CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING

----X

February 17, 2011 Start: 10:17 am Recess: 1:55 pm

HELD AT: Committee Room

250 Broadway, 16th Fl.

B E F O R E:

ROSIE MENDEZ

PETER F. VALLONE, JR.

Chairpersons

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Melissa Mark-Viverito
James G. Van Bramer
Maria del Carmen Arroyo
Daniel J. Halloran
Helen D. Foster
Margaret Chin
Eric Ulrich
Daniel R. Garodnick
David Greenfield

David Greenfield Vincent J. Gentile Jumaane D. Williams

Diana Reyna

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

John Rhea Chairman NYCHA

Gloria Finkelman Deputy General Manager for Operations NYCHA

Edward Delatorre Assistant Chief, Executive Officer NYPD's Housing Bureau

Brian Clarke Assistant Deputy Manager of Operations NYCHA

Janet Abrahams Chief Operating Officer Newark Housing Authority

Shawn Buchanan Senior Analyst for the Operations Department Newark Housing Authority

Reginald Bowman President Citywide Council of Presidents

Desmond Smith
President and Founder
Secure Watch

Larry Dolan Founder American Security Systems

Nydia Vasquez Aixa Torres Tenant's Association

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

Marquise Jenkins Organizer Good Old Lower East Side

Luther Stubblefield

Specifically, I want to hear what security systems are located in which NYCHA developments, what has been the cost, and who paid for it.

NYCHA has informed the New York

23

24

25

may itemize it even further--but five council

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

members have over \$2 million, another five council
members have over \$1 million allocated for cameras
in developments in their district.

I am also interested in NYCHA's housing portfolio is very varied. So when I look at where I grew up--Williamsburg Houses--it is a four-story walk-up comprised of 20 residential buildings, which has 1,628 units on four superblocks that were formerly 12 New York City blocks. How does cameras or multilayered access compare in price and in safety as opposed to, let's say, Baruch Houses in my district, which is 17 buildings, 14 stories high, comprised of 2,194 units on two superblocks that were formerly six New York City blocks. Jacob Riis Houses, where I put funding and there's cameras in the development, what kind of money would be needed to upgrade or change Jacob Riis Houses, which is comprised of 19 buildings, 1,768 units on three superblocks that were formerly 14 New York City blocks, the majority of those 13-story buildings, with the minority being six story.

So we can see some of the diversity there, First Houses is eight 6-story walk-ups with

sheets, and now I will turn it over to my cochair.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you, Chair Mendez. We've been joined by Council Members Mark-Viverito, Jimmy Van Bramer, I'm sure more will be stopping in, there are many hearings

21

22

23

24

25

I sponsored Local Law 52 in 2004, which helped put cameras into most of our public schools for safety reasons and I sponsored the

24

25

takes a lot of manpower and a lot of money. Other cameras--

[Off mic]

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: If we can all

4

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

end all the conversations and find seats,

3 everyone, thank you. [Pause] We good? Okay.

Like I said, the VIPER systems are very expensive,

but other cameras can be useful also, and they

6 don't require the same amount of staffing--it says

7 manpower, but I went with staffing--they're

8 expensive too, though, these other cameras. New

9 York is not in a position to pay for all of these

and that's why we need the federal government to

11 help us out.

Despite the clear need for cameras

NYCHA has frozen funding that the council members

have allocated for these cameras. I put cameras

in a housing development in my district first

thing, but now fellow council members who also

realize the importance of these cameras cannot get

that done because it's frozen—and that's one of

the reasons that my co-chair insisted that we hold

this hearing and I agreed—because of that money

being frozen.

So we're going to look at a few things today. We're going to look at the task force that Chair Mendez discussed, we're going to look at the use of cameras, the funding for those

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cameras, why it's frozen, and resolution 423 calling on the federal government to fund some of these cameras. Those are the issues, that's it.

And for the people who are testifying from the police department and the housing development, if any of my colleagues decide they want to ask you about specific instances of things in their district, which for some reason happens at most hearings, feel free to say, I will set up a meeting with you in the near future to discuss that. This is not the place to discuss individual occurrences in different districts; this is an overall oversight hearing. And if people decide to go to different topics other than these, which has occasionally occurred at our hearings also, again, you're more than willing to discuss that at another time when you're prepared to speak about it, set up a meeting any time that's convenient for you and that council member. But this hearing is about the task force, the cameras, and the funding for those cameras.

We're going to have a number panels after this panel. The second panel will be the

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 12
 1
      COO of Newark's Housing Authority. They've got a
 2
 3
      system there that they took some of our staff
 4
      members on tour of, which the New York City is
 5
      using as an example of what they would like to
 6
      install here. So they'll be testifying second,
 7
      and then some residents and some people with
 8
      security cameras will be testifying after that.
 9
                      So we've also been joined by
10
      Council Member Baez--not Baez--Arroyo, jeez,
11
      anyone else?
12
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           I didn't
13
      mention any of the Council Members--
14
                      [Crosstalk]
15
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I mentioned,
16
      I [off mic] Maria, I mentioned Jimmy--
17
                      [Crosstalk]
18
                      COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Maria's
19
      right.
20
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: -- I got
21
      Maria.
22
                                           Did you
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
23
      mentioned Melissa?
24
                      [Crosstalk]
25
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:
                                            I got
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 13
2	Melissa, I got Melissa and I gotno one else,
3	okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Just to let
5	everyone know, there is a briefing for council
6	members, the Mayor is coming out with his budget,
7	so you may see people, council members, coming in
8	a little later, some of them leaving and coming
9	back, but I just want to explain why. So thank
10	you for your patience on that.
11	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay. I
12	think we're ready to hear from our panel. Welcome
13	to all of you. I believe we'll hear from Chairman
14	Rhea first, and do we have his testimony, has it
15	been handed out?
16	[Off mic]
17	[Pause]
18	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: You didn't
19	get it?
20	[Pause]
21	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Nick, did we
22	get copies of his testimony? I don't have one. I
23	do have the police testimony though.
24	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yeah.
25	[Pause]

are copies of this but we will begin. So thank

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,

3 sir. [Long pause] Okay. We have to make some

5 you.

JOHN RHEA: They're coming. Good morning. Chairwoman Rosie Mendez, Chairman Peter Vallone, Jr., members of their respective committees, and to all members of the City Council, thank you for this opportunity to discuss with you the New York City Housing Authority's strategy and efforts to enhance the security of our city's public housing communities. I appreciate not only the attention you are bringing to this critical issue today, but also your ongoing support for improving the quality of life for NYCHA residents.

I am NYCHA's chairman, John Rhea, and joining me this morning are Deputy General Manager for Operations Gloria Finkelman, as well as other senior members of NYCHA's team, and Assistant Chief Edward Delatorre, the Executive Officer of the NYPD's Housing Bureau and a member of the NYCHA Safety and Security Task Force.

Nothing is more important than the

1

safety of NYCHA families. Security is a

3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cornerstone of a neighborhood's health and

4 stability and providing for the safety of those

5 under its care must be the first priority of any

6 governing body, agency, or council. As NYCHA

7 develops a long-term vision for the preservation

8 of public housing, improving the quality of life

9 for our residents by providing safeguards for

10 their well-being, and implementing strategies that

11 will reduce both the likelihood and incidence of

12 crime are critically important.

But NYCHA cannot do this urgent work alone. As you know, NYCHA is not a law enforcement agency, nor are we experts on crime prevention. To that end, the Authority has engaged a number of partners throughout the city to work with us on improving the safety of NYCHA communities. Beginning with a core group of key stakeholders, including the duly-elected Citywide Council of Presidents, Commissioner Ray Kelly, and senior leadership from the New York City Police Department, and a team of NYCHA senior managers, the NYCHA Safety and Security Task Force was formed in December of 2009. Since that time, the

task force has collaborated with the Office of the

3 Mayor, the Office of the Special Narcotics

4 Prosecutor for New York City, the New York City

Department of Youth and Community Development, the

6 New York County District Attorney's Community

7 Affairs Unit, and John Jay College of Criminal

8 Justice, as well as many others.

Over the past year, the task force has worked to improve stakeholder relationships and identify vulnerabilities in our current security systems, design strategies to address those challenges, and provided a framework for how we can consistently improve safety over the long term. Today I would like to discuss some of the task force's findings and recommendations.

The task force divided its work among five subcommittees: Resident Safety and Security Survey; two, security measures; three, resident engagement; four, NYPD policies and relationship with residents; and five, NYCHA's rules and regulations. First, in collaboration with resident associations, NYCHA and the NYPD created the Resident Safety and Security Survey to gauge residents' concerns, as well as gather ideas

for how to improve community safety. Of 10,000

234567

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

surveys mailed to households throughout 12

development, NYCHA collected and analyzed 1,100

completed surveys. The sample communities

represent a mix of NYCHA's developments, very

large or small, served by police service areas--

8 which we refer to as PSAs--or local police

9 precincts, with and without closed-circuit TV, low

10 to high crime rates, and family or senior-only

11 developments. The results of this survey are

available in the Safety and Security Task Force

13 Report, which will be released later this

14 afternoon.

Furthermore, as part of NYCHA's five-year plan to preserve public housing, the authority partnered with Baruch College's Survey Research Unit to conduct the detailed 61-question telephone survey, including a specific series of questions concerning safety, security, and the perceptions of crime, of more than 1,000 public housing residents and more than 600 Section 8 participants—one of the largest, data—rich, satisfaction and perception inquiries of public housing and Section 8 residents ever conducted.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

1

The data from this survey are still being analyzed

3 and the full results will be available later this

4 year as part of NYCHA's plan to preserve public

5 housing.

> Some of what we discovered confirmed our concerns, other findings surprised us. Briefly, when we asked residents how fearful they were about crime in their development, we found that more than three-quarters of public housing residents at the selected developments were very or somewhat fearful about crime in their developments. Nearly 60% of respondents reported that serious crimes had occurred in their development during the previous year. However, only 6% of residents surveyed reported that they were a victim of crime within their development. Therefore, we recognize that our efforts must both combat actual crime, as well as address residents' perceptions of crime which erode their quality of life.

> The data collected from our residents continues to inform the task force's work. We understand that investing in new technology and creating enhanced security measures

will take us only so far without the trust and cooperation of NYCHA residents. By working together with our residents and our partners at the NYPD, in the City Council, and throughout New York City, the Authority's security strategy seeks to accomplish four goals: Improve our physical security infrastructure; deter crime; discourage and redress evidence of disorder, such as broken doors and urine in elevators, all of which can

lead to further and more serious crime; and assist
our residents in complying with all NYCHA

13 guidelines.

First, we must make it more difficult to commit crime within NYCHA developments. Our current security infrastructure is not comprehensive, resulting in stand-alone systems that cannot efficiently manage new system demands or communicate across technology platforms. Upgrades to our systems will correct these vulnerabilities, as well as improve access control to NYCHA buildings.

To that end, the task force has recommended that the authority install a layered access control system. Residents will be issued

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

electronic key tags, or fobs, instead of keys to
their building's entrances. Electronic key tags

4 are easily modified to remove key holders from the

5 system and to remove keys that have been lost or

6 stolen. The layered system will also include

7 direct call intercoms that don't rely on telephone

8 company infrastructure. Residents will be able to

9 freely change their telephone service provider,

even if they choose to use only a cellular phone,

and maintain their ability to utilize their

12 building's intercom system.

This new system will add a mechanical component to our doors as well and will allow NYCHA doors to remain secure even if the electronic component fails or is compromised. All access control components will be designed to sustained frequent use and reduce vandalism. The design will allow for rapid repair or replacement of a failed component, reducing repair lag time and discouraging further vandalism.

Finally, all components of the layered access control system will have sensors that are able to transmit an electronic notification to a central monitoring site

2 indicating that the device has been vandalized or 3 has failed.

Because of a \$250,000 grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and additional matching funds from NYCHA, Mott Haven houses in the Bronx, located in Council Member Arroyo's district, will be the first pilot location for our new system and is scheduled for installation this summer.

The Authority is also investigating hiring security personnel to serve at a number of our developments. NYCHA currently employs security personnel in our senior developments and we believe there are benefits to having security officers to perform access control, respond to emergencies, enforce NYCHA guidelines, provide service to residents, and act as liaisons with members of the NYPD. And we plan to improve development lighting to enhance natural surveillance of police officers, security personnel, and residents alike.

None of these proposals are without cost, and we will need to work with our elected officials to identify funding sources.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One area where the City Council has been particularly helpful is in providing funding for CCTV cameras. Currently, 20% of NYCHA developments have some form of CCTV, most of which were made possible by approximately 21 million in funding from City Council members' discretionary budgets. Additionally, NYCHA has received, but not yet spent, almost 30 million from the Council for further CCTV installation. Data supports NYCHA's belief that CCTV cameras are most effective as part of a comprehensive effort, such as a layered access system, capital improvements, and active system monitoring. We have already met with many council members and the Speaker to discuss our proposed plan. We appreciate the support and collaborative engagement and we hope to continue working with Council to implement the Authority's broader strategy.

As you may know, at one time, NYCHA received more than \$30 million from the federal government for drug elimination activities.

During the previous administration, these funds were eliminated and never restored. As a result, NYCHA is forced to use operating funds for these

Patrol Program as the Resident Watch Program. Beginning with the support of Mayor Bloomberg's office and an \$85,000 grant to re-brand the program and provide volunteers with official Resident Watch gear, NYCHA is developing Resident Watch in accordance with principles and preparation of exceptional neighborhood associations. We are working to reengage residents who are already committed members of their development's Resident Watch teams, as well

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The NYPD in cooperation with

as actively recruit new volunteers.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

resident leaders, Resident Watch supervisors, and NYCHA, revised the training curriculum that all Resident Watch supervisors now receive. NYCHA is also working with the NYPD to create additional training that will mirror some of the preparation auxiliary police officers receive.

And in Brooklyn, the NYPD has piloted an effort involving designated officers and Resident Watch teams to better coordinate activities and share information.

Similarly, we are working together to strengthen the community supports for residents who help to reduce crime in their developments. And because research shows that victims of bullying are between two and nine times more likely to consider suicide and because bullying all too often leads to escalated risk of our young people carrying weapons or joining gangs, NYCHA partnered with Utterly Global to provide antibullying training to NYCHA staff at our community centers last summer and we hope to continue this effort. Reducing incidence of crime among our youth and young adults is a top priority of the task force.

We must also be better neighbors.

NYCHA recognizes that proper delivery of social services is often a pillar of individual well-being and overall community health. So we have developed a four-part approach to improve how NYCHA delivers social services. One, increase public awareness of available social services; two, enhance direct engagement with residents and resident leaders to streamline the referral process for those who may need to take advantage of these services; three, improve training for NYCHA staff on how to make social services referrals; and four, create liaisons between NYCHA and the NYPD to share information when necessary.

NYCHA, the NYPD, and other city, state, and national law enforcement agencies who serve our communities understand that some responsibilities for keeping neighborhoods can only be addressed through effective policing and improved communication between the organizations.

Last year NYCHA partnered with law enforcement agencies resulting in more than 200 arrests of individuals who committed serious felonies, including narcotics distribution, narcotics

3

4

1

possession with the intent to distribute, and weapons charges. Our joint law enforcement activities are active and ongoing and more arrests

5

are expected this year.

6

7

will go only so far without the cooperation of

As I mentioned earlier, our efforts

8

NYCHA's residents and NYCHA and the NYPD are

9

committed to working together to reestablish positive, mutually respectful resident-police

10 11

officer relationships. Following recommendations

12

from the task force with the assistance of NYCHA,

13

the NYPD is increasing its efforts to recruit

14

NYCHA residents for enrollment in the Youth Police

15

Academy, the Law Enforcement Exploring program,

16

and Explorer Academy. As some of you may know,

17

the Youth Police Academy is a six-week summer

18

program for young people that reinforces life

19

skills and aims to provide positive recreation.

20

The Law Enforcement Exploring program is designed

21 22 to promote an interest in law enforcement among youth and young adults between the ages of 14 and

23

20. And the Explorer Academy is a free summer

24

program that motivates explorers to become

25

responsible, engaged citizens by teaching positive

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

character and career development, leadership, and

3 life skills. Police officers serve as mentors and

4 participate in activities alongside participants

5 in all three programs and NYCHA has committed to

informing our residents and helping the NYPD

7 recruit among NYCHA's talented youth.

> We're also partnering to increase involvement of police officers in community center programs and activities, providing opportunities for NYCHA's youth and police officers to interact in a positive environment. NYCHA's Community Operations Department will work closely with the NYPD in our Cops and Kids program, which will bring officers together with NYCHA youth for overnight camping trips, pair NYCHA youth with members of the Police Athletic League to go bowling, and encourage Housing Bureau Cadets and Law Enforcement Explorers to participate in NYCHA's Annual Kids Walk, Annual Talent Show, Resident Art Show, and Citywide Olympics, among many other community events.

> Furthermore, the NYPD, in cooperation with resident leaders, has developed a new patrol guide for public housing officers based

on the principles that police officers are service providers. To date, nearly 3,000 police officers have received new guideline training and nearly all officers assigned to the Housing Bureau and the Precinct Housing Teams have received training. Throughout 2011 the remainder of the Patrol Service Bureau, as well as members of the Detective Bureau and Organized Crime Control Bureau, are scheduled to be trained, and officers who have already received training will receive a refresher course.

The NYPD has committed to create a new training video for members of the department that will focus on mutual respect and courtesy.

And the NYPD will continue to solicit feedback at community meetings and other forums and NYCHA will continue to engage our residents for feedback on the progress of these and other efforts.

Finally, NYCHA must ensure that our guidelines are consistently posted and clearly communicated. The task force has outlined a series of recommendations, including making the Authority's signs standard citywide, including signs in NYCHA parks and play areas; mailing a

Delatorre, the Executive Officer of the NYPD's

3 Housing Bureau. Thank you, Chairman Rhea, and

4 thank you members of the Council for the

5 opportunity to discuss with you the police

6 department's participation in the New York City

7 Housing Authority Safety and Security Task Force.

The New York City Police Department is pleased to express its support and appreciation for the commitment made by Chairman Rhea,

President Reginald Bowman and the entire Citywide

Council of Presidents to the work of the Safety

and Security Task Force. We are honored to be

part of this dynamic body which enhances the

partnership that already exists between the

residents of public housing, the management of the

New York City Housing Authority, and the NYPD.

been working together to expand and deepen this partnership, meeting and collaborating on a regular basis. The entire task force has met at least once a month since its inception and the police department members participate in the meetings of all five subcommittees, which generally take place every two weeks.

2.0

As Chairman Rhea has described, our
work has produced tangible results to improve the
quality of life for those who live in, work in,
and visit NYCHA developments. It has also
produced results which may be less tangible, but
no less real in the way that police officers and
residents of public housing relate to each other.

We are proud of the work we are doing with the Safety and Security Task Force and are committed to continuing our full participation in its efforts.

Thank you for this opportunity to discuss our goals and experiences as we move forward together.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Good morning and thank you for your testimony. So let's get started with one of the things that wasn't answered in the testimony that I asked--what is the composition of this task force?

[Pause]

JOHN RHEA: The principal composition of the task force is resident leadership, which is principally represented by all nine members of the Citywide Council of

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 32
 2
      Presidents and which Reggie Bowman is the chair.
 3
      Secondly, there are a number of residents who are
 4
      non-Citywide Council of Presidents participants.
 5
      Secondly--
 6
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           [Interposing]
 7
      How many?
 8
                     JOHN RHEA:
                                 Three--
 9
                     GLORIA FINKELMAN: Yes.
10
                     JOHN RHEA: --there are three non-
11
      Citywide Council Presidents NYCHA residents who
12
      are members of the task force. The second
13
      principal group is the top brass of the NYPD
14
      represented clearly by Chief Delatorre, but
15
      obviously he has other members of his top team
16
      that are at every single meeting, and the Chief
17
      can name those people if it's important to you,
18
      including at a number of the meetings we also had
19
      the head of the Housing Bureau participate in that
20
      as well.
21
                     The third group is NYCHA senior
22
      management. Myself, I chair the task force along
23
      with my co-chair person, which is Reginald Bowman,
24
      we are at all the meetings, we try to be at all
```

the meetings, at least the one meeting per month,

25

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 35
 1
 2
                     JOHN RHEA:
                                 The ultimate goal is to
 3
      increase safety in NYCHA communities and to
 4
       improve the perception of safety in NYCHA
 5
      communities. Our goal--
 6
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. Now
      tell me this--
 7
 8
                     JOHN RHEA: And we--let me finish.
 9
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. I'm
10
      just--
11
                     JOHN RHEA: And the way we look to
12
      do that is through collaboration of the three
13
      organizations that are most responsible for
14
      ensuring that that happened--residents themselves,
15
      the NYPD, law enforcement agencies, and NYCHA
16
      management -- and to ensure that we have identified
17
      what the challenges are that have not allowed us
18
      to reduce crimes to the level that we would all be
19
      comfortable with, and to address them head-on.
20
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           The scope?
21
      The scope of when they were first created, the
22
      scope was to ....
23
                     JOHN RHEA: Scope of the task
24
      force?
25
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Yes.
```

_ ′

present to the task force as an entire group or body, subcommittees have met with outside subject matter experts as well, and all that information is shared and discussed and debated and recommendations are made and either adopted by the entire group or tabled for further consideration.

You know, again, the background here is that the task force grew out of communications that I've had with residents, not just the Citywide Council President, which is obviously a very important representation of residents, but also with the individual residents and other resident groups as I visit developments across the city. And there was a clear expression that crime and crime prevention was very high on their list of priorities.

The Citywide Council of Presidents, when I first met with them after being appointed by the mayor, expressed a desire to have a more collaborative approach to identifying and addressing ways to improve safety and security in our developments. Meetings took place, not only with the Citywide Council of Presidents and NYCHA top management, but also with the top brass of the

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:

When was the city--my question is do you not know?

When was the City Council informed? Because I'm a

little frustrated, and I'll check, maybe it's my

own frustration and my memory doesn't work well

22

23

24

25

[Interposing]

2 1a
3 bu
4 fo
5 ge
6 sa
7 mo
8 a
9 sa

lately, 'cause there's a lot of stuff going on, but here your testimony says the task force was formed in December 2009 and in July of 2010 I'm getting frantic calls from my tenant leaders saying our security cameras aren't coming in, our money is frozen. In August I get informed there's a task force, and in September of 2010 many of us sat in a meeting with you. So just interested in knowing when was this task force—when were we informed officially of the creation of this task force?

me two questions, you're asking officially versus when were various members of City Council informed, and when did we make a public statement. So I want to be very clear, if the characterization is that six months, a year went by without members of the Council knowing formally or informally, the task force had been created, that's not correct. Number one, I met with many members at this dais and not here today to discuss the work of the Safety and Security Task Force from the moment it was created and implemented.

Number two, we released a press

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 40
 1
 2
      release upon the creation of the task force that
 3
      went out and--
 4
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Off mic].
 5
                     JOHN RHEA: -- and third, we had it
 6
      in, and it's continued to be discussed in all of
 7
      our communication in our journal to residents
 8
      about the creation of the task force, who was on
 9
      the task force, and what the purpose of the task
      force is.
10
11
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. So when
12
      were we informally told--
13
                     JOHN RHEA: I don't know--
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --that there
14
15
      was a task force--
16
                     JOHN RHEA: -- I don't know.
17
      don't know.
18
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --you don't
19
      know. Okay. The press release--
                      [Crosstalk]
20
21
                     JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Did you
22
      say informally?
23
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes,
24
      informally.
25
                     JOHN RHEA: Immediately.
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 41
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Immediately.
3	JOHN RHEA: Immediately.
4	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And those
5	words were used, task force.
6	JOHN RHEA: Yes, the creation of
7	the Safety and Security Task Force, absolutely.
8	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: So let me
9	justI'm going to hand it over for questioning to
10	my colleagues, but let me just say part of my
11	frustration is that we have City Council dollars
12	from 2004 that have been frozen and not used;
13	2005, 2006, and some of these Council members
14	aren't even in office anymore and they put their
15	money in for what they thought was security for
16	their constituents. So this is the parts that's
17	very frustrating to me. Peter?
18	JOHN RHEA: Would you like me to
19	respond to that?
20	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Sure.
21	JOHN RHEA: So first of all, we
22	share your concern about rapidly deploying funds
23	that have been made available by City Council
24	members and other elected officials to, whether it
25	be CCTV or other security measures that are
	i de la companya de

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 42

capital enhancements. We can do a better job of
that.

\$21 million that the City Council has made available in CCTV infrastructure throughout NYCHA. Over 100 developments have some form of CCTV, most of which is made available from funds that this Council and former Council members have provided to NYCHA. And so we feel we are, obviously, living up to the mandate that you've given to us to get those dollars invested, we can do better.

There is roughly \$30 million that
we have now that have been made available,
principally from current Council members and we
have been meeting with each of you to discuss how
we would like to deploy that money. I understood
Council Member Vallone's concerns about quote
unquote a moratorium when I came in and I was
looking at all of the areas in which NYCHA spends
money, particularly precious capital dollars, the
CCTV was under review just like all of our other
capital spending programs. I asked for specific
information around the effectiveness of CCTV
cameras and real empirical data that addresses and

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reduces crime. I asked about consistency in terms of the deployment of those cameras, about the cost per camera, about the cost of maintaining those systems, and about long-term abilities to replace those systems, because obviously they have a useful life. Many of those questions had questions as the answer.

Because of that I wanted to reengage around how best to use that \$30 million with recognizing the CCTV needed to be a part of a comprehensive capital investment solution to address crime, and I wanted to do that with full disclosure to Council members on what we had learned through our work. That is my job as the chairman and as a steward of the funds that you provide to us to make sure that they're being deployed as efficiently as possible and to share as transparently as we can the information that we've learned as it relates to our experience with CCTV and that's what we've done.

And I asked for 6 to 12 months to do that and I lived up to that and came back in inside of the time that I asked for and we made a recommendation on how we'd like to deploy that

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 44 money we've been working with each Council member, 2 3 as well as with Council leadership to try and get 4 your approval on our proposed plan. CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay. 5 Thank you. Let me first backup my co-chair. 6 7 [Off mic] 8 CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I'm sure you were meeting individually with Council members, 9 10 but I'm the chair of Public Safety, she's the 11 chair of the Committee on Public Housing, I didn't 12 get a meeting and I didn't get a phone call about 13 this task force, and perhaps we are two of the 14 people that should be personally reached out to 15 when there's a security initiative like this that 16 is being implemented in the future. 17 Regarding doing a better job of 18 using Council members' money, I mean, I understand 19 all the concerns you just mentioned and they're 20 completely legitimate, but some of these requests date back to fiscal years '04 and '05 and the 21 22 money is still frozen. At some point it's fish or 23 cut bait when it comes to this money in these

systems. We understand your concerns perhaps

negotiating individually with Council members

24

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 45
      isn't the best way to get this done if it's taking
 2
 3
      this long to determine how were you going to use
 4
      this money.
 5
                     We believe cameras are important.
 6
      We provide funding for things that are
      additionally necessary, we don't provide funding
 7
 8
      for tremendous programs like you just--tremendous
      in size and cost, and I happen to believe they
 9
10
      also seem pretty tremendous in goals too, I think
11
      it's a great program -- but we don't provide funding
12
      for programs like that, that's what the
13
      Administration funds. It's sort of like saying
      we'll give you the cops, but you pay for the guns.
14
15
      That's not our job. We stand ready to assist you
16
      in this, but we cannot fund a massive program like
17
      the one you were discussing. We can help you a
18
      little bit.
19
                     JOHN RHEA: Which program, Council
      Member?
20
21
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:
                                           Pretty much
22
      the focus of your testimony, the program to
      improve security at our housing developments, the
23
24
      program to install new access systems, more
25
      security, more cameras, everything you just
```

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 46
 1
 2
      mentioned, that program.
 3
                      JOHN RHEA: So you said who's
 4
      responsible for providing that--
 5
                      [Crosstalk]
 6
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]
 7
      The Administration should fund that.
                      JOHN RHEA: Which Administration,
 8
 9
      in Washington or locally or ...?
10
                      [Crosstalk]
11
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]
12
      Well I would hope that the Administration in
13
      Washington provides us funding, but failing that,
      the administration here in--
14
15
                      JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] They have
16
      not.
17
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: -- the city.
18
      I know, that's why I have a resolution--
19
                      JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] They
20
      specifically rescinded--
21
                      CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I'm aware of
22
      that, I have the resolution calling on them to
23
      fund this, which I assume you support?
24
                      JOHN RHEA: I beyond support it, I
25
      have been meeting in Washington with senior
```

leadership of both our congressional and senate delegation, as well as members of HUD at HUD to express my distress and concern about the elimination of what was referred to as drug elimination money that was used to support law enforcement activities in public housing across the country, which costs NYCHA roughly \$30 to \$50 million annually that we used to receive that we

don't receive at all today.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Well hopefully we can get this resolution passed for you quickly to help. If there's anything else we can do to help you in your lobbying of Washington, let us know, that's what we do.

So I guess back to my original points. Some of this money that we've allocated or other council members have allocated has been held up for some time now. What is the end date on this and what is your ultimate goal on that money?

JOHN RHEA: So, again, and I understand the concern about moving the money and deploying it as quickly as possible. Some of the money that you referred to has been tied up since

2004, I think we have to be, again, transparent about the facts. In many cases, money that's been provided was insufficient to complete the overall task. So we have partial funding in certain cases in which we've been trying to find matching funding to complete what's being requested by residents and deploying cameras in their communities.

In other instances, there are other investments that needed to be made in order to support the deployment of CCTV. And so the Council may have provided enough money for the CCTV cameras themselves, but there are other costs that are incurred in order to implement the CCTV cameras that we've also had to find matching funds to support the deployment.

Having said that, I asked again for 6 to 12 months so we could come back to you with a recommendation and we've come back with a recommendation. As a matter of fact, we came back with this recommendation over two months ago, before the end of last year where we were meeting with individual members who provided funding for CCTV to explain to them what our proposal was for

the layered access system. Subsequent to that, we requested a meeting with the leadership of City Council, which involved both Chair Mendez, as well as Speaker Quinn, and we discussed our proposal very explicitly and in detail and asked for their support and asked them to, as you suggested, maybe working with each individual Council Member is required but not sufficient, to work with us to try and organize it into a very comprehensive decision amongst the group. We are at the point

where we're working collaboratively with them to

try and get sign off.

absolutely they support the redeployment of the funds that were strictly for CCTV into other effective crime prevention solutions in terms of the capital investments and they have said that they would like to see the deployment of the layered access system into their developments ASAP, others have said they're still considering it. And we are still again working with Council leadership and I believe and hope that this hearing is part of that process to get to a conclusion that would be comprehensive.

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 51
 2
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                          Okay.
                                                  All
 3
      right, thank you.
 4
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:
                                           Thank you.
 5
      So the council members who have agreed to change
 6
      the focus of the funding towards this program, is
 7
      that money now moving forward and is that
 8
      happening?
 9
                     JOHN RHEA: Yes, it is.
10
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay. Great.
11
      And let me go back to what I originally said, I
12
      commend you on this work and I think it's a great
13
      program -- more cameras, more boots on the ground,
14
      perhaps some security desks like they do in
15
      Newark, I think those will be great things and I
16
      think we should get it done as soon as possible.
17
                     My last question before I go to
18
      some colleagues, one of the biggest problems, and
19
      you address it also, is the broken door locks.
20
      What have you determined regarding these door
21
      locks? Who is breaking them, why, and what is
22
      done once they're broken?
23
                     JOHN RHEA: I'd like to ask a
24
      member of my team to address that. So Brian or
25
      Patrick, which ever one of you would prefer to
```

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 52 2 take the question. 3 [Off mic] 4 JOHN RHEA: Yeah, state your name 5 and..... 6 BRIAN CLARKE: Good morning, I'm Brian Clark, Assistant Deputy Manager of 7 8 Operations. Up until the late eighties, early nineties, our actual building entrances didn't 9 10 have door locks. There was an initiative to 11 install door locks back then, it was a retrofit 12 program where the most cost effective way was to 13 put electromagnetic locks and use intercom systems 14 that would integrate with the existing phone 15 lines. Okay, so this was a good solution maybe 16 back then, but since that time we've experienced 17 problems with the system, mainly that there's 18 other options now for phone service. So if you 19 switch to cable service, you potentially can lose 20 your access to your intercom. 21 Also, working when you integrate 22 with another system like that we've had an awful 23 lot of maintenance problems and issues so you find 24 that the intercoms aren't working. We have a

single electronic magnetic lock system that is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

easily defeated. So you find that when you go out there, you find a broken door and you also find that the intercom is not functioning.

So what we're recommending is, first off, upgrade the electromagnetic locks, put on a mechanical lock that works with the electromagnetic locks, so in case the electromagnetic locks are defeated, we still have the mechanical lock there; a direct call intercom system, which is not relying upon the phone infrastructure actually makes calls out to multiple phones, so you can have multiple, depending upon the members of the family composition, you can have multiple phone numbers for that apartment; and then most importantly, we have intelligence to the system so that if the locks are compromised we get notification that the locks are broken or that a door has been propped open for an extended period of time.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: That all sounds great, seriously. And I look forward to hearing from some experts on that and moving forward with you to get that done. But my question was who's breaking the locks that exists

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 54 2 now and why and what are we doing about it. 3 BRIAN CLARKE: The locks can be 4 broken by non-NYCHA residents, it could be bad 5 behaving NYCHA residents; we don't know who's 6 breaking the locks. CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Well it's the 7 8 number one problem at most of our housing 9 developments, I think we should know a little bit 10 about who's doing this. Is it residents who 11 forgot their keys; is it people who are breaking 12 in; is the police department making arrests; do we 13 have a camera trained at every door; what's being 14 done about the biggest problem or one of the 15 biggest problems that exists in our housing 16 developments right now? 17 EDWARD DELATORRE: I can--I think 18 at this point, part of that biggest problem is 19 that the locking devices are easily defeated, they 20 don't have to be vandalized with a tool. Often 21 it's simply just banging with a shoulder to defeat 22 the doors, so it often would be residents and/or people visiting that would do this, and very 23

difficult to capture absent an actual camera on

the door and we don't have cameras on all the

24

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 55
2	doors so
3	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Well we have
4	cameras on many of the doors
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Twenty
6	percent
7	[Crosstalk]
8	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:20%
9	according to my co-chair. So how many arrests
10	have been made of people vandalizing NYCHA
11	property like that?
12	EDWARD DELATORRE: I don't have
13	that data right now, but I can get back to you
14	with it.
15	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I would like
16	to know. And if it is a resident that's caught
17	doing this, Mr. Chair, what happens to a resident
18	who is caught vandalizing a lock like that?
19	JOHN RHEA: We bring tenancy action
20	against the resident, I spend every week myself,
21	along with my other two board members, go through
22	what we call tenancy review processes and often
23	and they're exactly what you describe, which are
24	residents who have either committed some violation
25	of the lease that relates to vandalism or

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

defacement of property. Often, obviously, we bring it through a Termination of Tenancy Action, but 95% of the time a Termination of Tenancy is ultimately not what's pursued or what's determined by the impartial hearing office, it's some form of

probation to address the issue.

But you asked who's doing it, it's all of the above, it's residents who are frustrated that their intercoms don't work and they prop doors open so that visitors can have access. It's someone who left their key, it's someone who doesn't have respect for property, and it's criminals, it's all of the above. question is irrespective of who's doing, is what can we do to prevent it, and that's what we're attempting to do with the investments.

Also, the cost of the recurring problem from an operational perspective is very high on NYCHA, both in terms of replacement parts, but also in terms of people in the field deployed to fix something multiple times in the course of a week often, and so one of the things that we're looking to do, not only to make it harder to defeat and break, just because of the nature of

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 57
2	the ruggedness of the infrastructure or the
3	mechanical parts, but also that it can be
4	modularly fixed. So instead of someone out in the
5	field with 10 parts and screwdrivers and a drill,
6	something that can actually literally be pulled
7	out and replaced in a highly efficient way.
8	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: I'm sure that
9	will work, but I'm also sure whatever you put
10	there is also going to continue to be vandalized
11	and then perhaps something that's necessary here
12	is a camera pointed at every door with a little
13	sign that says this door under video surveillance,
14	that will go a long way to stopping one of the
15	biggest problems we have in our housing
16	developments.
17	Got a lot of questions, but I'll go
18	to my colleagues. First of all, Council Member
19	Halloran was here, I don't knowoh, they're still
20	here, so thanks for joining us. We're going to go
21	to Council Member Mark-Viverito for questions.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
23	Thank you, co-chairs, and good morning, Chairman
24	JOHN RHEA: Morning.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

3

5

6

7

8

9

1

and a specific beatiful that general prima NYCHA obvious Adminitudes again discussions and a second control of the second control of

and all those that are here. I have several very

specific questions, but again, not for the sake of

beating a dead horse, as they say, but I think

that just to echo some of the frustrations in

general that we as a Council generally have

primarily with this Administration--and, granted,

NYCHA is somewhat of a separate entity, but you're

obviously very closely aligned and work with the

10 Administration as we have to do, but a lot of

11 times we're picking up and really supporting,

again, all the monies that we have at our

discretion are your taxpayer dollars that we

reinvest in our communities, so let's get very

15 clear about that first and foremost. It's not

pork barrel, there's not pork that we have at our

disposal. And we submit and we enhance and

support a lot of the organizations and NYCHA

developments in our communities because it's in

20 the best interests of all of us.

You say that over the course of a period of time, you mentioned \$21 million that has been invested by the City Council in security improvements. How much has been invested by

25 NYCHA?

21

22

23

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 59
 1
 2
                     JOHN RHEA: Well That's a very
 3
      difficult number.
 4
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
                                                     Ιn
 5
      camera specifically--
 6
                     JOHN RHEA: Zero.
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: --
 7
 8
       'cause that is where most of the money--
 9
                      [Crosstalk]
10
                     JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] So in
11
      terms of capital in cameras I want to roughly say
12
      zero, they can correct me if necessary, let me
13
      finish. But I want to be clear, we provide 1.5%
14
      of our capital budget to the NYPD.
15
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
16
      Okay. But let me just--
17
                     JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Can I
18
      finish because this is important--
19
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
      Chairman, if I may--
20
21
                     JOHN RHEA: --no, I want to answer
22
      your question.
23
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: --I
24
      think I would like to make my point--
25
                      [Crosstalk]
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 60
2	JOHN RHEA: I want to your
3	question
4	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: No,
5	this is just
6	JOHN RHEA:1.5 % goes to the
7	NYPD, of which they have installed many camera
8	surveillance systems like VIPER. So NYCHA dollars
9	have been provided to the NYPD to invest in camera
10	systems.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
12	Okay. Fine, but I think you've
13	JOHN RHEA: Third, third
14	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
15	made your point.
16	JOHN RHEA: No, I haven't. Third,
17	we spend roughly \$3 million a year in operating
18	costs in maintaining the cameras that the Council
19	has put in. So if you will look at that over a
20	10-year period, that's 30 million alone, and we've
21	been investing and continue to maintain these
22	cameras that the Council has invested in. So our
23	operating dollars support the capital investments
24	that you have made for cameras
25	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 61 2 Okay. 3 JOHN RHEA: --and we provided 4 capital to the NYPD for--5 [Crosstalk] 6 COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: 7 [Interposing] So \$21 million versus zero 8 initially, fine, you want to talk about expense 9 and operating along the lines. Then we had a 10 couple of years ago where this Council fought to 11 restore \$18 million, which then was allocated to 12 community centers, of which absolutely we had no 13 input and discussion in terms of how that was 14 going to be invested. 15 So the frustration is that we have 16 our ears tuned into the needs of our residents, we 17 are supporting by investing their public monies, 18 reinvesting in our developments, and yet we get 19 isolated and not brought into the conversation. 20 Now you talk about the security 21 task force, what would have prevented NYCHA from 22 extending a hand to this Council and say to both 23 these co-chairs why do not you sit on the security 24 task force, why does this City Council not have a 25 representative on the security task force?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

questions.

25

small measure that could have been made to demonstrate and to reach out and to say we are truly going to be collaborative, 'cause we understand the value that you have as a player in this conversation. Just a small recommendation which maybe you want to take moving forward.

But having said that, okay, I want to thank you for your testimony, I want to thank you for all the thought that has been put into the security and concerns that most of our residents have. I take a very strong interest in this, as everybody knows, because I do have the most public housing by far in the city of New York--over 20 developments, 18,000 units of housing--so it's a real issue for me. I appreciate also some of the attention that you're putting to our senior buildings. I've said and I've indicated to you personally, I appreciate it, the senior NYCHA buildings really should have some particular attention, these are vulnerable populations and so definitely I appreciate that.

So very specific in terms of

JOHN RHEA: I need to respond--

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 63
2	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
3	Sure.
4	JOHN RHEA:first of all, you
5	asked about investments that we have made in CCTV.
6	We make other investments in improving security in
7	NYCHA developments, I said that number we'll have
8	to get back to you on. And I was very clear about
9	what we spent for VIPER systems through NYPD and
10	the operating dollars we spend, which are real
11	dollars, I don't know why you would suggest that
12	those aren't real dollars, that are more than what
13	the Council has provided.
14	Second, you said you haven't been
15	consulted. That's not accurate. The decision to
16	invest in CCTV was a joint decision by City
17	Council and NYCHA management years ago in which
18	NYCHA was very clear, it did not have capital
19	dollars sufficient to invest in CCTV, we have been
20	cut from our drug elimination money from the
21	federal government to the tune of 30, \$50 million
22	and the Council decided that it wanted to take a
23	joint effort to put cameras in NYCHA development.
24	That was
25	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: I'm

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 64
 2
      not talking about that portion of it.
 3
                     JOHN RHEA: --consulted so that
 4
      was--
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
 5
                                                     And
 6
      that's not what I was--
                     JOHN RHEA: --done in consultation.
 7
 8
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
      referring to, Chairman.
 9
10
                     JOHN RHEA: Secondly, you referred
11
      to membership. It was a joint decision by members
12
      of the task force--NYCHA management, NYCHA
13
      Citywide Council of Presidents, and other leaders,
      resident leaders, as well as the NYPD--that we
14
15
      would not have elected officials as members of the
16
      task force. You may not agree with it, you may not
17
      like it, but it was a mutual decision that was
18
      made because we recognize many elected officials,
19
      principally starting with City Council, have been
20
      very helpful and are concerned about this issue of
21
      crime, and the decision of who to invite on, who
22
      not to invite on to politicize it, it was a
23
      decision that we made. Again--
24
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
25
       [Interposing] Not to politicize it, staff could
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 65
2	have been invited to be part of the conversation
3	[Crosstalk]
4	JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Again, I
5	want to beand we have
6	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
7	room with those
8	JOHN RHEA:and we have invited
9	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
10	difference of opinion.
11	JOHN RHEA: And the last point I
12	made was
13	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
14	Difference of opinion
15	JOHN RHEA:we invited people
16	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
17	about the efforts and the actions that are
18	demonstrated by your
19	JOHN RHEA:we invite people
20	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
21	agency.
22	JOHN RHEA:to come and present
23	to the task force, and obviously elected officials
24	are a critical component of that group that we
25	want to hear from and we have consulted with. So

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 66

it's not to exclude you, it's just the process.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Well I think the small efforts would demonstrate a lot in terms of the intent, the intention to have been to at least involve us in some way in those conversations.

Having said that, again, and when I talked about the consultation, I'm not speaking about the CCTV and the decisions, because clearly when we allocate those capital dollars, clearly it's for cameras and we know that, and that's what we're saying when we invested. What I'm talking about as an example is the \$18 million that this Council, out of our ability for the small amount of money that we have, to allocate to keep our community centers open, decision was made by NYCHA and DYCD at the exclusion of this Council in terms of how that money was going to be applied.

When I talk about now the security task force and in terms of the concerns that have been raised by the two co-chairs here about the limited conversations that were had with this body at the beginning, I would like to get some details, if I may. You talk about the cost

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

something that's sustainable that we can build

3 upon. Right now, our CCTV systems are pretty much

4 stand-alone systems, the small scale systems.

5 What we're recommending is to make sure first

6 wherever we install cameras, to make sure that we

7 have connectivity to all our buildings through our

8 fiber optic network so that we have a foundation

9 to build upon.

We want to set it up so that the video comes back to a central location, the management office. Instead of requiring a DVR in each building, we would have three servers in the management office, which saves funding for hardware, also gives us redundancy, meaning that if we lose a server, we have a backup, presently we don't have that, and also intelligence with the system that it notifies us if there is a problem with the recording or with a camera. Right now we don't do that and we don't have that, we have to actually physically go out, check the cameras each day, and anytime we need to make a recording we have to physically go out there and check as well, which is time, labor, money.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: No,

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 69
 2
      so what is the figure that NYCHA is using now when
 3
      it comes to CCTVs per building?
 4
                     JOHN RHEA: So right now, what
 5
      we're using is to set up the initial building,
 6
      it's 150,000 for that--
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
 7
 8
      Hundred and fifty.
 9
                     JOHN RHEA: --initial building, and
      then it's between 90 and 100,000 for subsequent
10
11
      buildings when they go in. This is a preliminary
12
      estimate--
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
13
14
      Can you please repeat that?
15
                     JOHN RHEA: Sure, so if you had a
16
      10-building development--
17
                     COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
18
      Development, right.
19
                     JOHN RHEA: --okay, the first
20
      building where you want to have the recordings
21
      come back to, that would be approximately 150,000-
22
      -and these are very preliminary estimates, the
23
      market will tell us and we plan on competitively
24
      bidding it--and then the balance of the buildings
25
      would be between 90 and $100,000.
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 70
2	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: And
3	that's for CCTV.
4	JOHN RHEA: Yeah.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
6	Okay. And then for the multilayered, it's 50,000
7	per building pretty much standard.
8	JOHN RHEA: Correct.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: And
10	then that multilayered access, is the plan also as
11	you implement this that it's all centralized?
12	JOHN RHEA: Yes, so we need to know
13	if a lock is broken so it has to be able to
14	communicate back
15	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
16	[Interposing] Comes back to you.
17	JOHN RHEA:has to come back to a
18	central location.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
20	Okay. 'Cause you talk about the management
21	office, but you also talk about this being
22	centralized here.
23	JOHN RHEA: Correct, so
24	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
25	Okay.

to bring it back--

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

JOHN RHEA: --yeah, once we're able

[Interposing] Or somewhere else.

JOHN RHEA: --to the management office, then we have opportunities to bring it into our internal intranet and we can send it to different departments, such as emergency services or our security desk.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Okay. So I think, and obviously that's a big difference and I think that I see the benefits of this approach. The same time, though, I know it's not easy because sometimes we also want to listen to what our residents are saying and, in my case, although I personally may think that this might be the best way, I would want to be very consultative with my resident associations to make sure that they're on board and that they're comfortable, that this is the direction they want to take. So is that the general approach that you're taking as well? I know you're saying you're reaching out to council members individually, but how are you looking at approaching this as well?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN RHEA: Absolutely, so again, consistent with the ethos of the task force, which is management, law enforcement, and resident leadership, the whole idea is to make sure that all of the proposals that we want to pursue are, not only vetted with residents, but supported by residents. And so in the case of individual council members we obviously want to make our case to their staffs and to them directly, but we've asked for an opportunity to jointly go and make the case to residents, with the tenant association leadership, and then obviously with the resident body themselves. So that is exactly our approach. We recognize that's going to add time to the process and we've said to council members in terms of trying to deal with one goal of swiftly deploying the funds balanced against the goal of engagement, we need to all understand what that means and that's why we've actually--again, we are appreciative of this hearing alone to begin that process of, not only engagement amongst ourselves, but a commitment to go out and share our proposals with residents.

In the cases where council members

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING /
2	have already said yes, they want to deploy this
3	money, resident leadership has been involved in
4	that decision process already.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Now,
6	co-chairs, and just one more
7	[Crosstalk]
8	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: I
9	know, a couple, well two more quick questions. In
10	the case of buildings, I mean, I would like to
11	really look at senior buildings, I have like five
12	in my district, NYCHA, but they already have
13	existing CCTV systems. So if you want to go the
14	route of also doing this multilayered approach and
15	investing more money, one will notyou will keep
16	both in place?
17	JOHN RHEA: That is correct, this
18	does not currently account for the need to
19	retrofit existing cameras.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
21	Okay. And then the last question on the task
22	force, because obviously there's a cost attached
23	to the efforts that you're putting into this task
24	forceyou talk about the surveys, you talk about
25	all that effortI'm hoping to some extent that

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

want to thank you, I'm not interested in having an

adversarial relationship, but I'm very strong in

my opinions. I hope that you've taken into

22

23

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 75
2	account what we've shared here with you today
3	about being consultative with this body and moving
4	forward in the best interest of our residents,
5	that's why we're all here. Thank you very much.
6	JOHN RHEA: Understood
7	[Crosstalk]
8	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you,
9	Council Member. One quick question, did you say
10	that cameras are two to four times more expensive
11	than a new entry system, which is going to include
12	a new intercom for every tenant in the building?
13	[Pause]
14	JOHN RHEA: Yes, yes, just to be
15	clear, this is a retrofit system as well so we're
16	not going to be replacing the doors unless the
17	door is just not suitable for the retrofit.
18	MALE VOICE: But also the camera
19	[Pause]
20	[Off mic]
21	JOHN RHEA: Yeah, I mean, and the
22	other thing is with the camera system, of course
23	there's hardware, there's server costs, there's
24	software costs as well, and the interconnectivity
25	bringing everything back to the central location.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 76
2	Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Will the new
4	entrance system include a new intercom for every
5	apartment orbecause you said it would run on a
6	different
7	[Crosstalk]
8	JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Yeah, the
9	way it'll work is, so it's a callout system, so if
10	a resident has a hard line phone it would work
11	with that; if a resident has a mobile phone, we
12	can program that in, so it'll actually call that
13	number.
14	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: So do you
15	have to install something into every unit?
16	JOHN RHEA: No, no.
17	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: No? Okay.
18	JOHN RHEA: [Off mic].
19	MALE VOICE 1: But in the lobby.
20	MALE VOICE 2: Did you have a
21	JOHN RHEA: Yeah, but in the lobby,
22	yes, but not in the actual apartment unit, yeah.
23	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: If you can
24	just please clarify, so this multilayered access
25	will continue to have CCTV cameras which will

have to scale back the camera deployment, right, to just critical areas in order to be able to bring it in within a budget that would do both intercoms, re-enhancement of the doors, enhancements of the doors, as well as the electronic access, and then some cameras. Brian, I don't know if you want to give more clarity on that, but it's certainly not going to be a full deployment of cameras in the same fashion that it would have been done without the

layered access.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: So it's not like my 2 million, I can take a million and put it into another development, I would still need that 2 million, but you're saying I'm going to get more in that development with that 2 million. And instead of doing half a development with the 2 million, I'm going to be able to do the entire development where I would have cameras in key places and this multilayered access, is that correct?

JOHN RHEA: I don't think I'm saying that. What I'm saying is, number one, we're not proposing--money that's been allocated

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 79
 2
      for a specific development, we're not asking you
 3
      to redeploy that money to another development, and
 4
      that's one of the things we've been communicating
 5
      very directly with residents--just let me say that
 6
      first point. The second point--
 7
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           [Interposing]
 8
      Okay. But I think you misunderstood what I was
 9
      saying as well.
10
                     JOHN RHEA: I don't think so, I
11
      just want to make sure, I want to be--
12
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           [Interposing]
13
      No, I thought when this was explained to me--
14
                     JOHN RHEA:
                                 Right.
15
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --that it
16
      would be at a cost savings so that I might be able
17
      to take some of my money and either finish the
18
      entire development or take some of my money and
19
      move it to another development that doesn't have
20
      any security, or then there's always the option
21
      that I can take my money and put it in my public
      schools or something, you know.
22
23
                     JOHN RHEA: Okay. So what I'm
24
      saying is, if you allocated $1 million for CCTV,
25
      the CCTV program that we are proposing now--just
```

take CCTV as a stand-alone initiative—is more cost effective than the prior CCTV program and so if you just said, if your residents and you said I want to focus on CCTV, I can't deal with the layered access proposal, all I want is CCTV, then yes, you will get more cameras than were originally proposed. And so if that means there's money left over to take some of that and put it in another development, which is strictly CCTV, then that's something we will want to engage in a conversation.

But what we're proposing is that
the CCTV in and of itself, without investing in
other components like layered access, is less
effective and, therefore, we're proposing layered
access including some CCTV. It's not free,
meaning you're not going to get layered access and
a full-service CCTV that was originally proposed
for less money.

So to implement the full layered access proposal and CCTV, we have to either scale it to the budget that you've given us, and to tell you what that looks like in terms of a reduction in cameras, but a broader system overall for that

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 81 2 development, or to do the cameras the way they 3 were proposed plus the layered access and what the 4 incremental costs would be. 5 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And, I'm 6 sorry, I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues. 7 And you've done that analysis for the 22 council 8 members who currently have \$27,115,000 in capital 9 funding. 10 JOHN RHEA: We are in the process 11 of doing that, we've completed some, we have more 12 to go. What we do is we go out to each 13 development, we check to see to make sure first off we have connectivity between the buildings and 14 15 we prepare our proposals with different options. 16 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: We'd like a 17 list of the current council members who have 18 agreed to switch to this layered access, I'd like 19 to know who those members are. 20 We've been joined by Council Member 21 Foster and Council Member Chin. Council Member 22 Arroyo. 23 COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Thank you, 24 Madam Chair, Mr. Chair, and, Mr. Chair, I think 25 you have more gray hair since when I first met

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 82
2	you.
3	JOHN RHEA: I'm just happy I have
4	hair.
5	MALE VOICE: It's going
6	[Crosstalk]
7	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: I don't
8	want to belabor the point, but a real simple
9	question. So it's not that we do layered access
10	first and then CCTVs, it can be in tandem, and we
11	will talk about what development gets what in what
12	volume of variety at some point?
13	JOHN RHEA: That is correct, so as-
14	_
15	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:
16	[Interposing] When are we going to have those
17	conversations?
18	JOHN RHEA: So we have started
19	those conversations with some council members and,
20	as Mr. Clarke said, we are preparing an actual
21	taking the budget that you provided to us, looking
22	at what the actual implementation costs would be
23	at each development. 'Cause different
24	developments have different levels of existing
25	connectivity or not, so that's one of the first

_

J

things we have to identify. And then we're preparing alt options and those options are very similar to what you described, which would be CCTV simultaneously with layered access, what that cost looks like, CCTV layered access today, CCTV later, and so on. And for us to sit down with you and talk through the options and the cost of locations.

it's important that we have some conversations very, very quickly. We are currently in the process of pulling together a list of projects that we want to invest capital dollars in for the next fiscal year. And there are some tenant leaders that are more savvy and involved than others, but the word spreads very, very fast. So I started with funding one development for one building and now I have six developments on a list because they talk to each other. And that's a good thing.

But in wrapping up the process for the submissions that we're going to make to the Council for funding, I think it's important because requests for the traditional CCTV camera

different number of buildings. So in particular

25

2 for
3 so w
4 meml
5 the
6 the
7 abov
8 on l
9 func
10 inc:
11 the
12 some

for those, we need to have a conversation quickly so we can put that money out. I was one of those members who organized meetings with NYCHA, with the tenant leaders of all of the developments in the district, and we had a very broad conversation about it. So it is my impression that everyone is on board and supportive, but it's five years of funding that's sitting that can be making an incredible impact on the safety and well-being of the residents. So sooner rather than later is something I would prefer to do on that \$2.5 million.

JOHN RHEA: I want to first say thank you for your support, for the money, and we share your sense of urgency.

Assistant Chief Delatorre, in your testimony you referenced the work that the task force and then the involvement of NYPD in this process has provided for results which are less tangible, but no less real and that is the way police officers and residents of public housing relate to each other. And I know that's not the subject of this hearing, but when we deal with complaints from

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

residents, that is the first priority issue that they bring to our attention, it is. And primarily not the PSA officers because they're known to the residents, they know the residents, it's the local precinct officers and how they come into the developments in that relationship.

So I won't ask you to quantify that, but I challenge you that that is probably one of the most troubling complaints that we continually get, it is how officers relates to residents. And it's an uncomfortable subject, I think the precinct officers are not dealt with in terms of training or sensitivity about the developments and how they go in and the attitude and the approach that they bring with them when they go into these developments. Often these task force at NYPD in collaboration in trying to address crime and development, bring in officers that are not even from the local precinct or community who come in with certain perceptions that influence how that relationship can happen or that relating to can happen.

So I appreciate you making the statement in your testimony, but I challenge you

on how tangible it is because, again, the number one complaint we get is precisely that. So and we've had the conversation with the chairman how strongly we feel about it, and one thing that we just cannot stop working on. Officers cannot come into the development with a perception that those people are like that and we're going to treat them like they're whatever, and that's a challenge. So I'm not sure that I would celebrate it as much.

Mr. Chair, the survey that you've referenced in your testimony, nearly 60% of the respondents reported that serious crime had occurred in their development during the previous year, however, only 6% surveyed reported that they themselves had been a victim of a crime. Do you have statistics about the types of crimes, the numbers, and of those, the perpetrators of those crimes, are they NYCHA residents or are they individuals that are just bleeding into the NYCHA developments in their activity, criminal activity?

JOHN RHEA: First of all, we track certain data, we receive what's called the Eagle reports that come from the NYPD--

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: The what?

2	Having said that, one of the things
3	that this task force has identified and that we
4	are continuing to discuss with NYPD is the fact
5	that we don't track what many people refer to as
6	nuisance crimes the way we track those top seven.
7	And so whether that be vandalism or other things
8	that, not only erode the quality of life, but we
9	believe lead to other crimes that may bleed into
LO	the top seven, we need a better and more effective
11	method of tracking that data so that we can
12	identify the real issues and comprehensively
13	address them.
L 4	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: So what are
15	those seven crimes?
L 6	EDWARD DELATORRE: Oh, it's the
L7	seven majors, it would be murder, rape, robbery,
18	felony assault, burglary, grand larceny, and grand
19	larceny auto, the same seven majors that we track
20	for the city.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
22	[Crosstalk]
23	EDWARD DELATORRE: Right.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: So the

vandalism number that Council Member Vallone was

25

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 90
 2
      focusing on is not one of those.
 3
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: It's not one we
 4
      ordinarily track, no.
 5
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
                                                     So
      the PSAs are the ones tracking this or is NYCHA
 6
      tracking, who's tracking it?
 7
 8
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: No, the PSAs,
      the Housing Bureau tracks it for the -- we actually
 9
10
      track it for the entire Housing Authority, not
11
      just the PSAs.
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
12
                                                     So
      it's not just the police service area, the
13
14
      precincts are also--
15
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: [Interposing]
16
      No, it's the precincts as well, we track it for
17
      the entire Housing Authority. The Eagle report
18
      reports on crimes, the seven majors within the PSA
19
      area, as well as in the areas covered by the
20
      precincts.
21
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
22
      those lines blur, PSA seven, that's primarily the
23
      PSA that covers the district I represent, but I
24
      also in the district have four police precincts.
25
      So do we have a distinction between PSAs and how
```

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 91 that relates to the individual districts or one 2 3 number is duplicative of whatever the precinct 4 numbers are? 5 EDWARD DELATORRE: It's actually 6 broken down on our Eagle report by the precinct, 7 so if the 44 has a small part of it, a small development over in the 44, so that development 8 9 would reflect on our Eagle report as the 44 10 precinct on the bottom of the Eagle below the PSA, 11 but then go into the entire PSA number. So the 12 PSA still, when we say the PSA is up or down in 13 crime, the crime accounts for all crime in the 14 precincts as well as the PSA. 15 COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay. All 16 right, that helps to understand the number. 17 Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge you, urgency in coming 18 to this issue of the dollars as we, over the next 19 couple of weeks, we'll have to firm up our lists 20 and the numbers that we're going to be putting in 21 to continue to be supportive of the New York City 22 Housing Authority's efforts around safety of our 23 residents. 24 I'm not going to blur the line 25 about who's responsible for what, I think it's all

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 92
 1
 2
      of our responsibility, but unless we get some real
 3
      good numbers for very specific initiatives, we're
 4
      going to continue to drop dollars into a bucket
 5
      that we're going to have to talk about later and I
 6
      don't want to have to do that.
                     JOHN RHEA: Neither do I.
 7
 8
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okav.
 9
      Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Thank you,
11
      Council Member Arroyo. We will now hear from
12
      Council Member Halloran, followed by Council
13
      Member Chin.
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
14
                                                Thank
15
      you, Madam Chair, Mr. Chair.
16
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
17
      Oh, give me one second?
18
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
19
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: We have been
2.0
      joined by Council Member Ulrich from Queens, who
21
      is wearing a very distinctive bow tie.
22
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
23
      morning, Mr. Chair, good morning, Chief. I'm
24
      going to look at two different areas. First I'd
25
      like to speak to the police department, if I
```

2 could. Looking at the deployment of the Housing 3 Bureau, there is Housing Bureau Brooklyn, Housing Bureau Manhattan, and then there is Housing Bureau Bronx Queens. Does it make sense from a 5 6 deployment and logistical sense to have the Queens 7 service area in the Bronx, which is physically not 8 connected to Queens? At the point I understand 9 many, many years ago when we merged housing in, I 10 was still in the police department when that 11 happened and I recall how interesting it was when 12 that integration took place and how relieved many 13 cadets and recruits at the academy were that they 14 didn't have to worry about where they were being 15 assigned and which department when we had the 16 three separate ones. But does it make sense in 17 fact to leave--and I understand from a numeric 18 point of view, it might, because, of course, the 19 Bronx has 90 and Queens only has 26 projects, so 20 somehow that's less than the 100 in Manhattan or 21 the 100 of Brooklyn--but does it make any sense to 22 leave Queens as attached to the Bronx where it's a 23 bridge ride across the Sound in order for the 24 officers to really be in a Housing Bureau as 25 opposed to maybe connecting it to Brooklyn, or I

know 26 maybe doesn't justify an independent

3 Housing Bureau, but obviously there was, when the

4 Housing Department, was separate stations

5 throughout Queens at the housing projects.

still stations throughout Queens, they're all under PSA 9. The reason that they're combined for the purposes of the Eagle report is just for borough supervision. So the borough commander of the Bronx that has PSA 7 and 8 also covers PSA 9, which is a much smaller PSA, as you mentioned. The only difference there is that when the mobile IRT is deployed to Queens, they do have to travel across the bridge, that would be the only difference. But at the same time, we don't have the ability to create a mobile task force just for PSA 9, it's only one PSA.

council Member Halloran: Well I understand that, but again, just looking at it from a practical point of view, wouldn't it seem more sensible to send them through Brooklyn than to come over the bridge in the Bronx, A; and, B, doesn't it also make more sense Patrol Borough North and South in Queens have a lot more in

common with Patrol Borough North and South in Brooklyn than they do with Patrol Borough Bronx. And it just doesn't seem to me that, from a command supervision point of view, it makes sense, it certainly doesn't make rapid response sense for it because the bridges are not located in places where the housing developments are. If you're coming across the Throgs Neck and Whitestone, you're not running into any housing projects, you have to get into Central Queens to do that and that's far more accessible vis-à-vis Brooklyn than it is the Bronx. Far Rockaway where the majority of Queens projects are, is nowhere near the Bronx

So I'm not on the job anymore, so I'm not offering that from that perspective, but it just doesn't make sense to me.

and is in fact connected to Brooklyn.

logic is on point, that's why Far Rockaway, the 100 and the 101 precinct were actually ceded into the Queens Southborough command, they're under patrol now because of the distance. So your logic is on point and I agree, but for the purposes of supervision, we don't have the ability to create a

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 96
 1
 2
      whole new borough for Queens, and Brooklyn, if you
 3
      look at Brooklyn South and the areas you're
 4
      reaching it to in Brooklyn, it's probably further,
 5
      many of those areas are further from the Queens
 6
      PSA and the Queensbridge Houses and so on--
 7
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Right.
 8
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: --so it
 9
      logistically--
10
                      [Crosstalk]
11
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
12
       [Interposing] But not Brooklyn North, certainly.
13
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: No, but Brooklyn
14
      North is part of Brooklyn South for that borough--
15
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
                                               Oh, for
16
      purposes of that--
17
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: --of command--
18
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: --okay.
19
                     EDWARD DELATORRE: --so we combine
20
      those two patrol boroughs under that borough
21
      command, and Queens being a smaller one,
22
      obviously, if we didn't have a bridge, it would be
      a little better. But I understand what you're
23
      saying and, like I say, your thinking is on point,
24
25
      because that's why we took the Rockaways out of
```

the borough command and put them under the Patrol

Service Borough where they could be better

serviced with precinct modules under the 100 and

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

101 precinct.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And just one more on the police department side and then I'll speak to our chairman in NYCHA and ask him some interesting questions. With regards to the patrol patterns and the training, I know that the department has gone to great lengths to begin training specifically for this kind of contact, but obviously there are something wanting, I mean, many of the residents have expressed some displeasure with, not so much the Housing Bureau cops who are assigned to them who they get to know, but the precinct police officers. Has the CPOP units received housing-related training where they have units that are in that vicinity, are the CPOP beats and sectors modified in places where housing presence is light, Housing police presence is light or nonexistent, such as it is in Staten Island, and are those officers receiving any CPOP training related to those issues? Because obviously there's something that keeps popping up

2 over and over again?

training, the newly revised training that the task force actually put forward, along with the police department, was given to the entire Housing Bureau and to the entire group of precinct housing modules, which would be those groups that work like in Staten Island and places like that, they've already received that first layer of training.

The second layer of training, I think as the chairman mentioned in his opening statement, is going out now over the next 12 months during the year of 2011, all of those precincts—the 40th, the 42nd precinct—all of those patrol officers in all of the precincts in the city will be getting the same training over the course of 2011.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Thank

you, Chief, that's fantastic. Mr. Chair, good to

see you again, and I didn't notice that you had

gotten gray, but I haven't been here that long, so

I'll give it some time, maybe in 10 years we can

have this conversation again, assuming we don't

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING 99
 2
      extend our terms anymore.
 3
                     Let me turn to your numbers because
 4
      I'm trying to wrap my head around some things.
 5
      You indicated that on average it would be about
       $100,000 after the initial outlay to do the CCTV
 6
 7
      system per development, is that accurate per
 8
      building and development?
 9
                     JOHN RHEA: Yes, yes, it's
10
      accurate.
11
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
12
      All right. And you said it's about $50,000 per
13
      unit for the layered access system, is that
14
      correct?
15
                     JOHN RHEA: Correct.
16
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
17
      And my quick math on that is that there are 408
18
      developments throughout the five boroughs, is that
19
      accurate?
20
                     JOHN RHEA: No, we have 334
21
      developments throughout the--
22
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
                                               Three 34.
23
                     JOHN RHEA: --throughout the five
24
      boroughs.
25
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
                                               Okay.
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING100
2	So
3	JOHN RHEA: And as you know,
4	obviously, every development is different in terms
5	of the composition of the number
6	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Sure.
7	JOHN RHEA:of actual buildings.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Do we
9	have an average number or do we have the actual
10	number of total buildings in
11	JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Twenty
12	six hundred.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Twenty
14	six hundred, okay. So assuming for a moment that
15	what one of my council members indicated, which is
16	there's \$27 million available currently in capital
17	allotments and assuming that we have, as you've
18	indicated, the 334 developments, which is what
19	we're looking at as our number
20	JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Maybe,
21	and I don't know
22	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yeah.
23	JOHN RHEA:if this is where
24	you're going, our internal estimates so that if we
25	really want to implement layered access systemwide

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING101
in all 2,600 buildings, you're looking at north of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\$100 million in costs, something like 135 million-

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Right.

JOHN RHEA: --and to implement CCTV in the way that we'd like to, you're north of \$200 million of additional costs.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Right, and of which you have 27 million, so assuming for a second that we were only going with the layered access system, you're a little bit more than a quarter of the way into the pot, as they say. But there are two things that bother me about your math, and the first thing that bothers me is the per unit costs, I just -- 'cause Google's a wonderful thing--I just Googled electronic keyless door systems for buildings and came up with about 104 different places, Quantum Metrics being one of them, and they averaged per 100 unit building a cost of \$20,000 for their systems. Now I know the City likes to pay billions extra for everything it does and buys, but if we're looking at moving into the 21st century anyway, which I assume we are, we're talking about the potential for wireless

infrastructure, which might actually also help residents, 'cause you might actually be able to deliver wireless, some sort of public access wireless at the same time. Has the department looked at the potential for, A, operating the CCTVs and the layered access on a wireless system in each building which they could also piggyback with wireless service for the residents as a public access, and how much that would reduce costs and especially in installation because with a wireless system your only issue is electrical connection as opposed to hardwiring fiber optics systems.

In addition, I'm terrified of the notion of you being able to use a cell phone as an access point because if you're using a cell phone, you're telling me I could be three miles away, get the phone call, and buzz somebody in. If we're talking about safety and security, that certainly doesn't sound like safety and security to me.

And if the wireless system is implemented, just the one I found on the Internet just being a nobody Council Member siting in front of a computer and was able to find is a quarter of

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

3

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the cost of what you're projecting. And it used to be in the private sector that the more you bought of something, the less it cost--I know that doesn't necessarily work for city math for whatever reason, but my understanding is that's how it should work. So if we're talking about buying 2,600 units wireless systems for access and intercom, I would tend to think it'd be a hell of a smaller number per unit than what they're doing for a 100-unit business.

Are we really doing a sufficient job of vetting with these ideas that we have of looking at the market for long term, modern responses? 'Cause it doesn't sound like it to me.

JOHN RHEA: Okay. Couple things, one, I don't know which specific system you're referencing so I can't say whether it's apples to apples, but I will let Brian Clarke talk about the work that we've done to analyze our options. he'll talk about that in a second.

Two, a big piece of the rationale for evaluating how we've been spending council members' CCTV dollars is to make sure that we were doing it as efficiently as possible and that the

systems were scalable and worked for us in our new

3 technological set of options and alternatives.

4 And so we are looking at all of that and, again,

5 Brian can discuss the options wireless versus

6 wireline versus cable line, and why we're going

7 with what we're proposing.

The third point I want to make though is there's a separate, yet related, set of activities going on in NYCHA that are looking at the full cost and scalability of smart buildings, right, and that's beyond just layered access and CCTV, it deals with how can we remotely, wirelessly, and electronically control our heating systems, a whole range of things, right? So the smart buildings technology work that's being led by our Chief Information Officer, you know obviously informs a lot of the work that this team is doing around the security piece, but it has a whole separate and larger set of considerations and costs, okay?

So but, yes, we are looking at taking NYCHA forward as an organization that is using technology and information to better manage our business and serve our residents better.

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING105
 2
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
                                                Mr.
 3
      Chair, could you just address the security
 4
      question I asked you?
 5
                     JOHN RHEA: About to address it for
      you right now.
 6
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
 7
                                               Okav.
 8
                     JOHN RHEA: No, I'm sorry, the
 9
      security, about the cost, right?
10
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
                                               No, no,
11
      about the use of a cell phone to be able to buzz
12
      someone into a NYCHA residence. If you're using
13
      that as an access point, I don't have to be in the
14
      house to do it.
15
                     JOHN RHEA: That's correct.
16
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: So do you
17
      think that that's wise to be able to buzz people
18
      in to secure facilities like this after we're
19
      going through all the effort of having multilayer
2.0
      securities when somebody could simply pick up the
21
      phone and be three miles away and answer the phone
22
      to buzz them in?
23
                     JOHN RHEA: Well it basically is
24
      putting the decision to provide access to that
25
      building in the hand of the resident, who is a
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING106
2	legitimate member of the NYCHA community and has
3	the right to allow their visitors into their
4	residence and we
5	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
6	[Interposing] Even without their presence.
7	JOHN RHEA: Even without their
8	presence, I mean, we don't have rules and
9	regulations that say NYCHA can onlya resident
10	can only allow a visitor if their present, right?
11	I mean, you don't have that rule in your home and
12	we have no intent of trying to establish a rule
13	like that in NYCHA communities.
14	But the decision is being put in
15	the hands of the resident. If the resident abuses
16	that responsibility, it's a different point, we
17	will take action as it relates to tenancy matters.
18	But at the end of the day our goal is to put the
19	decision and the safety and security in the hand
20	of residents.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Mr.
22	Chair, I will respectfully disagree with you for
23	three reasons. The first is, if the point of
24	having multilayer security is to ensure that only
25	the right people are getting in there, I think you

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING107
2	open a Pandora's box of difficulties if you allow
3	a cell phone to buzz someone in and the person
4	doesn't need to be physically present. There is
5	something about personal responsibility which says
6	if you're there, you have an obligation to make
7	sure your guests behave, so by physically being
8	present when you buzz them in, I think that issue
9	is put more to rest.
10	While I understand wanting to
11	empower and give responsibility to the individual
12	residents, I wonder if we don't wind up in a
13	similar place to where we are now on other issues.
14	And, two
15	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: [Interposing]
16	Council Member, we understand you disagree, but
17	this is an argument perhaps for
18	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Sure.
19	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:another
20	time, we've got a few other Council Members
21	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Sure.
22	CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:waiting, so
23	just
24	[Crosstalk]
25	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yeah,

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING108

sure.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thanks.

years ago, they modified the penal law in order to make the police officer eligible to [off mic] the trespass person under trespass law, and now that's come under fire because now people feel that that's a problem. I just think that the cell phone issue is opening up--I won't get into all the details, but I would love to hear the response on the budget side of things that you were going to pass off.

BRIAN CLARKE: So first off, the way that we came to this decision, so Patrick, our security director and I, we co-chair the Security Measure Subcommittee. On that subcommittee, we have resident leaders--Mr. Johnson from Mott Haven Houses, Ms. Bergen from Isaacs Houses, as well as NYPD, and various other NYCHA departments. We brought in various vendors, we went out to various--we went to the Newark Housing Authority, Bayonne Housing Authority, Wavecrest, various--South Parkchester up in the Bronx. So we went to various similar, large type of residential

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING109

communities to review their access systems and CCTV systems and we found a commonality with layered access control and bringing back the video to a central location.

Regarding the wireless versus the fiber optic network, first off, when it comes to security and safety, you want to have the most reliable form of communication, and fiber optic communicating across cable is more reliable than wirelessly. Also, with wirelessly there's ongoing costs, there are going to be situations where we are going to have to use wireless because there won't be an ability for us to bring conduit back to the central location, but where we can, we prefer to put in the hard wired.

Okay? And then regarding your

Google search, regarding the Google search, with

the 50,000, like I said, it's a preliminary

estimate and, certainly, when we put it out for

competitive bid, we're hoping that we're going to

get reduced pricing, but it just simply isn't

electronic access control, it's adding a

mechanical lock to the system, ruggedized

hardware, and as well as the callout intercom

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING110
      system, with intelligence getting notification if
 2
 3
      there is a problem with the system coming back to
 4
      a central point.
 5
                     And then just to add to on to what
 6
      the chairman said before, when you put in this
      fiber optic network, you can build on it for
 7
 8
      various smart building technologies, which in the
 9
      long run is going to save the Housing Authority
10
      money. Okay.
11
                     COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
                                                Thank
12
      you, Mr. Chairman, appreciate it, appreciate your
13
      testimony.
14
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: We've been
15
      joined by the G contingent of the City Council,
16
      Council Member Dan Garodnick, Council Member
17
      Greenfield, and Council Member Gentile. And then
18
      to spoil it, we had Council Member Williams, who's
19
      not a G, come in as well and--
20
                      [Crosstalk]
21
                     MALE VOICE: --Jumaane.
22
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --yeah,
23
      Jumaane--oh, no, no, but that's a J.
24
                      [Crosstalk]
25
                     MALE VOICE: The G is silent.
```

2 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: G is silent.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Council Member Chin, to be followed by Council Member Ulrich.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Great, thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon, Chairman. was one of the council members that also visited Newark and I was quite excited about the system that was there until I was told that no way will be able to afford it to do it in New York City because that system is so much smaller than what we have. But I'm really anxious to bring it to the development that we have in my district, so I met with your staff. So I'm looking forward to the follow-up.

One of the concern or the question I have is that, I know we have a resolution introduced by Council Member Vallone that we need to ask the Congress and President for some money on this because there's no way that City Council members with the budget situation that we have that we can continue to fight for those huge capital dollars for this to do the security system. I mean, in my first year on the City Council I put in for this camera system \$800,000,

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

that was, like, most of the capital budgets that I was able to get and it just sat there for a whole year. So I'm really anxious to really see money being used so that the residents in the developments will be protected. So I think that in terms of the timeline how we can really get

9

that going.

The other issue is working with the residents. I know in your testimony you did talk about the training and the patrol, but even before all that is happening, I think I raised that in the past about the cheapest thing that could happen right away in terms of lighting 'cause some of the buildings they're all like in the back. Ιn the Smith Project, I was visiting 10 Catherine Slip, and that's all the way in the back and it's really quiet, all you need is just some bright lights there. And the intercom system, I mean right now, a lot of them are broken. I mean, the other day, I was there visiting a senior with the Meals on Wheels program, we couldn't get in because the buzzer, she couldn't buzz us in because one of the buttons was broken and we had to wait until somebody opened the door.

So I think the training and support for the resident is important. Even now, are there any mechanisms set up, even like with walkie-talkies for the resident patrol so that they can actually get some backup from PSA?

Because the tenant patrol that I visited at Smith, I mean, these were seniors and residents there, and there were people like knocking on the door wanting to get in, and if they don't let them in, they might get hurt. So there is no support for them, and they just tell me we're here, but this is what's going on.

So immediately, what can be put in place to help the security situation until we get all the cameras and everything else in place?

JOHN RHEA: Well I'm going to ask both Chief Delatorre and DGM Finkelman to answer portions of your question, but the first one regarding, as I said in my formal testimony, is we agree with you, there are immediate measures we can take like improved, enhanced lighting that go a long way to deterring crime and to making it safer even for the police officers who are there to serve residents.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm very concerned about ensuring that we aren't putting our residents--look, we want to engage our residents in helping to reduce and deter crime, but at the same time, we don't want to put our residents in harm way. So a very big piece of the re-launch of Resident Watch from Tenant Patrol was focused on the safety of those who have stepped forward to participate in trying to keep their communities safe. We feel an incredible responsibility to ensure that no one actually is harmed because of their willingness to step forward. So a big piece of that involved new training for residents who participate as members of Resident Watch and that training is coming directly from the police department and mirrors the type of training that they provide to cadets, and also increases the communication mediums between police officers and Resident Watch.

The money that was put forward by
Mayor Bloomberg to help us fund some of the
jackets and other things, it was very important
identifying them clearly and brightly, all of
those things, and to make it clear that that was a
re-launched program with the support of the NYPD

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Then you have people sitting around so when you come in and out, you feel much more safer.

JOHN RHEA: Right, absolutely and when we talk about layered access, and in my formal testimony I talked about CCTV is important, but it's only a component of a broader comprehensive system. The best providers of CCTV, the companies that are out there who do this and they do it really well, and we've met with most of them, the reputable ones will tell you--as much as they want to push their products and they believe the CCTV can be an effective part of a crime solution -- they tell you that -- and the most reputable ones won't actually take jobs unless you commit to make substantial investments in your overall infrastructure in order to enhance and ensure that their program works. And a lot of that are the things that you're talking about, it's not just the doors and the layer access that we are proposing, which is critically important and one of the fundamentals, but they also want you to make other types of investments in lighting, in community centers, and things that

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING117 2 actually provide enhance and security and 3 participation of residents in the community. 4 Those are costly initiatives, and 5 that's why, as you started I think your commentary 6 about we've got to have a more concerted effort if 7 we want to implement things like Newark has been 8 able to implement and ensuring that we receive 9 funding to do so. 10 Newark received certain funding, 11 they also have a smaller system so the total cost 12 of implementation is a lot lower, but obviously 13 they're a smaller system overall so relatively 14 they spent a lot of money, and they spend a 15 tremendous amount of money maintaining and 16 operating their system. 17 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: It's a good 18 system. 19 JOHN RHEA: Okay. 20 EDWARD DELATORRE: Okay. As to the 21 Resident Watch, I believe today is the first day 22 of the kickoff of the training actually. What we 23 did is we have the auxiliary coordinators from the 24 PSAs and the community affairs officers actually

doing the training for the local Resident Watch,

25

In Brooklyn, as the Chairman

effectively, but to also reinforce that

precinct or PSA personnel.

relationship that they should have with the

mentioned, we started piloting this relationship

where we designated officers from the PSA who are

going to be the liaison to the Resident Watch. So

in addition to training them, what we want is we

assist in recruitment, ensure that their visits

want them to share in their goals for recruitment,

are being made to the Resident Watch while they're

seating there, 'cause I think one of the biggest

concerns that the old Tenant Patrol raised was

that they're not getting enough visits by our

those visits are being made. And, again, to

well. And the training is kicking off today.

officers. So we've charged somebody in each of

these PSAs in Brooklyn as a pilot to ensure that

enhance that relationship on the training end as

2

1

that's not only to get training across

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

residents to socialize while they also are sitting

the idea of having some opportunity for the

Resident Watch. One of the things that the

GLORIA FINKELMAN: So you mention

Housing Authority does fund is we do fund different games, board games for anyone sitting Resident Watch the buildings, we fund them for monthly refreshments, and recently, just last week at the meeting, we spoke about what communication possibilities there are. We currently provide them with a phone and we are going to survey to ensure that all Resident Watch have a phone so that they can feel safe and call in to 911. We are also looking to see whether we could obtain funding for some walkie-talkies, as you mentioned.

JOHN RHEA: And then just lastly, I don't want to leave it as if we don't have the money, so we're not looking at what our options are, we will be coming back, not only to the Council, but in a much more comprehensive way to the community around the plan to preserve public housing. In that plan is clearly an articulation of the need to support and maintain and improve our community centers and we're looking at various mechanisms to do that, and I won't go into them here, but we recognize, Council Member Chin and others, that that's a big piece of the quality of life in the NYCHA community and we cannot abandon

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING120 2 it, and we've got to find a way to reinvest in it, 3 and it will be part of our plan. 4 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay. 5 you, I look forward to the follow-up meeting with 6 my office so that we can get the cameras into our 7 developments. 8 CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Thank you, Council Member Chin. The list is now closed 9 10 because you guys have to get out of here and we 11 need to get to some other panels. And so the only 12 two left to go, Ulrich and Greenfield, who have both promised they will be relatively quick. 13 Council Member Ulrich. 14 15 COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Thank you, 16 Mr. Chairman. I do apologize for coming late, I 17 was attending the budget hearing across the street 18 so I didn't get a chance to hear your testimony, 19 but I am very interested in the topic of today's 20 hearing. 21 I find that it's probably difficult 22 to police a building if you're not always 23 confident or sure who's living in it. And I bring 24 that up because we're talking about security in 25 public housing. My wife grew up on the Lower East

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING121
 2
      Side, matter of fact, her parents, my in-laws,
 3
      they're still living in the Lillian Wald Houses
 4
      right on East Houston, I'm there all the time.
 5
      And what's very concerning to them and very
 6
      concerning to many residents in those buildings,
 7
      we can have cameras, we can have jackets with
 8
      reflectors, we could have all these things, we can
      have people buzzing people in, but there's
 9
10
      systemic fraud going on in public housing where
11
      people illegally sublet apartments--
12
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:
                                            [Interposing]
13
      Council Member, I made--
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH:
14
                                              Yeah.
15
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: --the
16
      announcement, I know that you went to the other,
17
      as important, hearing, but this is only about
18
      cameras and about the composition of the task
19
      force, we're not going into any other security
20
      issues regarding public housing at this point.
21
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH:
22
      well, I mean, I will ask for the indulgence of the
23
      Chairman, maybe after the hearing we could talk
24
      about this, but it's increasingly difficult to
25
      talk about cameras and public safety when you're
```

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING122 on the Public Safety Committee when you don't even 2 3 know who's living in the building 'cause there's a 4 lot of illegal stuff taking place. 5 JOHN RHEA: So first of all, we 6 share your concern about recognizing -- accurately 7 reporting who are tenants of record, okay? 8 there's no argument there. 9 COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Riaht. 10 JOHN RHEA: We spend an incredible 11 amount of time ensuring that when we identify 12 residents who are not part of the household 13 composition that we bring tenancy action as 14 swiftly as possible. 15 To your point, part of the Safety 16 and Security Task Force is looking at the most 17 efficient and effective ways to deal with that 18 problem. So this is not a problem that is not, 19 again, on the table as part of the task force--20 COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Right. 21 JOHN RHEA: --you mentioned your 22 in-laws, well the residents and the CCOP who are 23 on this task force, they mirror your in-laws and 24 they're very concerned about illegal occupants in

their building and that's part of how we try to

25

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING123 address this comprehensively.

The proposal we have on the table around layered access obviously will have an impact on working with tenants to ensure that their household composition is updated, accurate, and reflects everybody is a tenant of record, and obviously key fobs will only be issued to those who are tenant of records.

One of the problems that my team talked about before you arrived is that, with traditional keys, they can be duplicated and passed out to anyone. Obviously, these fobs will only be made available to tenants of record in public housing apartment buildings.

mean, given the housing crisis and the economy it's really unfair. In my district, I don't have any NYCHA developments, but I have people who have fallen on hard times that qualify for these apartments and they can't get in, there's a waiting list, right? So you've got people that desperately need housing that can't get housing because you've got people who have illegally subletted apartments and it's just--

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING124
2	[Crosstalk]
3	JOHN RHEA: [Interposing] Council
4	Member, with all due respect, public housing
5	apartments is just one part of our
6	COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Right.
7	JOHN RHEA:affordable housing
8	pool, we also have Section 8, and I'm sure there
9	are a lot of members in your district who are
10	COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Sure.
11	JOHN RHEA:receiving Section 8
12	[Crosstalk]
13	COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: And there
14	sure are, and thank God they are, they wouldn't be
15	able to live anywhere else. So maybe we could
16	talk after the hearing, I don't want to take up
17	any more time and I know that the Chairman wants
18	to move this along, so thank you.
19	JOHN RHEA: Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. We've
21	been joined by Council Member Diana Reyna. And
22	now Council Member Greenfield.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD:
24	Incidentally, my constituents are on a very long
25	wait list for Section 8, but we won't go there. I

do appreciate your testimony today and I also appreciate—and I'll take a slightly different view than some of my Republican colleagues, one who's no longer here, so I feel bad doing this—but NYCHA housings shouldn't be prisons, right? I mean, these are welcome places, this is a home for the people that live there and they have every right to bring family members, just like the Council Member does to his home, and I definitely appreciate that you're keeping it open and welcome to guests.

I do just want to ask one quick question as well, 'cause I was also at that other budget briefing, and that is with the 20% in capital budget cuts that are being bandied about, how is that going to impact security in NYCHA facilities?

JOHN RHEA: NYCHA, like every other city agency that receives capital dollars, was affected by the 20% cut that was required by the Administration. We've worked very diligently to ensure that those cuts are not in areas where we were investing in security is the short answer. But obviously it has an impact on our capital

JOHN RHEA: If a Council Member, in consultation with residents, say we love your new system, we'll work with you to figure that out at a later date, we want to move forward with cameras, then we will come with a proposal on how to deploy the cameras.

CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Okay. Thank you. We need to get to our other panels, so I want to thank all of you--

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
Hold on.

13 CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: Sorry, not 14 yet?

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: We have 4 1/2 pages worth of questions, we only got to half, we will be forwarding those questions to NYCHA so you can get us the answers. There was a whole bunch of questions I had in my opening statement that we never got to, we'll forward that to you as well.

And just to make one last statement before this panel leaves. Mr. Chairman, the Authority may have and probably did mention to me that there is a Safety and Security Task Force, but when that is not followed up immediately with,

[Crosstalk]

understand the frustration, I want to also say that from my perspective—and this is my point of view—City Council is allocating money to reduce crime and improve safety in public housing. One of the proposals that you were funding at that time was CCTV. We asked for a reasonable period of time to come back to you with a proposal that we think is better than CCTV alone, we think we've honored that, and we still believe that what we're proposing is to reduce crime and improve safety in public housing. So if you allocated the \$1 million for that, we believe we're sticking with the spirit of what our request is.

Secondly, if you decide after
hearing our proposal, it all sounds good, but I
want my TVs, CCTVs, we will provide you with a
more cost effective way to implement the CCTV than
what was originally proposed when you allocated
the money. We hope that you will work with us to
do a proposal that collectively this task force
believes is more effective.

So we believe both in the spirit

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING131
 2
      and in terms of the substance of what we're
 3
      proposing and doing is consistent with what we
 4
      asked and that your million dollars didn't go down
      a rabbit hole to be stuck in an account without a
 5
 6
      plan.
 7
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Okay.
 8
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE: And if we get
      the federal funding, hopefully we can do all of
 9
10
      that for all of our--
11
                                 Thank you.
                     JOHN RHEA:
12
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Yes.
13
                     CHAIRPERSON VALLONE:
14
      developments, okay.
15
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           I just want
16
      chair's prerogative just to state this. To my far
17
      right, Diana Reyna has $2,235,000 in capital
18
      money; I have 2,015,000 in capital money; Melissa
19
      Mark Viverito, 1,400,000 in capital money; and
20
      Margaret Chin, 3 million in capital money, some of
21
      that goes back to 2004, considering she's been in
22
      office only a year, Margaret, that's really
23
      something. So just at this table alone, just at
24
      this table alone we're talking about more than $10
25
      million. Maria Carmen Arroyo has $2 1/2 million.
```

task force so that we can get those answers.

25

today to testify about our experience with implementing improved security for the residents we serve. The NHA has invested heavily in this solution and we are pleased to share our information with you.

The Newark Housing Authority has over 8,000 units of public housing and faced many of the same difficult funding situations as all other Housing Authorities. When I started working with NHA four years ago, we had individual meetings at every single one of our sites and one of the main complaint of our residents were they wanted us to increase safety and security.

implement a multi-pronged approach to improving our residents with increased safety and security. The system is made up of five components that we decided to purchase. We have physical changes to the lobbies and doors, installation of cameras, we have a visitor management system, resident access control system, and on-site and off-site security personnel.

The physical changes that we made to the properties overall included upgrades to our

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING135

common areas with improved lighting, redesigning security desks with line-of-sites, installation of magnetic door locks. To date, we have installed over 750 cameras throughout 27 senior buildings, two-family properties, and three scatter site communities. This system is centralized as opposed to an old system of site-based DVRs--and I'm sure everyone remembers the site-based DVRs.

[Off mic]

JANET ABRAHAMS: These cameras can zoom in for accurate pictures so that police can identify drug sellers, license plate numbers from hundreds of feet. We also have the ability to playback past incidents and also print high-resolution pictures, we have the capabilities of recording and storing up to 14 days of video in all cameras, the recorded video, it is encrypted, which is allowable in court. Both NHA and the police have used our videos as evidence in various criminal trials, eviction cases.

It should also be noted that we also installed in all our common areas speaker systems. The speaker system is used by the security guards to address potential offenders by

2 simply stating on the speaker system, please move 3 away, the police is on their way.

Obviously, we don't have cameras everywhere. So the last three aspects of the system was aimed at getting unauthorized and residents off and on off the property. The visitor management system, which is called the EasyLobby system, requires that every visitor register with the security guard and show a photo I.D. which is scanned into a database and a visitor badge is produced showing the visitor's pictures and the unit they are visiting.

The system was developed more for an office buildings, such as the tag that I'm currently wearing. As I'm sure many of you--it can be done quickly and imposes no inconvenience to our visitors.

We also implemented an I.D. badge access system that is for our current resident population. The badge will open designated doors to buildings and displays the resident's picture on the computer system that is standing on the security guard's desk so that they can confirm that it is the resident entering the building.

1

Now in instances where the guards realize that

3 someone else is using that I.D., the I.D. is

4 confiscated and the resident will have to pay a

fine to get that I.D. back from the management

6 office.

7

5

During the process of issuing photo

8 I.D.s to all valid lease holders, we discovered

9 unauthorized subtenants who everyone thought

10 legally lived in our buildings. Because of this

11 system we were able to capture those residents and

12 have those resident removed from our premises.

13 The last component is the 24/7

14 security quards. This includes 24 hour, seven

15 days a week security guards and a central control

16 center. The guards are monitored by the agency

17 control center, which is located in our main

18 office. The camera system itself is monitored,

19 not only by the operators in the central center,

20 but also by the security guards at the property

21 and the site manager. So each one of our site

22 managers, they're able to pull up the cameras for

23 their designated buildings on their computer

24 system.

Everyone now understands that they

25

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING138

are part of a system in increasing the safety of our residents. This has allowed the system to be used for non-security purposes also. For instance, a manager can simply sit at her desk and tell if the snow removal contractor is doing their job.

The integrated system hasn't been cheap. It required an upfront investment of \$5 million, with an ongoing investment of 3.5 million annually. This system does not cover all site, as it is focused on our vertical buildings. The vertical buildings have the access control in their lobbies and then, of course, the scatter sites and the family properties have visual and cam visual and speaker capabilities.

Cameras alone won't make the property safe and we realize that, so that's why we used the four-pronged approach to our system.

We have seen over the last year-two years that we implemented the system a
reduction in crime at our properties. Our
residents today, I really believe that we have
seen success in, not only real reduction in crime,
but also increasing sense of security that our
residents have. Our greatest endorsement of our

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING139
2	approach have come from residents themselves who
3	are now advocating for additional camera services.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you,
6	miss
7	JANET ABRAHAMS: Abrahams.
8	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Abrahams, and
9	I apologize for mispronouncing your name earlier.
10	Ms. Abrahams, you mentioned some numbers, and I
11	didn't quite capture them, of how much it costs
12	for the system and how much it costs to operate.
13	JANET ABRAHAMS: For the full
14	implementation of the system, it was \$5 million,
15	that's the upfront costs, that included the lobby
16	renovations, the installation of the cameras, and
17	the security guards in the first phase. For the
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
19	The security guards in the first phase?
20	JANET ABRAHAMS: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay.
22	JANET ABRAHAMS: In the first phase
23	of this process, what we did was we had one
24	security company that was responsible for the
25	entire oversight, not only of the sites, but also

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING140
2	the central system, and so the cost in the
3	beginning was a little cheaper, because we were
4	testing to see exactly how this process would
5	work. We do have privatized security guards and
6	so on an annual basis with the security guard and
7	for the maintenance of the system, we spend \$3.5
8	million.
9	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And that
10	covers how many residential units?
11	JANET ABRAHAMS: We haveI will
12	give you buildings, we have 27 senior buildings
13	that currently have
14	[Crosstalk]
15	SHAWN BUCHANAN:units.
16	JANET ABRAHAMS:it's about 2,800
17	units in the senior buildings, we have two family
18	properties that come to about 800 units, and then
19	the
20	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
21	Two-family, is that like
22	JANET ABRAHAMS: [Interposing] Two-
23	family size, those are the walk-ups, three-story
24	walk-ups.
25	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING141
2	JANET ABRAHAMS: And then of course
3	the scatter sites, those are the ones that are
4	adjoining, we have maybe about 300 of those units
5	with cameras.
6	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: I'm sorry, if
7	you could repeat the last one, I didn't jot it all
8	down, after the two-family, three-story walk-ups,
9	you had
10	JANET ABRAHAMS: [Interposing] The
11	scatter sites
12	[Crosstalk]
13	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: The scattered
14	site.
15	JANET ABRAHAMS: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And about how
17	many units
18	JANET ABRAHAMS: About 300 units.
19	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And in the 2-
20	family walk-ups?
21	JANET ABRAHAMS: About 800.
22	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Eight hundred,
23	okay. So that covers a little close to 4,000
24	JANET ABRAHAMS: That is correct
25	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:units.

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING142
2	JANET ABRAHAMS:yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: That takes
4	care of maybe two of my developments. And how
5	many people are staffing that add up to this 3.5
6	million annually, how many people are staffing,
7	reviewing cameras, or telling people to back away
8	or call the police, how many
9	JANET ABRAHAMS: [Interposing] Well
10	we have 24 hours, 7 days a week. And so we have
11	it three shifts, so the vertical buildings you
12	have three buildings per site, so if you're
13	looking at three different shifts, your one, two,
14	three, so we're probably talking about
15	SHAWN BUCHANAN: Seventy four
16	[Crosstalk]
17	JANET ABRAHAMS:about 74 guards,
18	about 74.
19	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And they're at
20	a post so they're either in the lobby or in a
21	booth, they're not doing any kind of vertical
22	patrol.
23	SHAWN BUCHANAN: That's correct.
24	JANET ABRAHAMS: That is correct.
25	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. And

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING143
2	then when I had the distinct honor of going to
3	seeing your site, not the buildings, but there was
4	an office space and someone was looking at TV
5	screens that had images from all of your different
6	sites, those staff people, what part of 3.5
7	million are those individuals?
8	JANET ABRAHAMS: Oh, that's the
9	central location, they are included in the 3.5.
10	So in the central location, which is the SCO, the
11	Security Central Office, what you have there, you
12	have also three shifts and the cameras are
13	monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and so,
L 4	but they are located at the 500 Broad Street
15	building.
16	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And you have
17	how many people there?
18	JANET ABRAHAMS: It's
L 9	SHAWN BUCHANAN: Two per
20	[Crosstalk]
21	JANET ABRAHAMS:two per shift.
22	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Two per shift.
23	JANET ABRAHAMS: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And so how
2.5	many staff altogether with weekends and?

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING144
2	JANET ABRAHAMS: About that 74 that
3	I told you
4	[Crosstalk]
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Oh, that's
6	part of the 74.
7	JANET ABRAHAMS: That is correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: I'm sorry, I
9	didn'tokay. My colleagues, do you have any
10	questions?
11	[Off mic]
12	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Thank you,
13	Madam Chair. I stepped out of the room 'cause we
14	had been sitting here for a long time. So I
15	missed the first part of your testimony, and since
16	we don't have a copy of the written testimony
17	JANET ABRAHAMS: I do apologize.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:I may ask
19	you a question that you may have already answered
20	in your testimony. How many developments in the
21	Newark system?
22	JANET ABRAHAMS: Right now, we
23	haveyou mean that has cameras or all together
24	with
25	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING145
 1
 2
       [Interposing] All together in your system.
 3
                      [Off mic]
 4
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: You're
 5
      whole public housing.
 6
                     JANET ABRAHAMS: We have 27 amps,
 7
      so when I say amp--
 8
                     SHAWN BUCHANAN: Twenty-seven
 9
      separate--
                      [Crosstalk]
10
11
                     JANET ABRAHAMS: --27 separate
12
      properties.
13
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: That--
14
                     JANET ABRAHAMS: Twenty-seven
15
      separate and some of those include maybe 7
16
      buildings, 12 buildings--
17
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
18
                     JANET ABRAHAMS: --so it's 27
19
      separate developments.
20
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay. I
21
      think the total units in the system--
22
                     JANET ABRAHAMS: About 8,000.
23
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay. I
24
      think I have 14,000 in my district alone, I think
25
      Melissa has 20,000 in hers.
```

JANET ABRAHAMS: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: and I

didn't realize that the difference in size was so
significant. While we're optimistic in
celebrating that, we have an example of a system
that works for a municipality, I'm concerned that
the difference in size might impact the
effectiveness in us adopting this as a method for
addressing some of the security concerns. Would

you agree or disagree?

Newark Housing Authority, yes, we're small, and we have one centralized system that pretty much covers all our sites, but I think as you grow and you kind of take a look at our system and look at our practices and say, maybe we can double this, we can duplicate this, or you can use it with different pieces of it. For instance, you do have the access system for residents. For instance, when residents swipe to go into the building, their picture will pop up on a computer screen. Do you have to have someone in the lobby, can it be at a central location where they are, in fact, watching the doors and making sure that those are

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING147 being used.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so what happens--and also our camera system have analytics that's embedded in there, we are now working with the analytics. And what is analytics? Analytics means you can go into the system and you can program anything you want. For instance, let's say you have an area where you know that three people in a gathering in that area is a problem, you can let the camera know that and what the camera does, the camera will go in, if there are three or four standing in that area, the camera will go in on that group, take pictures of every last one of them and store it for you so at the end of the day you can understand who you have vandalizing. I mean, there are different things that you can do with the building. If they break a glass, the camera can focus in, so you can program the camera to do the work for you.

So the analytics, it's there, and of course, there are different things that you can do to help with the size.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay. Now you testified that you don't have cameras in all

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING149
2	SHAWN BUCHANAN: We use DVTel for
3	resident access.
4	JANET ABRAHAMS: So we're very
5	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:
6	[Interposing] DVTel is a company?
7	SHAWN BUCHANAN: DVTel is the
8	yeah, it's the company's thatI'm sorry, DVTel is
9	the vendor for
10	[Crosstalk]
11	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
12	Can you
13	JANET ABRAHAMS: Say your name.
14	FEMALE VOICE: Identify yourself.
15	JANET ABRAHAMS: Identify yourself.
16	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you.
17	SHAWN BUCHANAN: I'm sorry.
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Identify
19	yourself.
20	SHAWN BUCHANAN: I'm Shawn
21	Buchanan, I'm the Senior Adviser to the Operations
22	Division.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: So the
24	company's, what is DV
25	SHAWN BUCHANAN: [Interposing] I'm

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING150
 2
      sorry, DVTel--
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: --DVTel.
 3
 4
                     SHAWN BUCHANAN: --DVTel is the
 5
      name of our software vendor, they're responsible
 6
      for the software that we use to monitor our
 7
      cameras.
 8
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: And the
 9
      hardware?
10
                     SHAWN BUCHANAN:
                                      They were the
11
      general contractor, so they did install the access
12
      system, which we use is Emerge.
13
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Oh, I see,
14
      okay.
15
                     SHAWN BUCHANAN: So they installed
16
      Emerge, which is our resident access control, and
17
      then we have a vendor EasyLobby who has provided
18
      us with the resident or visitor management.
19
                     COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
20
                     JANET ABRAHAMS: And just one
21
      comment. Once you put the system in place, what
22
      the Housing Authority did was train the trainer
23
      concept, so we have our own team of individuals
24
      that's responsible for the maintenance of the
25
      cameras, that way we brought it back in-house so
```

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSINGIST
2	that it will be more cost effective.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.
4	Thank you, Madam Chair.
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Council Member
6	Greenfield, followed by Council Member Melissa
7	Mark-Viverito.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Thanks
9	for crossing the river to come testify today, we
10	appreciate it.
11	Couple of quick questions. So this
12	new technology, what was the total cost?
13	JANET ABRAHAMS: For the
14	implementation
15	[Crosstalk]
16	JANET ABRAHAMS:five million.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Five
18	million, okay
19	JANET ABRAHAMS: Yes.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD:
21	that's not a huge amount of money in the grand
22	scheme of things.
23	JANET ABRAHAMS: Well for us it is,
24	we're smaller.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Fair

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING152 2 enough. How long have you had this system? 3 JANET ABRAHAMS: We're going on the 4 third year. 5 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. And have you seen a drop in crime and what sort of 6 7 drop have you seen in the years since you've 8 adopted this system? 9 JANET ABRAHAMS: I don't have the 10 full statistics because we're working with the 11 police department to get that information, but 12 what I can tell you from just viewing the cameras 13 on my desk, that I have the ability to view them 14 on a daily basis especially in our senior 15 buildings. In the beginning, when we implemented

at our senior sites, the 1st through the 10th of the month, the traffic was over a couple thousands in some of our buildings, and I can honestly tell you that when you look at those dates now, because we have that data, it's less than 300. So you can see a drop because of the fact that they have to check in at the desk. And when we implemented this system in the beginning, we had a visitor badge that would bleed. So what happens is that once you're in the building past your time, it

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING153
2	would say stop and so basically you would have to
3	go back downstairs and turn that in to get
4	reentered into the building.
5	So that kind of worked in the
6	beginning, we stopped that system because we don't
7	see the level of traffic anymore.
8	As far as the drug dealing, at one
9	of the bad sites that we had, we have had several
10	arrests and so we had literally, not stopped it,
11	but we definitely slowed down that process.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: So
13	things have improved, but you're not sure by
14	exactly how much.
15	JANET ABRAHAMS: I don't have the
16	numbers
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: It's
18	okay.
19	JANET ABRAHAMS:but it has
20	definitely improved.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Final
22	question, do you folks use the neighborhood watch
23	program similar to the one that we were discussing
24	here earlier at all or no?
25	JANET ABRAHAMS: The Tenant Patrol

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING154
2	Program?
3	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yeah.
4	JANET ABRAHAMS: No, that was
5	disbanded when I came to the Housing Authority.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Is
7	there a reason for that, have you found it not to
8	be effective or?
9	JANET ABRAHAMS: Well for us, what
10	happened when I came and I did the roster, I
11	noticed that most of my tenant patrollers were
12	very elderly residents, some of my residents never
13	came out of their home. So the program itself was
14	not being monitored correctly.
15	I do know from where I came from,
16	my other life I was at the Chicago Housing
17	Authority and the Housing Authority in Chicago
18	utilized the tenant patrol very well because it
19	was a well ran program.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Got it,
21	okay. Thank you very much.
22	JANET ABRAHAMS: Welcome.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Ms.
24	Abrahams, or am I getting your name right?
25	JANET ABRAHAMS: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Okay. Again, nice to see you, and I did with some of my colleagues do the tour of the authority and what you had set up, and it really was impressive because you were not only touching on the security issues, but you were also improving the quality of life within the buildings themselves because you did do the whole lobby refurbishing. And for those that have not seen it, it wasn't just refurbishing the lobby and putting in nicer tiles, it was actually creating a community room where people could socialize and doing basically extracurricular activities. So it's really impressive, I think.

But just to be very clear, obviously, because of the sheer size of our Authority, and as Maria has said, I have between 18 and 20,000 units of housing in my district alone, I know what this Authority is looking at is only on the securing of the entryways in terms of the lock system. Obviously implementing a secure 24-hour security personnel is just not realistic at this point, so I know that they were talking about different phases.

So obviously in that case, and just doing the securing of the buildings and the locks and the fobs, I guess the fob system, is obviously had been much cheaper in your case 'cause you were talking about a much smaller network of buildings, correct?

JANET ABRAHAMS: That is correct.

that was the first phase, so that's something that's to be very clear as we hear your testimony and the wonderful work you've done in your Authority, that we're only talking about a fraction or a portion of it, we're not talking about implementing it wholesale the way you have done because we just can't, in terms of the cost, it's prohibitive.

But that the securing of the doors and the lock systems and the equipment that they were talking about they indicated what it cost us about \$50,000 per building, is that something on average in scale to what you paid?

JANET ABRAHAMS: No, that's more than what we paid in some cases. Depending on how many doors they have, what they're trying to do

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING157
2	for each one of the doors with the mag locks and
3	putting in the access control and what have you, I
4	believe for one of our larger complex we spent
5	probably about \$35,000 just to get the cameras in,
6	to get the doors. In some cases, we had to
7	replace doors because doors were warped so they
8	would not
9	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
10	Close.
11	JANET ABRAHAMS:they would not
12	close and what have you. So it kind of varies
13	depending on how the condition of what we walked
14	into.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Now
16	by chance, I know you've been doing a lot of
17	showing people what work you've done. Have you by
18	chance done a tour of some of our developments or
19	our Authority?
20	JANET ABRAHAMS: Yes, when I first
21	moved here, I did tour some sites.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: No,
23	but in terms of this conversation between this
24	chairman
2.5	JANET ABRAHAMS: No.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING158
2	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
3	and your Authority, have you visited to maybe give
4	us some sense of maybe some additional input
5	[Crosstalk]
6	JANET ABRAHAMS: [Interposing] No,
7	no, I have not.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
9	Interesting to see. But I want to commend you for
LO	your work. Again, it's very impressive and I
11	think it's always great when different
12	municipalities could really just learn from each
13	other, you know, learn from experiences, know what
14	others are doing and that's the way that we can
15	provide better security for our residents. So
16	with that, thank you very much, Madam Chair.
L7	JANET ABRAHAMS: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Just a few
19	quick questions. So the residents in your
20	developments have actually seen increased safety
21	and they've articulated this to you in addition to
22	whatever is perceived safety, but its actual
23	safety that they're experiencing.
24	JANET ABRAHAMS: Oh, definitely, I
25	mean, right now we have the camera systems in the

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

common areas in the lobbies and the residents now 3 want us to take them on every floor. So I mean

4 that's a process that we're looking at to try to

5 see how we can bring cameras up to the other

6 floors. But they definitely want that because

7 they have seen a reduction.

> CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And just in terms of like percentages, you've seen an increase in more Housing Court actions for unauthorized tenants, more prosecution of people doing illegal activities in the buildings by the prosecutor out in New Jersey?

> JANET ABRAHAMS: We have seen definitely an increase in the arrest of drug dealers in our communities, definitely, and we've seen the prosecutor's office contacting us, asking us for footage. And in some cases, one of the experience that we had because we have the PTZ cameras that can zoom distance, we were able to pick up a crime on somebody else's property and was able to share that with the police department, so that really worked in our favor.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: So it hasn't just been an increase in arrests, it's been an

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING160 increase in convictions where you've been able to 2 3 get individuals off your property. 4 JANET ABRAHAMS: Oh, definitely, 5 definitely. 6 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okav. And has 7 the Newark Police Department done training with 8 the Housing Authority or was that always the 9 standard practice before? What, if anything, is 10 the relationship in terms of specifically with 11 your developments and the ones that don't have the 12 4,000, that don't have the surveillance system and the 4,000 that do have their surveillance system? 13 14 JANET ABRAHAMS: We have--15 SHAWN BUCHANAN: [Interposing] Now 16 that they're aware of it, they're coming to us to 17 ask--18 JANET ABRAHAMS: --we have, right 19 now, we have an ex-lieutenant that works for the 20 Housing Authority and we find that we had to bring 21 someone into the agency that had the relationship. 22 It was a difficult task in the beginning because 23 this is a new administration and most of the 24 administration were not from New Jersey, so we had 25 to bring someone in that can kind of pave the way

for us. And this lieutenant, he has been extremely successful in creating security meetings, teams, for instance, the captains of each one of the district, they go to meetings at the various sites when the residents have their meeting to talk about safety and security issues. And those are the buildings that do not have cameras.

As far as the buildings that have cameras, now that the police department is aware of our system they're constantly coming over, asking us can we view it, show us what you have. So they're working very well with us, but it took a while to get there, for them to understand that the system was there, we're not here to show them up, so to speak, we're here to kind of help you and work with you.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And the residents who live in non-Newark Public Housing Authority units or houses near these developments with the system, they've also have said that everything in the general area and outside your area is more safe?

JANET ABRAHAMS: Well what we get,

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING163
 1
 2
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Well if you
 3
      can leave that--
 4
                      [Crosstalk]
 5
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --with us, we
 6
      can make copies and distribute it to the members
      if you think that's okay. If not, we can give
 7
 8
      you--
 9
                     JANET ABRAHAMS:
                                      [Interposing] Well
10
      we will definitely leave something for you, I do
11
      apologize--
12
                      [Crosstalk]
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. We'll
13
14
      get you an e-mail address. Thank you so much.
15
                                       Thank you.
                     JANET ABRAHAMS:
16
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. We are
17
      going to hear from two security--
                      [Off mic]
18
19
                      [Long pause]
2.0
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay.
21
       [pause] okay. So this is actually the public
22
      testimony and so we're going to start putting
23
      people on timers, I will try to be a little bit
24
      flexible. On this panel, we'll have some security
25
      organizations, as well as Reginald Bowman, the
```

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING164
 1
      President from the Citywide Council of Presidents.
 2
 3
      We have Security Watch 24 and we have American
 4
      Security System. So if you can--
 5
                     [Crosstalk]
 6
                     FEMALE VOICE: --Johnson from CCOP.
 7
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Oh, and John
 8
      Johnson from CCop.
 9
                     DESMOND SMITH: He's gone.
10
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: He's gone,
11
      okay. Great. Who am I missing? American
12
      Security Systems, if you can come up on this panel
13
      as well.
14
                      [Off mic]
15
                      [Pause]
16
                     FEMALE VOICE: Yeah, we have.
17
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Oh, yeah.
                     MALE VOICE: I don't.
18
19
                      [Off mic]
20
                      [Pause]
21
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes, so I want
22
      to keep things a little tighter, but we'll have
23
      some flexibility, okay, and we'll work with you
24
      when we're ready to do the PowerPoint. And just
25
      for the security companies, if you can just give
```

us general information and not start talking about

3 any actual prices that your companies may have.

4 You can say whether you think the prices that the

5 Authority quoted were accurate earlier, but I'll

6 ask you to leave it to that. So first I want to

7 ask Mr. Bowman to start his testimony.

much. I turned it off. Thank you very much,
Chairman Mendez and to all of the distinguished
council members and everybody here. I'm going to
make this very brief because the Security and
Safety Task Force is meeting at 1 o'clock and I
want to make sure that I make it.

relentless and, friends, and basically the time, if it's used and applied with practical wisdom, that practical wisdom must now be applied to allocation of funding for the public housing physical infrastructure. Time and elements do not debate, time and elements erode and decay our physical facilities. So I am here today to advocate for the use of time strategically to get all of the funds necessary to restore and preserve our public housing.

I'm also, for the record, would like to say that it's good to note that this process of engagement called the Security and Safety Task Force, which is in its sophomore year, has made significant progress in creating an entity that combines the efforts of residents, governing bodies, agencies, and the stakeholders.

And I heard earlier in the testimony that there was a little friction about the breakdown of communication between the governing bodies of the City Council and the New York City Housing Authority and the resident leadership. However, when this process started, knowing the culture of the New York City Housing Authority, some of that was to be expected, and I'm pretty sure that going forward we're going to make sure that that does not happen again because we are relying on the partnership and relationship between the residents, our elected officials, and the agency to be a strong one so that we can get this problem solved.

First of all, as the Citywide

Council President who represents all of the 150-
178,000 families of public housing, we

resolution 0423-2010 calling upon the President

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 wholeheartedly support the City Council's

4 and Congress to provide a specific allocation of

5 funding for video security systems at all New York

6 City public housing developments and properties.

> We say that unequivocally and with total support and we will work with you to make sure that if there's anything you need from our council to assist you in getting that information in front of Congress and the White House, we certainly will be there for you.

I would also like to state for the record that I have the privilege of being part of a White House briefing that's been taken place this month. The last briefing will be February the 25th and I hope to be able to get some of the information and budget ideas in front of this briefing so that we can let them know that the public housing of New York should be something that is put on the front burner of the infrastructure discussion that's always being had. And I certainly hope that the City Council and NYCHA and other elected individuals will adopt the idea of NYCHA being an infrastructure and let's go COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING168

after some of these big dollars that are going into infrastructure in the country.

The Security and Safety Task Force was created to address the concerns of public housing residents and resident leaders, that our voices regarding the police and security of public housing grounds and facilities, calling for changes in NYCHA and NYPD policy need to be heard, to foster an atmosphere of positive interaction, feelings of mutual respect and change in the patrol practices and procedures used on NYCHA property.

One of the most pressing needs at this time is state-of-the-art video security systems on all NYCHA properties and developments covering the grounds, lobbies, stair, halls, and elevators. Public housing is an essential part of the infrastructure of the city of New York. We deserve investment in restoring that infrastructure and the special allocation called for in the resolution that I mentioned earlier should be the first of several specific allocations to restore and preserve public housing.

I think you guys have already heard the history of the task force, so I'm not going to go into that.

I just want to close with this.

The Safety and Security Task Force is now a unique partnership, among the CCOP, NYCHA, and NYPD, and all of the stakeholders that have been a part of it, and we certainly invite the City Council members to become a part of it. Since I'm the cochair of the task force, along with Chairman Rhea, I think that we need to continue this discussion to make sure that the elected members of our districts are—whether it's City Council or state or federal level should certainly be invited to participate in this process and join the efforts to make sure that we are all at the table working together.

I certainly believe that the task force has achieved one of the Citywide Council's primary goals. We wanted to make sure that we repositioned residents as partners at the head of the table and at the forefront in all policy decisions for making public housing safer and more secure for residents. It must also be clear that

```
2
      the task force does not supplant the duly elected
 3
      resident leadership of the CCOP, the resident
 4
      advisory boards, the districts, or the resident
 5
      tenant associations.
 6
                     This task force was created because
 7
      there was a problem. The problem was very unique,
 8
      and I think one of our distinguished council
      members--and I'm going to close--mentioned it
 9
10
      before. We want to make sure that as we go
11
      forward, that we take this task force concept and
      that we utilize it as a solution oriented tool and
12
13
      mechanism to make sure that we not only solve the
14
      security and safety issues, but also address the
15
      more pressing needs that exist in public housing
16
      in our community. Thank you.
17
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Thank you, Mr.
18
               I'm going to ask my colleagues, if we
      Bowman.
19
      have any questions of you now so that you can
20
      leave to get to your meeting.
21
                     REGINALD BOWMAN:
                                        Okav.
22
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Okay?
23
                     FEMALE VOICE:
                                     Yeah.
24
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: All right, so
25
      I don't have any questions--
```

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING170

1

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING171
2	REGINALD BOWMAN: No questions.
3	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:and
4	Melissa's running off. So
5	REGINALD BOWMAN: Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:thank you
7	very much for joining us and for your testimony.
8	And now gentlemen, whoever wants to go first.
9	[Pause] And, again, I just need to remind you to
10	identify yourselves for the record when you end up
11	speaking. And let me see how it works on your
12	mic, there is a light that is sometimes on.
13	DESMOND SMITH: I think this is on
14	now.
15	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay.
16	FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
17	DESMOND SMITH: Should I start?
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Whoever wants
19	to start is fine, who
20	DESMOND SMITH: My name is Desmond
21	Smith, I have a company called Secure Watch here
22	in New York City, I'm the president and founder of
23	that company. It began in 2001 as a real estate
24	residential real estate security company and it
25	hegan its roots in Harlem and in the South Brony

where I was a detective in narcotics for many years.

I retired from the police

department after 20 years, and I had a technology

background prior to being a police officer, I was

a tech specialist for the Xerox Corporation and an

avionics mechanic here in town, so I started a

little late. Later on, I was able to put those

two careers together and put together security

platforms for the residents and the owners who

existed up in those buildings up there.

A lot of that, in 2001 I had found that the industry had, for the most part, abandoned affordable housing throughout the city. They were, I guess, busy down here chasing the towers and the large complexes, but the majority of the affordable housing was deemed to be--there was nothing much you can do, you could just put up cameras and hope for the best and that was so far from the truth.

I got on the boards of several CHIPs, Community Housing Improvement Program, I spoke at several breakfasts, breakfasts and hosted these breakfasts telling them that there was no

such thing as a bad building, there was a bad apartment, and the truth is the residents of those apartments probably dislike this individual more than the owner does. And I got these owners to turn around and start investing money in security networks and their buildings.

Part of the security paradigm is that, we believe—those in my industry believe that technology is an answer, and I'll tell you right now, technology is not the whole answer. It is no different than handing someone a gun and shield and telling them they're a detective, doesn't work that way. And I've seen technology providers throughout the city hand technology to 60, 70, 80—unit apartment buildings, examples like Taino Towers and just tell people now you're safe, you have access control—well that's not. The combination, where the protocols come into play is when you create technology that functions seamlessly with the law enforcement component.

And that's what Secure Watch did initially, we said listen, you are not a security expert, we are, you wouldn't know where to put this technology, what to do, you're a property

manager, you're an owner. I said, let us handle security incidents, we will direct the video and the data to the NYPD or, in this case now, the Newark and Boston PD, and we will move that data across and we will facilitate this transfer of information, but most important you need to work closely with local law enforcement.

That began a success that today grew into 1,700 locations and 21,000 cameras that are throughout a 75-mile radius of the Empire State Building.

We three years ago were deemed the largest private surveillance network in the country and the crime reduction in some of those properties—and I'm talking about areas in the South Bronx and areas in Harlem where I served for 10 years—some of the crime reduction was 90% after six months of the implementation of the Secure Watch systems.

And I say systems because you have to know how to use that technology and you have to be able to give that technology and get it immediately to law enforcement. We now have an MOU in place with the Fire Department of New York,

success.

we realize that this is a brilliant first
responder program that from the time in 911 calls
that the city should have access to these cameras,
whether it's fire department responding or police
responding. We got our owner groups to offer that
free to the city to make sure that—I was on a
panel with Senator Adams and when we developed
that program last year, it's had tremendous

I probably know more about surveillance and security than most people in this town right now. I've been doing it a long time and we've done it very well and we've done it very cost effective. Part of it was the cost effectiveness of it. This system was built to compete on a very competitive market out there with the private sector and we have won hands down over and over. Even the components that we offer all come with five year parts and labor maintenance. We don't believe in turning over a high-tech system and then allowing it to—and then putting the responsibility on the municipality to take care of that.

I think I went over my time, and I

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING176
 2
      apologize. I didn't start by thanking everyone
 3
      for this opportunity. I know I'm a last-minute
 4
      entry, I would never come without a prepared
 5
      presentation to give to you, and I apologize that
 6
      this seems somewhat scattered.
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you for
 7
 8
      joining us and for testifying and I'll let the
 9
      next person present and then if I have any
10
      questions, I'll just start. There's been a wealth
      of information.
11
12
                     So if you want to do an intro, and
13
      I know you want to show us part of what your
14
      system covers, do want to give us an intro, sir?
15
                     LARRY DOLAN:
                                   Sure.
16
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And introduce
17
      yourself and if she can introduce [pause].
18
                     LARRY DOLAN: Can you hear me?
19
      Yes, my name is Larry Dolan, I'm the founder of
20
      American Security Systems, we've been in business
21
      31 years, we're a New York City, Long Island City-
22
      based company, we have over 8,000 accounts. We're
23
      a central station--burglar and fire alarm central
24
      station UO certified New York--
25
                     MALE VOICE: Microphone [off mic].
```

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING178

company in the industry. We believe that they deserve to come home to a safe building.

And it's interesting because a lot of the testimony really hones in on the system that we created for NYCHA. Actually, it's been out in the market for about three years, but it's the new area, it's the new development in CCTV systems, it's no longer a CCTV systems.

The chairman was talking about a layered system, he was talking about mixing and matching systems. Well we've been doing that for years and what we did was we actually married it into a UO certified 24/7 central station so that we could actually attack some of the issues that housing has.

Hector?

If you understand housing, if you understand apartment buildings, if you understand apartment buildings you look at--you could put cameras everywhere you want, but the truth is 95% of all apartment building crimes start at the entrance. If you can secure that entrance, then you have most of, a lot of the building security taking care of. So what we created was a system

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING179 called Safe Lobby, which is an interactive system. 2 3 One of the interesting things that 4 everybody talks about here is putting cameras and 5 the guards and the card access, and all that's 6 fine, but what they're not talking about is the 7 hidden costs of the infrastructure to have a hub. 8 You talked about with the Newark people, they have 74 people managing a system for 4,000 apartments. 9 10 Here, we have that hub, we've been doing this for 11 31 years, it's called the Central Station. 12 Hector? 13 The first thing we do is we attack something called forced entry. Okay? Go back. 14 15 And again, it was interesting because we know what 16 the biggest problem is: people are breaking the 17 locks, nobody knows about it. With the Safe Lobby 18 system -- why is that camera going out, Hector? 19 [Off mic] 20 LARRY DOLAN: Okay. With the Safe 21 Lobby system, we put a camera outside, we put card 22 Part of what we do is we manage the 23 camera, we manage the card access all remotely 24 from our Central Station, but if that door is

forced open, okay, which is a big issue, we take a

25

picture of the person who forces open the door, we

The next issue that people talked

The next issue is a big issue, it's

2

1

3 send a signal to our Central Station and

4

immediately we dispatch. Okay.

5

6 about was door ajar, right. And if you have a

7

door that is left open, well guess what, you have

8

no security for the building, anybody can enter.

So we put into our system if that door is left

9

open for two minutes or three minutes, we can

1011

program that, it sends a signal immediately to the

12

Central Station, our Central Station sends a JPEG

13

to building management shows who left the door

14

open, and sends them over to close the door.

15

16 called loitering. And again, people talked about

17

analytics, but loitering is if you have people

18

hanging out there, dealing drugs, you have them

19

hanging out there waiting to mug somebody, you

20

have gangs there. If they're there for more than-

21

-and, again, it's up to you when you want us to do

22

it and how long you want them to loiter, I guess

23

during the day with the babies, you don't really

24

manage it, but in evenings you manage it. When

25

they come in, we put analytics around them, all

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING181

right, and you'll see it goes from green to yellow to red. And we have speakers and microphones in the lobby, all right, and it sends a signal immediately to our office.

You don't need to invest in an infrastructure of an office that does all this, we do it, we've been doing this for 31 years. Our operators come online and we have a speaker on mic and we say, excuse me, sir, there is no loitering in this building. If they don't leave, we dispatch, okay?

We have a great relationship with the PD, all right, we have ex-detectives working for us as well. We understand this. When we dispatch on we have a visual, we dispatch on a visual, the police will respond, it's a high priority.

So Safe Lobby basically is--and when you think about all the security systems and, again, in all due deference to the security task force and what they're thinking about putting in, it's good, it's all good, but it's all history because the future is interactive, the future is interactive. The card access systems, great,

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING182 2 okay, and I think it's going to be terrific, it's 3 part of our system. 4 All of a sudden you're going to 5 attack what the young councilman was talking 6 about: all the people in the buildings that don't 7 belong in the buildings because you're going to 8 have them come up for a card, they can't have, they can't duplicate it. They lose a card, right, 9 10 no more keys, they have to now come to you and get 11 a card. There can't be people in there that don't 12 belong in there. 13 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: If I can ask 14 you to start summarizing, please? 15 LARRY DOLAN: Okay. 16 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Also went over 17 your time and I want to ask a few questions. LARRY DOLAN: You got it. And it 18 [off mic] has 24/7 CCTV recording, it has door 19 20 ajar notification, it has forced entry 21 dispatching, it has anti-loitering surveillance, 22 and it has 24/7 live on-call operators. And what 23 do you get out of it? What does it involve? 24 card access, no more keys, CCTV recording--back, 25 Hector--door ajar notification, anti-loitering

2 surveillance, live on-call operators. 3 And we added to this something 4 that's very interesting because it really affects 5 NYCHA residents probably more than any other 6 residents in the city. How many kids--Hector, you 7 can do it--how many kids come home every day to no 8 parent being there? All right. If you swipe your card, it goes to our Central Station and we will 9 10 e-mail or call the parent that their child has 11 arrived home safely. 12 So, it consists of--Hector, go--a 13 card access reader at the front door. So now we have a layered system and it's all part of a 14 15 system that we estimate will cost maybe \$25,000 a 16 building. 17 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: You weren't 18 supposed to say that, you weren't supposed to give 19 me money figures. 20 LARRY DOLAN: Okay. Sorry. 21 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: So--22 LARRY DOLAN: Camera speaker, 23 microphone in the lobby, a front door contact for 24 forced entry and door ajar, a DVR with analytics, 25 and it's a serious DVR with a terabyte of history,

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING183

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING184
2	and a WGAN receiver 'cause we added one more
3	issue, which was that a tenant comes in and if
4	they feel threatened or if they're attacked, they
5	press the transmitter, immediately it goes to our
6	central, our operators come on, and we see and we
7	talk and we take action. The Central Station is
8	enough?
9	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes.
10	LARRY DOLAN: Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you.
12	LARRY DOLAN: You're welcome.
13	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you. So
14	gentlemen, without quoting me any prices, you were
15	both here during the testimony of the chairman,
16	correct? Okay. And the systems that they were
17	talking about, this multilayered system seems like
18	more or less what you guys have talked about, is
19	that correct?
20	DESMOND SMITH: Correct.
21	LARRY DOLAN: Yes, well
22	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay, okay.
23	LARRY DOLAN:to some degree.
24	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. Yeah,
25	it may have a little bit, more or less. And were

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING185
 1
      the prices, without you giving me prices of what
 2
 3
      your company does, did the prices that they were
 4
      throwing out and the prices that the Newark
 5
      Housing Authority was throwing out, does that seem
 6
      like those are the normal prices in this field?
 7
      Just so, like, yes or no with a very short
 8
      explanation.
 9
                     DESMOND SMITH: You can go first on
10
      that one.
11
                     LARRY DOLAN: The answer is no, I
12
      mean, you know, it's high.
13
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Gentleman,
      sir?
14
15
                     DESMOND SMITH: My systems with
16
      comp--now they're not the NYCHA system, it's a
17
      different system, the system we currently deploy
      is for--
18
19
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           [Interposing]
20
      I just want a yes or no, I don't want to know
21
      about your system here.
22
                     DESMOND SMITH: Well I don't want
23
      to unfairly categorize a NYCHA system, it's a very
24
      robust and exotic system, but it's a lot more
25
      expensive than--
```

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSINGIS
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
3	The Newark system.
4	DESMOND SMITH: Well I don't know
5	about the Newark system, I really have very
6	little
7	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
8	Well what she was talking about, her system, you
9	couldn't get a sense from what she was saying?
10	DESMOND SMITH: They may be
11	comparable, the two systems in cost. The system
12	currently engaged in the private sector is
13	considerably less expensive than those spec
14	systems.
15	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. And
16	NYCHA currently doesn't have a multilayered
17	system, they have just CCTVs or VIPERs and so you-
18	_
19	DESMOND SMITH: [Interposing] They
20	have different systems and they're structuredin
21	some locations, they're structured more robustly
22	than others. I'm not an expert on the NYCHA
23	system so I'd be doing them an injustice if I
24	began to comment on it as an expert.
25	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes, okay.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING187
2	LARRY DOLAN: NYCHA hascan I
3	answer?
4	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes.
5	LARRY DOLAN: NYCHA has cameras
6	deployed around in certain complexes, NYCHA has
7	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
8	Twenty percent.
9	LARRY DOLAN:they have keys, all
10	right, they do have mag locks, and they do have
11	working intercom systems. You know when people
12	talk about the intercom systems, 'cause we service
13	the intercom systems, many, many, many times
14	they're talking about the locks. It's not that
15	the intercom doesn't work, it's 'cause the lock
16	has been broken and nobody knows, and, again, Safe
17	Lobby addresses that issue.
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Gentlemen, I
19	look forward to meeting with you and maybe my
20	colleagues might want to meet with you as well,
21	maybe we could arrange something, because the
22	stuff that we cannot discuss here, the numbers, I
23	think will give us a better idea to analyze what
24	NYCHA is proposing to us. So
25	DESMOND SMITH: Very good.

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING188
 1
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --I think
 2
 3
      you'll be hearing from my colleagues as well.
 4
                     LARRY DOLAN: Councilman, I repeat
 5
      what I offered to you when we first met which is
 6
      I--
 7
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
 8
      I can't have you say that on the record.
 9
                     LARRY DOLAN:
                                   Okay.
10
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay?
                                                 Thank
11
      you.
                     DESMOND SMITH: I was going to say
12
13
      thank you and I welcome the opportunity to speak
14
      on this--
15
                     [Crosstalk]
16
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                          Thank you.
17
                     LARRY DOLAN:
                                   Thank you.
18
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                          Thank you. So
19
      I want to thank everyone for your patience. And
20
      the next panel, I'm going to have two panels,
21
      Loretta McDonald, Harriet Hughes. [Pause] Okay,
22
      they were here from Brooklyn, I'm not quite sure
23
      what development, but they live in Council Member
      Steve Levin's district, so now they're gone. All
24
25
      right, Jacob Hill--I saw him earlier--okay, all
```

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING189
 1
 2
      right, Nydia Vasquez from Smith houses, please
 3
      come on up.
 4
                      [Off mic]
 5
                      CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           Luther
 6
      Stubblefield [phonetic], and Marquise Jenkins, if
 7
      you could all come on up.
 8
                      [Pause]
 9
                      [Off mic]
10
                      NYDIA VASQUEZ: Yes, oh, no, I
11
      don't have copies.
12
                      [Off mic]
13
                      [Long pause]
                      CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Whoever's
14
15
      ready to start.
16
                      NYDIA VASQUEZ: Push it.
17
                      CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And please
18
      identify yourself for the record.
19
                     NYDIA VASQUEZ: Good afternoon, my
20
      name is Nydia Vasquez and I live in the Alfred
21
      Smith Houses, I am here representing our president
22
      of the tenants association, Aixa Torres,
23
      unfortunately, she was not able to attend and so
24
      I'm reading her statement.
25
                     New York City Council Housing
```

_

Committee, Honorable Mendez, Council and committee members, on behalf of the residents of the Alfred E. Smith houses, we are expressing our concern for the well-being, dignity, and quality of life for all of us.

Well-being. Smith Houses' residents have in the last couple of years seen the decline police presence and the elimination of our patrol community officer who works closely with Tenant Patrol, now known as Resident Watch.

and functioning door systems that would assist the residents in having a sense of well-being. NYCHA has decided to stop the installation of cameras and look at the other methods of security. Please note that the resident association has sought and received funding for the placement of cameras in the development.

On September 1st, 2010, a fatal shooting took place in front of 46 Madison Street where a request for installation of cameras had been placed. The request came because the Residents Watch in that building consisted of elderly Chinese-American residents and they come

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING191

down every day, 52 weeks a year. The only exception is their New Year Day.

NYCHA pays New York City millions of dollars for police services and other property owner landowners pay the city government for police services.

Dignity. Public housing was built to ensure that all Americans, especially veterans of war and their families, would have decent, affordable shelter. Public housing is no longer affordable or decent to live in. Their residence are based on 30% of gross income of residents on the lease, not what a resident actually brings home or net pay. Residents on fixed incomes or unemployed insurance are still having their rents raised or not reduced to reflect their true income.

Overcrowded conditions for some families who are trapped in public housing because of high rent and economic situation in the country. There are families living in apartments with two bedrooms and over seven people in apartments made for a family of four. Most times children are sharing rooms into puberty and no

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING192 2 consideration whether a boy or girl in the same 3 room. 4 Quality of life. Since the 5 creation of our center call number, repair systems 6 have become a nightmare. Basic repairs now have a 7 24-hour wait period and the process of the call 8 center is sending someone to check and determine whether you need a repair and what repair is 9 10 needed. Major repairs are taking approximately 11 two years or more to get the repair done. I ask the council members to 12 13 question the NYCHA about our concerns and the issues that have been raised in the statement. 14 15 Respectfully, Aixa Torres, President. 16 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you, 17 thank you. Whoever is ready to give testimony 18 next. 19 MARQUISE JENKINS: Good afternoon, 20 Council Member Mendez. Let me start by thanking 21 you for this opportunity to have this hearing. My 22 name is Marquise Jenkins, I'm a committee 23 organizer of Good Old Lower East Side, and 24 longtime public housing resident. 25 GOLES is a neighborhood housing and

preservation organization that served the Lower
East Side of Manhattan since 1977, and it is
dedicated to tenants' right, homelessness
prevention, economic development, and community
revitalization. GOLES accomplishes our mission
through working with community residents to
advocate and organize.

GOLES long-term goals are to build power of low income residents on the Lower East Side and address displacement, serve community, serve determination over the use of public space, and ensure safe, clean, and healthy environments where people live, work, and play.

It is my hope that my testimony will amplify residents' concerns on the issues of safety within their developments. It is also my hope that my recommendations will lead to a comprehensive and holistic approach to improving residents' quality of life as it relates to their safety.

In May of 2010, GOLES launched a report card survey to assess the repairs and management of NYCHA. The survey was designed to allow residents to grade NYCHA on the services

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING194

they provide and the condition of residents' building, developments, and apartments. Thus far, we have surveyed over 700 public housing residents on the Lower East Side of Manhattan.

In our preliminary assessment, we found that 31% of residents gave NYCHA an F for police protection and 28% gave an F for building and development safety—F being the most common grade for both. Sixty-eight percent of the residents surveyed said that they would or do feel safer with surveillance cameras installed in their developments. While more than half of the residents we have surveyed prefer to have cameras, we at GOLES are firm in the belief that keeping our development safe requires much more.

It is clear by these results that something must be done about the safety of residents. We believe that the City Council's resolution 423-2010 calling for federal funds--for federal government to allocate federal dollars or funding to subsidize security cameras in NYCHA's development is a good start at tackling these issues. However, we believe that the City Council should request more funding, not only to subsidize

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING195 2 cameras, but also to provide resources for Tenant 3 Patrol and to set up a support for Tenant Patrol. 4 Residents are often the first line 5 of defense when it comes to making their 6 developments safe, therefore, they are best able to notify officials when they believe illegal 7 8 activity is taking place within their development. 9 As you already know, NYCHA 10 currently pays over 70 million a year for NYPD 11 quote unquote special services. This funding is 12 unjust. Public housing residents pay twice as 13 much for police services as any other resident in 14 New York City and many residents feel that they 15 are more harassed than protected by the PSA officers. 16 17 Our recommendations is that, in 18 addition to being used for capital improvements, 19 some of this funding should go towards providing 20 extra resources for Tenant Patrol. 21 Finally, as you know, NYCHA has put 22 a hold on further installation of surveillance 23 cameras in the developments while they wait for a 24 Safety and Security Task Force to put together a

report, which includes looking at the Newark

Housing Authority's security system. We are not sure of NYCHA's plan in use to assist them, but we would like to stress the following pros and cons-- I won't get to that.

Without seeing the system it is hard for us to accurately form an opinion about it. If NYCHA is certainly considering bringing the system to our or any components of it to New York, we request a tour of the Newark system for advocates and resident leaders so that we can make a full recommendations.

We further would like to stress that, with any new programs that will have a direct impact on residents, that there would be a hearing for residents to give feedback.

I want to thank the Council Member Mendez and the committee members for holding this hearing and listening to my testimony. We hope to continue dialogue with you and looking at ways to increase safety [off mic] in New York City housing developments.

LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: My name is

Luther Stubblefield, I'm--okay. My name is Luther

Stubblefield, I'm an advocate for the Lower East

Side, I'm also a resident at the Baruch Houses and

I'm a member of the GOLES on the Lower East Side

and I'm a member of the tenants association.

going to talk very quickly 'cause I have quite a

bit to say. I'm going to read the testimony, it's

more directed to the circumstances and the

8 situation that we have at Baruch Houses where we

have to separate ourselves from the tenants

association to outreach for security cameras.

I'd also like to mention at this time too that the Baruch Houses is NYCHA's largest development in Manhattan. And is 18 buildings with double entrances for each one.

Now what I've written for you today is Murder in the Baruch Houses. Sounds like a TV series or a movie or maybe the title of a mystery book. It is the sad environment where we live at Baruch Houses. This past February the 12th, 2011, tenants found a female body in a blood full elevator at 555 FDR Drive at 5 a.m. in the morning. She had been stabbed 11 times and, without security or police surveillance cameras, there are no video leads for the police to identify the assailant.

This is the third murder in three years at Baruch Houses. Baruch is the largest NYCHA development in Manhattan with 18 buildings and double entrances for each, and without video security of any kind.

Napoleon, the long term president of the tenants' association. I have served on the TA board for 12 years up to the year of 2010, and never was cameras applied for to the elected officials.

Last year I was instructed how to apply for the cameras without the assistance of the tenants' association by having the tenants signing petitions.

My first outreach, over 300 tenants came out to sign. The Council Member and the district leader came out to meet with each of the tenants and New York1 gave TV coverage.

The borough president's office called me the very next morning. Mr. Scott Stringer's assistant, offering Mr. Scott Stringer's assistance and he generously granted last year \$400,000--only enough to complete two buildings. I plan to seek donations from

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

foundations. Afterwards, 900 additional tenants came out to sign petitions and they e-mailed their requests for security cameras. What a response, and it made me feel very good.

I do not understand why Mr. Napoleon has not supported cameras for our area, but I hope the Council and the elected officials realize the need and, please, make it happen.

I would like to mention the fact that the murder that we had just this last Saturday with no cameras, and that means also that the money that was received by the NYPD to put surveillance cameras all over the New York City, that in our development we do have the NYPD surveillance cameras, but it only covers twothirds of our development, and one-third where this tragedy happened, they were not covered, so there is nothing. So the police office, they have nothing to go by. They have posted this form up now waiting and trying to see if the tenants can probably solve the problem.

We need the cameras desperately. I understand from my Councilwoman that -- which is Ms. Mendez -- that being that the project and the budget

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is so large, that it's going to probably take at least three years and working with different buildings. And that's my presentation.

Now I'd like to just make one more mention, please, from Mr. Rhea's conversation earlier about the security and having cell phones. That is not going to work. I would like to go on record to state the fact that even when you have land phones in your houses, many times people will ring your phone and they're not even looking for you. And if I'm at a restaurant, a movie, a meeting, I don't want people who were just trying to find access to the building ringing my cell phone.

I don't think that's going to work, but I do think a solution would be to have land phones in the apartments with a deposit paid by the tenants and, just like they charge every month for the air conditioners in the windows or for the dryers in your house, maybe there should be a \$3, \$4 charge on a monthly basis, which would offset the expenses to have repairs or whatever, but there should be land phones in these apartments.

And that is my strongest

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING201 2 suggestion. I have some other suggestions as far 3 the Tenant Patrol, but I'll put that together, 4 give it to my Councilwoman, and also give it to Mr. Bowman to be presented at the task force. 5 6 Thank you very much. 7 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you. 8 His testimony though, just to be clear, is that 9 you could send it to your cell phone or you can 10 keep it on your landline. A lot of people are 11 getting rid of their landlines, so they were going 12 to leave it up to the residents to decide how they 13 wanted to have the system for security to the 14 front door go to their individual apartment. 15 I think there were concerns raised 16 by some of my colleagues, so there are issues to 17 be discussed yet. 18 Mr. Stubblefield, you were not here 19 earlier when I threw out several different 20 developments, and 'cause NYCHA's portfolio is so 21 diverse, Baruch Houses happens to be the largest 22 development in Manhattan with 2,194 units--that's 23 about half of the Newark portfolio that's now

under surveillance. And so with the way Baruch

Houses was set up and comparing that to like First

24

Houses, that is a small tenement buildings within a city block with other private housing.

These are some of the details that we could not get from the Authority today that we need to get and we need to understand because they talked about capital costs, they never talked about expense costs, and Newark Housing Authority clearly laid out what the expense costs were for them. And so that is just for 4,000 units, we have 3,000--no 378,000 and I don't know how many other units, it's almost 379,000. So we're like a small city in many places but we're scattered

It will be challenging, and we need to get a better grasp of this.

throughout the five boroughs.

May I ask you one question please? In my
frustration I've been hearing earlier, if I'm
going out and trying to receive donations from
other places, like, for instance, I'm going to
Time Warner, Verizon, I'm going to work with
citizens of New York, if necessary I'll try to
approach a few banks 'cause I know our budgets is
so large. If I bring money into the project, is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it a possibility any of that money get sent to another--I was understanding that you can take money and put it to one other to finish off one another [off mic], will that stay within Baruch?

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: No, see, the money we were talking about, which you mentioned the borough president's money, the \$27,115,000 we were talking about is Council Member money, our individual money. So I decide, right now I have a little over 2 million in two developments, so I decide if I want to put that all into one development, split it between -- 'cause one is a small development so it would finish -- it would do one and not even maybe do half of the other, not quite, so I decide what to do with that money. I could decide to take that money and put it into my public schools, in my public libraries, or my public parks. I would have to go through the budget process and do a budget modification.

NYCHA has to keep accounting for that money that I've put in for my developments and has to keep accounting for it to me or to the City Council when I am term limited or if I should lose my next race or whatever. So they cannot

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING204 2 move it and use it in another development, it has 3 to be allocated and used there. But the NYCHA process takes, on the 4 5 short side, two years from allocation and budget 6 to them actually getting all the work done in the 7 development. Smaller developments get done 8 faster, larger developments, if all the money is there, does take a little longer. They have their 9 10 process for bidding things out and it is mandated 11 by the federal government how that process takes 12 place. So it all takes a while, and that's part of our frustration. 13 14 We can't change the federal system, 15 we have to get our congresspeople to do that. But 16 our biggest frustration right now is that in the 17 last budget, they knew this money was frozen, they 18 were going to freeze the next money we were going to allocate and didn't tell us until after we 19 20 passed the last budget. So that is our most--21 LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: [Interposing] 22

That is capital money, but if I bring money in from Bank of America or from Verizon or Time

Warner, does it go through the same process?

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: You know,

23

24

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING205
 1
      NYCHA has to do a bid. They hold onto that money
 2
 3
      in a pool that's dedicated for Baruch Houses, and
 4
      then they have to go through the federal
 5
      procurement process. So if you bring in $400,000
 6
      to go with the borough president's 400,000, they
 7
      can bid out whatever gets so many buildings done
 8
      for that amount.
 9
                     LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: So the money
10
      that I might bring in or we could receive in say
11
      this year 2011, it'll be two years before they
12
      start breaking ground, if at that time?
13
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes, at least,
      correct. And in Smith Houses, I see that there is
14
15
      money allocated under Council Member Chin, are
16
      there any cameras at the moment there?
17
                     LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: None, none.
18
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: No, I'm--
19
                      [Crosstalk]
20
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: --and I'm
21
      talking about Smith now.
22
                     LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: Oh, I'm
23
      sorry.
24
                     NYDIA VASQUEZ: Yeah, no, I
25
      understand that there is one in Seven St. James
```

```
1
     COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING206
 2
      and I don't know of any other, but I understand
 3
      that that was a gift from someone and not
 4
      something that was put on housing.
 5
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: It wasn't,
 6
      but--
 7
                     NYDIA VASQUEZ: [Interposing] It's
 8
      coming through the city, but not--
 9
                     CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
                                           [Interposing]
10
      It wasn't through your previous--I know the
11
      previous Council Member, which is why Margaret
12
      Chin has the biggest allocation, he allocated
13
      money during all his years in office, some going
      back as far as 2004 that has not been used yet.
14
15
      And so it may have come from former Council Member
16
      Alan Gerson or--so you don't know where it
17
      actually came from.
18
                      [Crosstalk]
19
                     NYDIA VASQUEZ: --I wouldn't know
20
      the details right now as to who--I just became a
21
      member of the tenants' association. And I have a
22
      question that it might sound a little off, but
23
      another city bank took over those 21 units, are we
24
      still part of that expense as far as cameras and
25
      all that?
```

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING207
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: The 21
3	developments
4	NYDIA VASQUEZ: Developments.
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:the city and
6	state developments are some of them have cameras,
7	some of them don't, it depends if the Council
8	Member funded it. I have a state development, I
9	funded cameras in there as well as in some of my
10	federal developments. Through the stimulus
11	funding that's going to allow the Housing
12	Authority to federalize those 21 developments,
13	which is approximately 21,000 units, there's a
14	whole bunch of federal stimulus funding that's
15	coming in for those developments, and then once
16	everything is done, all the major repairs that the
17	federal government has to come and review it, then
18	they have their own funding stream.
19	But right now, there's all this
20	federal stimulus funding coming in for them and
21	then they'll have their own funding stream
22	thereafter.
23	NYDIA VASQUEZ: Which means that
24	leaves the monies that you all have today for the
25	developments that were not taken over by Citibank,

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING208
2	doesn't that give you more options or more
3	finances to be able to
4	[Crosstalk]
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
6	No, no, it's
7	NYDIA VASQUEZ:faster?
8	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:it's apples
9	and oranges. We decide to put cameras, the ones
10	that got done, it could be city, it could be
11	state, it could be federal. And NYCHA is part of
12	that ownership, it's a private
13	NYDIA VASQUEZ: Investment
14	[Crosstalk]
15	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:
16	private/public organization that was created. And
17	so those buildings that have cameras, have them.
18	What NYCHA is saying isand we didn't get those
19	answers because we were running out of timemy
20	other question is those buildings that have
21	cameras, and it's going to be an individual
22	analysis, what does it take to give us layered
23	access there as opposed to buildings or
24	developments that have no cameras whatsoever.
25	So that's all going to range and

they're going to have to do it development by

3 development. And in cases like even in your

4 development where they may have one or several

5 buildings that have CCTVs and some of them don't

have anything, all that is going to change the

7 price per development.

Mr. Jenkins, let me ask you, you are from my district and you work in my district, so having worked with developments that do have the CCTVs like Jacob Riis and those that don't like Baruch Houses, have you seen any kind of difference in crime?

[Pause]

a difference, but what I will say is that one of the things that I am fearful of is if you don't put cameras in all the developments, all it simply does is it shifts the crime to areas where the cameras don't exist. So while it's not happening in Building A, it's just simply being moved to Building B. So in terms of numbers, I don't think that there's a difference in the quality of life as it relates to how the reduction in crime, unless there was a full holistic approach.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING210
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Do you think
3	that the tenants of Jacob Riis houses, let's say,
4	feels safer than the tenants at Baruch Houses
5	because the cameras are there?
6	MARQUISE JENKINS: I think there's
7	a sexy appeal about the cameras that residents are
8	asking for them. So I think they would say that
9	they feel safer, but I'm not sure if that's the
10	reality of what's happening.
11	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you.
12	Mr. Stubblefield
13	LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: [Interposing]
14	I'd like to give a statistic to that same
15	question. Lillian Wald was one of the very first
16	developments on the Lower East Side that received
17	the cameras.
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
19	They have, just for the record, they have a VIPER
20	system
21	LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:it was under
23	a pilot program that was done by the federal
24	government, but
25	LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: [Interposing]

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING21
2	But before
3	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:it's a
4	little different than the cameras that are going
5	in now.
6	LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: No, but I
7	know they're different, but before they received
8	any type of security at all, Lillian Wald at that
9	particular timeand that goes back to the
10	seventies and the early eightieshad the highest
11	crime and drug dealing in that whole area, and as
12	soon as the VIPER system or whatever came in, it
13	turned their situation around completely.
14	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. I want
15	to thank this panel for their testimony, we will
16	certainly be awaiting more information from the
17	Housing Authority. This hearing will be laid over
18	to so that we can vote on the Reso on another day
19	and
20	[Crosstalk]
21	FEMALE VOICE: The Reso.
22	[Pause]
23	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: The Resolution
24	will be laid over.
25	LUTHER STUBBLEFIELD: [Off mic].

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND PUBLIC HOUSING212
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Is that
3	technically correct? There we go, the Resolution
4	will be laid over, and I want to thank everyone
5	for coming to today's hearing. And I can bang? I
6	don't bang when it's laid over okay, whatever, all
7	right.
8	[Pause]
9	FEMALE VOICE: So you can bang.
10	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: The hearing is
11	adjourned, so there. And there was the bang
12	already, I'm not going to bang twice. Thank you.

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

Signature Tump Com

Date <u>March 14, 2011</u>