staff. Nonetheless, we have identified the most difficult housing areas in RNDC, those which house the most intractable inmates and we have added an additional officer in those units, providing backup and an additional set of eyes and ears to deal with the challenges I have described to you.

That means that on the two day shifts, 7:00 to 3:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 11:00, when there is the most activity in the housing area, the ratio of staff to inmates in those dorms is 1 officer to 25 inmates. And in the RNDC cellblocks that hold 33 inmates, and which are equally difficult to supervise because of their physical layout and sightlines, we have likewise added an additional officer on the two daytime shifts for an effective ratio of 1 to 17.

Teenagers fight. They fight in jail just as they do in the street. To assist our officers in April 2007 we sought and subsequently obtained permission from the State Commission of Correction to make better use of the pepper spray

carried by all of our officers. This change allows the spray to be better aimed and more effectively used, enabling our officers to intervene in fights sooner and with greater likelihood of success without resort to physical force.

We did this because we recognized, long before October 2008, that we needed to empower our officers to take more vigorous action to control the bullying and extortion we were seeing. What we have seen with the enhanced staffing ratio is that the extra officer has been helpful on post in the dayroom: reinforcing control, identifying problems earlier, discouraging fights and defusing those that do occur much quicker and with pepper spray, thus preventing more serious injuries to the inmates.

These are just some of the most significant security measures we have implemented. I would also like to tell you about measures we have taken and are planning in an effort to change the adolescent inmates themselves or at least their behaviors while in our custody.

While almost 75% of them are in our

2.0

custody on charges of serious violent crimes, they are nonetheless charged but not convicted and they are young men on the brink of adulthood with the possibility to change the course of their lives.

Jails are a microcosm of the communities the persons in our custody come from. These adolescents bring into jail all the maladaptive, antisocial behaviors we are struggling with on the streets and in our schools. Bullying and gang behavior doesn't begin in jail. In jail, however, it is concentrated in one place.

Numerous research studies have demonstrated that a very high percentage of adolescents in correctional or congregate care facilities suffer from a persistent pattern of behavior in which they violate age appropriate social norms or rules and the basic rights of others. Experts have found that incarcerating these adolescents often exacerbates their behavioral issues. That is why at the Department of Probation we have worked so hard to find alternatives to placement for juvenile delinquents.

Still, as long as New York State

2.0

2.3

law treats adolescents as adult defendants, we must continue to find new and more effective ways to provide for their care, custody and control in jail. When we last met I described our revitalization of the program known as the Institute for Inner Development, which seeks to imbue adolescents with the skills and the desire to change their patterns of destructive behavior, and utilizes Correction Officers trained to serve as mentors and coaches.

the IID, 89 for assignment to RNDC. By year's end, all officers assigned to RNDC adolescent housing areas will be trained for the IID. Going forward, the orientation of new admission inmates will be restructured for the adolescent population and will serve as a natural channel into the IID.

Inmates participating in the IID are assigned to separate housing areas, where they can support one another. Two new libraries have been opened and are available for all adolescents participating in the IID. We have been looking for ways to bring the parents of these adolescents into the jails to see for themselves who we are

and what we do.

Last week, we held the first of our community provider fairs for adolescents. We invited about 200 inmates and their families to attend together. Similar to a school or health fair, the provider fairs expose adolescent detainees and their parents to community based organizations that can assist them upon their return to the community. We are gratified that nearly one half the parents attended, meeting with their sons and a broad range of community groups.

Looking forward, in April we are planning a pilot of a new parent orientation session that will bring parents of adolescents newly admitted to RNDC to discuss programs and security. We are trying, with the resources available to us, to expand in-jail programming during the time that adolescents are not in school sessions, including sports and participation in several well-established programs designed to help young people turn their lives around. Despite extremely tight budgets, we are soliciting private and foundation funds to support the expansion of after-jail programs for adolescents.

2.0

2.3

Another step we have taken since

October to strengthen adolescent safety is an

Enhanced Adolescent Mental Observation Unit,

giving us more options for separating and housing

inmates according to their abilities to get along

without violence. We also have created a new

response to misbehavior, focused on behavior

modification as much as it is on the immediate

work with the Department of Education to ensure the continuation of adolescent education programs.

control of violence. In all of our efforts we

system-wide changes that we discussed at our last meeting, which are already playing a role in improving inmate safety throughout our entire system. The result of our previous efforts was that total inmate on inmate fights in RNDC dropped from 943 in 2006 to 894 in 2007 to 749 last year. That is while the inmate population grew or remained constant. It has not dropped. And there still has not been a stabbing or slashing involving an adolescent since July 2007.

Since January we monitor and track violence statistics and security issues for the

adolescent housing areas separate from the older adult areas of RNDC. Going forward this will obviously equip us to better monitor conditions there.

Let me now briefly address the two bills before you today. The first would require the Department to provide monthly reports to the Council regarding adolescent-related data. This Department tries to be as transparent as possible, and we are always working to become more so.

As you may know, many of our policies and procedures are posted on the Department's website, and security data is made available to the public through the MMR, the Citywide Performance Report and in a separate statistics report on the Department website. In view of the Council's interest, and our discussion with Council staff, we are giving serious consideration to expanding the data we make available to the public, including breaking it down by adolescent and older adult.

But it is important that the data that is shared, the frequency of reporting and the method by which the information is shared must all

be meaningful and not overly burdensome, so that we can continue to focus our resources on using the data to manage the agency. We look forward to continuing our discussions with the Council on this issue.

The second bill would require the Department to develop a Discharge Plan for every sentenced adolescent leaving city jail that would serve ten days or more after sentencing. While no one is more committed to Discharge Planning than we are, the Department is opposed to this bill.

From Fiscal year 2006 through

Fiscal year 2008, with funding and support from

the Council, the Department launched the

Adolescent Reentry Initiative in partnership with

the Vera Institute.

In its first full year of operation, just as the program was beginning to show promise, but before we could evaluate it, funding for ARI was eliminated from the budget adopted by the Council. Since July 2008 we have aggressively sought replacement funding for the program, thus far to no avail.

As the Council recognized when it

2.0

passed the original discharge planning
legislation, this field is still a work in
progress, an experiment that has not yet been
proven in the jail setting. For that reason
alone, while we must make every effort to continue
our efforts in this area, discharge planning
services should not be mandated. Moreover,
millions of dollars would be required to implement
this bill. These are among our objections to
passage of the proposed legislation.

We ask that the Council instead join us in restoring funding for ARI because the progress we were making and what we were learning from that initiative is significant and holds promise.

Members of the Council, the list of changes that we have made to the way we supervise and care for adolescents, in recent years, and particularly in recent months goes on and on. The measures we have taken and the steps we are working on will improve the safety of those in our custody. In fact, I think they already have.

But I must caution you today, as I did in November, that keeping persons in custody

2.0

safe, especially adolescents-is a difficult challenge faced by jail managers throughout the country. As the data from the Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics indicate, none of us succeeds completely, but New York City succeeds better than most.

Our custody of adolescents is affected by another factor, the physical plant on Rikers Island. Rikers Island is an isolating place that discourages outside visitors. That is why I believe so strongly that it is vitally important to the transparency of our jails that we confine more of our inmates closer to their homes, their families, and the services that can help them stay out of jail upon release.

Let me make one request. Most people, thankfully, are unfamiliar with the reality of incarceration. They have not been arrested and detained, and cannot know or even picture, other than from the stereotypes of the entertainment industry, how jails operate.

I once again ask all of you to visit Rikers Island to see first hand the strengths and weaknesses of our facilities and the

challenges they present, to visit the areas in which we house and teach the adolescents in our custody, and to observe the program expansions and other measures we have taken to maintain their safety.

With me today, and seated to my left is Warden Edmond Duffy, the Warden of RNDC, and to his left, Kathleen Coughlin, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Discharge Planning, and we look forward to answering any questions the Council may have.

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Thank you

Commissioner. I just want to recognize, before we
proceed, Council Member Mathieu Eugene, member of
the Committee, Council Member Maria Avella, Carmen
Arroyo, Council Member Carmen Arroyo, and Council
Member Darlene Mealy who was here earlier.

I also want to ask my colleagues so that we could have a--there are two very important issues that we're discussing today. One is our oversight topic and then the other are the two important bills that are being presented today.

So I want to ask my colleagues, if we could focus our first part of the discussion on the oversight

topic. And then we could come back and discuss in detail the proposed legislation. I just don't want it to mix in with the discussion.

Commissioner, one, I want to thank you for your testimony and also for a lot of the work that you've described since the last time we met to discuss the issue of violence particularly among our adolescent population. I just have a couple of questions and then I want to turn it over to my Co-Chair.

With regards to, I understand last month that, at the Board of Correction meeting you reported some data to the Board regarding both the population at large and the adolescent population.

And while I recognize that many indicators reflect decrease, I'd like to ask about some of the increases.

And I see, if you could elaborate on some of the reasons why you believe the increase exists. For example, before I asked the question though I also want to go over some terminology.

What's the difference between A use of force, and B use of force? And I know I made

3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

some reference to it in my opening remarks but if you could just elaborate on that, if you can.

4 COMMISSIONER HORN: Certainly 5 First of all, we have a very broad Chairman. 6 definition of use of force. Essentially we consider it a use of force any time an officer 7 makes physical contact with an inmate in any sort 8 of confrontational situation other than simply 9 10 reasserting control during an escort or applying 11 mechanical restraints, including the use of 12 chemical agents, we consider that a use of force. So it's a very broad definition. 13

The difference between an A use of force and a B use of force, first of all the difference between an A and a B use of force depends upon the level of injury to one of the parties. It doesn't necessarily apply only to injuries to an inmate. If an officer is injured in the course of a use of force, we will categorize it as an A or a B, okay.

Essentially A uses of force are those uses of force that require medical care over and above that which is provided in the course of normal first aid treatment in the jail. Anything

2.0

that requires sutures, anything that constitutes a fracture, anything that requires a trip to the emergency room is considered an A use of force.

Even those things that we can handle on Rikers

Island with stitches for example will be considered an A use of force.

So a B use of force is a contusion, a simple bruise, perhaps a sprain. What we have found, first of all, is that with respect to A uses of force, the growth, even the overall use of force has remained very low and if you look at the data and I'd be happy to provide—and I have provided in the past, the actual data, year by year, it is very low for A uses of force generally. But to the extent that there is any growth, it is entirely attributable to the increase in injuries to officers rather than to injuries to staff. The officers are getting injured quite frankly now more often than they were before.

The growth in the B's I think is attributable to several factors. I think, first of all we can't ignore the change in our jails attributable to the installation of 3,000 video

2.0

2.3

surveillance cameras. As I said there were only 800 that were requires as a result of settlements that we made in legal cases. We've gone far beyond that.

We now have a visual record of every—a far more, not of every, but of far more of the inmate/staff interactions. And oftentimes our staff who are required to review them periodically will observe what they consider a use of force even though the officer involved might not have considered it and might not have reported it, a use of force.

So we are finding more uses of force. And as I say, we take a very, very conservative approach. We over report. We--any time it looks like it could be a use of force we report it as use of force. So you can't ignore the fact that with 3,000 cameras we're observing things that we weren't observing before. And I think we should all consider that a good thing.

Use of force is not necessarily bad. In a jail, it's just part of the fact of life. Unfortunately sometimes we have to use force to protect people from others, to protect

themselves, and sometimes to protect ourselves or to ensure that our rules are followed.

Also as I have previously

testified, and I testified in November, for some

time now, every time an inmate is injured, we, and

has a serious injury, we do an investigation to

determine whether or not the injury occurred as it

was first described to us. It has not been

uncommon and as recently as last week we had a

case of an individual who reported slipping and

falling in the shower and fracturing something. I

forget if it was the jaw or what.

When we investigated, we found that that injury as it was originally described to us by the inmate did not occur as the inmate described it to us. And so we now look into everything. And sometimes it was a use of force, sometimes it was an inmate on inmate. But we look at every injury.

The other thing that we have done is we have encouraged our officers to make greater use of the pepper spray that they are equipped with. Officers who are not properly equipped in the past, it would not be inappropriate for them,

2.0

2.3

if the	ere	was	a	fight	betv	ween	two	inmates,	to	step
back,	soı	ınd	an	alarm	and	wait	for	addition	nal	staff
to arı	rive	e on	ı tl	ne scer	ne.					

What we now encourage officers to do when two other--two inmates are fighting is to intervene more quickly and to use pepper spray where it's appropriate. That will increase the numbers of uses of force. And again, it's not a bad thing that we are asking officers to intervene more quickly. We hope that by intervening the degree of harm that will result from the fight will be mitigated by their swift intervention.

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Correct. And you, my, I understand that you reported that in the B use of force, there had been an increase from 2004 through 2007 from 1,300 in 2007 to approximately 1,600 in 2008--

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: --correct?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: And as you mentioned the use of the B force is when you had the intervention of the officer, either

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 44
2	intervening in a fight, correct?
3	COMMISSIONER HORN: That would
4	constitute a B use of force
5	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:
6	[Interposing] Correct.
7	COMMISSIONER HORN:if there were
8	serious injuries.
9	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: And
10	therefore if there is an increase in the
11	intervention, obviously there has to be also,
12	there are more violent acts taking place 'cause
13	the officer has to intervene.
14	COMMISSIONER HORN: Not
15	necessarily. There might be the same number of
16	fights, but the officers are intervening more
17	swiftly than they were in the past. So the number
18	of fights wouldn't necessarily have changed.
19	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: But, but I
20	understand and I don't understand. In other
21	words, if I have to intervene and I have 100
22	officers, and of the 100 officers, they're
23	interveningwe have 200 B use of force because
24	they're intervening 200 times; there were 200
25	incidents of violence or fights, correct?

2.0

2.3

2	COMMISSIONER HORN: Well. Not
3	every intervention is the result of a fight.
4	Officer might use force if an inmate
5	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:

[Interposing] Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER HORN: --is refusing to follow the rules. If an inmate refuses to submit to a search or to give up property there might be a use of force. So there are lots of reasons why there might be uses of force. I think, the point is this, let's just take one fight. There are a couple of possible outcomes. If the officer stands by or asks or calls for help, the fight might just peter out by itself with no intervention or no use of force by the officer, in which case it would simply be recorded as a fight, with no use of force. But there might be a serious injury to an inmate.

If on the other hand the officer intervened, for example, using pepper spray, and because the officer intervened, the fight ended faster without a serious injury to an inmate, it would be used as a B use of force.

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: I understand

that. But notwithstanding though, the impact, the factors you mentioned may have an increase in these figures. So the fact that it may be pepper spray, the fact that it may be a search, sometimes those are considered the B. And what percentage of the increases do you believe are simply as a result of more activity requiring the use of force?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Well I do

think, I don't--I can't say with precision what

percentage. I don't think that we'll ever have

information that enables us to accurately know

that. I do think that as we, you know, we're on

the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, we are

saying we want to supervise inmates closely and

protect them from each other, protect inmates from

fighting with each other, from being harmed at the

hands of other inmates, from extorting them. And

on the other hand we're questioning why there's an

increase in the use of force.

If officers are going to intervene to protect inmates, there's going to be an increase in use of force. Thankfully the increase is in the B level uses of force where there is no

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 4
2	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:
3	[Interposing] Yeah. You said you
4	COMMISSIONER HORN:but we can
5	provide
6	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:speak, all
7	right. So what do you attribute the dramatic
8	increase in the A use of force?
9	COMMISSIONER HORN: The increase in
10	A uses of force, first of all the growth is
11	primarily attributable to more injuries to
12	officers rather than injuries to inmates.
13	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Um-hum.
14	COMMISSIONER HORN: Also this was a
15	year in which we had a lot of contact with inmates
16	around a lot of issues. Let me name two of them
17	in particular.
18	One is that in December or January…
19	December, we changed the footwear for all 13,000
20	of our detainee inmates. We went through an
21	exchange. We took away their personal footwear
22	and gave them Department issued footwear. This
23	was something that we have sought to do for a long
24	time because we found that inmates were fighting
25	over their sneakers. A lot of inmates didn't want

2.0

2.3

to give up their footwear and so we had some increase in uses of force in order to enforce that new rule.

Secondly, one of the things that we have done is that we have identified those inmates who are most predatory and moved them to housing areas where we can more closely supervise them.

And in many of those cases it requires that the inmate be escorted everywhere the inmate goes.

And the inmates don't like being escorted and they resist those escorts. And it is not uncommon for those, the resistance to those escorts, to result in the application of force by the officer.

As I say, every A use of force is investigated by our Internal Affairs Unit. And where the officers use force outside our rules, we take action, either criminal action or administrative action.

and narrow it down though. And I understand that the changes in terms of the minimum standards.

But to what degree does the increase simply a reflection of an increase in the incidents requiring the use of force? Taking away some of

the incidents you just described and the changes in terms of policy.

COMMISSIONER HORN: Well again, keep in mind that we're working off a very small base. So the number of A uses of force to begin with has historically been low and coming down.

And I'm not prepared to concede that this change over a three to six month period constitutes a trend as compared to what really has been a four or five year coming down.

I certainly, you, if there is an increase, there had to have been more instances in which the level of force required that. But, you know, the distinction of an A use of force and a B use of force, really depends upon how the use of force occurs.

Two incidents can occur, the officers can respond the same way, but in one case, someone, an officer or an inmate, their head hits against the wall and a jaw gets broken and it becomes an A. In the exact same circumstance arising out of the same motivation on the part of everybody involved ends without somebody hitting their head against the wall, it's not an A use of

force.

So it's very hard to--nobody sets out to have an A use of force. We don't enter into a use of force saying oh this is going to be an A, we intend to use that level of force. It depends upon when it happens, where it happens, who the inmate is, how quickly the inmate is subdued.

It depends upon the number of officers who are present, the skill of the individual officers. It depends upon the location where it occurs. If it occurs in an area where there are sharp edges, where there's metal that a person can bang their head against, it's more likely to result in injury. So without more analysis I can't give you a better answer.

of, I know you said this earlier in terms of the description being vague in terms of not being specific in terms of what's A, what's B, and so forth, but is there any written directive in terms of what's A, what's B and how—what's reported and how it's reported?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes. And I

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 52
2	don't want to concede the point that the
3	distinction between the A and a B is vague. I
4	think it's very clear. I think it is clear that
5	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:
6	[Interposing] No I just wanted
7	COMMISSIONER HORN:yeah, we have
8	a directive
9	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:you
10	answered those
11	COMMISSIONER HORN:and it very
12	clearly I think describes, we'd be happy to make
13	it available
14	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:
15	[Interposing] Yeah, can you share that with the
16	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
17	Sure.
18	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ:Committee,
19	please?
20	COMMISSIONER HORN: In fact I
21	believe it's available on our public website.
22	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Okay. It's
23	not, by the way, counsel's telling us
24	Commissioner
25	COMMISSIONER HORN: No it's not?
	d.

25

2	CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: And before
3	my last question before I turn to my Co-Chair.
4	How frequently are officers trained to use force
5	in the appropriate manner and what's the nature of
6	their training?
7	COMMISSIONER HORN: All right.
8	First of all, every officer receives 15 weeks of
9	Academy training before assignment to the jails.
10	That is more than any other jail in the State and
11	probably more than just about every jail system in
12	the country I would venture.
13	Thereafter every officerand
14	training in the use of force is a critical part,
15	several hours of that training. In addition the
16	officers must demonstrate that they have the
17	ability, that they have the ability to use force
18	in the way in which they've been trained in order
19	to satisfactorily complete their initial Academy
20	training.
21	Thereafter every officer receives
22	40 hours a year of what we refer to as Block
23	Training, and included within that are several

hours of training in the use of force annually.

And again every time they go through that they

2 must demonstrate proficiency.

CHAIRPERSON MARTINEZ: Thank you

Commissioner. I'm going to turn it over to my Co
Chair, Sally Gonzalez.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Thank you

Chair. Thank you Commissioner for your testimony.

I'm going to sort of go on with the training part

of it because my question is related to, you say

here that by July 1st an expanded adolescent

specific lesson plan will be introduced to all

officers. Could you talk to me a little bit about

that?

Training Academy has been working for the last several months to develop a training program that helps the officers to understand the differences between the adolescents and the adults in terms of their needs, in terms of their behaviors, in terms of their responses to direction, and to teach them alternative ways of dealing with that adolescent behavior without neglecting to hold individuals accountable for their behavior and simultaneously ensuring that they follow our rules to keep everybody safe.

[Pause]

2	[Pause]
3	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: I was just
4	wondering. I was thinking here to myself a
5	little. In respect to the issue with the gangs,
6	is there any possibility that in that expanded
7	training the officers receive anything in respect
8	to identifying or understanding the gang?
9	COMMISSIONER HORN: Well let me say
10	a couple of things about that. First of all I
11	think that the notion of gangs and the use of the
12	term gangs in this context is potentially
13	misleading. We know, for a long time the New York
14	City's Corrections Department has offered training
15	to all of its officers in gang identification. We
16	have a very, very aggressive and vigorous
17	intelligence unit. And every inmate that we
18	receive into the system is assessed for gang
19	membership in the terms that we normally
20	understand the word gang.
21	What we are finding as we've looked
22	more closely, and there's no question that we've
23	taken a closer look at the adolescent population
24	in recent months, what we've learned is that the
25	behavior in the jail is not along the lines of

2.0

your typical Bloods versus Crypts versus Latin

Kings kind of gang membership. What we find is

two things.

One is that a lot of these youngsters are shopping around and their allegiances change from week to week or month to month. And as with adolescents generally, there is a strong proclivity to join cliques, to join groups. And those cliques or groups may refer to themselves as gangs but we can't discern that they are in any way connected to organized or semi-organized or identifiable gangs in the community. There are some but that's not the issue.

And what we believe happens is that within any housing unit, some group of inmates is going to attempt to be dominant. Some individual is going to attempt to be dominant and dominate other individuals. And that domination is going to take the form of extortion, taking peoples' property, stealing their property. If one individual has a wealthier family and has better sneakers or better blue jeans or a nicer sweatshirt, some other juvenile is going to try and take it from them.

2.0

their commissary account and purchases more commissary, a stronger, more aggressive individual is going to try and take it from them. And sometimes they will get together with other inmates and prey upon the weaker inmates. And they will call themselves a gang. They will call themselves The Team as they are alleged to have done in the Robinson case. But we don't believe, and we've seen no evidence that it is connected to our common understanding of gangs.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: So

Commissioner would you say that even the young people that are detained and only stay there for a short period of time, that they too begin to just sort of practice the new dynamics of where they are and they no longer associate themselves with let's say the Bloods or whatever it is. You're saying that that's what you have gathered?

COMMISSIONER HORN: As I said
there's a mix. There are probably are some
individuals who come into our custody who had an
association with a group on the street that might
have called themselves Bloods or called themselves

2.0

2.3

Crypts or called themselves Latin King. But the
vast majority of the adolescents, we're talking
about the adolescents that come in, have not
formed that link yet, and they'll form a new link.

And if you take two housing units and they may call themselves Bloods. So there'll be a group of inmates in Housing Area A and they'll call themselves Bloods. And there might be a group of inmates in Housing Area B, and they'll call themselves Bloods. If you put the two together they'll fight with each other.

There's no link between the two.

I mean in some ways they're adopting the terminology of sort of popular culture.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: So I guess from hearing what you're saying, you feel that there's no need to even implement any kind of training for officers in respect to--and I just want to say before you step in, from my own experience with working with gangs in the 70's, 70's, the Police Department, you know, needed to really understand when they were out there in the communities the dynamics of all these different

gangs, so. And it worked better because they were able to--

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

Well. Let me, let me correct a misconception.

It's not at all what I said. In fact we have a very aggressive gang intervention unit. And gang identification and breaking up gang behavior is a very, very big part of our training curriculum and a big part of what we do through our intelligence gathering. What I am suggesting is that among the adolescents, at least, it's a more nuanced phenomenon. It is not strictly speaking transferable, the gangs in the community to what becomes in the jail.

An inmate who, it's entirely possible and certainly we've seen it, an individual, an adolescent in our jails who has had no gang affiliation in the community can live in the housing unit and if he chooses to become the dominant person and has the ability to dominate the other individuals in that housing unit and surrounds himself with acolytes if you will, they will call themselves a gang. They may well adopt a name, but it's not the same as what we see in

2.0

injury, if there has been an allegation made, if
we know that there has been a use of force, we can
go back, after the fact, and have a video record
of what occurred. However we also require our
management staff, Wardens and Deputy Wardens, to
periodically look at videos at random.

And I will tell you that we have the capacity and I indeed have the capacity to view these videos on my desktop computer. And I will sit at my office during the day and unbeknownst to the facility staff I can look into some of these jails and just watch what's going on and get a feel for what's going on.

But primarily we use these videos after the fact to determine what actually happened. And by the way, 3,000 is where we're at today. Our plan is to grow well beyond that.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Now I do understand that there have been areas that there are blind spots in the adolescent units. And would you say that there would--that cameras would be valuable in these areas or--

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
Of course.

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 62
2	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Okay.
3	[Pause]
4	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: In the
5	future, they're going to be installed, in the near
6	future?
7	COMMISSIONER HORN: We are moving,
8	you know, again, we're, we are constrained by the
9	monies available to us
10	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ:
11	[Interposing] I understand.
12	COMMISSIONER HORN: And we are
13	constrained by the physical time it takes just to
14	lay the cable and install the cameras. These
15	cameras are all in secure housings and so on. But
16	it is certainly our goal to have as many cameras
17	in as many critical areas of the jails as we can,
18	as quickly as possible.
19	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: And one more
20	question, in respect to when you work with the
21	Department of Juvenile Justice and you stated here
22	that 19% of 16 to 19-year old admissions over the
23	past year have had a history with that Department,
24	is there any collaboration or gathering of
25	information or, you know, that you speak to each

2.0

receive	thair	כתידים
TCCCTAC	CTICTT	CLUI

COMMISSIONER HORN: Do we know, on an annual basis?

5 MS. KATHLEEN COUGHLIN: I don't

have the number but the issue is whether--how--

COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY:

[Interposing] Got it, hit the mic.

MS. COUGHLIN: Oh I'm sorry. The issue is how close they are when they come in.

Because, you know, our average length of stay is pretty short--

COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY:

[Interposing] 40 days.

MS. COUGHLIN: --so the idea is to make sure they're engaged in school while they're there and then if they take the predictor and are not ready to take the test, to get them connected on the outside so that they can take it.

COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY: 'Cause what I have found out, some of our young men and women are ready, almost at the borderline to getting their high school diploma then they drop out. So when they do come into your system, if they take the test right away, we would know, we would get,

age of 18 who don't have a high school diploma.

25

After they are 18 years of age, they are not required to attend school.

paying inmates who attended school as much as we were paying inmates who chose to mop the floor. So with money from the Mayor's Commission on Economic Opportunity, beginning last year, we started to offer incentive pay to inmates over the age of 18 who are not mandatory school students to encourage them. And as a result there has been an increase in the number of students attending our school.

We are also in the process of building a new building to house the school at RNDC. The Department is spending Department money, not DOE money, about \$5,000,000 addition to the building which will increase the capacity of our school by about an additional 140 seats. We are very committed to education. And it's--for these, you know, let me say this. This is an opportunity for me to say something that is on my mind.

The big issue for me among these adolescents, remember, they are standing accused

of crime. They haven't been convicted. We are a jail not a prison. So we don't offer the kinds of work programs that the prisons offer.

Our average length of stay for these youngsters is 45 days. And if you come to our jails you see, the predominant reality of our jails is boredom. And with adolescents, boredom is the worst thing. So at least for the five days a week that school's in session, they're going to school.

After school is out, on weekends, on holidays, for that week that school's not in session, and it's not as if these kids are great readers, they don't, you know, there's on television set in a housing unit for 50 kids or 33 kids. It's not as if there's a lot for them to do. And so getting them to--if I had my druthers I'd keep them in school until 6:00 o'clock at night.

COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY: [Chuckles]
Okay. So this, after the Youth, Parent, Provider
Fair.

24 COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY: Will you

feel you will continue doing this?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes. This is something we are very excited about. And I think this is something very unique in the country.

We've decided that we want to invite the parents of—this is mostly focused on the young men. We have about 34 to 40 young women adolescents in custody and most of the issues we're talking about, we're not going to forget about them, but let's keep in mind that the problems that we've been dealing with are the young men.

and see them in the visiting room but they never actually get to go inside the jail. They never get to meet the officers and the supervisors and the managers who run the jail. They never get to hear from us in the first person about what our values are and what we believe and develop a relationship with us where they feel comfortable picking up the phone and calling us if there's a problem.

And so we have determined to bring the parents right into the jail building. And so beginning in April we're going to start having an

orientation so that when an adolescent male is newly admitted to RNDC, we're going to set up opportunities, kind of like open school night, for the parents to come out to the jail, to see the physical building where their son is being held, to meet some of the officers and the managers and the supervisors who are involved in their custody, to hear from us, our expectations for how we want these young men to behave in our custody, to speak to them frankly about the dangers that might arise while they are in our custody, and to encourage them to work with us to make the jail safer.

understand that. I don't know how far we can talk about it. The same way that the parents would want to feel that their children--even though they did create and do a crime, that's why they're there. But to have the people who are supposed to be protecting them, to get into certain other little program things, how do you feel the parents feel about, when they do call and they don't get the right information, even talking about the incident that just happened. I don't know if we can really speak about it. The Robinson...

2	COMMISSIONER HORN: Well look. We
3	endeavor to give accurate information. So I would
4	imagine, in general, that any parent who feels
5	that their concerns have not been given due
6	consideration is going to be unhappy with that.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY: But could
8	you tell me if, you know, I hear that you do
9	listen to their telephone conversations. If an
LO	inmate called home and kind of hint to the parent
11	that they're being abused, what actions do you
12	take when you gotsuspect that they hear, they're
L3	saying that maybe the Correction Officer is doing
L4	something, not an inmate.
L5	COMMISSIONER HORN: We would
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY:
L7	[Interposing] What is the proced
18	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
L9	Okay.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY: Give me some
21	of the procedures that you would
22	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
23	We would immediately investigate it. The first
24	thing we would do is we would check to ensure that
25	the inmate is physically okay, just a medical sort

of Corrections has their own inspectors in our jails. And one of the things that we've done in recent months is we've asked and the Board of Corrections has stepped up to the plate and increased their presence in the adolescent jail so that there are more people who don't work for us that they can talk to.

COUNCIL MEMBER MEALY: Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Council Member James.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Thank you.

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.0

2.3

We've discussed and there's been much back and forth with regards to the inmates. I want to talk a little bit about the Correction Officers. What changes, if any, have been implemented subsequent to the death of Christopher Robinson to protect adolescents since it appears that there were some Correction Officers who were involved in his death.

COMMISSIONER HORN: Well first of all I think that it's worth saying than the officers are as entitled to the presumption of innocence as anyone else accused before the law.

We, as I said in my testimony, take a backseat to no one with respect to the aggressiveness with which we pursue and take action against wrongdoing. In fact if one were to go back historically and read the archives, for examples, of the Civil Service Chief, you would see union leaders criticizing me for the vigor and the aggressiveness that we have shown in prosecuting cases against our officers.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So let me ask you this question. How many cases have you prosecuted against Correction Officers?

So whether you're talking about how to serve an inmate's meals, how to run recreation, the concept of integrity is emphasized to a greater degree than ever before.

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Secondly we have created a separate section, I believe it's a three hour section on bullying and intimidation that inmates engage in,

2.0

in order that our officers better know how to
identify it when it is occurring and better
understand their obligation to break it up and not
to participate in it

Thirdly, as I say, you cannot ignore the installation of 3,000 cameras which have enabled us and in fact have, we have brought cases against officers who we have observed on camera doing things that are against the rules.

Fourthly, is the telephone monitoring. We are more aggressively looking at-listening to the phone calls. And where there is any hint of wrongdoing on the part of our officers initiating an investigation.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So listening to the phone calls of officers?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Of inmates.

And we are looking, we are looking as well, for instances in which--because we also look at matches between the phone numbers, if we identify that an inmate is calling an officer at home, they may be collusion. So we now cross tabulate the inmate phone calls against known phone numbers of our Correction Officers.

FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 78
COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: And has the
union objected to that practice?
COMMISSIONER HORN: We have a very
robust labor management
COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
[Interposing] I've heard. I've
COMMISSIONER HORN:relationship
with the COBA
COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
[Interposing] I've heard.
COMMISSIONER HORN:Ilet me say
this. I believe, very deeply.
COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Um-hum.
COMMISSIONER HORN: That the COBA
and its President, Norman Seabrook, know the
difference between right and wrong.
COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Um-hum.
COMMISSIONER HORN: And do notand
I have heard them speak very, very soundly and
very emphatically to their members
COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
[Interposing] Um-hum.
COMMISSIONER HORN:about their
expectations for them. And they expect their

2.0

2.3

officers to do the right thing. They tell them to
do the right thing. They have an obligation to
defend their officers. And we respect that.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: I recognize that there are conversations between counsel and client which is privileged, is it not privileged communication, is not the concept of privilege does not that extend to a Correction Officer. And what authority do you have to tape the phone call of a Correction Officer?

COMMISSIONER HORN: We're not taping the phone calls of a Correction Officer.

We're taping--phone call, we're monitoring, we're recording the outgoing conversations of inmates, except those that are made to privileged parties.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: And the-okay. Now let me just talk to you a little bit-so the extent is the phone call, the monitoring of
outgoing phone calls to individuals who are not,
to those that are not privileged. Training. That
is the extent of the reforms that you have
implemented in the aftermath of the Robinson case.

COMMISSIONER HORN: No I wouldn't say that.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: But the vast

25

2.0

majority that are currently under your supervision are there for, for the most part, 45 days or less.

COMMISSIONER HORN: On average.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: On average.

And you testified that the--one of the causes as
to why there's so much violence is because there's
boredom and you don't have supportive services for
these individuals, is that true? One of the
reasons, one of the factors.

COMMISSIONER HORN: Sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: And part of the reason why you do not have supportive services is because we are currently now in austere times and in the past we've had--we've not had enough revenue or enough funds to provide for supportive services.

COMMISSIONER HORN: No that's not the case.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay. Why do we not have--

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

The City has never provided services for detainees other than education.

25 [Pause]

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:

first time you because aware that Correction

When was the

24

25

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 84
2	Officers were using teen inmates.
3	COMMISSIONER HORN: Teen, did you
4	say teen or team?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Teen.
6	COMMISSIONER HORN: Teen?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Adolescent
8	inmates.
9	COMMISSIONER HORN: I, I think
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: When did you
11	first become aware?
12	COMMISSIONER HORN: You know, it's
13	so hard to answer that question. We have been
14	aware, I've been aware, certainly, throughout my
15	career of the possibility of officers colluding
16	with inmates, adult or teen, to engage in
17	wrongdoing. That is something that we are always
18	concerned about and on the alert for.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So that was
20	an ongoing investigation?
21	COMMISSIONER HORN: An ongoing
22	investigation of what?
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: You just
24	said you'd be you were aware there was a
25	possibility

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 85
2	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
3	That's right.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:so if you,
5	if it was possible, the question was were you
6	looking into it? And if you were looking into it,
7	was it in the form of an investigation?
8	COMMISSIONER HORN: We're always on
9	the lookout for it.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So
11	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
12	There was no specific investigation. There are
13	investigations of individual acts and individual
14	incidents. I did say that going back as far as
15	2005, for the very reason that we have this
16	concern, we have sought the tools to ascertain
17	when it is occurring.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So the
19	answer to the question is there was no formal
20	investigation.
21	COMMISSIONER HORN: There have been
22	investigations of individual incidents.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: But in terms
24	of the possibilities that you believe were
25	occurring there was no formal investigation.

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 86
2	COMMISSIONER HORN: Investigation
3	per se? No.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER HORN: Of a conspiracy
6	or an ongoing enterprise, no.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: When was the
8	first time you heard the term, The Program, or The
9	Team?
10	[Pause]
11	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Were you
12	aware of The Program or The Team or was
13	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
14	Yeah, I'm advised by counsel that this isthis
15	matter is subject to litigation. I'm really not
16	at liberty to answer your questions.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: It's my
18	understanding that in February 2008, Correction
19	Officer Nicholson was indicted on charges of gang
20	assault. My question to you was in fact, what
21	actions were taken by the Department to weed out
22	or to monitor the actions of Correction Officer
23	Nicholson, if any?
24	COMMISSIONER HORN: Well for the
25	record, that matterOfficer Nicholson has been

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:

24 [Interposing] Okay.

23

25 COMMISSIONER HORN: --he was

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 88
2	suspended without pay
3	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
4	[Interposing] Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER HORN:and remains
6	suspended without pay.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So let me
8	ask you this question. If in fact there's an
9	officer who was brought up on conduct, either by
10	the Department and/or under investigation, would
11	there be any additional supervision or monitoring
12	of that Correction Officer's conduct?
13	COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay. By
15	who?
16	COMMISSIONER HORN: By our
17	managers.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: By your
19	managers? And is this a new procedure or practice
20	or it was ongoing?
21	COMMISSIONER HORN: Ongoing.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay.
23	[Pause]
24	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: And were
25	there any, as far as you know, was there any

2.0

efforts to monitor inmate conversations to determine if there were any ongoing related behavior or, let me not ask that question.

[Pause]

Nicholson, the other officers that were involved in that incident, you had just--you had stated earlier that there was some possibility that there might be some ongoing concerns that you have with some Correction Officers. And so I guess what my question was, was there any supervision of conversations with inmates and Officer Nicholson and/or the other officers who were working with him prior to his indictment.

COMMISSIONER HORN: Ma'am, that matter is facing--he faces criminal charges in Bronx County and I'm not going to comment on that case in any way.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay. Is there anything that you think you could have done in between the time of the Nicholson indictment and the allegations subject to the current indictments related to the death of Mr. Robinson which would have uncovered the wrongdoing of the

2.0

Correction Officers?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Well again, in so far as there is litigation against the City with respect to that very issue, I'm really not at liberty to answer that question.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Let's talk a little bit about staffing ratios. You said in your testimony, you talked about, you said you changed staffing ratios, but given the fact that these were austere times you were somewhat limited. So can you discuss a little bit about staffing ratios and how we have addressed staffing ratios to prevent a similar type of incident from happening in the future?

I have to say that I'm not convinced that there is a direct relationship between the wrongdoing that is alleged in the Robinson indictment and staffing ratios. I think there is a relationship to inmate safety and staffing ratios. But you could have a one to one relationship, if the officer compromises his or her integrity it doesn't matter what your staffing ratio is, correct?

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER HORN: However, we do

believe that officers who feel safe in doing their job, who have sufficient backup are less likely to be compromised. We do believe that they are more likely to intervene swiftly when there is a fight. And for that reason we identified those housing units among the adolescents in RNDC that were the most troublesome and that were having the most difficulties with inmate on inmate violence. And we have assigned on the two day shifts, 7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. and 3:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M., an additional officer. We have done that by using overtime to fund that additional post. And we've attempted to fund it by reducing overtime expenditures in other possibly less critical positions.

We believe that the ratios are driven in some respect by the size of the housing units. You know, one of the things that people don't understand is that most of the inmates in our custody live in open dormitories. And in an open dormitory there are 50 young people living side by side, cheek by jowl, sleeping, eating, entertaining themselves together, literally 24

2.0

2.3

hours a day, 7 days a week. And it's not as if they're locked in cells.

So you've got 50 inmates. We've not got on those 2 shifts, 2 officers for those 50 inmates which creates an effective staff to inmate ratio of 1 to 25. In the cell blocks there are only 33 cells. So by putting 2 officers in those cell blocks we have an effective ratio of 1 to 17. I understand that in the Department of Juvenile Justice, some of their dormitories house 24 individuals and there's 1 Juvenile Detention person assigned, and on some shifts there's an additional Social Worker, but that Social Worker typically works 5 days a week and a single shift.

So I would argue that our staffing ratios are comparable to those. Now it is true that in the Department of Juvenile Justice some of the housing units were built to house as few as 8 individuals. And that's a good thing. They were built for that purpose. And so if they've got 1 officer assigned or one detention aid assigned, then they're going to have a ratio of 1 to 8.

If I could afford to put 3 or 4 officers in those dormitories that house 50

inmates,	Ι	certa	ainly	would.	But	we	have	to	be
reasonabl	و	with	Our	resource	allo	ocat	ions		

mean in your testimony you talked a little bit about new lesson plans, new lesson plans on bullying and intimidation and on intelligence gathering. On July 1st an expanded adolescent specific lesson plan will be introduced. And last but not least you talked about the six new classifications for adolescents. Is it possible that you can provide this Committee a copy of your new lesson plan on bullying an intimidation and—

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:

intelligence gathering? And may you also provide this Committee a copy of your expanded adolescent specific lesson plan? And could you expound a little on your expanded adolescent specific lesson plan. What does that mean?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Well we certainly can provide copies of the bullying and the intelligence gathering lesson plans, those are complete. They are in use. And we will be happy

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

to provide copies to the Committee. The

adolescent specific lesson plan is not yet

complete. As I indicated, it will be complete and

delivered effective July 1st and when it is

complete we will be more than happy to provide a

copy. I am not a trainer.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER HORN: And I am not the person who is writing it but I do know from conversations with the people who are that the purpose of it is to help our officers understand the way in which adolescents are different from adults; the way in which they respond to each other; their needs; the way in which they learn; the way in which they relate to each other; the way in which they respond to authority; and to teach them techniques that will obtain better results in helping these adolescents respond to the coercive custodial situation in which they find themselves. I don't know Ed or Kathy if you've been more directly involved. If you want to add to this?

MS. COUGHLIN: No I think that's it. It's just make sure--

2.0

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:

[Interposing]	Could	you	please	state	your	name	for
the record							

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing] I introduced Kathy Coughlin.

MS. COUGHLIN: Yeah. Kathy
Coughlin, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and
Discharge Planning. It's really an attempt to
understand adolescent development. That they're
not grown up adults, even if they've done
something or are alleged to have done something,
they're still in development, and how you deal
with them. Many of these officers know this from
dealing with their own kids but haven't yet
transferred it to dealing with our adolescents.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So can you give me a--I know you can't provide a copy of the training manual 'cause it's not yet been developed, but can you give me a thought process with regards to what this training would consist of? Some ideas.

MS. COUGHLIN: I would expect just from knowing how we do training that it's a combination of didactic information, this is what

I mean,

21

22

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER HORN: --not manual, will be delivered to all officers who work with adolescents at the time they're assigned to work with the adolescents or for those who are already on the job, we'll catch up and ensure that they all have it. Hopefully it will improve the way in which we obtain compliance and civil behavior, normative behavior from the adolescents in our

2.0

2.3

0		1.1 1			1.1				C	
4	custody	tnat	WTTT	avoia	tne	neea	LO	use	Lorce	

But again I want to say that sometimes using force in a correctional situation is necessary and appropriate.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: No I recognize that. But this is an attempt to, I guess, engage in some sort of communication, improve communication.

COMMISSIONER HORN: Precisely.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay. Now can you talk to me a little bit about enhancing the integrity training? What's the atmosphere so that if an officer wishes to discuss with a supervisor the fact, some information, provide some information that may assist you in preventing another situation from happening, what is the environment like? Is there a place where officers can go to confide with your staff confidentially?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay. And how--what's that, what are the mechanisms?

COMMISSIONER HORN: There are a

variety of opportunities for an officer who has a concern about the integrity of another officer.

2.0

They can report it to the Warden's confidential
hotline. They can refer it, and they are
encouraged to refer wrongdoing pursuant to the
Mayor's Executive Order 16, to the Department of
Investigation, confidentially and anonymously if
need be. They may ask to speak to a supervisor or
to the Warden in private in which case they will
be seen in private. They could ask to speak to
our Internal Affairs people in private.

And you know what? I even tell the officers that they should speak to their union delegate because I know that the union knows what's right and what's wrong and that they want our workforce to be as full of integrity as we do and that they will counsel them to bring it to the attention of the appropriate authorities. There are—my point is there are many avenues for an officer who wishes to report wrongdoing to do so.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Last two questions. Have many officers taken advantage of this?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Define many.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: [Chuckling]

I don't know. Have any?

Τ	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 99
2	COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: How many?
4	COMMISSIONER HORN: I can't give
5	you an exact number because sometimes they report
6	it to DOI confidentially. But it is a fair
7	number. We, in fact, the record is very clear
8	that we have made cases that have been brought to
9	our attention
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
11	[Interposing] With the cooperation?
12	COMMISSIONER HORN:with the
13	cooperation of officers.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Last
15	question is regarding the 6 new classifications
16	for adolescents, high and low security classes for
17	16-year olds, 17-year olds and 18-year olds. Can
18	you perhaps expound a little further on these 6
19	new classifications and how one determines what
20	classification
21	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
22	Sure.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:an inmate
24	would be
25	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

Sure.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: --assigned.

4 COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

Historically in New York City and we did a little checking, it is common practice throughout New York where other jails hold adolescents as we do, to house 16 to 19-years olds in housing units together. And typically we have a classification instrument that we have used that very well serves us in identifying those individuals who are predatory from those who are vulnerable.

And it consists of a series of questions, I believe we've previously provided a copy of the 239 form to this Committee which is the basic data collection that we use in arriving at that classification and it's behaviorally based. The best predictor of a person's future behavior is their past behavior.

So where we know that an individual has been aggressive, has been a bully, or has been a victim, we use that in distinguishing between those who are high risk and those who are low risk.

Historically we would have housed

2.0

2.3

the 16 to 19-year old low risk individuals
together and the 16 to 19 high risk individuals
together. What we are now realizing is that even
within a group of low, so called low risk
individuals there is still a continuum of risk

Some are more--and what we find is that larger, older, a 19-year old, a person who is about to turn 19 is very developmentally different from a person who has just turned 16. And so we believe that creating these more granular distinctions so that we have high and low designations within each age group will further serve to reduce violence.

It's a hypothesis. It's as yet untested.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:

Commissioner, I'm sorry, I apologize. I misspoke. But from what I understand the population that you serve, 70% to 80% of the inmates have some form of an addiction; 20% require detoxification; 32% are illiterate; and 40% require some form of mental health service. Is there a classification for, particularly those who suffer from mental health challenges, those who require detox? I mean I

2.0

about you created a new response to misbehavior focused on behavior modification as much as it is on the immediate control of violence. What is behavior modification consist of?

to ask Warden Duffy and Kathy Coughlin to address that in greater specificity but let me simply say that in the past our reaction to inmate misbehavior has been punitive, okay? And this represents a change and Warden Duffy and Commissioner Coughlin have been instrumental in putting this together. So I'm going to let them address it.

WARDEN EDMUND DUFFY: Good morning.

What we're going to create in March is a new
punitive area but it's an alternate to the
existing punitive lockdown system where they
effectively spend 23 hours locked in per day.

We're looking to, rather than have them release
guys that have the—inmates that have the
potential of being worse than when they were first
entered in, we're looking to make it a more
constructive program where during the days they're
going to be receiving constructive programming.

2	We are still writing a curriculum
3	on it. We are going to IID train the officers who
4	will administer it. It's a work in progress but
5	we're looking to get the ball rolling and get this
6	effective in March, early March.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: That assumes
8	that you receive some funding for these
9	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ:
10	[Interposing] For purposes of recording Warden,
11	would you please state your name for the record.
12	And I know that the Commissioner stated her name
13	but it is important, thank you.
14	WARDEN DUFFY: Warden Edmund Duffy.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: You talked,
16	Warden, you said constructive programs. What
17	constructive programs do you envision given these
18	austere times and it appears that the only program
19	that you provide is basededucational.
20	WARDEN DUFFY: Well Board of
21	Education services will be provided within the
22	housing area but in addition to that we're looking
23	at life skills and also a structured program as to
24	what makes these guys tick. We have a design

program that we're looking to implement in the

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 10!
2	area which focuses on cycles of destructive
3	behavior, of what caused me to get into the mess
4	I'm in in the first place.
5	And if we can get these adolescents
6	to recognize whatwhere they went wrong and what
7	behaviors they need to modify in themselves, we
8	believe we can truly have an impact on these young
9	men.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: you
11	anticipate additional staff for this program?
12	WARDEN DUFFY: We're going to
13	utilize the
14	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
15	[Interposing] Existing?
16	WARDEN DUFFY:train the housing
17	area staff. And we will trywe will actually
18	utilize the existing staff and train them in how
19	to implement these programs. And we're also going
20	to rely on community based volunteers that have
21	already agreed, after we presented it to them, to
22	assist us in this endeavor.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Thank you.
24	Thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIR GONZALES: Okay. I have one

2	more question Commissioner, then we're going to go
3	on to Councilman Gerson who has been waiting there
4	very patiently. Thank you.
5	In respect to the Institute for
6	Inner Development, the question that I have is
7	that something that will be a permanent expansion
8	as far as what you can tell us today?
9	COMMISSIONER HORN: Certainly it is
LO	as far as I'm concerned, yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Okay. Thank
12	you. Councilman Gerson.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Thank you
L4	very much Madam Chair. And let me take the
15	opportunity to thank you for your leadership in
L6	addressing the needs of a vulnerable part of our
L7	very needy youth population which are really has
18	directed this Council and inspires us all.
L9	Good afternoon Commissioner.
20	COMMISSIONER HORN: Good afternoon
21	Mr. Gerson.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Does
23	Department policy currently forbid without
24	exception the use of inmates to in any way
25	supervise any adolescent inmate?

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 107
2	COMMISSIONER HORN: Absolutely,
3	yes.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: And this
5	policy is clear and known and widespread among the
6	entire force and anticipating your answer to that,
7	what would be the response by the Department to a
8	violation by an officer of that policy?
9	COMMISSIONER HORN: I think our
LO	record is clear. Where we have found it we have
11	brought charges. We have, where it rises to a
L2	serious level, sought termination. We have on
13	some cases obtained termination. And where it
L4	crosses the threshold of criminal behavior we've
L5	referred it for prosecution.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: And just to
L7	be clear, my question was directed not just to any
18	enterprise where there was an exchange of
L9	consideration but any delegation of supervisory
20	responsibility whatsoever, the assignment of an
21	inmate to act, for example, as a monitor over
22	another inmate, that is covered by what is
23	forbidden under
0.4	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

Absolutely true, yes.

25

2	the job description and the expectations are very
3	clear, if that inmate sees something amiss, he or
4	she is to report it. Simply that, nothing more.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: And is that
6	inmate, the inmate selected for that
7	responsibility, does that inmate undergo any
8	training?
9	COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Is there
11	any other role or position where an inmate is
L2	asked to monitor, observe or report on any other
13	inmates?
L4	COMMISSIONER HORN: Not to monitor
15	or observe but we doyeah, with inmates who are
L6	disabled, we do pay other inmates to assist them.
L7	For example with pushing a wheelchair.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Okay.
L9	COMMISSIONER HORN: And again those
20	inmates are carefully selected. They're paid for
21	the service and they are trained.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Okay. So
23	we have the assistance of inmates with
24	disabilities, we have suicide observation,
25	anything else?

COMMISSIONER HORN:

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

Give me some cover, would you?

[Interposing]

That is--

23

24

25

2.0

2.3

believe so.

No.

we'll give each other cover and more importantly
we'll work together to come up with the funding.
But it certainly makes sense if we do that with
increasing frequency in the communities and I
think there's a need, a population which has that
need

Now just to be clear, when we've been referring to adolescents as 16 to 19-year olds. Typically the public school system upper age limit is 17 sometimes 18. Is there any group of 18, 19 or even 17, 18, or 19-year olds who are not enrolled at all in a school program because they have completed the normal sequence?

COMMISSIONER HORN: An individual who has completed their high school diploma and whose record indicates such with the Department of Education is not required to go to school.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: But do you have a significant number of such inmates?

COMMISSIONER HORN: No. I don't

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: 'Cause I would be very concerned over a 17, 18, 19-year old who in addition to, you know, does not even have

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

the	school	time	responsibility.
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~		

COMMISSIONER HORN: No we mandate school up to age 18 if they do not have a high school diploma. And--

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

[Interposing] Well--

COMMISSIONER HORN: -- and we pay them, and even if they're over 18 and are not legally required to attend, we pay them in order to encourage them to attend if they have not completed their high school diploma.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

Commissioner you testified that if you had the resources you would expand the ratio of officers to adolescents even more. If we were to add one additional officer for each of the shifts, seven days a week, to each of the adolescent units, what would the cost be?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Oh I'd have to do some figuring and ask my financial people but we--

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

[Interposing] Could you give us an estimate? COMMISSIONER HORN: Hold on. Let

COMMISSIONER HORN: I think if there are--if there's more adult supervision, more

24

25

2.0

2.3

responsible adult supervision, and they know we
are watching, there will be fewer fights. I think
too that if we can do something to relieve the
boredom that that too will contribute to a
decrease in fights

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

[Interposing] So it sounds like we have a two prong strategy. We're already going to go to the Department of Education to deal with part of the latter. Let me ask you this, is there any non-uniformed person, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, Psychologist, to whom an inmate is assigned and told they will have access to that person to meet with, speak with, you know, confidentially and who has at least one meeting with each inmate for the purpose of getting to know them and beginning a process of social work, guidance counseling?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Well we have Correction Counselors assigned to each of the jails. And while they're--

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

[Interposing] So what is--who is a Correction Counselor?

2	COMMISSIONER HORN: They are
3	civilian trained counselor, I don't know offhand,
4	they meet the Civil Service requirements to be a
5	counselor. I don't know offhand. I'm sure they
6	have a college degree, perhaps a Master's degree,
7	I don't know for sure
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:
9	[Interposing] They're specifically assigned to the
10	adolescents?
11	COMMISSIONER HORN: There are.
12	There are counselors who are assigned to the
13	adolescents. My point is that at this point in
14	time the staffing ratios are so high that I cannot
15	tell you that one is assigned to each individual.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Do you know
17	if the school has a Guidance Counselor assigned to
18	each
19	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
20	Yes.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:enrollee
22	who serves that purpose?
23	COMMISSIONER HORN: I know that the
24	school has Guidance Counselors assigned. I don't
25	know what their ratio is, you'd have to ask that

2.0

)	٦f	DOE.
	ノエ	DOE .

3	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: so let me
4	make a suggestion. If we're talking, you know, I
5	heard that your testimony about the new efforts
6	and, you know, what it is called, the new response
7	to misbehavior, but you also testified that
8	virtually every adolescent that comes into your
9	care comes with issues that are disproportionate
10	to the normal adolescent issues.

COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: And it seems to me that it would make sense for every adolescent in your care to have contact with a Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, Psychologist to initiate a process of working with that inmate that could also continue after discharge. Does that make sense to you?

COMMISSIONER HORN: It certainly does.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Well I think we should add that to our--

COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

Our shopping list?

25 COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: --our

2	shopping list. But you know what? In the scheme
3	of things, even in austere times, it sounds to me
4	that, you know, making use of available resources
5	such as Guidance Counselors or School
6	Psychologists within the Department of Education
7	assigned, and enhancing them somewhat compared to
8	the benefit we would obtain, even in austere
9	times, would still be extraordinarily cost
10	effective. So I'm certainly going to follow up
11	aggressively on each of these three items. And I
12	hope you will join us in doing so.
13	COMMISSIONER HORN: I look forward
14	to the conversation Councilman.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Okay.
16	Madam Chair.
17	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: That's it?
18	Council Member?
19	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Yeah, one
20	last area but briefly. Bullyingoh and by the
21	way I must say in our last hearing we did talk
22	about the age separation advantage. And I'm very
23	gladdened to see that that is now being
24	implemented. So we
25	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]

And let me say as a result of your suggestions we took a look at the Department of Education's bullying materials and have extracted from it that which was useful and looked at our own, and it has informed our training program.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: So you preempted my next question. So let me then jump to what I hope will be the final one. Do we have a zero tolerance policy for bullying and fighting within the system, meaning that any inmate who initiates a fight or an act of bullying will expect a response from the system, corrective and/or punitive?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Yes. And I think the important distinction is that where before our response was primarily punitive, we are trying to, as Warden Duffy explained, make it more of an opportunity for behavior modification to extinguish the behaviors that led to it.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: All right well Madam Chair I look forward to working with you and with the Commissioner on following up on the three specific areas of follow-up we just discussed as well as the other areas that have

it.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 121
2	come up in the course of this hearing. Thank you
3	very much.
4	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Thank you.
5	Thank you Council Member. Well Commissioner thank
6	you so much for your testimony. Thank you too,
7	and your staff. Today's hearing in respect to the
8	issue that we've been dealing with, violence
9	against adolescents at Rikers Island, is an issue
10	that is of significance to us and to the entire
11	City.
12	But today's Committee is also as
13	you spoke earlier and we spoke considering two
14	bills and a resolution. We heard some of your
15	comments on it. And we will continue to hear and
16	work with you as we go along. I strongly look
17	forward to it and the Committee looks forward to

Okay it looks like Council Member Tish has some questions on the bill. So.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Just wanted to know the position of the Department with respect to each of these bills and why there is opposition, if any, to these bills?

> I think I COMMISSIONER HORN:

2 stated that in my statement.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So if you could just elaborate on why there's opposition.

You oppose a mandate on a Discharge Plan for adolescents leaving City jails. And I believe you indicated in your testimony part of it has to do with the lack of resources, is that true?

COMMISSIONER HORN: Absolutely true.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Okay. And other than the lack of resources do you have a philosophical opposition to a Discharge Plan for inmates who are leaving City jail?

COMMISSIONER HORN: In general no, in fact we are very strong supporters of discharge planning. I think that we must keep two things in mind. One we have to be prudent with respect to our resource allocation and decide the appropriate point in time at which to intervene and so the ten day cutoff that is proposed in the bill may be much too soon.

Secondly we do have to recognize that as strenuously as we have supported and advocated for discharge planning, in all candor,

2	we have to admit that its efficacy is as yet
3	unproven. And we question why the Council would
4	move forward with something as ambitious as this
5	bill without allowing us to reinstate the
6	Adolescent Reentry Initiative which the Council
7	funded but which was taken out of last year's
8	adopted budget without seeing a few years of
9	evidence to see how well that works.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Have you
11	sought resources from the Mayor with regards to
12	COMMISSIONER HORN: [Interposing]
13	Yes.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:this end?
15	And his response?
16	COMMISSIONER HORN: This was
17	negotiated with the Council. I don't discuss my
18	discussions with the Mayor or OMB.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Do you know
20	whether or not the Mayor is supportive of this
21	program?
22	COMMISSIONER HORN: The Mayor has
23	been supportive of discharge planning.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Is it not
25	true that the Mavor on his own could implement

the resolution.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: You have
3	any at this point in time what are your thoughts
4	with regards to the New York State legislature
5	enacting and passing legislation which would
6	change the juvenile status age to include 16, 17
7	and 18-year olds?
8	COMMISSIONER HORN: I think the
9	legislature has much to consider.
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: And not
11	withstanding the legislature, what is your
L2	position?
L3	COMMISSIONER HORN: Again I can't
L4	take a position without knowing the specific
L5	language.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Basically
L7	16, 17 and 18-year olds will be handled in Family
L8	Court.
L9	COMMISSIONER HORN: I think there
20	are a lot of variables that have to be taken into
21	consideration. You know, in the adult court an
22	individual who stands accused has the right to be
23	arraigned within 24 hours. Under the Family Court
24	Act than individual would not be brought before a
25	iudge for up to 72 hours. So I think that's one

2 consideration.

3	I have concern that matters in the
4	Family Court tend to be adjourned longer and take
5	longer to dispose of than matters in the adult
6	court. And I also think, given what we know about
7	18-year olds, certainly, and perhaps some of the
8	17-year olds, I think that thought needs to be
9	given to the impact their presence would have on
10	the juvenile detention facilities. So I'm just
11	not going to hazard a position on that matter.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Just going
13	back to talk, justI just have a question which I
14	did not get to ask earlier. And that is the
15	number, the amount of violence which is currently
16	being committed in the facility, is there more
17	inmate on inmate violence or is it more violence
18	involving an officer?
19	COMMISSIONER HORN: Undoubtedly
20	most of the violence is inmate on inmate
21	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:
22	[Interposing] Is there an increase?
23	COMMISSIONER HORN: Well again
24	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES:

25 [Interposing] The adolescent--

2	we get them or what we get at this point but we
3	hopefully will move forward in the interests of
4	this population.
5	I mean after all they've been
6	entrusted to the City and to you and to your staff
7	so for us it is important in order for us to have
8	appropriate oversight. So I thank you today and
9	your staff for your testimony. I look forward to
10	it. Thank you.
11	[Pause]
12	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Mishi
13	Faruqee, Children's Defense Fund, please step
14	forward. Lisa Ortega from Rights for Imprisoned,
15	Nancy Ginsburg, Legal Aid Society, Mary Dougherty,
16	Rights for Imprisoned People. I think I got it
17	right. That's it?
18	[Pause]
19	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: When you're
20	ready, please state your name for the record and
21	proceed. Thank you.
22	[Pause]
23	MS. NANCY GINSBERG: For the Legal
24	Aid Society, Nancy Ginsberg. Good afternoon.
25	Thank you for the opportunity to

2.0

testify concerning violence against adolescents in the New York City adult jails. I am Nancy Ginsburg, and I supervise the adolescent practice of the criminal trial offices of Legal Aid's Criminal Defense Practice.

The Legal Aid Society is the nation's largest and oldest provider of legal services to poor families and individuals. Our Prisoners' Rights Project has successfully brought litigation challenging a variety of practices in the New York City jails. In addition, each week our office receives as many as 200 letters or phone calls requesting assistance from inmates in the New York City jails and state prisons. We attempt to remedy these problems by intervening administratively with the Department of Correction and other appropriate agencies.

This daily contact with inmates and their families has given our office a firsthand view of many of the problems confronting inmates.

It is on that basis of our direct contact over the past several years with literally thousands of prisoners and their family members that we offer these comments and recommendations to the City

Council.

We submit this testimony on behalf of the Legal Aid Society, and thank Chairs

Gonzalez and Martinez and the Committees on Fire and Criminal Justice Services and on Juvenile

Justice for inviting our thoughts on these issues.

On November 24, 2008, we provided extensive written testimony addressing our concerns about the culture of violence to which adolescents are exposed on Rikers Island. We append that testimony submitted in November to today's submission for your complete review.

Today, we hope to address some of the recent assertions of the Department of Correction and to provide comments on the laudable legislation proposed by the Council members.

The Department of Correction has actual knowledge of violent conditions at RNDC.

The Department of Correction maintains that it has limited access to intelligence concerning the conditions on Rikers Island. This stems from what they claim is reluctance of the teenagers to report incidents of violence. Despite DOC assertions that they "take appropriate action to

2.0

2.3

ensure adolescents' safety", there is no way to test this assertion.

We urge the Council to request that the Department of Correction produce to your Committees copies of the records of the complaints filed about violence perpetrated by staff or where there is an allegation of staff complicity. We also urge that you request the records reflecting the investigations of these complaints and the outcome of the investigations.

We make this recommendation because the Legal Aid Society's Prisoners' Rights Project has repeatedly reported incidents of violence to the Department of Correction. These reports have included incidents where staff assaulted and bullied adolescents on Rikers Island. The reports also included instances of staff complicity, with reference to The Program that was addressed in the recent indictments in the Bronx and has been widely covered in recent media reports.

We believe that despite their protestations to the contrary, the Department of Correction has had knowledge of the existence of The Program and of the existence of staff

complicity in violence among the adolescents, and simply has not done enough to address it.

We provide some examples to support this assertion. On February 3, 2009, as reported by the New York Times in an article entitled

Lawsuits Suggest Pattern of Rikers Guards Looking

Other Way, the Legal Aid Society, together with outside counsel, filed an action in Federal Court seeking damages for injuries sustained by a former RNDC inmate who had been badly beaten by another inmate in March, 2007 because he had sat in a chair in the dayroom without "permission" from the inmates who controlled the housing area.

Our client suffered multiple facial fractures and was obviously injured. He was denied access to the clinic for two days before a Captain recognized him, because the boy's mother used to work in the building, and took him to the clinic. He was thereafter moved to protective custody in RNDC, where he was beaten again, by an officer, suffering additional facial fractures.

On April 20, 2007, almost two years ago, Legal Aid Society staff contacted the administrative offices of the DOC on behalf of an

2.0

inmate whose cell had been unlocked, after lock in, and who was then viciously assaulted by a group of armed inmates. This inmate was transferred out of City custody within days of Legal Aid's contact with the Department.

In our communication, we requested that staff assigned to the housing area be questioned about what had transpired. We know that this inmate, through private counsel, has sued the City, and we are not in a position to state what the Department's investigation disclosed, or what, if anything, they did about this incident. We do know that he had told RNDC staff that he was at risk from gang members in that jail and that he was housed there anyway.

A year before Christopher

Robinson's death, in September of 2007, our office contacted the DOC on behalf of another adolescent inmate beaten in RNDC after his cell was unlocked and he was assaulted by a group of prisoners.

This assault followed his answering no when asked by these inmates whether he was with it. This inmate told us that staff took no steps to stop the assault in the cell. When he was seen in the

clinic for his injuries, he reported that he had injured himself because of his fears of retaliation. Two days later, he was moved to close custody.

In July, 2008, the Society contacted the DOC on behalf of another inmate who had been transferred out of One Upper in RNDC who two months earlier, following several physical altercations with gang members, was transferred back to the jail and assigned to the very same housing area he had been moved from. This inmate told us that he is specifically warned by an inmate worker that he was at risk of assault, and in fact he was attacked the very next morning in front of, he said, a Captain, who did nothing.

He alleged that he was then assaulted by staff members in an isolated area of the jail, suffering a fractured nose among other injuries. After being treated at Elmhurst Hospital, he was returned to the jail where, he stated, he was warned by a jail supervisor that he should "leave this right here."

In September 19th, 2008, a month before Christopher Robinson was beaten to death,

the Legal Aid Society contacted the Department of Correction and the Department of Investigation with specific allegations from an inmate in RNDC that he had been asked by inmates in his housing area if he was "with the program," and then asked for his PIN number and booking case number. When he refused to give the information, he alleged, he was assaulted by the inmates, then struck by an officer after being told to place his hands on his head.

This boy had visible injuries-as witnessed by a Legal Aid staff person with whom he spoke but was denied medical attention by staff.

He was also warned by inmates in the housing area "he's going to get you." In other words, not to snitch on the officer.

Even after the publicity
surrounding Mr. Robinson's death, and the
indictments in the Bronx, the Legal Aid Society
continues to receive similar allegations. On
January 29th, 2009, just days after the
indictments, an RNDC inmate contacted the Society
to report that he was assaulted by a Correction
Officer after he refused the officer's demand that

2.0

he turn over his commissary. The inmate said he was denied access to the clinic until the following morning, after which he was transferred to another building.

Several weeks ago, we received complaints from inmates in another housing area in RNDC that certain inmates are being afforded access to contraband and cell phones and are allowed to run the phones and control access to the dayroom.

According to the inmates with whom our staff spoke, officers signal the inmates when supervisors are en route to the housing area, and when searches are about to be conducted. All of these allegations have been communicated to law enforcement. We maintain that the assertion by the Department of Correction that the Department is doing everything it can to address the problem of violence in RNDC cannot and should not be credited.

Even after the death of Christopher Robinson, acts of staff complicity in violent incidents have been reported. A culture of violence has developed and has been allowed to

2.0

2.3

continue in RNDC. Such a problem cannot be addressed on a case by case basis and the responsibility for notifying the DOC cannot fall on the teenagers who are victims of the culture.

The Department of Corrections has been on notice and certainly is on notice now.

There is clearly more that could have, in the past, and currently, can be done, and the Council must continue to demand accountability.

Department of Correction has increased the number of cameras placed in RNDC. We support this advancement, but pose the following questions: do all the cameras record, or only some? Are the recordings stored? Where are the recordings stored? Who has the responsibility for the storage and safekeeping of the recordings? Who has access to the recordings? And how long are the recordings preserved? Are facility supervisors who are responsible for investigating incidents in the jail adequately trained in downloading and viewing video recordings?

We urge the Council to pose these questions in order to ensure that the efforts to

2.0

record occurrences are meaningful and that the DOC is held accountable.

We understand that the DOC has increased the ratio from the time of the last hearing when it was 1 officer per 50 inmates to 2 officers per 50 inmates. We support such an effort, but request that the Council continue to ask the DOC to do more. Many teenagers in custody are held in large dorms where kids have easy access to each others' belongings and the environment lends itself to constant conflict.

Smaller housing units lend themselves to improved supervision and reduced conflict. Adolescents, aged 16 to 18, experiencing the stress of incarceration and separation from their families and communities should have supervision that approaches the 1 to 8 ratio that the Department of Juvenile Justice provides to 15-year olds.

We applaud the Committees for proposing legislation to increase the accountability of the DOC to City government. We believe this will lead to greater transparency and, hopefully, safer conditions for the teenagers

2.0

on Rikers Island.

Despite the recent legislative and media focus on conditions for teenage boys at RNDC, it is important not to forget the teenage girls in this ongoing inquiry. Teenage girls are held at the Rose M. Singer Center. We request that your efforts to collect information about teenagers in DOC custody specifically include the girls and that this information be disaggregated from the information concerning the boys.

We have just a few comments concerning the language of the proposal to amend Section 9-129 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York. As to the proposed language for Section 9-129(b)(2), we suggest that reports from the Department of Correction should not be limited to those involving serious injuries as a result of fights or assaults or uses of force because serious injury is left undefined in this section.

In order to have an accurate picture of what is occurring, we urge you to request the actual incident reports, so that you can make your own assessments of the number and severity of the injuries; how, when and where

25

2	these incidents arise; how they are reported; and
3	the adequacy of the investigation.
4	Further, we suggest that section 9-
5	129(b)(3) be amended to read as follows:
6	Restrictive placement. The report shall include:
7	(1) the total number of adolescents housed apart
8	from general population (a) for their own
9	protection, (b) as disciplined for infractions,
10	(c) because of their psychiatric condition or
11	mental observation and for any other purposed
12	designated by the Department of Correction.
13	And the average length of stay of
14	inmates in each category in subdivision 1 and 3
15	disaggregated providing the number and percentage
16	of inmates placed into protective custody at the
17	inmates' request and those placed there
18	involuntarily by the Department of Correction.
19	Before I get to my recommendations
20	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ:
21	[Interposing] Okay. Before we move on, in the
22	interest of time, we do have your recommendations.
23	We will take them for the record. I do have a

question I'd like to ask you--

MS. GINSBERG: [Interposing] Sure.

1	FIRE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE 141
2	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Before we
3	move on. What has been the response of DOC in
4	respect to the reports that you mentioned in your
5	testimony?
6	MS. GINSBERG: Well as Commissioner
7	Horn indicated, they appear to investigate each
8	individually or they claim they do. They're not
9	required to turn over documents to us. We simply
10	report the incidents as they come to our
11	attention. It's our position that it's the
12	Department is hard pressed to claim that they
13	don't see a pattern.
14	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Okay. We
15	have your testimony and so we'll move on. These
16	are the recommendations. We certainly welcome
17	anything that you have here in respect to our
18	legislation.
19	MS. GINSBERG: I would just like to
20	make one comment as to Commissioner Horn's

MS. GINSBERG: I would just like to make one comment as to Commissioner Horn's statement as to the enhanced services that they're going to provide to the mentally ill adolescents. We obviously support taking those adolescents out of close custody. We believe that it's inhumane to place mentally ill teenagers in a 23 hour

2.0

2.3

To	ockdown. However I would urge the Council to
re	equest specific information about these civilian
vo	colunteers who are going to be providing services
to	o these adolescents; what the specific services
aı	re; whether or not those services are going to be
70	verseen by mental health professionals; by the
he	ealth providers in or outside of the facilities.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Okay. Thank you. And it definitely will be taken into consideration, I'll request it. Tish?

another piece of legislation specifically as it relates to the adolescents who unfortunately suffer from mental illness. So there will be another round of legislation that I'll be sponsoring.

Is there someone here from

Department of Corrections? You have the testimony
of Legal Aid? Would you like a copy? Okay. I'm
going to be providing copies of your testimony to
the representatives from the Department of
Corrections. And hopefully, and I'm sure, will
urge the Chairs to follow up with the Department
of Corrections on all of the incidents that are

2.0

2 cited in here.

But I recognize, as you stated, it's not case by case. It should be really more systematic. And so it's troubling that they have not gotten back with you with respect to all of the cases that you have referred to them.

If you could, if there's more information that you could provide to my office, I would appreciate that. Again I'm going to urge the Chairs, I know--and if the Chairs do not join me, I will be urging a meeting to follow up on all of these matters. And we'll be getting back to you. Thank you.

MS. GINSBERG: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: I've heard

you and in the interests of time, thank you.

State your name for the record.

MS. MISHI FARUQEE: Good afternoon.

My name is Mishi Faruqee, I am the Director of the

Youth Justice Program at the Children's Defense

Fund New York.

And I know that we're out of time so I'm not going to read my testimony. I just wanted to make a few comments. You know, as Nancy

2.0

I think very, very clearly testified that we know that the Christopher Robinson case is not an aberration. I know that the Commissioner said he was shocked by the allegations when the indictment came out on the Correctional Officers. But those allegations are very, very common allegations that we've been hearing for years and years from young people who have been on Rikers, and it in no way was an aberration, as Nancy said, there really is a culture of violence at RNDC.

And so we are heartened to hear that the Department of Correction has recently started taking steps to address it. So I just want to talk about some of the things that have happened over the last few weeks and few months in response to very serious, serious problems at Rikers and particular RNDC.

The staffing levels, we are happy to hear that the Department of Correction is increasing staffing in some of the adolescent units at Rikers, particularly in the high classification dormitory units and in some of the cell units on some of the shifts. But we feel strongly that this higher staffing level should be

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 implemented in all of the adolescent units on all

3 shifts.

The Commissioner spoke about the Department of Juvenile Justice and he said that, you know, the Department of Juvenile Justice sometimes has a 1 to 8 staffing ratio. reality is that the Department of Juvenile Justice has a mandated staffing ratio of 1 staff to 8 young people. It's mandated by law and there's always that staffing ratio for the Department of Juvenile Justice. It's not, you know, an occasional or a sometimes situation. That's what the staffing ratio is. And so we believe strongly that if the Department of Correction can't get to a 1 to 8 ratio to try to get as close to possible to a 1 to 8 ratio on all of the units at all times.

Regarding the Institute for Inner

Development, we are also happy to hear that the

Department is planning to expand that program. I

did have the opportunity to go visit the Institute

of Inner Development, one of the units, at RNDC,

and I was very impressed with that unit.

We, when we went to go visit the

unit there was one Correctional Officer and 50 young people, but the Correctional Officer was very, very engaged with the young people. The young people were in a group and they were talking about what is manhood. And they were very, very engaged and they clearly—there clearly was a difference on that unit from the other adolescent units on Rikers.

And when we came in we asked the young people what made this Correctional Officer different than the other Correctional Officers that they had come in contact with. And they had-they gave a very simple answer. They all, all of them said pretty much the same thing.

They said that this Correctional
Officer actually cares about us. You know, which
was such a basic thing and it, for me, it was also
just really striking that that's what made him
stand out as a Correctional Officer is that he
stood—that he actually cared about the young
people on the unit. And the young people knew
that. And because they knew that, they actually,
they felt safe on that unit and they felt like
this wasn't a place where they needed to fight to

2.0

2 protect themselves.

And so it's not really about, you know, enhancing the Correctional Officer's use of pepper spray or anything about—it's really just basically about the Correctional Officer's interactions with the young people. And I think that was very clear from the Institute for Inner Development and from what we saw in that unit.

And so I really, really recommend that the City Council keep the pressure on the Department of Correction to not only expand that program but also to, you know, provide the training that you asked for in terms of the module on adolescent development. I think that that training if it's implemented well and if the Correctional Officers really do understand what it means to be an adolescent and the developmental differences with adolescents, that that training can make a difference. But it's really—it's very important that the City Council keep the pressure on the Department of Correction in this regard.

And then the last thing that I just wanted to point out was that the Commissioner, you know, talked about the City has, you know,

expanded alternative to incarceration programs for young people. And there have been a lot of improvements in this area but really nothing in terms of expanding alternative to incarceration for 16, 17, 18-year olds who are now incarcerated at Rikers Island. And there really needs to be more programs put in place to divert young people from Rikers Island.

I do agree with the Commissioner, I think most people agree that Rikers is not a place for anybody, but it's definitely not a place for adolescents. And so as, you know, as we look at expanding the—raising the age to 16 and 17—year olds and expanding the jurisdiction of Family Court which I think is an important thing for us to do but in the short term, the City really needs to put much more emphasis on expanding alternatives for young people to be on Rikers Island. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Thank you
Mishi so much for your testimony. I just want to
say that throughout the years you've been
instrumental in respect to our Committee on
Juvenile Justice and we certainly hear your

16

Δ.	FIRE AND GOVENIDE GOSTICE 11
2	experience and the work that you do is very
3	significant to us in moving forward.
4	And I do agree with you that it is
5	important that our 16, 17 and 18-year olds receive
6	the services necessary to be able to exit at some
7	point and exit in a successful way. So I thank
8	you. Thank you for your testimony. And on behalf
9	of Council Member Martinez who had to leave, and
10	myself, Council Member Gonzalez, I adjourn the
11	meeting today. And I thank you all for attending.
12	[Gavel banging]
13	CHAIRPERSON GONZALEZ: Thank you to
14	the staff.

[END TAPE 1002]

CERTIFICATE

I, Laura L. Springate 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.

Lama L. Springate

Signature __Laura L. Springate_____

Date _____March 3, 2009_____