CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS

----- X

11/14/2022

Start: 10:30 a.m. Recess: 11:33 a.m.

HELD AT: COMMITTEE ROOM, CITY HALL

B E F O R E: Keith Powers, Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Justin L. Brannan

Gale Brewer

Selvena Brooks-Powers

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Lily Shapiro, Attorney Candidate for LCRC

David Fuller, Professor Candidate for LCRC

Gregorio Mayers, Professor Candidate for LCRC

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SERGEANT AT ARMS: This is the hybrid hearing on the Committee On Rules, Privileges, and Elections.

At this time, please set all electronic devices to vibrate on silent mode. Thank you Chair. We are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Good morning and welcome to the meeting. Welcome to the meeting of the Committee on Rules, Privileges and Elections. I'm City Councilmember Keith Powers, Chair of the Committee. Before we begin, I'd like to introduce the other members of the Committee who are present with us here today. We have Councilmember Borelli on Zoom, Councilmember Brannon. We will be joined by Councilmember Brewer who is in the chambers right now, Councilmember Selvena Brooks-Powers, and Councilmember Pierina Sanchez, and well I'm sure we'll be joined by others as well. I'd like to acknowledge the staff and committee... committee staff here today, Committee Counsel Jeff Compagna, and the Committee staff who worked on the appointments that we're hearing today, Chief Ethics Counsel Pearl Moore, Director of Investigations Francesca Dellavecchia, and investigators Ramses Boutin, and Alicia Vessel.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

By letters dated September 30, 2022, Mayor Eric

Adams requested the advice and consent of The Council

regarding the appointment of xxxLily Shapiro, David

Fullard, and Gregorio Myers to the New York City

Local Conditional Release Commission, which will be

referred to as the LCRC. Today The Council is

holding a public hearing to assist us in determining

whether to give these candidates advice and consent.

Just about the local release commission before we get started: Section 271 of the New York State Correction Law provides that the city of New York may adopt a local law establishing a Local Conditional Release Commission consisting of at least five members. Each of them shall be appointed by the mayor with the advice and consent of The Council. Local Law 60 of 2020, which I had the honor of sponsoring and introducing, established the latest incarnation of the LCRC in New York City. Each member of the LCRC must be a graduate of an accredited 4-year college or university and have at least five years of experience in the field of criminology, administration of criminal justice, law enforcement, probation, parole, law, social work,

committee on Rules, Privileges, and Elections 5 social sciences, psychology, psychiatry, or corrections. (Any one of us.) The term of office for each member of an LCRC is four years, provided that any member chosen to fill a vacancy occurring other than by expiration of a term shall be appointed for the remainder of an unexpired term.

2.2

2.3

The mayor may remove any member for cause after notice and an opportunity to be heard. The director of the local probation department or such director's designee shall serve as an ex officio nonvoting member of the LCRC. Further, the local department shall provide support staff to LCRC as well. The LCRC has a duty to determine which persons are serving... who are serving definite sentences for imprisonment in local correctional facilities, and who are eligible for early release may be released on conditional release and under what conditions.

Persons are eligible for conditional release when, under the following conditions: They are serving one or more definite sentences of imprisonment in a local correctional facility with an aggregate term in excess of 90 days. They've not been sentenced for a violent felony offense as defined in Section 70.02 of the Penal Law, which

includes manslaughter in the second degree...

manslaughter in the second degree, vehicular

manslaughter and second degree, vehicular

manslaughter the first degree, criminally negligent

homicide, and offenses defined in our article 130 of

the Penal Law, incest or an offense... an offense

defined in article 263 of the Penal Law, or

aggravated harassment of an employee by an

incarcerated individual.

2.2

2.3

Number three, they have a jail record which makes them eligible for reduction of sentence for good behavior under Section 804 of the Correction Law, and four, they have verified community ties in any of the following areas: Employment, permanent residence, and family.

Persons who are eligible for conditional release may apply for release after serving 60 days in a correctional facility. However, no person shall be granted release until they have served at least 90 days of their sentence. If at any time during the period of conditional release, The Commission or any member thereof, has caused to believe that a person who has been released has lapsed into criminal ways or company, or has violated one or more conditions of

conditional release, The Commission or such member may declare such a person delinquent and issue a written declaration of delinquency. Upon such declaration, The Commission or any member may issue a warrant for the retaking and temporary detention of such person. Upon a finding in support of violation, The Commission may revoke the condition release or continue to modify conditions of the release. Any such actions by The Commission shall be deemed a judicial function and shall not be reviewable if done in accordance with the law.

Today, we have three candidates here. I'm going to introduce them. We're joined by first by Lily Shapiro. Ms. Shapiro is an attorney who has worked in various capacities in the field of criminal justice since 1996, including seven years in the New York City Department of Probation, and most recently The Fortunate Society, which is one of the largest providers of direct services to the formerly incarcerated. She's a graduate Harvard College and New York University School of Law.

If The Council grants its advice and consent, she will be appointed to the Conditional Release

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS

Commission where she'll serve a four-year term

expiring four days from the date of appointment.

We're also joined by David Fuller, Mr. Fuller has worked in the New York City Department of Correction for nearly 30 years in various capacities. He's a graduate of the School of Visual Arts and the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and holds a PhD in forensic psychology granted by the Union Institute and University. If The Council grants its advice and consent, he'll be appointed to Local Conditional Release Commission and will suffer for year term expiring four years from the date of appointment.

Our third candidate is Gregorio Mayers. He is also an attorney. He served as senior adviser to Mayor Michael Bloomberg and is now an associate professor at Medgar Evers College. He's a graduate of Medgar Evers College, CUNY Law, and Columbia University's Graduate non-for-profit program.

Does that sound like you three? I'm just kidding.

Welcome to... First of all, congratulations on your... on your nominations. If you would just raise your hands... your right hand so we can swear you in.

2.2

2.3

- COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 1 2 COUNSEL COMPAGNA: Please state your names and in 3 order. 4 MS. SHAPIRO: Lily Shapiro. MR. FULLER: David Fuller. MR. MAYERS: Gregorio Mayers. 6 7 COUNSEL COMPAGNA: Do you affirm to tell the 8 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Committee and in answer to 10 all Councilmember questions. 11 ALL: I do.
- 12 COUNSEL COMPAGNA: Thank you.
 - CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. You're now recognized to make an opening statement. We're going to... The way we're going to work is we're going to let you all make an opening statement, and then we'll go to questions from The Committee.
 - We're going to begin with Miss Shapiro, followed by Mr. Fuller, then followed by Mr. Mayers. Rules Committee members can find copies of the candidates opening statements in your booklets.
- 22 So with that, Ms. Shapiro, you can begin.
- We have been joined by Councilmember Brewer as well. I recognized you earlier.
- 25 Go ahead.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 MS. SHAPIRO: Oh, I believe that... Okay.

2.2

2.3

Pardon me. Good morning, Chair Powers and members of the Committee. I want to thank you for holding this hearing and for considering my nomination to serve on the Local Conditional Release Commission. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to the administration for this nomination.

I believe that city service is an honor. I represent the third generation of my family to have been raised in New York City and I am now raising the fourth generation, after my great grandparents came here with nothing, at least one as an unaccompanied minor, fleeing antisemitism and poverty in Eastern Europe. I am also the third generation of my family to have served as a city employee.

I believe that The Commission can provide a much needed means of ensuring that people leaving our city jails have access to critical transitional support as provided by the New York City Department of Probation. I have worked in the criminal and juvenile justice fields for over 20 years in multiple capacities, including providing direct service, as well as engaging in policy development and program design. My experiences serving with the Department

of Probation, representing my fellow New Yorkers as a public defender, and now engaging in policy work at The Fortune Society, a provider of alternative to incarceration and reentry services, has shown me firsthand what has been proven by research:

Connecting people to strength based supervision and community based resources, based on their risks and needs, enhances individual well-being and collective public safety.

2.2

2.3

When people sentenced to serve time in our city jails are ultimately released, they all too often lack connection to the kinds of services and programs that might help them move forward instead of backwards trapped in a revolving cycle. For people who are statutorily eligible for release based on their conviction and sentence, and who meet the criteria for release, this could be an opportunity to break that cycle. That would not only benefit them and their families, but all of us. For these reasons, I would be honored to serve our great city and my fellow New Yorkers in this new capacity on The Commission. I thank you again for your time and welcome your questions.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. FULLER: Good morning Chair Powers and members of the city council. My name is David Fuller, and I'm an associate professor at SUNY Empire State College. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today regarding my candidacy as a commissioner with the Local Conditional Release Commission. I hope to expound on my work history in the correctional field and my education in psychology and penology, to demonstrate how my experience is in line with Dr. Ernest Boyer's concept of the scholarship of application. Namely, it moves towards engagement by asking, "How can knowledge be responsible be applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions? And further, can social problems themselves be defined as agenda of for scholarly investigation?" I trust that my testimony today will demonstrate that they can, and they must.

Prior to my current work as professor and mentor,

I was employed by the New York City Department of

Correction for 29 years, retiring at the rank of

captain. I worked at the now-closed Bronx House of

Detention For Men, and in the Rikers Island complex.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

Over the years, especially on Rikers, I saw acts of violence within the incarcerated and uniformed population that reflected an absence of humanity and empathy. I'm sure I don't need to give graphic examples of this reality. Much of it has been covered in media exposes, or lawsuits against the city. During that same period, however, I saw acts of kindness, compassion, and caring, yet again from both the uniformed correctional staff and from those persons who were incarcerated, where individuals on both sides of the correctional community tried to help one another in ways that can only be described as inspirational. These spontaneous acts of kindness received far less attention than those acts of violence.

With these issues in mind, the work of the Local Conditional Release Commission is paramount. Non-violent individuals who are attempting to make major positive changes in their lives need the support of The Commission to further their aspirations to become functional and active members of New York City citizenry. Not only do nonviolent individuals deserve the second chance, but it's also a crucial component of social justice, given the number of

committee on Rules, Privileges, and Elections 14
those caught up in an unequal policing and sentencing
pattern, which has given rise to a crisis of mass
incarceration over the recent years. Keeping people
locked up does not serve their rehabilitation, nor
does it serve society.

2.2

2.3

With the frequently problematic conditions behind bars, having someone serve an entire sentence, and then releasing them, untreated, and unsupported into society may worsen public safety. Instead, with societal safety and security at the forefront, we want to assess and release individuals who pose no danger. With the help of a case management probation officer, overseeing that they receive the needed social services to ensure their success as returning citizens, we will serve social justice well.

While working as a correctional officer, I began to pursue higher education in the field of criminal justice, earning two master's degrees and a PhD. My academic work includes research and advanced degrees in the fields of criminology, penology, correction, administration, substance abuse, and forensic clinical psychological assessment and treatment. These studies enhanced my use of hands-on correctional experience. Together, my background

provides insight into how to accurately and

1

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

3 effectively diagnose and evaluate an individual's

4 mental health and what supports they would need to

5 require successful reintegration into society.

I've long tried to bridge what Dr. Boyer calls the gap between values in the academy and the needs of the larger world. As part of The Commission, I would make certain that we carefully review an incarcerated individual's history, both institutional and criminal, following a structured, evidence-based assessment protocol provided by the Department of Probation. These assessment tools include such data as the severity of the offense, disciplinary infractions, ties to the community, having supportive family or supportive housing upon release, a willingness to seek employment, and a willingness to seek treatment if necessary. Personal interviews with potential release candidates gives the individual the opportunity to explain what has changed within them and outside of them that will enable the person to live safely and productively once free in the community. This will also... This will also enable the evaluators to see if they have gained insight. We will do everything in our power

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 16 to release individuals who appear to be safe for society with a strong support system in place. It is crucial to consider how the impact of releasing someone might depreciate the seriousness of the crime that was committed and possibly even undermine respect for the law. To determine this, the assessment must look at the impact on the victim, considering both the victims impact statement and the severity of the offense by examining what the individual was charged with, and convicted of. Convictions for serious charges are terrifying to anyone. Releasing individuals who are convicted of such crimes would be detrimental to society by devaluing the laws that have been violated. However, releasing persons convicted of lesser nonviolent offenses does not have the same effect on depreciating the seriousness of the crime, undermining respect for the law, or causing future harm to the victim. Therefore, it is crucial for The Commission to have information about the severity of the offense and any institutional infractions on making potential release determinations. The welfare of society is paramount.

24

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

One predictor of future violence is a history of serious predatory violence. This prediction becomes even more accurate if the person is an act of untreated substance abuser and has no clear connection to supportive people in the community. Release of such a person can raise concerns over issues of societal safety and security. For example, an individual who is a gang member by his own admission, a substance abuser who is not in treatment and refuses to go to treatment, who will assault someone while intoxicated, will most likely do poorly if released. On the other hand, a person who jumps the turnstile in the train station, admits to drug use in the past but is currently in treatment, who is also supported by his family and able to live at home has a better chance of being successful in a treatment program set up and monitored by a probation officer.

All this information must be gathered systematically, weighed, and reviewed using the evaluators' informed and experienced judgment. Those who do not meet the criteria set out for release by The Commission simply will not be granted conditional release. The Commission provides a unique

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 1 18 opportunity to put into practice Dr. Boyer's 2 3 discussion of the importance of service that 4 addresses the needs of the larger world. And in Boyer's own words, "not just sitting on Committees Advising Student clubs, or performing departmental 6 chores." Service activities must be tied directly to 8 one special field of knowledge and relate to and flow directly out of this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring the 10 11 rigor and accountability traditionally associated 12 with research activities. As both a criminal justice 13 academic and a criminal justice practitioner, I come 14 to The Commission with a somewhat unique skill set. 15 It is my goal to utilize that skill set in 16 collaboration with my fellow commission members to 17 identify nonviolent individuals who can safely be 18 released to the community.

Part of this release recommendation will include a review of post release housing conditions, social service support, education, vocational training, and employment, overseen by a probation officer acting as a compassionate and caring case manager rather than just the law enforcement officer.

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

It is also my goal, to recommend that individuals who are identified as still having the propensity towards acting out in a violent manner, not be released to the community and instead receive needed services while incarcerated to address their ongoing issues. This places public safety first and foremost, both while these more violent individuals are serving their sentence, and for once they are released at some time in the future.

I view service on The Commission as an opportunity to identify individuals who deserve a second chance, provide them with the support to ensure that they succeed, while simultaneously enhancing public safety. Thank you for listening.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony. Go ahead.

MR. MAYERS: Thank you. Greeting Chair Powers and Councilmembers Brooks-Powers and Brennan. My name is Gregorio Mayers, and I've been nominated to serve on the Local Conditional Release Commission.

I thank you for the opportunity to come before you to testify and to share my background and why I believe that I would bring value to this commission.

I'm a tenured professor of law and government at

Medgar Evers College at the City University of New York, where I teach courses in criminal law and other matters. I have been a resident of the great borough of Brooklyn for a little over 40 years. I've lived in Bedford Stuyvesant neighborhood with my wife and two children for over 20 years. Throughout the years, I've maintained an active presence in the community development, having served on Community Board Nine, on the board of Lamad Charter School, as well as the deacon board at my church Cornerstone Baptist Church.

In addition, I speak to many organizations in preparing young people for college. At the college, I also coordinate a number of programs, law pathway programs, and serve as ombudsman. I believe that my personal and professional experience will allow me to bring value to this commission. I am an Afro-Latino male immigrant from Central America, who has lived and experienced both the social challenges and the discrimination in certain environments that all new immigrants face. And I had to lend my voice in speaking for equality during my years as an undergraduate students, as well as in law school.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

As a result of such activism, I was invited to be one of the keynote speakers by Nelson Mandela's team when he visited New York City after being wrongfully incarcerated for defending the rights of his people.

I was one of the co-founders of the Black And Latino Male Initiative at Medgar Evers College, where the goal was to address the racial inequalities in the system that prevented this population from achieving their desired goals. Many of the students were also formerly incarcerated and came back to school to change their lives. Today, I'm proud that CUNY Central Office has recognized this program as a model program, and now is in more than 15 of the CUNY colleges.

Given the current societal challenges, many of which have been exacerbated by the pandemic, I see the need now more than ever to evaluate applicants who perhaps can be released back to the community with the services and assistance needed. It will be the job of The Commission members to ensure that we are balanced in public safety and fairness, while assuring members of the respective communities that if released, the services and resources will be made available. I'm interested in serving The Commission

committee on Rules, Privileges, And Elections 22
because I believe that my collective experiences in
academia, law, community development, and prior
experience in government give me the necessar tools
in the decision-making to ensure fairness, that the
residents of the community feel safe with our
decisions, and that we can balance both the safety of

the public and given an opportunity to those people

in custody, who can be safely returned back to their

communities and successfully complete their sentence.

2.2

2.3

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. And I look forward to answering any questions from the members.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Thank you all for your testimony and your thoughtful comments.

I had a few questions and I'll hand it over to my colleagues before I come back to round two. The last point that you had made Mr. Mayers, that I felt was an important part of the conversation here, and obviously one that the public is going to ask is:

Finding that balance between public safety and fairness here, and also, of course, as you mentioned, making sure -- I'm just looking at your testimony -- services and resources made available to those individuals as they're leaving or being released.

2.2

2.3

I think, Mr. Fuller, you laid this out... so, in your testimony, I think, in a detailed way. So I'll... maybe I'll ask for the other two: How do you ensure both... both goals -- maintaining balance, public safety, and fairness -- when you're working on... as... if you're an appointee of The Commission? And... and I guess it would be... it'd be helpful, I think, for us to know what are those factors that you might be looking at, in addition to obviously what's statutorily required or mandated? What are the, sort of, things that one would be looking at, and how do you in this role balance those two things at the same time, fairness and public safety?

MS. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Chair Powers, for the question. I think, first of all, we need to be looking at what... what would... what's appropriate for the individual before us... before The Commission, and also balancing that against public safety. And I think that requires a very individualized approach, looking at the person's records while they have been incarcerated. And I think it's also very important, as well as their application materials, their community ties as laid out in the statute. And I think it's important to

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS emphasize here, again, as the Committee knows that people who are released by The Commission would then be under a period of probation supervision for one year, which is very important... sort of bulwark, if you will, in thinking about the public safety question, because probation officers are trained extensively in the use of validated risk needs assessments to determine, with their expertise using those assessments, with the range of resources they have at their disposal, and that they know about in the community, they have the ability to match people with the kinds of supports and services, in addition to the supervision by the officer themselves, but to the kinds of programs and services that would be individually tailored to meet that person's needs. So that piece of it is... is very well-resourced and taken care of. Did you want to add anything? MR. MAYERS: Yeah, sure. Thank you. And I'll agree with that. But I would also add that part of our role is to make sure that the... the likelihood of the applicant reoffending, right? That's the balancing test that we will have to answer to the

community. But I think that each applicant -- I'm

sure you'll agree with me -- comes with their whole

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 25 history, and they have a story behind. And I think, as Lily said, to... looking at each case, looking at each of the factors in that, and whether or not the proper supervision, whether it is drug treatment, whether there's any kind of rehab... rehabilitation, that they have those services in those needs there. And I think that's where the balancing would be, but we will able to further examine, I think the record, if need be, to ascertain exactly in our decision making, you know, what is what is ... what is the best decision and outcome. But again, I just think that each applicant with that impartiality, because we're balancing that test. And I think we will be able to do that factually case by case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MR. FULLER: They both answered the question perfectly. I would only add the following: One of the things that we're going to look at are the conditions of release. And I'm basing this on a brand new book that just came out called The Limits of Recidivism, and it was published by the National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine, which I'm super-impressed by. And one of the things that they look at: They look at the key domains for a successful reintegration into society. So they're

looking at things like housing, employment, family 2

3 and social relationships, mainly support, physical

4 health, mental health, substance abuse, participation

in a help... self-help, peer self-help groups, and

education. 6

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Again, this is going to be individualized, so we're going to be looking at what the person is coming in with, we're going to make sure that the conditions of release match the issues that that person has, so that we know they're getting all the services that they need.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. Thank you for those In a... I've seen one... another part of answers. this is to maintain public trust, and the LCRC have to make sure that we also address the mistakes that have been made in the past of this Commission when... in former... in former iterations, which includes, you know, concerns around public corruption, and particularly involving people that were in elected office. Can you talk to us about applications for release of people convicted for public corruption, and whether those should be given extra or greater scrutiny? And if so, what factors would you consider in that instance?

2.0

2.3

MS. SHAPIRO: So I will say this is a new day.

[laughs] This will be a new commission. And each application will be considered on its individual merits. The statutes lay... lay out the types of convictions that would render someone ineligible for release. Crimes of public corruption are not on that list. That would be a state legislative change that would have to occur. So they will receive the same individualized review as... as anyone else would. I think that's the only way to maintain fairness.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Do you guys want to add anything?

MR. FULLER: Yeah. Just piggybacking on that, it's the statutory law that we're going to be focusing on. And that's going to guide us. So yeah, I really don't see anything else that would guide us.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Just one followup question, and then I'm going to hand it over to my colleagues. Obviously, one of the things you have to do is review, and I think there's... in the requirements of this is to review, obviously, community support, and ability... but what happens if it's, if that support comes from prominent elected officials, or people

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 28 that hold public office? How would you... How would

you weigh those out versus other factors?

2.2

2.3

MR. MAYERS: If I may, I... I think certainly, as every applicant has the right to come before The Commission, and we will definitely, you know, evaluate that each... each and every one. But the point that you that you raise, I think, is important, because we want to be able to ensure the public trust in matters like that. And we, you know, I personally will commit, that I would not, you know, compromise the integrity of the process of this commission, by anyone who maybe has an authority or was a former elected official. And I think that's my commitment that I can give you: That they will be given the same impartiality and looked at, you know, as every applicant coming before this commission.

MS. SHAPIRO: And I would just add to that, that, in looking at evidence of community support and community ties, I would say what we're... what I imagine we would be looking for, and obviously, we will have to work this out collaboratively, is looking for those people who can attest to the kind of support they would be giving to the person once they are released, how they would be actively engaged

2 | in providing that support, so that... a letter from

3 an elected official or another prominent person would

4 not carry particular weight, unless they were in a

5 position personally, outside of their position, to be

6 offering that kind of continual support.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Got it. Thank you for that answer. I'm going to go to colleagues. I think

Councilmember Sanchez is signed up for a question,

and then we... Okay. Did you? Yeah, we'll go to

Councilmember Brooks-Powers.

COUNCILMEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you. This first question is for all of the nominees. And first I'd like to say thank you for your willingness to serve in this volunteer capacity on such an important Commission.

So under state law, The Commission cannot grant "conditional release", unless there is a reasonable probability that an applicant won't violate the law again. As commissioner, what criteria would you consider when making this determination of reasonable probability?

MS. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Councilmember, for that important question. I would analyze that criteria.

Again, I have to come back to each individual's

application, the story, the history they bring before The Commission. I would look to whether the person appears willing to engage in any services that appear to be necessary -- that willingness, I believe is critical --, whether they have the requisite community ties and whether they otherwise satisfy any other specific criteria that we must consider under the law, or any other criteria that The Commission members in consultation with the Department of Probation believe to be necessary in determining whether someone should be released. This would include a review of any disciplinary program participation and pro-social activity history. And if those criteria are satisfied... if those questions are satisfied, then I would find that the particular criteria you mentioned would also be satisfied. In particular, again, I must emphasize because those released individuals will be placed on a period... a one-year period of supervision, which I believe is, again, incredibly important to keep in mind here: That when people complete their sentences in our city jails, they are released, right?

inevitably will come home. They will come home to

their communities. The Commission and the... the

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS

30

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

committee on Rules, Privileges, and Elections 31 statutory framework of The Commission allows those into vigils who've been deemed eligible for early release to have this connection to structure and

5 support, which again, I think can make all of us

6 safer.

1

2

3

4

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MR. FULLER: The only thing that I have to add to that is the importance of the probation officer. Again, this is a person who's trained to do this kind of work and to, again, utilize the tools that they have to diagnose, really, a person to find out exactly what... what specific things that the individual needs, and then provide them with that. think that's extremely important, and I... I look at folks that are released, but don't have that particular interaction with someone that's going to be supportive. And when you look at the research, the research tells us that they tend not to do as well as someone who is really engaged with a probation officer who is utilizing a set of tools to diagnose someone, and then provide support for that person.

COUNCILMEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Just a followup for you Mr. Gregorio... Mr. Mayers, sorry, excuse me. I want to just ask in addition to that: When you say

no outside support, as some... as a factor that you take into consideration, my only, I guess, concern with that would be that someone may not have that support, but I think as a part of the role of The Commission is to ensure that there are resources and supportive services connected with those individuals. So would it be that you would ensure that they are connected to those services? Or will not having, like family or social support independent of those resources, be an eliminator, in terms of qualifying

MR. FULLER: That's an interesting question.

Because I've done work in the community with people that don't have family, and they depend on me to give them guidance and at least direct them to services that they need. I think that's what the probation officer would be doing. And I'm sure they have many cases where an individual under their supervision does not have the support that we would love for them to have. And I think it's that probation officer that will provide that support for them.

MR. MAYERS: Sure, thank you. I'll take that a bit further using personal experience.

2.2

2.3

for the early release?

2.2

2.3

So in addition to the support from the Department of Probation, once they're released, I only can bring my personal experience to this, and that is seeing the CBOs, the churches, and other not-for-profit groups that I have witnessed, and I've seen folks in, in my community in my district, who have gotten the external, I guess, support services.

So in... The question is: Which communities are they been released to? We know, frankly, that the services provided vary from community to community.

So it would be important in addition to the Department of Probation: What are the ties? What are the connective factors in those districts? A mentorship program, 500 Men Who Serve, whether or not we can refer them to such organizations that provide this type of counseling for them.

So I will add... so in addition to that, whether they don't have or another, what is the surrounding community support services? And many of those communities that we come from, it may not be listed, but we may have that... we have that support. It may come from the clergy group. It may come from a men's organization or women's group organization. So I would look in addition to that, because we know we're

2.2

2.3

the community. So yes.

COUNCILMEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you for that.

And then... Chair Powers asked one of the questions I had, but I noticed that each of you had mentioned that you would look at each applicant on an individual basis, which is great. But I also want to hear from you how do you prevent unintended bias in those decisions? Because when folks are sentenced, we have seen historically that people of color have been sentenced and punished at a much more harsh penalty. And so I'm interested in understanding — while looking at it individually, which I think is important — how do you... what is that, like, firewall to ensure that you are not having unintended bias in that decision?

MR. MAYERS: Sure. If I may take that first. So I've had personal experience. I recall someone who's a student who did not make his appointment. And, you know, certainly we were offended that he missed his appointment. But when we look at the society and how we deal with those formerly incarcerated folks, in listening to his story, because he was a student, he did not have a Access MetroCard. He could not reach

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 35 the DOP at the time. Social services were cut. it wasn't intentional, right? So we're talking about, as you said, some of the ills in the system and in the structure that affect that. So I would think this is where the case-by-case would come in. Because knowing this student was an excellent student. So we were surprised when we got the word that did he not show up, was not following up. the problem was really economic. And he said to me, "I didn't want to jump the turnstile. You know, the folks that were waiting to bring me the money. just wasn't there. They didn't get there yet. Social Services, funds, food stamps, things were cut off. The bureaucracy failed me, professor." So in matters like that, I guess, is to go back when we talk about facts, right? Let's... Let's examine the record, if we have that ability to see if someone reoffended. So I just wanted to just share that as a as an example, since you talk about bias and discrimination. How do we look at it knowing that there is that line there that we really need to be giving in to be candid about in our decision-making?

COUNCILMEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2 MS. SHAPIRO: Sorry. We're arguing about who 3 gets to go next. Off to a terrible start here.

[laughs]

2.2

2.3

That's an incredibly important question,

Councilmember. And thank you for raising it.

Because as we all know, these... our criminal justice system disproportionately impacts black and brown people nationally and certainly in this city. That is who is disproportionately convicted and sentenced and, and held pretrial at Rikers.

I would say that, in addition to being mindful as best we can of whatever biases we may personally bring to the table, I think data collection and reporting will be incredibly important here. I know that The Commission will have to be reporting annually to The Council. And I think reporting on demographics of who applies, and who is granted conditional release, and who is not, I think would be very important to keeping a check on ensuring that the work of The Commission is not exacerbating the existing racial disparities in the system.

MR. FULLER: Thank you. I want to relate a story about a guy by the name of Christopher Robinson.

Some of you might remember him. It's a sad story,

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 37 because folks just didn't listen to him. Had they listened to him, he would still be alive today. He is dead. He died at ARDC, the Adolescent Reception Detention Center. Chris was out. He was on probation. He was working. And he was quite happy at his job. He had an appointment to come in and see his PO. He called the PO, and he said, "You know, they've offered me overtime. I need the additional money so I can take care of my family, and take care of whatever business I need to take care of." He assumed that the probation officer understood what he was saying. He even offered the probation officer, "You come down. You can see me. I'm at work. I'm here. You can talk to my supervisor," et cetera, et cetera.

Well, he was violated, and he ended up at Rikers. He had already changed his life. So coming back to Rikers was a major problem for him. The gangs wanted him to get involved in all the other little madness that they do at Rikers. They wanted his... his... they have a PIN number for the phone. They wanted to take his PIN number, because they saw that he was trying to do the right thing. And they knew that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2 they could probably get away with taking it because

3 he wasn't going to fight them.

2.2

2.3

Well, he decided to stand up for himself. In doing so he ended up getting jumped and murdered on Rikers Island. And I... it's obviously a sad case, but it didn't have to happen. Both my colleagues talked about the individual basis by which we're going to look at things. That is key. You have to understand from the perspective of the client, what's going on. That is key. That's how you... you rule out all of the bias than all the other problems that are associated with this, just by listening to the person and making an evaluation

COUNCILMEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: So I'll just close by saying thank you for your responses. This commission is something that is extremely important. It has the ability to -- while it can't correct all of the wrongs of the criminal justice system -- it has a way as... as I said. Few doubt that when we have this commission in place, those who have been sentenced with greater penalty have the opportunity to have an early release to be returned to their families, to be returned to society. I do also, you know, know that there's this grand conversation about

2 | public safety right now. And so it has to be

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

3 something that is... is measured to make sure that we

4 are returning to community folks that are going to

5 get the services they need, that are not going to be

6 likely to return for some other incident or another.

But it's important. I encourage you to work with each other and listen to one another, to be able to ensure that the unintended bias does not happen.

Because I know me and my colleagues will be looking at these reports, and seeing how they are impacting

So I thank you Chair for allowing me the opportunity to ask questions on this important issue.

community, how they impact individuals.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Thanks for the questions. I just wanted to quickly... with questions from one of our colleagues who will... couldn't be here to ask them. But from Councilmember Sanchez, I'm going to ask them and then speak to some specific questions about... for each of you. And she asked me to extend her congratulations to all of you as well and commend you for your service to the city.

I just want to... I'm going to do... there's three of them. I'll ask them and then let you have an opportunity to respond to them.

2.2

2.3

Number one is for Ms. Shapiro: Can you describe how the different segments of your career as a public defender, at the Department of Probation, now The Fortune Society would inform your tenure at the LCRC?

And number two is for Mr. Fuller: Can you speak to your professional experiences on the importance of linking alternative care with release? And how should the LCRC address decarceration with attention to mental health, substance abuse, education, housing and social services?

And number... and then Mr. Mayers: You have previously served as director -- this is from Katherine Rivera -- you had previously served as Deputy Director for The Mayor's Special Initiative for Rebuilding and Resiliency, where you coordinated with city, state, and federal elected officials to address the impacts of Hurricane Sandy. How do you anticipate as a commissioner, you should, or may, or may not partner with legislators at different levels of government? And what best practices in that regard would you bring to the role?

And I'm happy, Ms. Shapiro, if you want to start, I am happy to restate the questions as I get come to you.

2.2

2.3

MS. SHAPIRO: I think I got the question, but if you wouldn't mind?

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Sure, yeah. Can you describe how the different segments of your career inform your tenure at LC... for the... would inform your tenure on the LCRC?

MS. SHAPIRO: Thank you. Please pass my thanks to Councilmember Sanchez for the question.

My collective experiences all carry a common thread, I would say which is I am animated by the belief, as the great Bryan Stevenson says that none of us should be judged by the worst thing that we've ever done. I would also say that throughout all the positions I have been fortunate to hold, I have seen and fully believe in the power of individual transformation. I have seen that in numerous individuals that I have represented, in people who are under probation supervision, and now in our clients and some of my colleagues at The Fortune Society as well.

I also believe that there is no one-size-fits-all solution, or program, or resource, right?, and that things need to be individually tailored, individually and culturally appropriate for people to be able to

42

2 | succeed. And I think the Conditional Release

3 Commission, with its connection to the expertise and

4 work of the Department of Probation, I think can be a

5 | vehicle towards ensuring that people who have already

6 started, internally, to think about how to do

7 differently -- how to avoid situations, how to make

8 different choices -- I think this could really have a

9 powerful impact on the lives of individuals and their

10 | families, and our greater community.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you for that. I'm going to go to the other two. I'll just restate the questions. It is actually from Councilmember Rivera, who Chairs the Committee on Criminal Justice, but couldn't be here.

And for Mr. Fuller: Can you speak Due to your professional experiences on the importance of linking alternative care with release? How should the LCRC address decarceration with attention to mental health, substance abuse, education, housing, and other social services?

MR. MAYERS: Did you catch the question?

MR. FULLER: Sorry, because I'm having a little

24 | bit of trouble hearing it.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I can restate it. The question is: Can you speak to your professional experiences on the importance of linking alternative care with release? And how should the LCRC address decarceration with attention to mental health, substance abuse treatment, education, housing, and other social services?

MR. FULLER: Okay. I'm not sure I have the question. Are you asking... what... what I would look for in a client that's trying to be released, that has a mental health or substance abuse problem?

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I think the question is:

How can the LCRC be used -- this is from

Councilmember Rivera -- how can LCRC be used to

address decarceration while... while also attending

to needs around mental health, substance abuse,

education, housing, and social services?

MR. FULLER: I'm having a lot of trouble hearing... would you... hold one sec. I'm sorry.

[Ms. Shapiro speaks to him.]

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Why don't I ask my questionof Mr. Mayers, and then...

MR. FULLER: [talking to Ms. Shapiro] Oh, sure. Okay.

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 45 different levels of government. Do you anticipate in this role that you would or should partner with legislators at different levels of government, and what best practices do you think you bring to that role?

2.2

2.3

MR. MAYERS: Yeah. And thank the Councilman for that question. Although I don't think jurisdiction-wise that this commission... while... is... the statutory language is written from the state legislature, gives us any authority to go beyond this... the federal government or so forth, if that's your question. So the Special Initiative: Yes, I did, but that was rebuilding, after Hurricane Sandy. I even wrote chapters in the... in the report on the conditions, and that relationship was mostly, yes, with the State Governor's office, and with Washington DC.

If the question is more about my experience, I do have the experience in working with... the relationship with both city, state, and federal, because the goal was to make sure to ensure that, both from a budget perspective and any possible legislation with FEMA, and with the Governor's Office of Storm Recovery, that the city got... got its

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS 1 46 first... its fair share, and the communities that I 2 3 was representing, under the city got theirs. 4 don't see the direct relationship with the local conditional releases. If she's asking me my 5 expertise, of my experience, in that it would be 6 7 understanding the different communities that was hit by Sandy and the impact that each of them had and how 8 we had to address each of those issues. So that root of understanding the needs of the communities kind of 10 11 will be my best. So I really don't think we have 12 that authority to let's say, go to Albany and speak on behalf of matters like that. I don't think that's 13 14 within our purview. And I'm sure you know, best with 15 the legislation, whether or not we do or not. 16

So, my apologies to her if I didn't answer it correctly.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: You answered the question.

MR. MAYERS: But I'd be happy to follow up if she has further questions on it.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks.

MR. FULLER: Okay, sorry about that. But you're coming in muffled to me. I have really bad ears.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: No worries. No worries.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MR. FULLER: Those gates slamming at Rikers has pretty much destroyed my hearing. But she wrote the question out for me.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. It's... it's an interesting and important question, and one that I think I have a little bit of knowledge on.

When I was at Rikers, I worked in forensic services. And one of the programs we had was intensive case management, which I believe a probation officer would be able to do quite well. Ιt involved having social workers, substance abuse counselors, and other mental health practitioners having a caseload of 10 and they monitored the clients very carefully. And in fact, they assisted them going to different appointments, medical appointments, psychiatric appointments, they monitored their medication, they monitored their activities, and they kept them involved -- this was the important part--, they kept them involved in other supportive services other than the substance abuse and mental health. They involved them with peers that would work with them, so that their day was completely filled. They had things to do. had no downtime. And the case managers would report

48

2 back to corrections with their success. None of

3 those people got into additional trouble. No one got

4 rearrested. There was no recidivism in that

5 particular program. The problem with the program was

6 | it was expensive. So the problem, you know, caused

7 | the program to completely disappear. But it was one

8 of our most successful programs.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Just a few more questions. Just some specifics. So I just want to ask a follow up question to what you had just mentioned, and your experience working at Rikers Island. As you're... As you're evaluating someone, when they come before The Commission, having experience with working with folks that are incarcerated: What do you see as the leading factor or condition that might make you decide that a person should be eligible for release?

[Ms. Shapiro talks to Mr. Fuller]

MR. FULLER: The leading factor that would make someone eligible, one of the things I would look for is whether the person is motivated to really change. That would be a leading factor for me. People make mistakes. That's the bottom line. When I was working at Rikers, oftentimes I would work with an

inmate, and at some point I would ask him: "Why are you here? What happened?" The answers ran the gamut. Some people didn't understand why they were there. Others would talk about mistakes that they had made, and you know, they... they look at us, they look at the correctional officers. And if they have a good rapport with them, you will oftentimes hear them say, you know, if I hadn't made this mistake, I

So I do really believe that some people are ready to change. And when they are ready to change, there needs to be a support system in place for that person. If there was no support system there, they're going to continue to do what they're doing. If there's a support system there, people change. And I've seen it, I've been involved in it.

would be where you are right now. I'd be working.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Thanks for that.

For Ms. Shapiro, your responses to our vetting questions, you had asserted that you would not revoke conditional lease for purely technical violations of the conditions of release? Can you describe to us what's a purely technical violation of a condition for someone on conditional release? And should that

2.2

2.3

go... Do you believe that should go without any
punishment?

2.2

2.3

MS. SHAPIRO: So to... A technical violation is one that is about breaking a rule, and that does not necessarily implicate public safety in any way. For example, missing an appointment. And while that's something that would certainly warrant, I believe, you know, complete exploration by the probation officer, if that... it's rare for something like that, to rise to the level of the person being a threat to public safety, which is I really feel like, what... those are the sorts of violations that would warrant some sort of serious action.

But otherwise, you know, sometimes it turns out there are reasons as Mr. Mayer's was just, you know, describing from his personal experience, an inability to get somewhere, you know, making a poor choice and forgetting, which doesn't mean you're a danger to society. Sometimes certain programs that people are matched to end up being really terrible fit. So they don't go, but that they would be willing to engage in other services.

So that those are the sorts of things that to me, are technical violations.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And a follow up question:

Should... should there be a consequence for something of that nature? And second is, when would you say that it rises to the point where perhaps there needs to be a discussion of... because one-time offenses, versus patterns maybe would have a difference of opinion for an individual was making these decisions? Or maybe not? But it's just question of when that would rise to a point where you might say, "We want to revoke," or you believe it's worth revoking the conditional release?

MS. SHAPIRO: Sure. It's a little tricky to answer in the abstract without an individual and all of their circumstances in front of us, but I would say that the response to say, technical violations, or even certain forms of repeated technical violations should be determined again, based on that individual person's circumstances. Is this about lack of funds and lack of transportation? Is this about not having an alarm clock? Is this about continuing... Is this about a relapse, and they need more structured treatment services or something of that nature?

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

So the responses could really range from increased reporting to probation, to a different type of service, something of that nature. And again, it would depend on individual circumstances. Certainly getting re-arrested for something where there has been harm to another individual, that would be a very serious matter. But everything else really would depend on the individual circumstances.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. Thanks. And for Mr. Mayers, in your written responses to the Committee, you wrote that policy decisions on criminal justice reform should be made at the national level. How do you reconcile that position with the fact that most of the criminal law is state law and that the New York City LCRC was a creature of the state law established by local law? And that the decision about whether you're going to grant conditional release or not involves substantial policy discretion at a very local level?

MR. MAYERS: Thank you for that question. My response was more from... On the national level... I get it: States' rights and the local government role. But I think... I preface my remarks was more from a leadership of a national perspective. It came

2 back from the question whether, you know, we

1

20

25

3 | incarcerate more individuals than any other civilized

4 | society, right? Industrialized society. So it

5 was... The question to me was, if the... if the

6 national government on you know, federal, you know,

government could probably set policies different, as

8 | we've seen legislation, you know, in Washington

9 during the Black Life Movement, and so forth, to

10 | really work with the state government in changing

11 some of the of the policies when it comes to criminal

12 | justice and criminal law, and the legislation to that

13 | effect. So my point was more from that perspective,

14 | not to say that the local policy is not paramount.

15 And I know because, you know, state... state-by-state

16 law. But I think that we as a whole could be a

17 | leader if there was leadership on criminal justice

18 | reform from the national level. That's was where my

19 question was more reformed to, yes.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. Thank you.

21 I don't believe there are any other questions

22 | from Councilmembers. So I want to congratulate you

23 on your nomination. Thank you for being here today.

24 | And thank you for your testimony. Obviously, if we

have any follow up questions, we'll be in touch with

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PRIVILEGES, AND ELECTIONS you... all three of you. And thank you guys for being here today. Thanks so much. Thank you. Thank you. ALL: CHAIRPERSON POWERS: We will call to see if there any members of the public who are here to testify on today's nominees. Seeing none, the public hearing on these nominees is now closed. I'd like to think again, the nominees and members of the public, speaker, my colleagues on the Committee, Committee Counsel, and staff and Sergeant at Arms. This meeting is hereby adjourned. [GAVEL]

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date 11/21/2022