CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

----- X

September 15, 2016 Start: 10:10 a.m. Recess: 1:48 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

B E F O R E: Vanessa L. Gibson

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Vincent J. Gentile

James Vacca

Julissa Ferreras-Copeland

Jumaane D. Williams Robert E. Cornegy, Jr.

Chaim M. Deutsch Rafael Espinal, Jr. Rory I. Lancman Ritchie J. Torres Steven Matteo

Stephen Levin Daniel Garodnick

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

Robert Messner
Assistant Deputy Commissioner of NYPD Civil
Enforcement Unit

Gregory Sheehan NYPD Deputy Inspector

Oleg Chernyavsky NYPD Director of Legal Affairs

Martin Morales
Deputy Chief Executive Officer of Patrol
Services

Felicia Morales [sp?]
NYPD Property Clerk Division

Felix Ortiz Brooklyn State Assemblyman

Michael and Carmen Ojeda Parents of Briana Ojeda

Damaris Ojeda Aunt of Briana Ojeda

Ivelisse Espinal Redemption Point AHA Instructor

Anca Grigore Brooklyn Defender Services

Adam Shoop Bronx Defender Services

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

Thomas O'Brien Legal Aid Society

Kenneth Crouch
Bronx Defender Services

Chris Alexander Drug Policy Alliance

Debra Kriensky New York City Audubon

	4

2	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Good morning ladies
3	and gentleman. Welcome to the City Council Chambers.
4	I am Council Member Vanessa Gibson of the 16 th
5	District in the Bronx. I am proud to Chair the
6	Committee on Public Safety, and I welcome all of my
7	colleagues and each and every one of you to today's
8	hearing. I want to acknowledge the members of the
9	Public Safety Committee who have joined us, our
LO	Minority Leader, Steve Matteo, Council Member James
L1	Vacca, and we also have Council Member Andrew Cohen,
L2	and we will be joined by other members of the
L3	Committee, and we will start this hearing in just a
L 4	few moments. Thank you very much, colleagues, for
L5	joining us today. And we also have with us member of
L 6	the Committee Council Member Jumaane Williams. We
L7	have several important pieces of legislation that we
L8	are hearing this morning. I want to thank each of my
L9	colleagues for being here and sharing their thoughts
20	and as well as the Administration who has joined us.
21	Today's hearing will focus on five pieces of
22	legislation and one resolution covering a variety of
23	subject areas. These topics include procedures and
24	reporting relating to civil forfeiture and seizure,

CPR certification of NYPD officers, the public

2	availability of the NYPD patrol guide, and penalties
3	related to the use of all-terrain vehicles or ATV's.
4	In 2010, young Briana Ojeda died of an asthma attack
5	in our City after a police officer claimed that he
6	was not qualified to perform CPR on her. Today, we
7	are hearing Intro 83 which relates to requiring the
8	NYPD to submit reports concerning CPR and AED
9	certification to the City Council and Resolution 1181
10	calling on the State Legislature to pass and the
11	Governor to sign Briana's Law, which will require all
12	police officers to be re-trained in CPR every two
13	years. Both of these pieces of legislation bring to
14	light the important issue of Officers, CPR and AED
15	certification such that we can hopefully prevent any
16	similar tragedies from happening in this city. I want
17	to thank Council Member Steve Levin for sponsoring
18	these pieces of legislation and all of his work
19	around Briana's Law. Council Member Dan Garodnick
20	has sponsored Proposed Intro 728A which relates to
21	requiring the publication of the NYPD patrol guide
22	and to repeal paragraph II of subdivision B of
23	section 14-150 of the Administrative Code which
24	relates to quarterly submission of the NYPD patrol
25	guide. Currently, various organizations have posted

excerpts of the patrol guide on their websites and
private companies sell it online, but neither of
these entities have access to or sell regular updates
with frequency. Proposed Intro 728A would require
the NYPD to post the entire guide publicly online.
While portions of the guide related to confidential
information or information that would compromise the
safety of the public or the police officer is
excluded, New Yorkers will be able to see the
policies, procedures and guidelines that officers are
required to follow. I thank Council Member Garodnick
for this bill. Intro 834 relates to the use of all-
terrain vehicles, sponsored by Council Member Andrew
Cohen, would prohibit the use of ATV's in our City,
and individuals found in violation of the law would
be subject to increased civil penalties. The improper
use of ATV's continues to be an issue on the streets
of our city. This bill will hopefully give the NYPD
additional tools to get these vehicles off of our
streets. Finally, Council Member Ritchie Torres
sponsors two bills on today's agenda, Proposed Intro
1000A related to requiring the Police Department to
report on seized property data on an annual basis,
and 1272 which relates to the codification of the

2	procedures offering vehicle owners the opportunity to
3	recover possession of a seized vehicle in connection
4	with an arrest. Both of these bills will provide
5	additional transparency regarding NYPD data and the
6	process related to recovering personal property that
7	is seized or vouchered by the Department after an
8	arrest. I'd like to thank all of the sponsors that
9	have introduced these bills for proposing these
10	measures, and I know we have colleagues that want to
11	bring remarks as prime sponsors of the legislation.
12	Before I get to that, I want to recognize all of the
13	staff on the Committee on Public Safety that do
14	tremendous work to make these hearings happen, our
15	Committee Counsel Deepa Ambekar, Legislative Counsel
16	Beth Golub, our Policy Analyst Laurie Wen, and our
17	Financial Analyst Ellen Eng, and on my staff Kaitlyn
18	O'Hagan and Dana Wax. And on this day before I
19	conclude and turn this over to my colleagues, I just
20	want to recognize that after several months of
21	working with us here at the City Council and on this
22	Committee, our Policy Analyst is leaving. Today is
23	her last day. Today is her last Public Safety
24	hearing. I know she's going to miss us and all the
25	work we've done together, but on this day, I want to

2.2

2.3

publicly acknowledge and recognize our Policy Analyst Laurie Wen for all the work you have done. Even now you're still working on your last day, and we thank you so much. On behalf of my colleagues and I, we thank you for your tremendous service to this Committee, to this City Council, to the City, and we wish you well in your future endeavors. Don't forget about us, and thank you for all of your incredible service. Thank you.

[applause]

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: And now, I'd like to get to our first prime sponsor of Briana's Law, Intro 83, Council Member Steve Levin for remarks.

much, Chair Gibson, for conducting this hearing today. I want to thank representatives from the New York City Police Department who are here today. The measures before the Committee on Public Safety today, Intro 83 and Resolution 1181, would ensure that all police officers in New York City receive high quality and ongoing training in lifesaving skills. I introduced these measures in honor of a constituent of mine, a young 11-year-old girl, Briana Ojeda who died six years ago after a police officer did not

perform potentially lifesaving CPR on her as she was
suffering from a severe asthma attack with her
mother. The officer stated later that he did not
know CPR. Intro 83 would require that the Police
Department submit reports to the New York City
Council concerning cardiopulmonary resuscitation and
automated external defibrillator certification for
uniformed officers, school safety agents and other
civilian employees. Resolution 1181 calls on the
State Legislature to pass and the Governor to sign
Briana's Law, a bill named after Briana Ojeda that
would require police officers to be re-trained in
cardiopulmonary resuscitation every two years and
demonstrate satisfactory completion of such training.
Briana's Law has been introduced each year since 2010
and has passed the Assembly in the last four
sessions, but unfortunately, the Senate has not moved
the bill forward despite having bipartisan support, a
Republican prime sponsor and support from police
unions. Since 2010, the Ojeda family has advocated
tirelessly in honor of Briana, and they have in very
moving fashion turned their grief and their pain into
action to save others' lives, and the fact of the
matter is that these bills and having adequate CPR

and AED training for all police officers would, in
fact, save lives. The American Heart Association, the
American Red Cross have endorsed these measures, and
I thank them sincerely for their support. It is
crucial to saving lives that first responders are
qualified to perform CPR and that they are regularly
retrained. More than 350,000 out-of-hospital cardiac
arrests occur at home each year in the United States
with almost 90 percent resulting in death. However,
if CPR is performed within the first few minutes of
cardiac arrest, an individual's chance of survival
can be double or even tripled. I want to also thank
Melinda Murray who is here with the American Heart
Association who lost her son, her only child Domenic,
age 17, to cardiac arrest. I hope that my colleagues
will join me in honoring Briana and Domenic's memory
by endorsing these critical measures, and I hope that
the New York City Police Department does as well to
ensure that our officers, our New York City police
officers whom we have such great expectations of and
who bear such an immense responsibility are properly
trained and equipped to be the best police officers
that they can be. Thank you.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much, Council Member Levin, and thank you for your compassion and your commitment to make sure that we honor the life of Briana, and certainly can prevent many cases from ever happening again. Next, we're going to get to my colleague's prime sponsor of Intro 834 to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York in relation to use of ATV's, Council Member Andrew Cohen.

COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: Thank you, Chair. Before I start in my comments, I just wanted to thank you personally for your support in getting this heard. I know this committee always has a very busy agenda, but I appreciate you finding the time to get this bill heard. In 2014, there were nine deaths from all-terrain vehicles or ATV's accidents in the Bronx, two of which took place within two months-within the first two months, and each were just a few blocks from my district office. The NYPD, because of the significant danger to the public, has a "no chase" policy due to--for these vehicles based on danger to nearby pedestrians. These vehicles are capable of creating significant destruction in park In my district, Van Cortlandt Park has been

2 torn up repeatedly by the illegal operation of these 3 vehicles, parade grounds, picnic areas, totally 4 unusable to the public after late night escapades with these vehicles. New York City is only one terrain, an urban terrain, and it is no place for 6 7 all-terrain vehicles. Introduction 834 prohibits the 8 operation of all-terrain vehicles in New York City. The legislation creates a civil penalty for first violations at 500 dollars, the second and subsequent 10 11 violations at 1,000 dollars. The legislation, I think more significantly, allows for civil seizure 12 and forfeiture of these vehicles. I wanted to do 13 14 something to solve this problem. That is why I 15 introduced this legislation, and while it's not perfect that it does solve -- I hope it will solve the 16 17 problem of unregistered, unlicensed and uninsured 18 driver who operates these vehicles in a reckless 19 It does at least place a blanket prohibition 20 across the City, putting all on notice that they will not be allowed to operate ATV's in our urban terrain 21 2.2 as well as provide the NYPD with another tool in 2.3 their tool belt to enforce against these illegal acts. I was shocked by the blatant use of these 24 vehicles on our streets. I have a literally a 30-25

J

second video or a about a minute video I would just like to show the committee, and that will conclude my remarks. I did want to thank Kelly Taylor for her help in drafting this legislation, and again, I want to thank the Chair for her support.

[video presentation]

COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: That was Times Square. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Council Member Cohen. And now we will have the prime sponsor of proposed Intro 728A to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York in relation to requiring the publication of the NYPD patrol guide, Council Member Dan Garodnick.

much, Madam Chair, and I appreciate your hearing this bill. I also want to thank Council Member Andy Cohen for raising the game of Council Members in introducing some video technology in an opening statement. That is a first for me in 11 years, and I congratulate him. Also, I'm troubled to see what I just saw, because that also is part of my Council District, and the idea that ATV's would be in a position block of traffic and cause such a disruptive

2 condition is something that I certainly am very 3 concerned about. Intro 728 is a bill that would 4 require the New York City Police Department to public 5 its patrol quide and all subsequent amendments on the Department website. The patrol quide spells out all 6 7 the rules the police officers must follow in carrying out their duties. These rules cover protocols for 8 school safety agents, bicycle collisions, handcuffing students arrested within school facilities, 10 11 photography in the New York City transit system, and 12 more. If the average New Yorker wanted to check out the NYPD patrol guide today, they would have to FOIA 13 14 it, buy a copy for 50 dollars at a private store or 15 download an unofficial and perhaps inaccurate or 16 outdated copy off a third-party website. None of 17 these options is acceptable or necessary. During the 18 past couple of years, there have been many well-19 publicized instances of supposedly routine police 20 interactions turning harmful or even fatal, including 21 in our own city. Those these interactions are not 2.2 representative of the NYPD as a whole, they have 2.3 raised serious concerns about the relationship between Police Departments and the communities they 24 serve, especially communities of color. This bill 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

would bring increased transparency and accountability to NYPD policies and practices because New Yorkers will be able to know what to expect in interactions with officers and will be better equipped to speak out of procedure is not followed. There's no reason for secrecy here. The rules governing our officers are extensive. They are carefully crafted. They are learned and tested, and the general public should be able to access them. This bill is a simple way to help build the trust some feel is lacking between police and communities, and I look forward to hearing today's testimony and working with NYPD leaders to ensure that this smart new level of transparency is implemented. Thank you again, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much,

Council Member Garodnick. And I also want to

acknowledge we've been joined by Council Member Rory

Lancman, and now we will begin with our first panel,

which is the NYPD and representatives, our Director

Oleg Chernyavsky. We have Inspector Greg Sheehan,

Assistant Deputy Commissioner Robert Messner, Chief

Martin Morales, and Sergeant Felicia Morales. And if

you all could just raise your right hand so we can

administer the oath.

_

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee and to respond honestly to Council Member questions? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much. You can begin, and welcome, thank you for being here.

ROBERT MESSNER: Good morning Chair Gibson and Members of the Council. I am Robert F. Messner, Assistant Deputy Commissioner of the New York City Police Department's, NYPD, Civil Enforcement Unit. I am joined here today as you mentioned by several of my colleagues who will introduce themselves during today's question and answer session. On behalf of Police Commissioner William J. Bratton, I wish to thank the Council for the opportunity to comment on these bills under consideration today. The New York City Police Department's Civil Asset Forfeiture program is specifically devoted to deterring future criminal activity by removing the economic incentive to commit crimes. Under the provision of the New York City Administrative Code and the rules of the City of New York, the NYPD is authorized to forfeit property used

2	as "the instrumentality of or as the means of	
3	committing or employed in aide or in furtherance of a	
4	crime." In this way, our goal is to remove both the	
5	incentive and the means of committing crime. It is	
6	important to note that there has often been confusion	
7	about property seized by the Police Department and	
8	property subject to forfeiture. There are many ways	
9	in which property comes into the custody of the NYPD.	
10	Property may be held by the property clerk for	
11	safekeeping or to determine true owner. In these	
12	instances, the property would not be forfeited.	
13	Property may also be seized for investigation.	
14	Additionally, at the time of an arrest, property may	
15	be taken into custody and invoiced as arrest	
16	evidence. A vast majority of the time, this type of	
17	property is merely held by the property clerk and	
18	returned to the person from whom it was taken or to	
19	the rightful owner once its investigatory value has	
20	been exhausted, the criminal case completed, or after	
21	the District Attorney's office issues a release for	
22	the property. However, when such seized property has	
23	been used to facilitate the commission of a crime or	
24	is the proceeds, substituted proceeds of a crime,	
25	then a civil action for forfeiture may be commenced	

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to forfeit the property. The Civil Enforcement Unit reviews and handles all potential forfeiture cases. A case is viable for forfeiture if it can be proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the property is the proceeds or instrumentality of a crime and that the owner knew or should have known that. case meets this threshold, it is opened and either offered a settlement or assigned for litigation after a forfeiture case has been commenced in New York State Supreme Court. If the Supreme Court in the civil forfeiture action determines that the property at issue should be forfeited, the title to the property is transferred to the City of New York. the property is a vehicle or other tangible property, it will often be auction. The special procedures applicable to the forfeiture of vehicles will be discussed later in my testimony. The proceeds of forfeited currency and from auctions and settlements are deposited into the City's general fund as mandated by the Administrative Code. The goal of the NYPD's forfeiture program is to deter crime. In 2015, the NYPD retained 11,653 dollars in currency and 98 motor vehicles for the city after settlement or judgement in civil forfeiture cases. These figures

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

do not come close to the expenses associated with our forfeiture program. Rather than attempt to generate revenue, the program is a partnership between department attorneys and their operational colleagues intended to deprive criminals of financial benefits and instrumentalities of their crimes. I will now address the legislation on the consideration today, which cover a number of diverse topics, beginning with Intro 1000A. Intro 1000A would require the Police Department to report on an annual basis the data relating to tangible property and currency the Department takes into possession, releases to claimants and retains as a result of settlements or forfeiture judgements. While the Department is supportive of increased transparency with respect to this issue, the property and evidence tracking system known as PETS software used by the Department to invoice property was not designed to run the type of large searches and reports that would be required under intro 1000A. The system was designed to catalog property at intake and ensure the accurate tracking of property through its final disposition. As a result, attempts to perform the types of searches envisioned in the bill will lead to system

2	crashes and significant delays during the intake and			
3	release process in each command utilizing PETS			
4	citywide. In effect, the only way the Department			
5	could possibly comply with the bill would be a manual			
6	count of over half a million invoices each year.			
7	While the Department is capable of producing certain			
8	types of data relative to forfeited property, PETS			
9	does not have the capability to provide the type of			
10	aggregate data sought, nor are all of the types of			
11	property requested by the bill captured in PETS.			
12	Despite that there are concerns about our software's			
13	current technological capability to provide the exact			
14	information sought by Intro 1000A, the Department is			
15	willing to work with the Council to achieve the goal			
16	of the bill. Intro 1272: Intro 1272 would			
17	essentially codify the procedures offering vehicle			
18	owners the opportunity to recover their vehicles in			
19	connection with an arrest. These procedures are			
20	dictated by the Federal Court Order in Krimstock			
21	versus Kelly. In 2001, the Federal Courts put into			
22	place special procedures applicable to the seizer of			
23	vehicles where forfeiture is contemplated. These			
24	procedures allow the defendant, titled owner, or			
25	their legal representative to request a hearing at			

2.3

24

25

the New York City Office of Administrative Trials and Hearing, known as OATH, to determine whether the Police Department may retain custody of the vehicle during the pendency of the forfeiture action. hearing, the Police Department is required to prove three elements, that probable cause existed for the arrest, that the City is likely to succeed in the forfeiture action, and that it is necessary that the vehicle remains in Police Department custody pending the completion of the forfeiture action. If the NYPD prevails at the hearing, the vehicle will be kept in the Department's possession pending the outcome of the civil forfeiture action in Supreme Court. OATH rules in favor of the respondent, the vehicle is released to the owner of the vehicle while the Department proceeds with civil forfeiture action in Supreme Court. The Police Department supports efforts to make the public more aware of this process. We do, however, have some initial legal concerns since these procedures were the exercise of judicial power and originated from a court order. believe this legislation requires further substantive conversations between the Administration and the Council and we look forward to doing so. Intro 834:

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Intro 834 seeks to address the dangerous conditions created by all-terrain vehicles, ATV's, on our city streets. The bill would prohibit the operation of an ATV in the City and would make the operator liable for a civil penalty. In addition, any ATV seized by the Police Department would be subject to civil forfeiture. Out the outset it is important to note that currently the operation of an ATV on the City's streets is illegal. Nevertheless, each year our officers encounter many riders in large roving vans-bans or small groups who operate these vehicles and often disregard traffic control devices and speed limits, drive against traffic, and perform dangerous stunts. Nothing is more dangerous to our communities than using our streets and sidewalks in the reckless manner that some individuals chose to operate their Their behavior endangers pedestrians, endangers bicyclists, endangers motorists, and even themselves. The Department has directed significant attention to addressing the dangers posed by ATV's as well as dirt bikes. Due to their ability to outmaneuver cars, it is the Department's policy not to chase ATV's and dirt bike operators through the city streets, given the inherent risk posed to the public.

2 Throughout the City we conduct coordinated 3 initiatives using many of our department resources. 4 These operations sometimes run daily, but with a focus on the weekends when this type of illegal behavior is most prevalent. We use our precinct 6 7 personnel, highway patrol officers and the strategic response group for these operations. We also 8 coordinate with our Aviation Unit, and we set up checkpoints to stop these groups and seize their 10 11 vehicles. The purpose of these operations to address 12 illegal ATV use is consistent with the Department's commitment to Vision Zero and our pledge to keep 13 14 dangerous drivers off our roadways. Year-to-date we 15 have made 51 arrests for reckless operation of an 16 ATV, as well as dozens of seizures of ATV's. Our 17 enforcement efforts have yielded real results as 18 well. We have seen a decrease of 65 percent in ATV-19 related collisions and no fatalities related to ATV's in 2016 as well as recent decreases in 311 and 911 20 calls regarding ATV's. Each arrest and each seizure 21 2.2 is potentially a life saved. When enforcement is 2.3 taken against an ATV operator, they are often charged with reckless driving under the vehicle and traffic 24

law and/or reckless endangerment under the penal law

2	in addition to other appropriate criminal or civil
3	penalties. Such charges make the ATV eligible for
4	forfeiture, which is one of the aims of Intro 834.
5	Intro 834 represents a thoughtful means to address
6	the dangers created by ATV's, and we support the
7	goals of this bill. However, we have concerns
8	regarding the creation of a unique seizure and
9	forfeiture procedures based solely on a civil
10	penalty. Nevertheless, we appreciate the Council's
11	efforts to expand the enforcement options available
12	to our officers in the field, and we look forward to
13	further discussions on this legislation. Intro 83:
14	Intro 83 would require the Police Department to
15	prepare an annual report on the number of NYPD
16	employees certified in cardiopulmonary resuscitation
17	and automated external defibrillation, CPR and AED.
18	In the past calendar year, disaggregated by the
19	number of uniformed officers, school safety and other
20	civilian employees. Currently, all entry-level
21	police officers recruits become certified to perform
22	CPR and AED during their training at the Police
23	Academy. They receive their certification by
24	completing the basic life-support course, which is
25	cortified by the American Heart Association the AHA

2 This intensive course pairs classroom instruction 3 with hands-on practical exercises to provide our new 4 police officers with the knowledge and skills to 5 render aide in the event of a medical emergency. course teaches how to recognize life-threatening 6 7 medical emergencies, provide effective CPR and AED, 8 identify and treat symptoms of choking and shock, as well as the Administration of Naloxone in cases of opioid overdose. In addition, the Police Department 10 11 offers CPR/AED refresher courses that our offices attend on a biennial basis with a specific emphasis 12 13 on retraining officers who were assigned to command 14 that interact with the public on a daily basis. 15 refresher courses are offered daily at the Police 16 Academy and are taught by AHA certified instructors. 17 The department supports the concept of Into 83, which 18 is to publicly report the number of employees trained 19 to support CPR/AED. We have some technical concerns 20 with the bill such as the need to report the number 21 of civilians receiving CPR/AED as amending the frequency of the report to math our biennial training 2.2 2.3 cycle. Notwithstanding these concerns, we welcome the opportunity to collaborate with the Council on 24 achieving the goal of this legislation. Intro 728A: 25

2	the last bill under consideration today is 728A. The			
3	bill would require the Police Department to publish			
4	its patrol guide online, excluding portions that			
5	would reveal non-routine investigative techniques or			
6	confidential information as well as any information			
7	that would compromise law enforcement investigations			
8	or operations or the safety of the public and police			
9	officers. The Police Department supports this			
10	legislation. However, we ask that an amendment be			
11	made to the current draft in order to allow the			
12	Department 72 hours to publish any updates on our			
13	website. This bill serves as a critical part of the			
14	Department's ongoing efforts to increase transparency			
15	as well as strengthen our relationship with the			
16	communities we serve. We believe that posting the			
17	patrol guide with the appropriate safeguards			
18	contemplated in Intro 728A will yield tangible			
19	results, not only by educating and informing the			
20	public of our procedures, but also by increasing			
21	trust and confidence in the Department. Thank you			
22	for the opportunity to speak with you today and we			
23	are happy to answer any questions you may have.			
24	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much			

for your testimony and for your presence today. I'd

Crisis Intervention Team training course that we

24

25

deliver.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2	CHAIRPERSON	I GIBSON:	Right.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, recruits coming through the Academy do receive the Crisis Intervention Team training as part of their entrylevel training at the Police Academy. Right now we're processing approximately 30 in-service members through the Crisis Intervention Team training that are coming from uniform patrol commands. commands that we're selecting those officers to come from has been decided based upon where we see the Department of Health have the intention of placing drop-in centers for those with mental health needs. So, the commands that are being prioritized this training are being dictated where we see, you know, numerous 911 calls for people with mental illness interacting with the police and where the Department of Health plans on instituting their drop-in centers in the future.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Do you also look at hospital data from emergency rooms in terms of, you know, admissions and other measures?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: We do not, but that's part of the Department of Health's overall input.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

24

2.3

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

GREGORY SHEEHAN: The training does not in

any way say that the officer should defer and wait

until expert medical professional—

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: [interposing] Right.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: be that EMS or otherwise

arrive on the scene. Officers are trained that if

8 they identify a situation in which they can take
9 action to potentially save somebody's life, that they
10 should do so.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. And I remember some time ago with the former Police Commissioner there was talk about every police precinct having an AED equipped in the precinct. Do you know where we are with that, and is that still the case?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: I can't speak to that particular concern.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: But I can tell you that the Department has 1,270 automated external defibrillators stations throughout the police precincts and out on patrol in our vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Okay. And do you know if there will be an increase in that number at some point?

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1

GREGORY SHEEHAN: My understanding is that 3 the particular unit that runs that program is in the 4 process of attempting to purchase more defibrillator

5 devices.

> CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, okay, great. Thank you. And I know my colleague Council Member Levin will have more questions on that. Regarding Intro 728, the patrol guide publication, you talked a little bit about potential amendments, in terms of the period where there are changes. So, if we have any procedure changes that are added to the patrol quide, you're asking for a timeframe of 72 hours in order to provide those updates on the website. Is that correct?

> > ROBERT MESSNER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, okay. Do you know if there will be any cost measures that would make this bill difficult to implement for you in terms of publicizing the patrol guide online? Would there be any cost that we need to factor in? I have to put my Finance hat on.

OLEG CHERNYAVSKY: Right, we don't believe so, but we'll look into-- we'll look into it further.

2.0 where

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 33		
2	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. And I know my		
3	colleague will ask more questions about that, but		
4	before this bill was proposed, do you know if there		
5	was any idea or talk about posting the patrol guide		
6	online? Keeping in mind that, you know, we just had		
7	the roll out several months ago of CompStat 2.0 where		
8	all New Yorkers can go on the website and look at		
9	crime reports and crime data. Was that ever a part		
10	of the conversation to even have the patrol guide		
11	online or accessible to the public?		
12	OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: I'm not aware of any.		
13	I wasn't part of it.		
14	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Understand.		
15	The bills, Intro 1000 and 1272 that relate to asset		
16	forfeiture, I wanted to ask about our FY 2017 Four-		
17	Year Executive Capital Plan, there's 400 million		
18	dollars in capital funds for a new property clerk		
19	(SIC) facility. I believe it's in Queens. Is there		
20	any update you can give us on the property clerk		
21	facility? It's a big project.		
22	FELICIA MORALES: Sergeant Morales from		

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Can you put the mic closer? I can't hear you.

the Property Clerk Division.

23

24

2	

4

1

FELICIA MORALES: Currently I have really no information regarding that. I know that there were talks about it, but other than that I have nothing on it.

5

6

7

8

don't--

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Council Member, we

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: [interposing] I will

definitely reach out.

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Right. We can get you answers on that after speaking with our Deputy Commissioner of Management and Budget that would probably have that information.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Because it was talked during the budget, so I just wanted to find out if there was any update you could give us. Okay, I think my final question is in the testimony, the amount that you provided in the forfeiture program, "Last year we retained 11,653 dollars in currency." I wanted to find out, in deriving that number, does that also include any individual that failed to recoup any money that was collected? So where-what's factored in to get to this amount?

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.3

2 ROBERT MESSNER: That amount is only 3 forfeiture cases.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

where the Police Department affirmatively started a forfeiture case based on the facts that the property was used to facilitate a crime or was the proceeds of a crime, and that the owner knew that to be the case. That would not include monies that a person never came back for. So, if there is money that came into the custody of the Police Department, and that could happen in a large variety of ways, and no one ever comes back for it, that's not included in that amount.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Oh, okay. So is there a separate tracking system that accounts for that?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Right, so I think this is the point about the software limitations that--

22 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: [interposing] Okay.

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Commissioner Messner had mentioned in his testimony, that absent a manual review of-- it's more-- we take in approximately half

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

a million vouchers every year, but to figure out how much money was returned at any particular calendar year, you would have to take a look at the prior year or maybe two prior years to that year, because it's in theory if a voucher was opened in 2013 and money was seized, and then that money was given out or returned to the owner in 2015, we would have to look at the voucher that was opened up a year, maybe two years ago, and the issue-- the issue being that the PET system was built as a cataloging system for the intake of property and the tracking of property for purposes of chain of custody as well as to identify a piece of property when an individual comes back to retrieve it. The system was not built to aggregate data in the manner envisioned in the bill.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: So, whereas we were able to provide you numbers in the testimony, for example, 98 cars seized last year, 11 thousand—11,000 in change in terms of money that was forfeited. Pardon me, 98 cars that were forfeited last year. The reason we were able to get that data because we were able to get that data directly from the Forfeiture Unit who tracks what they actually

1

forfeit every year. If we needed to now put that

3 number in context, we would be unable to because the

4 PET system we can search to see how many cars we have

5 seized last year. We can look up any particular car.

So, for example, if we seize the car from a 6

7 particular individual and they came with their

8 voucher, that car would-- we would punch in the

voucher and the system would pull that up and give us

the location of the car. We can close out the 10

voucher and so on, but it will not be able to 11

12 aggregate all the data.

13 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. So, I

14 appreciate that the Department is willing to work

15 with us on this. The bill is calling for an annual

report, and so we're hoping that whatever measures 16

17 that we could entertain and look to, I mean, PET

18 sounds like -- I don't want to sound antiquated, but I

19 know it's a system that's probably not ready for

20 2016, but whatever we can do to try to make it more

21 operable and disaggregate data based on what we need,

I think that would be something that we would 2.2

2.3 certainly want to help you on. And so, you know, I

always ask the question of the cost. Everything has 24

a cost, and I know there's a lot of man-power and 25

2.3

hours of labor that go into this operation of this system. so, moving forward, and I'm sure the prime sponsor would agree, that if there are, you know, other factors that we should consider, you know, definitely please let us know and let's keep talking about that so what we can get more information from the system. Make sense?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, great. Thank
you. I'm going to go to prime sponsor Council Member
Andrew Cohen, but before I do that, let me announce
that we have been joined by Council Member Julissa
Ferreras-Copeland, Council Member Ritchie Torres, and
we will now go to Council Member Cohen for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: Thank you, Madam

Chair. Thank the Department for your testimony. I

also want to thank you for it sound like significant

work being done in this area and trying to make the

streets safe from the illegal operation of ATV's. I

was curious from the testimony, you testified about

the seizure of the vehicles. What happens—under

the current regime, what happens after the vehicles

are seized?

2 ROBERT MESSNER: May I? Okay. Council 3 Member, that's actually a comp-- a deceivingly 4 complex question because as with all property, as 5 with all vehicles, it's completely dependent on the circumstances of the seizure of the vehicle. For 6 7 example, many of these vehicle are found with no 8 rider because the rider has run away, because the rider realizes they're about to be arrested by the police, and oddly enough that causes many people to 10 11 run away. So, when the vehicle comes in and is 12 rider-less, we then end up seizing the vehicle and categorize it as something called "determine true 13 14 owner" where we're trying to figure out who's the 15 owner of this vehicle and what if any responsibility 16 they may bear, for example any damage caused by the 17 vehicle. So, that could be one process. Another 18 could be if the operator of the vehicle is arrested, 19 now that vehicle is arrest evidence and may be 20 subject to forfeiture if the vehicle was used to 21 facilitate a crime. So, in the testimony we use the 2.2 example, and I know that Chief Morales would, you 2.3 know, could expand on this from an operational perspective, but if that vehicle is used in a manner 24 that causes the rider to be charged with reckless 25

2	endangerment and reckless operation which are both
3	criminal conduct, then that vehicle could be
4	forfeited, can be subjected to forfeiture subject to
5	all the rules. Another way can be if that vehicle
6	comes into the Police Department's custody as part of
7	an investigation, and now you have another category
8	called "investigation." A vehicle can't be forfeited
9	if it's being held for investigation, but down the
10	road it might be subject to forfeiture if a person
11	was arrested for the illegal operation of that
12	vehicle. So, unfortunately there's no straight as
13	with most of these property questions, there's no
14	simple straightforward answer to what happens to the
15	vehicles. But I will tell you that we do in cases
16	where these vehicles are used in a criminal manner,
17	 we aggressively pursue forfeiture.

COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: Can I just ask maybe a slightly different way? Under what circumstances do you return the vehicle?

ROBERT MESSNER: Well, it would be a lot of circumstances where we'd return the vehicle, but before the vehicle could be returned, first of all the vehicle could not be used in a commission of a crime. Secondly, a person would have to establish

their ownership of the vehicle and that the vehicle
complied with all the requirements of the law. The
vehicle couldn't be ridden, even if it were to be
returned. The vehicle can't be ridden out of a
Department facility because it's not a street legal
vehicle. So it has to be removed on a trailer. So,
if you asked me what would be a you know, again,
this is all hypothetical, but if an ATV is stolen
from someone's yard and recovered by the Police
Department, and it turned out that this person was in
deed the victim of a crime, they had their lawfully
possessed ATV stolen by someone else, we're not going
to forfeit that ATV. That would be completely
unfair. We're going to return that ATV to the crime
victim. That would be an example of when we might
return an ATV.

COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: Okay, just one final question maybe, and it's all I guess to the same point. Do you have any idea of how many of these vehicles come into the Department's possession every year?

ROBERT MESSNER: Chief?

MARTIN MORALES: Yes, good morning. I'm Chief Martin Morales. I'm the Executive Officer of

other in place of the Fire Department?

2.2

2.3

GREGORY SHEEHAN: I'm not sure I can speak to what standards the Fire Department and/or the Emergency Medical Services underneath the Fire Department train to, but what I can say is that the standard in the Department is as far as for our uniformed members, police officers as you asked, is the American Heart Association's course BLS, Basic

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And is there a continuum of levels of training where BLS falls somewhere in that continuum?

Life Support, updated as of 2015.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Right. So, all entrylevel uniformed police officers attend a one-day
training course that the Department has since January
of this year termed "BLASTT", Basic Life Support and
Trauma Treatment. That's the new version of the
course that we introduced in January of this year.
Basically, the first half of the course is the
American Heart Association's BLS course, the standard
one that anyone else could go out and attend at a
different organization. It's a standard course.
Recruits attend that. Certified AHA instructors
deliver it. The second half of the day involves
training on trauma treatment, specifically the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Department's new piece of equipment that we
introduced in January, the belt-worn trauma kit.
That's basically a group of devices that address
hemorrhage control and traumatic injuries that
officers may encounter in the field. So, in that one
day of training officers are receiving a number of
different pieces of individuals training. The first
part is the American Heart Association's BLS course
which is infant and adult CPR, infant and adult
defibrillation, the administrat I'm sorry, the
Naloxone is not part of the BLS course. Treatment
for shock, choking. Then there's a module of
instruction based on the New York State Department of
Health Naloxone curriculum, Naloxone being the formal
name for the Narcan product that's available for use.
Officers are trained how to treat opiate overdoses,
and then the last part of the course is the belt-worn
trauma kit specifically towards use of a tourniquet
and hemorrhage control devices.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: That has—— so, the BLS training was as of January of 2016. What was it prior to that?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: The content in the BLS courses prior to the most recent AHA revision, I

I'm not going to ask you about specifics of

individual cases, but in two instances that there is,

24

2.2

2.3

2	you know, publicly available testimony regarding in
3	the manslaughter trial of Officer Peter Liang and the
4	officer who is involved with the Briana Ojeda's
5	death, both testified that they did not feel equipped
6	from their training to be able to perform CPR.
7	Obviously, Briana Ojeda passed away in 2010. The
8	Akai Gurley passed away in I believe 2014. Is there-
9	- can you speak to at least the level of training and
10	whether or not that comports with NYPD standards
11	today and whether it comported with NYPD standards at
12	the time, and if you can kind of speak to that? You

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Right. So, as far as each individual case that you mentioned, obviously I can't provide specific comments.

know, here are anecdotal instances where it seems as

if the training protocol was not measuring up.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Sure.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: I'm not neither specifically informed as to the content of each individual case or any pending disciplinary process or litigation, so I appreciate that. However, to speak to the more broader point, so the Department is obviously committed to ensuring that our officers and especially officers in uniform who interact with the

public day to day answering 911 calls are trained to
our best ability. The introduction of the belt-worn
trauma kit component of our training is an example of
the Department's commitment to this. So, currently
on patrol right now in New York City there's over
8,000 officers that are equipped with this particular
device which they could deploy in a situation be it a
mass casualty incident such as an active shooter or a
simply vehicle accident where someone has some
traumatic injury and has an issue with massive
hemorrhaging. So, I think that is a great example of
how the Department is committed to increasing the
level of training, increasing the level of
proficiency that our officers have. As to the
standard, again, it's not a Department invented
course. The content comes from the American Heart
Association Course. So, the basic life support
course we teach now and previously the basic life
support course for healthcare providers was the name.
That is the course content. As to, you know, the
specific circumstances of the two individuals that
you mentioned, I can't comment on that, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Is it something—
I'm assuming that NYPD has conversations with the
American Heart Association and there are best
practices elsewhere in the country, whereas I'm
wondering whether that's something that is looked

21

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1

upon favorably as, you know, by AHA or other

3 jurisdictions?

> GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, I would agree with you that best practices is probably as you stated the American Heart Association's recommendation as other organizations recommend a biennial retraining course, yes.

> COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Because obviously there are a lot of uniformed personal in NYPD who have been on the job for a long time, you know, maybe joined the force 10, 15, 20 years ago, and it-- I imagine that it would be-- that includes a lot of patrol officers, and so--

> GREGORY SHEEHAN: Right, so the target of our retraining efforts is to ensure that we get as many officers from the, again, the uniform patrol commands that are interacting with people out in the street that are answering 911 jobs and things of that nature, but is there a mandate? No.

> COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: School safety agents? There are 1.1 million school children in New York City in our public schools. Every public school has a school safety agent.

> > GREGORY SHEEHAN: Sure.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: That's a lot of kids, a lot of-- it's a lot of chances for things to go wrong. Are school safety agents receiving training?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Yes, sir. So the school safety agent training regimen is slightly different than the uniform police officers. School safety agents are trained in the American Heart Association's course called "Heart Saver." It's a slightly different version of the BLS course. The difference is "Heart Saver" is basically the layperson's version of Basic Life Support. Basic Life Support assumes a higher level of content knowledge. Patrol officers are taught a lot more other techniques besides just Basic Life Support such as belt trauma kit, etcetera, but it is an American Heart Association certified course. The school safety agent themselves are covered under the Department of Education's contract with a vendor called Emergency Skills. So the NYPD does not deliver the training for school safety agents. That's covered under a contract between the Department of Education and this vendor. The vendor

2 gives certification training using American Heart

3 | Association's Heart Saver course.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Other NYPD civilian employees, do they receive any training on CPR or AED?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, the Basic Life Support course is part of the entry-level police administrative aid curriculum. Police administrative aid are basically the people that you would interact with, the civilian members when you would walk into a precinct. They might be answering the telephone. They're taking complaints in the complaint room. they do have a public interaction. That is included, the Basic Life Support course, in their introductory curriculum. There is no requirement for civilian members to come back and retrain on a biennial basis, but PAA's are given that training as part of their initial introduction in the Academy. However, civilians are not turned away should they come to training. So again, our priority is uniform patrol officers interacting with the public 911 jobs, that type of environment, but civilian members are encouraged to attend as well.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And how many	
3	civilian employees are with the NYPD? So, I don't	
4	mean to quiz you.	
5	MARTIN MORALES: Seventeen, about 17,000.	
6	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Seventeen	
7	thousand? And uniformed officers?	
8	GREGORY SHEEHAN: The number's thir in	
9	the low 35,000's, 35,800, 700?	
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Do you know off	
L1	the top of your head how many school safety agents?	
12	GREGORY SHEEHAN: Yes, total number of	
L3	school safety agents not including those currently in	
L4	the academy is 4,872.	
L5	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Do you have a if	
L6	every school safety agent, civilian employee	
L7	uniformed officer were to be trained and every two	
L8	years recertified, do you know how much difference in	
L9	cost that would be from where the NYPD is today? Do	
20	you have a sense of how much additional cost would be	
21	required?	
22	GREGORY SHEEHAN: I couldn't say. The	

through-put would move-- again, I'd have to refer

back and get back to you an answer on that.

23

2	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: That I would be
3	interested to know. I think one of the barriers, and
4	I know you're not here to testify on the Resolution,
5	but one of the challenges that we've run into on the
6	state legislation is a question of they said unfunded
7	mandate. It would be good to know. New York City,
8	obviously, being by far the largest jurisdiction in
9	the state. What type of additional cost that you
10	would see if that bill went into effect? If that's
11	possible to do an analysis of it, it'd be very good
12	to know. With AED's, I know that Chair Gibson had
13	asked about this. In 2003, Commissioner Kelly said
14	that every precinct would be equipped with an AED.
15	Is that is every precinct equipped with an AED at
16	this point?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Council Member, we'll get back to you on that. We'll double check. I think the inspector gave the total number that we have department-wide, and we'll look into the deployment of the AED's to every facility.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: The training protocol for AED is included as part of the BLSTT, is that right?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Yes, it's included in the Basic Life Support course.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: With regard to Basic Life Support course, is that -- is there a more intensive course that the American Heart Association offers, or is that a standard that there's no departure from?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, the matrix, of course, is that the American Heart Association offers cater to different types of individuals. Our assessment is that the Basic Life Support curriculum that AHA offers is probably the most appropriate one for the population of people that we're training, first responders. Heart Saver, as I said, is not lesser training. It just minimizes the medical terminology and things of that nature. It just makes it more accessible to a layperson. So the training is not less than. It's just a bit more approachable for someone that doesn't have experience being a first responder. I know that there are lesser courses, you know, below Heart Saver. They teach them at high schools, you know, things like that. As far as what is beyond Basic Life Support, I'm not sure if there's a course that would be more complex above heart--

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2 above Basic Life Support that American Heart 3 Association offers.

2.2

2.3

able to- in light of recent incidents, has the NYPD been able to do candid interviews with police officers to find out whether they feel that they're appropriately adequately trained, whether their training is sufficient to be able to deploy those, that knowledge in a high-pressure situation. Are you able to get candid feedback from officers on the ground?

the belt-worn trauma kit, we did survey the officers that were attending the training, but going back to the question I think that you're asking is that you're asking more of a historical question going back to some of the incidents that we mentioned earlier, whether or not in response to that we gone and queried officers on patrol to assess their current state as to whether or not they feel equipped or not.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Yeah.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: I can't say whether or not that's been done.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, it would be

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

for those officers?

1

good to know. I mean, in these instances where police officers in question have, you know, testified in court proceedings that they did not at the time feel adequately prepared. It would be good to know whether that is a widespread perception among uniformed officers or whether that ws isolated cases. And then last question, what is the proper protocol for a police officers if they don't feel that they are adequately prepared or adequately trained in CPR when they're confronted with an individual that requires CPR? Is there-- what is the-- is that reflected in the patrol guide or is there a protocol in place where if they don't feel that they're prepared to address the situation? It's time sensitive. Every minute counts. What is the protocol

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, I think this goes, but not back-- not to a specific piece of training we deliver, but if you're an officer out in a patrol command and through our unit training process this cascading training process that we have throughout the Department, if you felt there came a time when you were, you know, ill-equipped or felt that your

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.2

2.3

skills had diminished within that two-year time frame, each individual command has an individual identified as a training supervisor who you can approach and address any deficiencies you may have or any deficiencies that you would like to address to receive additional training.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I mean in the moment, in the moment where they're confronted with a, you know, a very time sensitive circumstance.

obviously to ensure that the appropriate medical authorities are responding in a situation like that. So, your question is if an officer were to encounter an incident in which he felt ill-equipped to respond to the incident.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And he's the first one there. And he's the first one there.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Right. SO, you know, as always, you know, one of the first things we are trained to do in a medical situation is to ensure that EMS is notified and that they are prioritizing their response in the appropriate manner. If you encounter a situation that you feel you cannot take the initial steps to help treat that individual, that

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

_ 1

25

might be a piece of information you would want to relay, be it CPR or any other type of medical treatment to advise the dispatcher to prioritize EMS because you as the initial first responder are not necessarily equipped to assist this individual.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And then-- I'm sorry, Chair Gibson. One thing I want to read into the record here, and you don't have to respond, but I think it is relevant and I want to make sure that it's on the record, that when in the case of Briana Ojeda's death, when the police officer was interviewed following Briana's death, he testified that he had only learned CPR from a textbook and that he was uncomfortable placing his hands on her. at the time when she was suffering from an asthma attack, a severe asthma attack, that was what he testified was that he was uncomfortable placing his hands on her and that he had only learned CPR from text book. This was an officer on patrol in 2010. So, just you don't have to respond. It's an individual case, but I want to make sure that that's read into the record.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much, Council Member Levin. We've also been joined by

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

guide. Forfeiture first. You noted in your

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Yes.

FELICIA MORALES: Yes.

24

1

3

4

5

6

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Same thing would be true for currency, if I were to say how much money do we have in our possession as a result of confiscation even if it has not yet gone through the official civil forfeiture process? Do we know the amount of that?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Correct. It would be the same. You would have to manually count every voucher to add up the money. In that sense, I think if you're-- the initial feeling would be that okay, you get the monies deposited, so you can count that. However there's a situation in a holding to hold the money in the holding account, but what would happen is if it's a relatively small amount of money that's removed from an individual being arrested and that individual is released and receives that money back and that money never gets deposited. Yes, we vouchered it, but no, it wouldn't have been deposited. It would have been returned. So, absent counting every single voucher and adding it up, you would not get an accurate number.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And for the bigger amounts, is the money deposited into a

number 1,567 you all cited as the number of vehicles

to retrieve the vehicle, we look up that particular

voucher, and the vehicle isn't there when we--

24

1

3

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: [interposing] Understood. Understood. It's a question about the searchability [sic].

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: I mean, the system sounds pretty useless from the perspective of generating a report and clearly antiquated. So, the question then becomes, have you identified what sort of system you would need to be able to rejuvenate the Police Department's technology here to be able to create such a report?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: I think Council Member Torres' bill has stimulated that conversation within the Department of what the different options that are available to us, whether it's upgrading the existing system, a new system or figuring out ways in which data can be manipulated within the system which will in effect be an upgrade.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Good, because I think we should probably be able to know the answer to that question, and so we're glad you're looking at that and we look forward to continuing the conversation. On the patrol guide, thank you for your general support of this initiative. One basic

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.2

2.3

question, why is the patrol guide not publicly available today?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: I'm not sure. I'm not sure I could answer that. I know that patrol guide sections are made available whether it be through FOIA requests, through discovery and lawsuits, as you mentioned that apparently it's available online to be purchased. I've heard that. I haven't actually seen that, but I don't think I can answer that. However, what your bill does is actually— it's a logical step in our drive for greater transparency, and that's why we support it.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Do we need a bill to do this? I mean, we'll pass the bill, happily pass the bill, but shouldn't the Police Department just be doing this?

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Well, I think we're committed at this point. Again, you've stimulated the conversation. We're committed to doing it. If you pull your bill, I think we would still be committed to doing it, but yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. The bill says that you're required to publish the patrol guide excluding portions that would reveal non-

_

routine investigative techniques and things like that and confidential information. That's how the bill is drafted by the City Council. Just give a sense as to what sorts of things we are therefore excluding from public review here. I have a sense, but I think it's worth our just identifying that.

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Sure. I would think—
I'm spit balling, and you're right, and that's what I
was thinking about is, for example, our response to
active shooter. You know, we wouldn't really want to
telegraph what is our response is to active shooter
is. Maybe situations about safeguarding weapons, you
know, how we would safeguard a weapon if an officer
finds himself or herself in a struggle, how they
would position their body to safeguard their weapons.
I don't think we would want to be telegraphing that.
I think those are a couple of good examples.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: I'm not sure.

Does that constitute non-routine investigative

technique or confidential information? Though, I

just want to make sure we get the language right so

there's no--

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: [interposing] Right.

dispute here between Police Department and the

Council as to what you should be putting up there.

_	
-2.	

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

for 72 hours.

21

2.2

2.3

24

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: [interposing] We--

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Right. I think the vast majority of the patrol guide would fall outside

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: ultimate

of the exemption that was put in it. I think what

we're talking about is the exception, not the norm. I

think the norm would be to post it, however subject

to information that may endanger, and I think other

than compromising investigative techniques and so on.

I think there's also a provision in there for the

safety of officers and the safety of the general

public, and I think those are the examples.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.

lastly, I noted you wanted a little time to be able

to update it online. That seems perfectly

reasonable. You know, what the precise amount of

time is what we should discuss. I know you've asked

OLEG CHERNYAVASKY: Sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: That does not-

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very much.

court decision that gets passed down. We would just

like to have a little bit of time to review that

before we post it, and that's really the basis.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Council

Member Garodnick. Quick question before I get to my
next colleague. Do you know how many, the number of
uniformed members of the Department AHA certified to
administer the BLS CPR training at the Academy? Like
is there a number that you have of trainers?
Instructors, sorry.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: You're asking about instructors?

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Trainers, instructors, yes.

train, re-train officers on any kind of regular

periodic basis on how to perform CPR. Is that right?

2.2

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

GREGORY SHEEHAN: There is no written policy mandating an officer to come back for the biennial refresher training.

refer to the biannual refresher training, that leads—
when I hear that I would think, okay, there's
biannual refresher training and every officer
biannually every two years has to be refreshed. What
is the biannual refresher training if it's not a
mandate that every officer receives CPR training at
least once every two years?

attend, you would then next be expected to show up after the two-year period. Right? So, if you went in May of this year, two years later from May, that would be the time where you would be expected to come back and attend the refresher training on your previous training. If you're a recruit in the Academy, when you graduate it's two years after you exit the academy. That's when your biennial refresher requirement, you know, would be instituted.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: So I--

2.2

2.3

a

2.3

GREGORY SHEEHAN: [interposing] But is there a written policy that says every uniform member is mandated to attend, there answer is no.

council Member Lancman: So, I don't understand the difference between-- you're used to the word expectation, it would be expected. What do you mean that a recruit is expected to get refresher training two years after the--leaving the Academy. What is the expectation beyond after you've left the academy to get retrained every two years? I don't understand the use of the word expectation.

mandate, because there is no rule mandating that you attend. However, the uniform patrol commands, patrol transit housing, etcetera, they all along with every other unit in the Department have a local training supervisor which is responsible for managing the scheduling of training both where they send officers to the academy and other places, and unit training that they conduct at roll call within their own individual facility with their own individual cops.

As part of the program, those sergeants are told to schedule these individuals to come back for training.

2.2

2.3

council Member Lancman: So, what you're saying is, I think, there's no uniform NYPD-level rule that the officers will get retrained every two years, but that each command has its own policy, with a lowercase "p", where the officers within that command will get refresher training every two years.

Am I understanding it right?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: I think that's a good summation of it.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: So, when did this policy, this practice of refresher training every two years, when did that begin? Is this something that the NYPD has done, you know, for decades now or this is something that, you know, six years ago was— it became the custom or the practice?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: I couldn't tell you historically when either a rule was no longer enforced. My understanding is there was never a rule. As to a date, historical perspective, on the policy as you said with the small "p" I couldn't answer that question, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: Okay. Well, how long have you been on the force?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Twenty years.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: For as long as

you've been on the force.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Yes, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: And you know, you're the guy they send here to testify today, so I want to ask you what you are aware of beyond your own personal experience. And so what can you say about whether or not this biannual expectation is being met throughout the various commands in the NYPD? Are people getting their biannual refresher training?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, within the two years we've trained 19,459 uniformed members of the service in the biennial period.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Yes.

something that's always been on the training agenda.

_

2.3

I don't think there's necessarily been a particular incident or two. Obviously as the Department's been in the newspaper for deficiencies that have been noted by your fellow Council Members, these topics do come up during training sessions as far as what commands may be falling behind. We need to pay additional attention to these problems. You know, let's get some additional support for this particular location. They're falling behind. But I do believe it's something that has been on the agenda as far as getting officers into training for as long as I've been in this position.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: And how long has that been?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: Just over two years.

anyone-- well, let's look at it this way. What is the highest level within the NYPD, right, you got the Commissioner and then down from there, whose responsibility and who actually is fulfilling that responsibility to see if the various commands are meeting this expectation and at what level and measuring commanders in part based on whether they're meeting this expectation? Like, I know, you know,

2.2

2.3

CompStat, the commanding officers show up and get grilled on different metrics in their precinct. Is this one of them?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: No, it is not. It's not one that's spoken about at CompStat.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: Okay.

GREGORY SHEEHAN: But training and compliance with training directive is something that's a requirement of every supervisor, be it a newly promoted sergeant all the way up to, you know, the chiefs. You know, training is something that every supervisor has a rule in throughout the Department.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: Okay. Alright, thank you. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Before I get to my next colleague, I just wanted to say, and I think, you know, the reason why— and I'm really glad that we're having this hearing, and while there are a different number of bills, but the CPR and AED topic in itself to me warrants further discussion. I think, you know, it's a little concerning when you think about officers that are on patrol in the City and they have received their CPR training, but if you

don't use it enough, I mean, and you're not mandated
to return for CPR training, I mean, how much are you
really going to remember. And so, you know, without
that mandate with a strong encouragement, you know,
there's nothing that propels an officer unless it's
their individual, you know, decision to say I want to
take a refresher courses. You know, it's a little
concerning. So, I want to put it on the record, and
certainly we'll talk to the incoming Commissioner
about having further conversation on the training
itself and how we can put something in the procedure
to make sure that officers are obviously well-
prepared, but you know, in those cases where you just
don't, you know, administer CPR frequent enough,
there it could be officers that don't feel
comfortable enough to administer that. And I know,
you know, contrary to what, you know, my colleague
have said, we've seen cases where offices have
admitted that, that they just didn't feel comfortable
vehicle of the level of training that they received.
So, I just wanted to make sure that you all
understood that from our perspective, we want to have
further conversation about this particular topic.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 Moving forward, okay? Next, we're going to have 3 Council Member Deutsch.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, I want to express the importance of having the training, CPR training, for officers. I think almost exactly a year ago I honored Officer Shi [sp?] from Transit District 34 who was on Sheepshead Bay Road Station and where this 19-year-old teenager collapsed and went unconscious when Officer Shi performed CPR and waited for EMS to arrive. It took EMS a while to attend. So, I want to commend Officer Shi as well as the importance, express the importance of having the CPR training to all officers. So, we did touch upon that school safety officers. Madam Chair spoke about the school safety officers. We spoke about uniform patrol officers out in the street. My concern also-my concern is officers that work in transit. Sometimes you have an issue with communication, and it takes a lot longer for the EMS to get there, sometimes because of the lack of communication or underground communication. Although technology has been upgraded, but going underground is very

difficult, and communicating from underneath,

something that could be looked at?

2.2

2.3

2			GREGORY	SHEEHAN:	Could	certainly	look
3	into	it.					

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Okay. I want to get back to the ATV's. So, firstly, if someone drives under influence of alcohol, DWI or DUI, if you pull someone— a patrol officer pulls someone over who's under the influence of DUI or DWI, what happens to that vehicle?

ROBERT MESSNER: We have a program for forfeit vehicles that are driven by people in violation of VTL who are under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and that's been ongoing since 1999.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So, what happens to the vehicle once it's seized?

ROBERT MESSNER: Well, the vehicle is—
in the case of a person who is arrested for DWI, the
person is arrested, the vehicle is seized as arrest
evidence, and it's also considered for forfeiture
because of the arrest for DWI, and if after review of
the circumstances of the case, it is a viable
forfeiture case, meaning that, for example, meaning
that the vehicle was used to facilitate a crime.
Well, that's always the case in a DWI, because you
can't commit DWI without a vehicle, but you also have

2 to be able

1

to be able to prove knowledge on the part of the

3 owner. So, for example, before I mentioned a case

4 where an ATV is stolen out of someone's yard. If a

5 person is arrested for driving that ATV while

6 intoxicated we wouldn't forfeit that ATV because the

7 owner of the ATV didn't know this person was going to

8 be riding it. It was stolen from the owner. So, it

9 would be unfair and the law would not support

10 | forfeiting that ATV. However, if you had a

11 circumstance where a person was driving their own

12 ATV, an ATV that they own, they're the owner, they're

13 intoxicated, then that ATV would be subjected to

14 forfeiture.

24

25

15 COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So, anytime

16 whether it's a ATV or it's a vehicle, it has to be

17 the owner of the vehicle driving that vehicle or ATV

19 put into forfeiture.

20 ROBERT MESSNER: That's one circumstance

21 where the owner is driving, but in other

22 circumstances where the owner had actual or implicit

23 \parallel knowledge of the person who's driving the vehicle.

So, the issue, one of the many issues and this is--

there are a tremendous number of different

4

6

7

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

ROBERT MESSNER: Could be.

permutations of this, but one of the most common situations is people don't always title vehicles in the name of the real owner for a variety of reasons, insurance reasons, liability reasons. People like to ti-- people tend to title vehicles in the name of a straw person owner who's actually not the owner of the vehicle, and in that circumstance the law supports a concept called "Beneficial Ownership." So, a person may not be the owner on paper, but we may be actually able to prove the person's the owner. Another instance would be where we're able to prove that the owner had knowledge that the person was going to use this vehicle in a crime. Now, that is more difficult in the case of DWI, but for example, if there was a close relationship between the owner and the operator of the vehicle, and the operator had been arrested prior for the same crime, then we would take the position that the owner should have known that this person was going to drive the car drunk or the ATV drunk.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So, how does that work? Is it a husband/wife?

2 COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Is this family

3 member--

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ROBERT MESSNER: Fam--

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: [interposing] Is that defined anywhere? Is it defined?

ROBERT MESSNER: It's defined by case law. there's, you know, hundreds of cases that talk about beneficial owner, but you have to remember that each of these cases is first considered by an Administrative Law Judge at the OATH hearing to determine if the Police Department can retain the vehicle during the forfeiture case, and then each case is individually reviewed by a New York State Supreme Court Judge. So, this isn't the Police Department making a decision when to take someone's vehicle away from them. Two different judges have to decide that the circumstance is appropriate that a vehicle be subjected to forfeiture. And, you know, I hate to prattle on, but you know, you ask the lawyer a question sometimes bad things happen, they talk forever. But you also should know that we were the first jurisdiction in the country to offer settlements in DWI forfeiture cases that is actually linked to the alcohol abuse, the potential for

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 85
2	alcohol abuse. So, we have had a settlement policy
3	in the NYPD since the early 2000's wherein cases, in
4	many cases, where there are no aggravated factors
5	where a person who is arrested for DWI is offered the
6	ability to settle their forfeiture case by going to a
7	state-certified alcoholism counselor for an
8	assessment and for following whatever treatment
9	recommendation that alcoholism counselor makes, and
10	we make that the settlement term for the forfeiture
11	case. That was the first time in the country that
12	anyone had ever linked assessment and treatment of
13	potential alcoholism problem to the resolution of a
14	forfeiture case, and we're very proud of that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Thank you. I want to go back to CPR training. So, New York City Police Department does not mandate officers to be trained on CPR. Now, how many months is a cadet or someone at the Police Academy in training before they become a cop?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, the entry-level recruit training for an incoming police officer is six months long.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Six months, and how long is the CPR training for each officer?

2 GREGORY SHEEHAN: I

GREGORY SHEEHAN: It's approximately one

3 day.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: One day. So, if you have six months, an officer gets trained for six months, six long months, with intensive training.

They come out bruised sometimes climbing over walls and all types of exercises. Why is officers not mandated for CPR if it's just going to be six months and one day and it could save even one life?

GREGORY SHEEHAN: So, recruit officers in the Police Academy attend CPR and defibrillator training, the AHA BLS course as a mandatory component of the entry-level police academy. There is no policy mandating that after they graduate the Academy that they return on a biennial basis during in-service training, but it is required as part of the entry-level Police Academy training for new officers.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So, why wouldn't it be required for one day after that? How many sick days does an officer get? How many vacation days does an officer get? Why can't they-- why do we have to go through legislation and put in the resolution for the state for one day of training per year or for every two years? I mean, this is why I don't-- I am

2.2

2.3

Queens, Staten Island. So, there's one in each borough.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. So, can you just walk me through a scenario of someone's property being seized? Would it go to the local precinct and then it's, you know, invoiced, and then it would go to that location in that particular borough? How would that work?

FELICIA MORALES: Right. Well, once the property's in taken at the precinct level, then it will go, if it's a car, it will go to one of our pounds. We have two pounds, auto pounds. If it's general property, it will go to the Property Clerk Office in that borough, but then we also have the warehouses where they intake big pieces of property, huge items of property. So, if it's a small item it can go to a borough office, but if it's a big item, let's just say a refrigerator, that will go to one of our warehouses.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So, during the summer I know there's a lot of property seized around-- some of the large speakers for like large parties and things that happen. So would that be considered large-scale as well?

system?

2 FELICIA MORALES: Yes.

2.2

2.3

3 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

 $\label{eq:felicia_morales:} \mbox{It's catalogued under}$ the PET system.

wanted to understand a little bit more, because there are a number of cases that, you know, sometimes come to our offices of mothers and fathers, you know, loved ones that were, you know, unfortunately killed and they're trying to retrieve some sort of property, and so I was just trying to understand how all of that works, and even in cases where individuals were, you know, not killed, but just how, you know, parents and others can go about retrieving that particular property.

be retrieved at the borough location where it's located. A lot of times the person is given an invoice, and that invoice will say which precinct took in the property, but then they can call—it's on the NewYorkCity.gov under Property Clerk Division, and each borough office has their information on there. So, you can call the borough office to make arrangements, and we have a special VIP for

okay.

	$FFI.TCT\Delta$	MORALES:	Roth	7705

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. And then at the precinct level, the Property Clerk's Office is handled by who?

FELICIA MORALES: At the precinct level it's usually a property officer and that office is usually a very tiny office.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

FELICIA MORALES: They don't keep a lot of property on-hand there, because also property which is currency is deposited into the bank at the precinct level.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Oh, okay, and that's also done on a rotating basis as well?

FELICIA MORALES: Well, the property for the US currency will be deposited the day that they intake it. It will not stay at the precinct.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. So, I'm sure you guys are aware that last year we started the IDNYC program, the New York City Municipal Identification program, and it's our effort to make sure that any New Yorker that is not able to get a New York State issued ID has sufficient

identification. Is that something that is acceptable

kind of other identification on yourself, which it

could be a credit card, a-- something from the post

24

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

office, some correspondence that has your name and address, and as long as that picture is there, they'll give you the ID that was invoiced.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Oh, okay. I definitely want to have as we continue to talk about this bill, much more conversation because I do know and I will admit that there are a number of cases where that doesn't happen as smooth as you've described. I think about some people that may have a temporary residence. They may be in a shelter or some sort of transitional housing, and their property is confiscated and they don't have, you know, utility or a cable bill or any other picture or photo ID, no credit cards, so they really don't have any other documentation to state who they are, so it's not as smooth as we all hope it would be, and some of those cases have come to my office. So, I'd love to have further conversation about that.

FELICIA MORALES: That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: And one last question. I always have questions, I'm sorry. described an invoice. What is it that's given to the person to retrieve the property? Is it an invoice? What does that look like?

information they can look it up in the system.

2	CHAIRPERSON	GIBSON:	Okay,	okay.

2.2

2.3

FELICIA MORALES: Again, the PET system is made to track evidence. So, the person's name will be on the invoice, and we can track it just by a name.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Any other questions? Thank you all. Thank you so much for coming today. We do have a few other panels behind you, but I thank you so much for your presence, for your testimony and giving us some suggestions. So, you know, we will do a lot of follow-up and certainly work with you as we continue to move these bills forward. Thank you for joining us today. Thank you.

ROBERT MESSNER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Our next panel here to speak on Resolution 1181 and Intro 83, we have Brooklyn State Assemblyman Felix Ortiz. We have Michael and Carmen Ojeda. We have Melinda Maure [sp?] from the American Heart Association, and we have Ivelisse Espinal from Redemption Point. And if any of you has any testimony with you, if you could please give it to our sergeant. And anyone else here that still wishes to testify that has not signed up, please do so right at the front and make sure that

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

you get your name down on the record so you can speak at an upcoming panel. Thank you. Thank you again for joining us, and Assistant Speaker, my former colleague, Felix Ortiz, good to see you today, and you can begin or if you want to defer to someone else, that's fine as well. But thank you once again for joining us today. Thank you. Make sure the mic is on.

MICHAEL OJEDA: Good morning ladies and gentleman of the City Council. I stand before you with a heavy heart to introduce this legislation, Briana's Law which would save hundreds, thousands and millions of New Yorker's lives as time goes by once it becomes law. This legislation is to make sure that our first responders in the greatest city of the world are equipped with this life-saving skill, so, that is so easy to learn in such little time, but has such a great impact on saving a life. Did you know that 90 percent of people who need CPR and receive CPR live? Police officers are usually the first ones at the scene. How would you feel if an officer would have to tell a frantic mother that she would have to wait for EMS in order to start and try to save her child's life while her child is dying? This can be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

you, you, you, and even you. This is why I ask of you to make this legislation a law. On August 27th of 2010, I lost the greatest love of my life to this procedures. Briana Amarles [sp?] Ojeda is her name. Briana was an 11-year-old baby girl who happened to run into a police officer who couldn't do CPR, nor did he try to help her in escorting her, and went into hiding and shaved his bald, and only when we found them through a gas receipt was when he was named. Losing Briana has been a life-sentence of depression, anxiety and heartbroken. By the passage of this legislation it would make sure that no other family would have to endure this pain that would never go away, get better or ever be the same. American Heart Association strongly encourages everyone to learn CPR and especially those called upon during an emergency. This legislation could increase the survival rate in New York, and I strongly urge its adoption. The President of the PBA, Mr. Pat Lynch, has written several letters in support of this training because he knows everyone loses in this situation, the person who passes on and the police officer who fails to save a life. To be human, this definitely has to have an effect on you,

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

This legislation is imperative to the City and its communities to bridge them together in a time when they are divided. Thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Michael.

so please do the right thing and pass Briana's Law.

In the words of Mayor de Blasio, "For One New York."

I know that it's extremely hard for you to be here, but I tell you that you are not alone, and your strength lies in the fact that you're here, and in honor of your daughter, we will continue to keep working so that her legacy lives on. I thank you for your strength. I thank you for taking your pain and really turning it into a plan. I served in Albany with Felix several years ago, and you know, I remember the visits, and you know, it still sits on me, and so even hearing you here today, it's painful to hear, but I know that, you know, there's always a light at the end of the tunnel, and I encourage you to please do not give up. Please do not give up and please continue to fight on behalf of your daughter. Thank you for being here and thank you all of being here.

CARMEN OJEDA: Hi, I'm Carmen Ojeda, and I'm Briana's mom. It shouldn't take the death of a

1

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

child for shortfalls like this to come to light.

3 While nothing can change what happened on that day in

4 Brooklyn, the City could use this incident to ensure

it never happens again. Please do what's necessary

to make these seamlessly simple changes that have the 6

7 potential to make a huge impact. It is my hope that a

8 child like my daughter Briana Ojeda never again be

denied CPR treatment from a member of the NYPD. For

this reason, I ask that measures be put in place 10

11 requiring the biannual recertification of all

12 officers. CPR certification must be tracked by NYPD

to ensure all officers have up-to-date credential in 13

14 this regard. Also, because officer safety is also of

15 utmost importance too, that all patrol units and

16 police vehicles be required to carry mouth guards and

17 protective CPR gear, leaving no excuse for denial of

18 this life-saving act. Thank you.

> IVELISSE ESPINAL: Good morning ladies and gentleman. I'm here on behalf of the request to pass Briana's Laws -- Briana's Law. The loss has not only affected the immediate family, but the entire community. Being a life-saver educator myself, I come to understand that we can all become a life-

saver. As we all know, it takes a village to raise a

4

1

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

child. I am here today with the hopes you can get us to pass this bill. I also wanted to give the honors to Redemption Point for the opportunity to be able to train others in our community with this God-given gift in the name of Briana Ojeda. We generally do not see the importance of our profession until it happens in our backyard. This is where it hit home to Mr. Saunders and I, an idea of opening a CPR training center in the community in hopes of educating the community as a whole with this lifesaving skill. My name is Ivelisse Espinal and I'm an American Heart Association Instructor.

ROBIN VITALE: Good afternoon. I am not Melinda Murray. She unfortunately had to leave for work requirements, but my name is Robin Vitale. serve as Senior Director of Government Relations for the American Heart Association, and with your permission I'm going to read Melinda's testimony into record. I'll do my best to synopsize. According to AHA science, the most recent heart disease and stroke statistics update, approximately 356,500 people experienced out of hospital cardiac arrest in the United States. Of those patients who were initially treated by Emergency Medical Services, only

2 approximately 12 percent survived. However, in those 3 cases where the cardiac arrest was witnessed by a bystander before EMS arrived, 38.6 percent survived. 4 In other words, if someone in the vicinity of the victim is prepared and able to respond, they are able 6 7 to practically triple their chance at surviving 8 cardiac arrest. For every minute that passes, once your heart stops beating, your chance of surviving decreases by seven to 10 percent unless someone 10 11 intervenes. This is why the American Heart Association is so passionate about our chain of 12 13 survival, making sure that we recognize when cardiac arrest occurs. We call 911 and we begin chest 14 15 compressions as quickly as possible. It's simply not an appropriate response in any cardiac emergency to 16 17 wait for the ambulance to arrive. You must be 18 prepared to respond and to respond quickly. It's a 19 clear expectation that our city's first responders should be trained and certified in CPR and the use of 20 an AED. The NYPD's mission statement includes the 21 goal to protect life. Let's save more lives from the 2.2 2.3 devastation of cardiac arrest by making sure our law enforcement is ready to respond. For Melinda, this 24 issue transcends science and protocol. 25

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

personal. She wanted to be here today to support the mission of the Ojeda family because similar to them her world was also irrevocably changed by cardiac arrest. On October 5th, 2009, her only child, her son Domenic, was taken from all of us far too soon when his heart stopped during a pick-up basketball No one around him knew to start CPR. waited for emergency services to arrive, but it was too late. Domenic had been in college for just a mere seven weeks. Please help us make sure that no other families in New York City have to suffer this experience. It just makes good sense to make sure that our state police officers are re-certified in CPR and the use of an AED every two years. Melinda and the Heart Association, we look forward to finally seeing this policy fully approved. The Ojeda's deserve this law. The American Heart Association also applauds your additional goal to increase the oversight of NYPD's efforts to certify department employees. This accountability will certainly escalate the focus on CPR certification and thereby help save more lives. The American Heart Association supports both bills, and we look forward to your approval. Thank you.

4

25

1

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much.

3 | Thank you.

FELIX ORTIZ: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 Thank you very much for holding this important

6 hearing today. My name is Assemblyman Felix Ortiz.

7 I am the Assistant Speaker of the New York State

8 Assembly. I represent the 51st District in Brooklyn.

9 I also would like to commend Council Member Levin for

10 | always being a big supporter and vigilant about this

11 | issue, and also I would like to thank him, you and

12 | the City Council for also naming a street name on

13 | behalf of Briana Ojeda. I think every time that I

14 pass that street, I used to represent that district

15 probably back in 1994 when I first got elected. I

16 don't do it anymore, but that's the street that I

17 | always take when I go back to Brooklyn, and I always

18 \parallel go that way to my house, and every time that I go I

19 \parallel see the name, and I hope everybody that see that name

20 | always remember that we still have a fight ahead of

21 us to get the bill done in the New York State

22 Assembly. I also would like to thank Assembly--

23 Council Member Torres for helping here to listen to

24 us all. I will just to get off of my testimony

because you have it there, but just a couple of

2 I think that your questions to the police officers representatives that was here was right on 3 4 the money. I used to work for the Office of Management and Budget, changing my hat a little bit, 5 and I used to oversee the Police Department, and it's 6 7 not so much changed about the way they respond when 8 we used to ask questions to the Police Department about statistics, numbers. How many police headcount do you have? It's not so much different from the 10 11 answer they give to you today. So, I hope that your 12 perseverance and your persistence it will continue to 13 ensure that not only that they will be able to give 14 to the Council a list of the police who has been 15 trained with the speculation that they will get--16 they getting the training on CPR. I think that will 17 be something transparency to look into it. There 18 will be something that I might add to my own 19 legislation as a result of what I heard here today. I 20 think that my legislation is very simple, what is asked exactly what everybody's been asking for. Just 21 retrain police officers every two year throughout the 2.2 2.3 state. Our law enforcement should have the necessary skill, very simple skill that we do not need to be 24 sitting in this room again asking for another 25

2	clemency that we need retrain our police officer. W
3	all know that by protecting our families, our
4	constituents, we also protecting our police officer,
5	because their if our police officer know how to
6	perform CPR adequately, the bottom line is that they
7	will be able to save their own brothers and sister i
8	the law enforcement. When the lack of services or
9	training happen, this is the kind of circumstances
10	that we have. Lastly, I would like to say that was
11	mentioned and I was trying to make the numbers in my
12	head when I used to work in OMB about what was the
13	headcount with the Police Department as they were
14	talking. So you're talking about 35,000, 36,000
15	police officer, and you're talking about 17,000,
16	18,000 civilian, and you're talking about 4,000,
17	5,000 school safety guard. If you take all those
18	number together, it will give you between 58-59,000
19	good trainers of CPR, and if you take the money out,
20	the amount of money that need to be paid if somebody
21	get and I believe they mentioned that they have 20
22	people that may 15 to 20 people that they already
23	certify that they can do the training. Well, that
24	training is only 200 to 300 bucks. So, you're
25	talking about do the math, 50 times 20. It's a

thousand dollar. So if you do the math, about 59,000
plus five dollar person let's make it 10 dollar,
just to give the Police Department an advantage.
That is too expensive when their budget is probably
billions of dollars, the second largest after the
Department of Education, okay? Don't tell me that
they cannot find 300,000 dollars just to put it into
the budget to retrain police officer in the Academy.
So if they can go to be trained for firearms every
six months or a year, well, why not to put why not
to mandate that the CPR should be part of the firearm
training? And let me just ask I think you asked the
question. Seventy-seven precinct, how many police
officers do we have in every precinct? Well, guess
what? Let's then train three or four people inside
the police, the 77 precinct, one each, and let's have
those four people who has been trained for CPR, they
have to do better. Let's do it every six months or a
year inside the precinct. Then we refresh them in
the Academy. Bingo. I was very happy to be invited
to this day [sic] to be here and listen to the folks
from the the representative from the Police
Department, because these numbers are very low.
These numbers can be found in the 52 billion, 72

2	billion dollar budget in the City of New York as well
3	as the 167 billion dollar budget from the State of
4	New York. So, my presence here today is to support
5	your resolution, to continue to work with you all,
6	and to hope that when we start session, you can also
7	come to the assembly and to the Senate where we're
8	getting stuck and show these people in the Senate
9	that we're only talking about roughly throughout the
10	state, the 62 municipalities and the 62 county,
11	roughly three million dollars to be put in the budget
12	if the other municipality is complaining about
13	unfunded mandate. Thank you, Madam Speaker for
14	allowing me Madam Chairwoman for allowing me to
15	speak here today on this important issue, and I hope
16	that at the end of the day we understand that this is
17	about not just saving somebody's life, but it's to
18	saving our own life as well. Thank you very much,
19	and may God bless.
20	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much. I know, yes, yes, you are Briana's Aunt? Okay, yes, so just please state your name for the record, and then you can begin. Thank you again for coming.

DAMARIS OJEDA: Thank you. Damaris Ojeda. I am Briana's paternal Aunt and Godmother. I

25

21

22

23

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Briana's Law.

2	stand before you today extremely grateful for this
3	opportunity to express how necessary and crucial it
4	is that we get Briana's Law passed. Briana's Law
5	would require first responders to be ready, willing
6	and able to deliver life-saving procedure such as
7	rescue breathing. Let's make it mandatory that firs
8	responders carry CPR kits with barrier devices for
9	their protection. This legislation would mandate
10	that first responders do just that, be the first to
11	respond and take concerted action. For the past six
12	agonizing years, my family have been on a relentless
13	pursuit to have this critical bill become a law.
14	Today, we ask that you deeply consider this and that
15	you too become an advocate of Briana's Law. It will

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much, Damaris, and thank you all. Thank you, Assemblyman. And to the family and to American Heart Association and to Redemption Point, thank you, thank you, and thank you. my heart is heavy as well because I want to do everything that I can as a Council Member and as one of your partners to help you because I too

literally save the lives of millions. It might even

be you or someone you love. Please help us pass

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

realize that just as easily as you sit there, it could be me too, and so I realized that, and because you know, we have an important role to play, it's important to make sure that these conversations are had. And you know, sometimes I can't always explain why we have stalemates in government. I can't explain that, but I do know that the work we're doing is about saving lives, and if we can use our positions with the resources we have to save one life, then we have done a good job. And so I thank you for coming today, and I want to turn this over to my colleague Steve Levin who has been doing a tremendous amount of work working with you, working with the family, and you know, this is really his bill that he's championing, and I want to give him an opportunity to speak. So, thank you once again for joining us, and we also with us Council Member Ritchie Torres, as well. Council Member?

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you, Madam

Chair. I want to thank this panel. Assemblyman,

thank you very much for your sponsorship of this

legislation and for shepherding it in Albany. We

look forward to its full passage this year, and you

can count on this Council to help you in that

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

endeavor, and we're confident that this will happen this year. To Briana's family, to Michael and Carmen, you have -- you have taken this tragedy that has befallen your family and has befallen you and your lives and made it a mission to action to save others' lives, and that's the greatest lesson that you can give to your community and to our city and to humanity, and with all my heart I commend you, and I thank you for not falling into despair, for taking this pain and doing your best to create change and positive change and blessings. And deeply affected me and my life, and you have and you continue to serve your daughter's memory with great dignity. I want to thank Melinda Murray as well for her actions and the service of the memory of her son. May we not lose any other children so senselessly because of a lack of resources in training. I want to thank you. You can count on this Council's support. God bless you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: I just have one question for the Assemblyman. Knowing and understanding how Albany works and the fact that the Democratic-led Assembly has passed this bill more than once, moving into the new legislative session in

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

January, are there any strategies that you have for getting the Senate sponsor and getting, you know, IDC and others involved so that we can really see movement? And also, you know, on behalf of my colleagues and I, we certainly want to be of help and support to all of you to make sure that that can happen in the next legislative session.

FELIX ORTIZ: Yes. Two things. one, IDC has been very supportive of the legislation. So we have them on our side. We only have probably about three or four legislators from upstate New York who continue to believe that this is an unfunded mandate. As a result that we are-- have done some of the most detailed research analysis, if you will, about how many law enforcement do we have in every municipality and in every county, have both the county and the municipalities. We believed and we probably need about three million dollars to be put in the budget just to believe -- assuming that they will continue to believe that it's unfunded mandate. For me, I don't believe it's an unfunded mandate, because I do believe that every law enforcement throughout the state of New York, every municipality and country provide CPR in the Academy. So, if

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

they're doing that already, so we are really reducing how much the impact, the financial impact is going to be in the municipalities. So my strategy is number one, is to continue to have a conversation with my Speaker, with the President of the Senate and the Governor, and to push the Governor to ensure that we will be-- we'll probably be able to allocate at least three to five million dollar into the budget in the new budget cycle to cover what they believe we'll spend unfunded mandate at cost, just in case it is the cost, just to protect ourselves. I think that if I do that and I have that allocation into the budget, then we will be able to have the Senate finally to agree to pass the piece of legislation, because no longer it's going to be unfunded mandate, but the justification that I have put in my bill show that it's not a financial burn, if you will, even in the most small municipality in the state of New York because they're still sharing law enforcement in some of the municipalities, and when they share money-when they share that they've been trained already because they do have CPR trainers in their training facility. So, should not be an issue, but they still make it an issue as a result probably because as you

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

probably know-- you've been in the Assembly, you know the deal because they probably want something in exchange. But it's not here, nothing to exchange. We have 150 member in the Assembly, and we had only one Republican who vote against the bill out of the 42. So, in reality, they finally last year-- this year, I'm sorry, this year finally we got 40 out of the 41 to vote for the bill for the first time. year it was only three Republican who vote against the bill in the Assembly. So now we're getting more and more close to get everybody in the Assembly. it's only three members in Senate that really-- from upstate New York who really put in the-- has been put the pressure on it. But again, I think we have something in November happening, so we hope that we can probably have the magic number, and if that is true-- so we probably-- we probably will be able to get it done by February, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you. I'm glad you said that. I was going to say that there were some new faces going to Albany, and I certainly encourage you and everyone on the panel to please make sure you visit them. I think it's something where we have to put the people before the politics.

We're talking about saving lives of every New Yorker	<u>^</u> ,
and also, I mean, just protecting law enforcement as	3
well and giving them the tools that they need. It's	3
very concerning when you hear in some of the cases	
we've had recently where officers are admitting that	-
they don't feel comfortable because they're not, you	1
know, certified in CPR enough. I mean, that's very,	
very convening to us. So, I appreciate the	
Administration's willingness to talk about it, and I	_
think this hearing obviously propelled and stimulate	∍d
a conversation, but you know, we at the Council are	
going to take that discussion obviously to the next	
level and whatever financial issues we have to deal	
with. We're approaching a new budget season, so it'	S
important for us to make sure that we can push this,	
but obviously I'm fighting for New York City, but if	=
we can get it done in the State, that's even better.	,
Getting the Governor on board and making sure that	
this could be one of the issues that he champions in	1
2017. So, I thank you. You have been a strong	
leader on this, and I really appreciate all the work	2
you've done, and you know, you have our support,	
Council Member Levin and all of us we will do what	

we can to help you If

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

we can to help you. If it means a trip to Albany,

I'm okay going to Albany.

 $\label{eq:felix ortiz: We have a good kitchen} % \begin{center} \begin{center}$

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Yes, yes, yes, yes Thank you so much. So, I do have one more we do. panel after you, but thank you for joining us today. Thank you for your testimony. Thank you for your strength and the work that you have done, and I encourage you to please remain committed. There are so many voices out there that we may not ever hear that may share your story, and you are a source of strength for many people that you may know and many that you may not even know. So, I thank you for just your work in keeping Briana's memory alive. So, thank you, and may God bless you and keep you. Thank you for coming today. Our next panel is Adam Shoop of the Bronx Defenders, Thomas O'Brien from the Legal Aid Society, Kenneth Crouch from Bronx Defenders, Chris Alexander from the Drug Policy Alliance, and Anca Gregory [sic], I believe, Grigore, from Brooklyn Defender Services here talking about two bills, Intro 1000. Thomas O'Brien, Kenneth Crouch, Anca Grigore, Chris Alexander, and Adam Shoop. And before we

1

3

4

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

begin, I also want to acknowledge and recognize that for the record we have received testimony from the American Red Cross. Okay, you may begin.

ADAM SHOOP: Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you. Thank you for coming.

ADAM SHOOP: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker and members of the Committee. My name is Adam Shoop. I'm a Staff Attorney in the Civil Action Practice of the Bronx Defenders, and at our office many clients come through our doors because of a criminal case, but it's our Civil Attorneys and legal advocates that represent many of those people and their families who as a result of that arrest also face enmeshed penalties such as police confiscation of property and cash. I want to thank the Council for its attention to this important issue and for the opportunity to testify on Intro 1000. There are lengthy written comments from myself and my colleague Kenneth Crouch who is also here with me. I'm just going to touch on kind of the general overview of the issues that we face and also address a couple of matters that were raised when the NYPD members were testifying on the first panel. The clients that we

2 have at the Bronx Defenders, these are mainly poor 3 and working poor men, women and youth of color. 4 live in communities in the Bronx that are over-5 policed and disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system, and in almost every arrest, 6 7 whether that person is ultimately charged with a crime or whether they're ever convicted, the NYPD 8 takes some form of personal property that includes things like cash, phones even cars, as was spoken 10 about earlier. It's a cornerstone of our criminal 11 12 justice system that there is a presumption of 13 innocence, and yet, in the property retrieval system 14 within New York City, this very notion is turned on 15 its head. The NYPD can take a person's property 16 during the book process and as Deputy Commissioner 17 Messner said, they can continue to hold that for a 18 variety of reasons, whether it be safe-keeping, 19 arrest evidence, civil forfeiture or because they're 20 conducting an ongoing investigation, and the burden falls on the individual to get their essential 21 2.2 property back. The laws in New York City around 2.3 retrieving property that's been seized by the NYPD including but not limited to civil forfeiture laws 24 are incredibly confusing and complicated. They've 25

been referred to by scholars and federal court judges 2 3 alike as bizarrely worded and byzantine. Outgoing 4 Commissioner Bratton actually has openly advocated 5 confiscating cars and cash even for low level offenses, because in is words, "The criminal justice 6 7 system no longer provides a disincentive," and he has 8 actually praised property seizure and civil forfeiture practices as among the most effective enforcement techniques in Broken Windows policing. 10 11 As you will hear from my colleague Kenny, these Broken Windows tactics like "Stop and Frisk," 12 13 property seizure disproportionately affects low 14 income community's color and the consequences can be 15 devastating. Intro 1000 begins to provide 16 transparency on this issue, and we really thank the 17 Committee, especially Council Member Torres for sponsoring this bill, the bill's 36 other co-sponsors 18 19 for their leadership on this issue, but we believe 20 that the bill could be strengthened by making several changes that I've outlined in my written testimony. 21 I'd like to take a moment just to briefly focus on 2.2 2.3 one, and that's the issue of unclaimed property. This came up during the first panel. As the bill is 24 currently drafted, it would not report on the 25

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

disposition of all money and vehicles, just those that are returned to claimants and only these that are kept by the NYPD through civil forfeiture. Earlier, Deputy Commissioner Messner had mentioned that they had seized 11,653 dollars in forfeiture and 98 vehicles, but if you take a look at the documents that we received through the Freedom of Information Law Request that we filed in 2014 and that the NYPD belatedly responded to 19 months later, it shows that there's a great -- the great majority of money that they're actually counting as revenue from seized cash is what they consider unclaimed property. numbers don't match up with what was reported today, but in fiscal year-- or calendar year, excuse me, 2013, there was about half a million dollars in money that was seized through forfeiture, about half a million in revenue from automobiles and other property that was auctioned, and five million dollars in unclaimed property. So, I think it's absolutely essential that money that the NYPD is determining that is never going to be returned to an owner that they're keeping and counting as revenue which they report to the City Council every year in upwards of six to seven million dollars of revenue through

3

4

6

_

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unclaimed cash and property sale, that that become part of this bill. In other words, we need to know the final outcome of how all cash, vehicles and property is disposed of. And we'd be grateful for the Council to work on— to work with them on any language effectuating the changes that we've recommended, and I'm happy to go into greater detail if you have questions.

KENNETH CROUCH: Thank you. Thank you, members of the committee. My name is Kenneth Crouch, and I am a Civil Legal Advocate in the Civil Action Practice of the Bronx Defenders. In that capacity, I assist clients in a variety of civil issues, among those property retrieval. I'd like to provide a window into the experiences of a client I worked with personally to illustrate the magnitude of disruption that claimants face. About four months ago, NYPD officers stormed into the apartment of Anna and Nate Ortiz, a mother and son who live in the South Bronx. They were looking for a friend of Mr. Ortiz's who was allegedly in violation of his parole. Police officers ended up arresting the friend for drug possession, but also arrested Mr. Ortiz and another acquaintance who was visiting the apartment.

2 Furthermore, they took over 2,500 dollars in cash that Mrs. Ortiz had saved in the apartment to pay 3 down rent she had fallen behind on. Mr. Ortiz ended 4 5 up pleading to a disorderly conduct for insisting that police officers produce a search warrant. 6 7 Bronx Defenders fought a demand with the Bronx Property Clerk for Mrs. Ortiz's cash and left several 8 messages following up with the Civil Enforcement Unit. None of those messages were returned. A month 10 later when the deadline for the NYPD took-- excuse 11 12 A month later when the deadline for the NYPD to 13 file a civil forfeiture action had already expired, 14 we belatedly received a letter from the Police 15 Department incorrectly characterizing our demand as 16 improper, and when in fact it was. Undeterred, we 17 obtained a DA release. We submitted a new demand, 18 this time to the Civil Enforcement Unit, and only two 19 weeks ago from today, the New York City Police 20 Department finally agreed to release the money as a result of the Bronx Defenders multiple inquires and 21 demands. In July, in the midst of these protracted 2.2 2.3 efforts, Mrs. Ortiz was brought to Housing Court and today is still fighting off an eviction case because 24 she can't pay her back rent. Our efforts made all 25

,

the difference between a measure of stability and devastating homelessness. Mrs. Ortiz's story is one of dozens that I could share today, and our written testimony highlights the specific hardships faced by other clients forced to navigate the process. We submit these comments certainly on behalf of the Bronx Defenders and sincerely thank the Council for its carful intention to this important issue, and of course, for the opportunity to testify. And Adam and I are happy to entertain any question or comment the City Council may have.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Good afternoon. I'm

Thomas O'Brien of the Legal Aid Society, and we submitted written testimony, and we enthusiastically support Intro 1000 for all the reasons that my colleague have just stated. And you know, Louie Brandi [sic] said, "Sunshine is the best disinfectant," and that's what we need in this situation. The testimony I prepared though is oriented to the other end of the system, not what the NYPD tells about how it ultimately disposes of property, but the manner in which it gets the property in the first instance and that's a system that is very unfair and subject to abuse, and that's

what's happen. So, in the written testimony I detail
that there's Krimstock hearing for cars, so I was
kind of taken aback to discover that that's one of
the the 1272 is a bill that is under consideration
that would apparently codify the Krimstock ruling.
So, I have a special interest in that. I brought the
Krimstock case. I argued it three times in the
Second Circuit, everything that happened in district
courts and, you know, the Krimstock hearing that
stands is a result of it. So, I have to say strongly
hold off on that because the problem as I show in my
testimony, that the Krimstock order from 2007, the
last order that is apparently to be codified has been
subverted and thwarted by the conduct of police
lawyers and OATH judges since that. And so that, the
order that would be codified needs itself to be
repaired and there are a couple of fixes that can be
made before anything final is done. So, I'll show
you a few ways in which it's happened that the
process has been subverted. You have to remember
that this is largely from the point of view of the
people whose vehicles are taken. They're without
lawyers. There is no right to appointment of civil
council in a civil proceeding. So, they are facing

2	what is usually two lawyers sent by NYPD, and what's
3	happened is the number of hearings has been
4	drastically reduced because of that. To give you one
5	contrast: In July 2007 there were 20 hearings at
6	OATH in that month alone, and the claimants prevailed
7	in 16 of them. In July of this year there were no
8	hearings. There are there's calendar and so cases
9	are put on the OATH calendar and people will come,
10	you know, to litigate their claim, but they're almost
11	all settled or abandoned. So, the actual process
12	that, you know, we think exists is really just a
13	shadow of what it used to be. So, why does this
14	happen? Well, one reason is it's the duty of the
15	Police Department to send the notice to a person
16	whose car is seized when the hearing is. Along with
17	that notice they often send what they call a
18	Discovery Demand. It's about six page, single
19	spaces, demanding your tax returns for the last three
20	years, all receipts involved in paying for the car,
21	your credit card, you know, receipts, all this
22	information, and one of the results of that is the
23	default. So, a lot of people who request hearings
24	end up not showing up. They outnumber the people who
25	actually do get hearings, and you can imagine why.

2	If someone if a police agency is demanding all
3	these, you know, intimate financial details of your
4	life, a lot of people just decide it's not worth it.
5	And so that's it amounts to an abandonment of the
6	applicant [sic] to get the vehicle. If they do
7	arrive at OATH, there's a very heavy settlement
8	pressure from the police lawyers and the OATH judge,
9	because the OATH judge who does the hearing, which
10	they don't have much to do anymore and the OATH judge
11	who oversees settlement, and overwhelmingly there are
12	a lot more settlements than actually hearings.
13	Settlements always amount to payment to the Police
14	Department of money. Now, Mr. Messner of the Police
15	Department talked before about proud they are of
16	their Oasis Drug Treatment Program. They still
17	always demand money, and the Oasis Program is now
18	part of the penal law. So, it's really it's not
19	necessary, but in drug cases where drugs were found
20	in an automobile, the police lawyers will come in and
21	they will demand 5,000, 3,000, 2,000 dollars. Now,
22	think about that for a moment. They're supposedly
23	the purpose of the program is to take cars away, you
24	know, that were used in crime, but with the
25	settlement policy, they're basically saying, "Here's

2 your car back, as long as you give us some of the 3 money you made, you know, as a drug dealer or whatever." So, that's-- you know, there are figures 4 that Intro 1000 would hopefully produce, but the 5 money gets there in kind of a seemly way. 6 7 would say the third thing that thwarts the OATH 8 process is rather than give people notice of their right to hearing, the Police Vehicle Seizure Unit will send them a letter, and the letter will say we 10 11 have a settlement program and you can settle the case 12 by sending us money. This is totally outside of any 13 forfeiture process of OATH, of any legal process. 14 This is just sending letters to people and them 15 sending money back to the Police Department, and I 16 really have -- I don't know how much that amounts to, 17 but it's a very regular practice, and the other thing 18 that I would say to urge some amendment of the 19 Krimstock codification is to bring in money into 20 that. Seized money essentially has no due process. 21 You have a theoretical right to a trial. I don't know of a trial for money forfeiture in the past 15 2.2 2.3 or 20 years. It just doesn't happen, and the results from today's testimony indicate that. If the police 24 can say that the entire amount of money that they get 25

24

25

2 from forfeiture is 11,000 dollars, but they're

3 seizing what could be millions of dollars, it just

4 shows that forfeiture is a process. There's a lot

5 wrong with it, but it represents legal process, and

6 so there's almost none of that. So, any codification

7 of Krimstock should also include seized money as

8 well, you know, there should be a ceiling or a floor

9 of maybe 500 dollars or something like that because

10 there are a lot of petty amounts, but that's, you

11 know, that would ensure some type of fairness, you

12 know, which doesn't exist now. They're just taking

13 | it, and the process of getting it back is so

14 difficult that people walk away from it.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank-- thank you

16 very much. Thank you.

17 CHRIS ALEXANDER: Chris Alexander, Policy

18 | Coordinator, Drug Policy Alliance, New York Policy

19 Office. Thank you members of the Committee on Public

20 Safety for inviting our testimony. Drug Policy

21 Alliance strongly supports Intro 1000 and urges the

22 City Council to support this legislation and moving

23 forward. The Drug Policy Alliance is a nation

leading organization working to end the war on drugs,

halt mass incarceration and repair the harms that

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

have been wrought on families and communities mostly of color as a byproduct of failed drug policy. Drug Policy Alliance has been examining asset forfeiture for some time, as much as the low-level misdemeanor arrests where property is seized that are made by police departments across the country for drug offenses, usually possession. Our organization has been working now in various states and on the federal level to address the injustices around the practice of civil asset forfeiture and are thankful to the Bronx Defenders and Council Member Ritchie Torres for bringing this issue to light. In our work, we have found that civil asset forfeiture as a practice violates both the due process rights of individuals and exacerbates already problematic policing tactics by incentivizing Police Department with the financial payout as they enforce draconian drug laws. I would also add that civil asset forfeiture is not unique to our state or our city. In fact, every state engages in the practice, but what's worse is the lack of transparency that we have here in our city that people have discussed today. I'll just say brief comments on the bill and why DPA supports it. The bill obviously goes great lengths to

2	increase transparency. We believe that the current
3	practice and the lack of information around what is
4	being seized and its characterization is very
5	problematic. We also agree that the bill would begin
6	to reduce the harms of bad drug policies. The Drug
7	Policy Alliance is dedicated to end the war on drugs
8	and repairing the harms it has created. This body
9	and many other elected officials across the state
10	have already advocated for taking a new approach on
11	misguided and racially biased police policies like
12	marijuana prohibition. That advocacy comes in part
13	because the enforcement of the existing law is
14	entirely racially biased, but also because of the
15	glare [sic] of consequences associated with said
16	enforcement. The seizing of property by the NYPD is
17	one of those glare [sic] of consequences, the taking
18	of a cell phone or of a wallet of a person who's been
19	detained can create immense difficulties that we
20	spoke to today as well. And lastly, this bill will
21	be a positive first step in reforming New York City's
22	asset forfeiture laws. Jurisdictions across the
23	nation are already reviewing their asset forfeiture
24	laws and New York City should follow suit. In 2016
25	alone at least 22 states have introduced bills to

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

forward.

Thank you.

limit civilized forfeiture and reforms have been 2 3 enacted in eight states. The current red tape 4 surrounding our voucher program and the practice of asset forfeiture itself means that those most vulnerable New Yorkers who we are all committed to 6 7 serve are the ones who are continuously harmed. 8 need to take a closer look at the practice and to increase transparency of the NYPD. The violation of due process, the lack of transparency and the 10 11 prohibition of public accountability undoubtedly contributes to the already deteriorating relationship 12 13 between police and communities across the city. DPA

ANCA GRIGORE: Good afternoon. My name is Anca Grigore. You pronounced it correctly,

Council Member Gibson. I'm a Staff Attorney at the

Civil Justice Practice at Brooklyn Defender Services.

Thank you for this opportunity to address the New

York City Council Committee on Public Safety. While

BDS supports Intro Number 83, Intro Number 728A,

Intro Number 1000, and Resolution Number 1181, I'm

going to focus my oral testimony today on civil

forfeiture and police accountability. As one of only

urges you to move this piece of important legislation

2 a few comprehensive indigent legal services 3 organizations, BDS does provide free legal 4 representation to our clients in matters related to 5 civil forfeiture. Just to give a little background, the New York Police Department can effectively take 6 New Yorkers' cash and property at will and hold it 8 for months, even years, and then eventually forfeit it permanently. The vast, as Mr. O'Brien mentioned, the vast majority of civil forfeitures never even 10 11 reach a hearing. Representation is rare, and forfeiture can occur without any criminal conviction. 12 13 The absence of meaningful oversight and 14 accountability in this law enforcement practice is 15 critical. This is undeniably a very lucrative source 16 of income for the NYPD and New York City. This 17 encourages policing for profit, reinforces community 18 distrust of the police and disproportionately harms 19 impoverished communities and people of color. 20 practice, civil forfeiture is even more problematic. 21 First, like has been mentioned, it's important to 2.2 note that innocence does not mean that the property 2.3 will automatically be returned to its owner. We often see cases that result in dismissals where the NYPD 24

still pursues forfeiture. This goes towards what the

2	NYPD panel was saying earlier how he claimed to be
3	concerned with the preponderance standard that is
4	required in civil criminal court, but very often the
5	NYPD will pursue forfeiture despite it being next to
6	impossible to meet this standard. They often require
7	settlement fees anywhere between 500 and 3,000 of our
8	indigent [sic] clients. Even when the NYPD is
9	offering settlement, they're under no obligation to
10	release any information about the allegations, their
11	evidence or reasons for seeking forfeiture. Second,
12	those who are arrested and charged with a crime, even
13	if they do get to the hearing, they're often unable
14	to testify in the civil forfeiture proceedings
15	because it can be used against them in any related
16	criminal proceeding. Instead, they're forced to pay
17	to settle the case or they can wait again months,
18	even years until the criminal case is over. Third,
19	when the criminal case is over or was never
20	prosecuted in the first place, it can be extremely
21	difficult for the property owner to get any
22	information about why their property is being held or
23	how to get it back. This lack of transparency makes
24	it difficult for us attorneys to advise our clients,
25	and even more difficult for owners to decide what to

25

2 To illustrate these points, I have a few client 3 stories as well. The first one is a client who was a 4 passenger in a friend's car. The friend was pulled over for driving with earbuds in. The car was searched, and ultimately an arrest resulted for the 6 7 sale and possession of marijuana. The car was 8 seized, but the property collection didn't stop The cops-- the police officers asked our client if he owned a car as well. They seized his 10 11 driver's license, found his address on his driver's license, drove almost four miles to his house, 12 13 knocked on the door, told his younger brother that 14 they needed to seize the car because it was blocking 15 a driveway, and they seized the car and put it in 16 forfeiture proceedings. Again, it's clear that this 17 car had nothing to do with the underlying arrest. 18 was four miles away at the time of the arrest, but it 19 The police officers then used this car was seized. 20 as leverage against our client in an attempt to get 21 him to testify against his friend. In the end, the client couldn't wait for his criminal case to end, so 2.2 2.3 he ended up paying 500 dollars to get his own car back that was not involved in any arrest. Another 24

client, we were able to help them get their car back

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

without paying a settlement fee, but there were other punishments embedded in the process. This client had to pay almost a thousand dollars on rental cars to get a loved on to their regular doctor's appointments while his car was seized. Final and more recent and particularly disturbing example is a client who recently got his car seized, and the NYPD has lost his car. He was given a voucher as they described before. The voucher number does not match with his car. There's nothing that matches his car number or his name in their system. The car is completely unaccounted for. The car remains unaccounted for, and neither the DA's office nor the NYPD has offered any recourse for our client. In conclusion, our indigent clients are being robbed of cash, property and justice. Fighting to protect their own rights means suffering unrecoverable loss of time, wages, missed medical appointments, stable housing and more. Well, fundamental reforms or the abolishment of civil forfeiture must be our ultimate goal. Establishing transparency in the process is an important step forward. With public reporting on the value of cash and property seized, the results of such seizures and the precincts responsible, Intro 1000 shines a

BDS
1
rt the
hope that
further
even
a
1
required
worth
l State
.n
ishment

that can and destroy lives-- can and does destroy

comments. BDS looks forward to continuing to work

lives, excuse me. Thank you for considering my

2.2

with the Council.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, very,
very much. Brooklyn Defender Services, Legal Aid,
Bronx Defenders, truly appreciate your work and all
of, you know, the efforts that you are involved in in
making sure that we not only pass sound legislation
that really addresses a lot of the deficiencies we
have in the system, but I appreciate the partnership.

After today's hearing I mean, some of the cases you
described about the lost car and I think there was
one that was lost money that was vouchered under a
co-defendant. I'd like, you know, the NYPD, I believe
we do have representatives that are still here at the
hearing, to have a conversation with you in regards
to some of those individual cases; ensure that there
is some follow-up done. I appreciate the leadership
of my colleague, and you have two Bronx colleagues
that are still here. So, I just have two quick
questions, and then I'm going to turn this over to
Council Member Torres who has really done a
tremendous amount of work on this issue. Previously,
the NYPD testified, Sergeant Morales talked about the
Property Clerk Office. So, I want to know from your
perspective, the Bronx Property Office in the Bronx
in someone's testimony I saw that there are a few
staff, and some of you described some really long
situations of going to these locations to retrieve
property. So can you describe for me and you know,
I have to ask just about the Bronx because it's the
borough that I represent some of the challenges
that you face with retrieving property for your

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.2

2.3

2 clients with respect to the Bronx Property Clerk
3 Office.

KENNETH CROUCH: Sure, so I'm happy to speak a little bit about that. So, for the entire county of the Bronx, there are three officers at three windows in the basement of the Bronx Property Clerk basement that process any seized property.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: In the entire borough?

KENNETH CROUCH: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

KENNETH CROUCH: I mean, and additionally, many of our clients are indigent, they're homeless, they don't have the official documentation would require even getting safe-keeping property which is presumably the easiest property to obtain.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So, when I asked the question before, and that's why I brought up the IDNYC, because I can imagine a client whose wallet was retrieved, was seized, you know, you don't have proper identification. You don't have an extra credit card or, you know, someone that may live in short-term housing. So how do you deal with those

types of cases, and also cases where a client, let's say they lose their voucher, they lose the invoice and they have no documentation of what was seized by the Department?

Voucher you have to go back to the precinct of arrest wherever you were processed. It doesn't matter where you're from, you know, or what community you're a part of, you back to that precinct, you get that voucher. If it's a pending case that has been where the Police Department has had your property for maybe two weeks or more, then the Bronx Central Property Office will provide a voucher, but again, it has to be really two weeks into you not having your property. And in regards to property where you said your ID's are taken, one has to prepare a sworn statement and deputize another individual with the proper ID to pick up that property, and that has to be notarized by a public notary.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So, the person would have to go a location to get the paperwork notarized and then return?

KENNETH CROUCH: That is correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

)

10 11

12

1314

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

case last year of a client, I think I sent them over to Bronx Defenders. Her medicine was vouchered and it was seized, and it was some sort of medication that she needed to like every day, right? Maybe diabetic or blood pressure, and it took quite some

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. And I had a

for us to get that back. So, do you encounter some

time even with, you know, stating the medical need

of those types of cases where something is seized and it's of an urgent need to return it?

KENNETH CROUCH: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

Yeah, we have numerous cases, some of which are in

our written testimony, where you know they're very

important items. Even cellphones, like the modern lifeblood of society, and especially, you know, those

certain items that people just can't get access to,

right? In one case I can think of specifically, I

have a client who due to a clerical error on his

voucher was unable to claim his property, even though

the voucher claimed that he, you know-- there was

only defendant in this case. The actual owner

category listed PSNY, which stands for Property of

the State of New York, and so despite him being the only defendant in the case and despite the case being

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

_ .

21

2.3

2.2

24

25

dismissed, he had to go through bureaucratic delay in this process just to get his property back.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

KENNETH CROUCH: And Adam, I don't know if you wanted to speak more to that.

ADAM SHOOP: I would just add on the ID thing, if you look at exhibit A, the kind of supplemental package to our testimony, we included actually the list that the Bronx Property Clerk provides of what ID's, what forms of ID are acceptable. the list is both more expansive than what's provided in the NYPD regulations in the RCNY, but also deviates in that the regulations say that if you come in with a New York State driver's license or non-driver photo ID, that's the only identification that we require, but you can see from that list that the Property Clerk requires two forms of ID in all instances regardless of what form of ID you come with, and then in some ways it's just not a sensible approach. You can get -- you can show the DMV if you're applying for a New York State photo ID, prove your name and date of birth by coming in with your birth certificate and a social security card, but if you came in with those two documents to retrieve your

able to be manipulated to extrapolate the data that

1

25

didn't understand how PETS operated and didn't know

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

we're looking for in the bill. So they have been
willing and are willing to work with us. So, I

certainly want to work with all of you to make sure
that we can try to make as many changes as possible
according to the bill to make sure that if we're
going to provide some revisions or upgrade, we do a

lot of technological upgrades here to make sure that
that's something that you are a part of because I

that it was as antiquated, because it's set up for a certain purpose, and you know, if you're trying to change that purpose you can't always make it easily as, you know, manipulative. So, I encourage you to

as, you know, manipulative. So, I encourage you to work with us and, you know, through the testimony you've given just provide some input on what we need

ADAM SHOOP:

to do to see if we can get more information.

quickly on that point that I have to respectfully
disagree with Deputy Commissioner Messner. If you

21 take a look at the documents that we were provided

22 that I attached to the appendix. The NYPD appears to

23 be able to generate some type of reports that

24 actually provide information--

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: [interposing] Right.

I do just want to say

ADAM SHOOP: that he said would not be 2 3 available in PETS. So they're able to provide, for 4 example, all of the cash that they have on hand in any given month, and they're able to show how much came in that month and how much went out. They also 6 7 have what's called a "revenue generated report," and 8 that shows, again, as best I can understand the document, how much they took in through actual civil forfeiture whether through a settlement in the 10 11 process or an actual lawsuit, how much property was auctioned, and then the rest of it is unclaimed 12 13 property. So there does seem to be a way, and again, 14 they're reporting to the City Council on budget 15 documents millions of dollars in revenue. It seems 16 to me that that's at the point that they've made a determination that they're never going to give that 17 18 back to the person because the deadline is expired or 19 for whatever other reason that they've never come to 20 claim or been able to successfully claim the cash that was seized from them. PETS was-- to the best of 21 my knowledge it came about in 2012/2013. If you look 2.2 2.3 online, there are actually -- it was nominated for some sort of an aware for how sophisticated it was. 24 This is an electronic tracking system that uses 25

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

software that was selected because it was supposed to be an industry leading standard, but it's used by Fortune 500 companies. So, I think there is maybe more information to get out of the PET system than what the NYPD has suggested is possible, just based on the sliver of response that we got through our FOIA request, and as I mentioned in the written testimony, we're actually litigating that because they haven't provided any of the other documents that we requested. So we'll see what happens with that, but to the extent that newer or different software is necessary, I think that's a-- that's not a reason not to report on it. There's too much money and property that's being seized, and I think we need to know what's happening. And I think bottom line is we just want the system to operate more efficiently. I think you representing our constituents as clients, I mean, you simply need to make the system, you know, better and more operable so that, you know, a family member or a loved one doesn't have to go through a nightmare just to retrieve property. And I know there's human error everywhere, but you know, vouchers, you know, need to be accurate. We need to make sure that, you know, things are not put in a co-defendant's name or

you have a car that's simply missing. I mean, those

3 types of things I know happen all the time, and so

4 just hearing those types of stories is enough for me

5 to say that we do have to do better, and you know,

whether there's a cost or whether there's manpower or 6

7 hours of labor, I mean, whatever it is it's

8 achievable, because the data is already there, and in

this bill we're asking for it on an annual basis. I

don't think that's something that's impossible to do, 10

11 and I think they did acknowledge that. So, we will

12 continue to work with them and make sure that we push

13 the bill along, but also have further conversations

14 around some of the challenges that you face in

15 representing many of our constituents. So, I thank

16 you again, and let me know turn it over to Council

17 Member Torres.

24

18 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Thank you, Madam

19 I do have a question about Commissioner Chairwoman.

Bratton's comment that forfeiture is an element of 20

21 Broken Windows policing, and his notion that it's

been a deterrent against criminal activity. 2.2

2.3 there ever been any empirical research done

concluding that civil forfeiture reduces criminal

25 activity? That you know of, or?

2.2

2.3

ADAM SHOOP: I'm not aware of, and I
think, you know, just the general research that's
come out disputing the effectiveness of Broken
Windows in terms of reducing crime in general seems
to dispute that notion. I think the asset forfeiture
or property seizure component of that hasn't been
specifically examined, but--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, even though the NYPD claims that the purpose of civil forfeiture is to deter criminal activity, the fact is that you can actually be deprived of your property regardless of whether you were convicted or even committed a crime. Is that true?

ADAM SHOOP: That's right.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Okay.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I can also say that the reason, one reason it's not a deterrent, is that hardly anybody knows about it. People are often take, you know, shocked that the car was taken. They got a release from the DA, so it's not needed as evidence, and yet now the police are trying to keep [inaudible]. Lawyers are often surprised to find that, you know, that there's this proceeding now where they're trying to forfeit a car. Very often

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

when cars are stopped and there's an arrest, the police on the scene will let somebody take it away who's not the arrestee. So, again, I mean, the whole Department is not really with the program, but it's like an unfortunate minority who would then end up, you know, trying to get that car back and having to pay money to get it back. So, it's just a-- there's not a uniformity or even type of publicity about It was-- when it originally started back when Mayor Giuliani was seizing cars in DWI cases that was a program that people knew about, but since then there's virtually no publicity or, you know, like campaign to, you know, to warn people this is what's going to happen. So, that's why as I said, it's become something that's all about the money.

Strange that probably the most technologically sophisticated police force the world has ever known cannot track property seizures in the aggregate. I just have trouble imaging that that's the case or that this industry led— this industry standard database cannot produce basic— I, you know— so I'm skeptical about the NYPD's testimony. You know, one of the concerns I have is about the criminalization

2

3

4

5

6

Ŭ

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

2.3

24

25

of poverty, and I don't know if you can elaborate on how abuses in civil forfeiture can have the effect of criminalizing poverty, the disproportionate impact that it has on lower income communities of color.

Can you discuss that?

ADAM SHOOP: We have some -- you know, Kenny can speak to other clients that he's worked We shared several anecdote in our written remarks. I will just make one important related point which is that the communities we work with in the South Bronx are the most unbanked and underbanked residents in all of New York City. What does that It means that they're more likely to keep their cash wages in cash form whether that be on their person or in their house, and I think there is often sometimes skepticism towards that. Why would-the person must have done something wrong. Otherwise, why would they have such a large-- why would they have such a large sum of cash? And their first suspicion or guess is not that they were-- they get paid in cash wages by their employer, not in a paycheck or that they took their paycheck to a check cashing business and they don't have a bank account to deposit money in, and it can--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] Or

in fact there was actually an elderly woman who was just a victim of robbery. She had 600 dollars, which is quite a bit. I don't think anyone thinks she's a criminal or-- so. Can you just walk me through the process? Because I want to have a sense of how onerous the process of property retrieval can be. Or let me actually rewind back. What are the various categories of property seizures within the NYPD? I know there are several categories. Can you explain each one?

ADAM SHOOP: One of the recommendations that we made was that the bill should track all of the designations, and so there are— we go through this in detail in our written testimony. There is safe-keeping property which means that they're just holding on to it until the person is released after arrest. It's just to safeguard their valuable property until they get out of court. Arrest evidence means that the arresting officer is asserting or believes that this property might have some evidentiary value in the criminal case. They simply want to give the District Attorney's Office the ability to review and make a determination. One

2	of the sticking points there is that so in order to
3	get that in addition to the safe-keeping requirement
4	such as ID and having the voucher, then you also need
5	to get the District Attorney's permission in the form
6	of a written release, and it had long been the
7	practice in the Bronx that the District Attorney's
8	Office would simply ignore a request, and there
9	really isn't legal recourse other than filing an
10	Article 78 proceeding in State Supreme Court, which
11	would be onerous and next to impossible for a
12	litigant who didn't have an attorney to do to
13	challenge that, basically a constructive denial of
14	that. We also see property over-designated as arrest
15	evidence. So, in almost every drug-related case,
16	phones and money will be designated as arrest
17	evidence. In very few of those cases do they ever
18	get the required search warrant that they would need
19	to get under a US Supreme Court law to evaluate or go
20	into the phone. So why they're hanging on to the
21	phone for the duration of their criminal case, which
22	even in misdemeanor case can last one, two, three
23	years. The Bronx Defenders is also, of course,
24	involved in litigation challenging the
25	constitutionality on speedy trial grounds of how long

2	it takes folks to get the case to trial. So, their
3	property can be tied up for the duration of their
4	criminal case if the District Attorney is not willing
5	to provide a release. Then you can put even more
6	complicated and onerous requirements with forfeiture
7	which involves them negotiating with not only the
8	District Attorney because of the Criminal Court, but
9	the sort of parallel civil track, and it may never
10	reach the level of an actual court proceeding, but it
11	does require at the very least negotiating with the
12	Civil Enforcement Unit of the NYPD for them to make a
13	determination either to provide a release if they're
14	not going to pursue a civil forfeiture action, or if
15	they do so, then that'll be a separate case that you
16	would be
17	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] Do
18	those cases proceed simultaneously?
19	ADAM SHOOP: They can proceed
20	simultaneously. So, in the
21	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] So,
22	if I'm accused of a crime, I'm expected to defend
23	myself against the criminal and civil action at the

same time, or?

2.2

ADAM SHOOP: That's right. So, using the
car as an example, which Mr. O'Brien had described.
If you are arrested for DWI or some offense, or the
even I guess in unrelated offenses Anca had spoken
about in her Brooklyn case, if they connect to your
car and their view to forfeiture, you're going to
need the District Attorney's release and then you're
going to have to make a demand with the Property
Clerk, and then they have 25 days to begin a civil
forfeiture proceeding, whether you you can also go
to the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings
if it's a car and not other types of property to try
to get your car back while the civil case would be
pending which also could take years until it would
actually reach a trial if it went that far.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Can a layperson can be reasonably expected to defend themselves against a forfeiture action without legal representation? Like, how complicated are these proceedings?

ADAM SHOOP: I don't think a person could reasonably expect to do even the administrative hearing at OATH, let alone litigate a civil forfeiture proceeding in Supreme Court.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 15
2	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, effectively,
3	property retrieval is reserved for those who can
4	afford it. Is that
5	ADAM SHOOP: [interposing] That's right.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Is that the
7	practical effect of

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I could just add that even for those that can afford it, you need a lawyer, and if they--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] Those who can afford the attorney, I'm sorry.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes, but a lot of people just make a practical decision to abandon it because the amount seized, even a high amount like 2,000 dollars, a lawyer would cost a lot more than that. And so you hire a lawyer to get back a 2,000 dollar car or a 2,000 dollar seize, or do you just write it off? So, that's why the unclaimed property line in the police testimony is like so much larger than anything else, because, you know, the rational decision is to give up on it.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And who makes the determination or classification of arrest evidence? Is that the D's office? Is that the police officer?

2 KENNETH CROUCH: It's the arresting 3 officer.

2.2

2.3

officer. And who's scrutinizing that determination?

Is it-- like, if I just, as an officer I just make an arbitrary determination this is arrest evidence.

Who's evaluating--

ADAM SHOOP: [interposing] I believe a supervising officer of some sort reviews the voucher at the time that it's entered. I'm not-- I can't speak exactly to what that--

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Actually, I can speak to that. There's a patrol guide section that require the officers to mark it arrest evidence if they mark it forfeiture and vice versa. So, you're almost always— and in the case of the car, you're always going to have the, like the dual bodies, the District Attorney and the police who want to hold onto it.

So, for cars, you actually— under the latest Krimstock ruling, you can go to the Criminal Court Judge to challenge the DA's claim that something is needed as evidence. For money there's no judge you can go to. They're basically, you know, unaccountable to anyone for that. So that's why, you

)

2.2

know, the police won't release cellphone or money until they get released from the DA, and the DA's, you know, they may just not return phone calls.

That's the common way of denying, you know, request for release. And then you're, you know, then you're stuck and the process isn't moving forward, and you give up, and all this money ends up in the police, and they don't have to do any forfeiture action.

They just have to be passed [sic].

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: What's driving the over-designation? Is it just arbitrary determinations on the part of the officers, the lack of guidance in the patrol guide? What's behind that?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I think it's just simpler for them, because a lot of-- often, something that is arrest evidence is so connected to the crime that it can be, you know, hypothetically at least, you know, considered forfeiture, held for forfeiture as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Does the patrol guide offer any guidance on when it's proper for a police officer to classify possessions as arrest evidence, or is it?

1
_

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I don't believe it does, and I recall that in litigating this issue that's part of Krimstock, the lawyers, you know, the DA's said the police officer doesn't really know if-- you know, it's the DA's only who know whether something is evidence or not. So, it's kind of--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] And so when in doubt, you're interest [sic] inclined to classify it as arrest evidence.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, part of it is a lack of guidance, a lack of clear standards, and effectively the officers who are making these determinations are laypeople or probably ill-equipped to determine the evidence? Is that a fair-- is that a--

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah, and usually in money cases, it has no evidentiary value.

Cellphones, sometimes you can imagine it, and in that case they should get a warrant if it does, and otherwise, they shouldn't be holding onto it. We shouldn't be treating it as a hostage. You can always get your cellphone back if you plead guilty.

24

25

2	ADAM SHOOP: I would contrast cars with
3	money. And so in the procedures that one of the NYPD
4	officers spoke to on the earlier panel, it made it
5	sound as in many if not all cases the money is
6	deposited into a bank account, and yet they're still
7	purportedly holding onto the actual physical money as
8	somehow relevant or necessary to the criminal trial.
9	If you contrast that with cars, under the greater
10	projections that are provided by Krimstock, the
11	District Attorney in order to hold onto a car without
12	providing a release has to make a showing of why
13	there's no less burdensome means such as taking
14	photographs, for example, if there was an accident
15	and they want to show damage to the vehicle, or
16	forensic testing if you could imagine if there was a
17	shooting or some other some other value. That's
18	what they would be bringing into the courtroom,
19	probably not driving the car into the courtroom, and
20	so that's what they're required to what they're
21	required to do. But for some reason, even if money
22	is deposited into a bank account and maybe they would
23	bring in a photograph of money if there was some

evidentiary value. The money is still going to be

tied up for the duration, the entire duration of the

2.2

case, because there is no standard or requirement
that makes them have to do a greater showing. They
can simply refuse to release on the basis that it's
required as evidence. You can then under the law ask
for a review by a supervising ADA, and they can
refuse you for the same reason, and again, your
recourse would be to file an Article 78 proceeding in
Supreme Court where the standard is very deferential.
It would be whether the determination is arbitrary
and capricious. So, if there is any rational basis
for why they're holding onto it, you're going to lose
that lawsuit.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, the categories of property seizures as I understand it are safe-keeping, arrest evidence, forfeiture--

ADAM SHOOP: [interposing] And I would add to that investigatory, which is property--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] So, can you-- yeah. Can you explain that distinction between arrest and investigatory evidence from here?

ADAM SHOOP: Investigatory property is evidence, as I understand it, and as delineated from the single most important case prior to Krimstock, the McClendon [sp?] v. Rosetti [sp?] case which was

ongoing in the district court between the 1970's and
1990's, distinguished investigatory property as
property that's unconnected to an arrest. Meaning
McClendon and the rules under the RCNY, what arrest
evidence or arrest property is, whether safe-keeping,
arrest or forfeiture means that it's either taken in
conjunction at the moment of arrest where they've
seized it and they make an arrest at some later
point. Investigatory property is property that
they've seized without making an arrest, and we
provide an example in our testimony of a client who
was taken to a precinct for questioning. He was
interrogated. He was never released. They had
believed that his car or a car that looked like his
was seen near a crime or involved at the scene of a
crime. He drove home from the precinct, and two
weeks later woke up to find that his car was missing
from where he had parked it the night before. He
called the precinct or called the police to report it
stolen and was told that they knew about his car,
they had possession of it and that they wanted to
speak to him. He was questioned further. Again,
released, but not he was not allowed to take his
car that time. He wasn't given a vougher. He had

1

3

4

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

several more trips to the precinct inquiring about his car. He was finally provided with a voucher. Some months later he had made his way to the Bronx Defenders. Again, no arrest, right? So he's not provided with a lawyer at any point in that police interrogation or questioning process, because he's not been arrested and booked and gone to court for arraignment, but he came to our office through our community intake, and we agreed to assist him. Once we made inquiries with the Civil Enforcement Unit of the NYPD, after a week or two they had determined that it was no longer needed for any ongoing investigation and that he could pick up his car from the auto pound, which at that point had been in police custody for six months.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, investigatory and arrest evidence are mutually exclusive categories, but not all of the categories are mutually exclusive. I noticed one of the recommendations that you make is that the reporting should not be non-duplicative. Right? If money and vehicles could be held for more than one reason, for example, as both arrest evidence and for forfeiture, they should only be counted in one category.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which category should they be counted in? If it's-if it qualifies as both arrest evidence and
forfeiture, which category should prevail for the
purposes of reporting?

ADAM SHOOP: I--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing]

Because that's not included in your recommendations.

ADAM SHOOP: I guess there are arguments in favor of both, and I'm not sure that I have fully a strong position in favor of one or the other, because as I mentioned there can be problems if it is held as both arrest evidence and forfeiture, that can entail both problems with getting a District Attorney's release, and it can entail problems on the forfeiture side with the Civil Enforcement Unit in terms of the length of time that a person would be deprived of their property. As I understand the PET system, if it is going to be held as forfeiture in addition to arrest evidence, the category on every property voucher that I've seen indicates forfeiture and not arrest evidence. So, again, if we see that it says forfeiture on the voucher, we can presume that it's also being held as arrest evidence, and even if the District Attorney does not wish to hold

accept.

2.2

2.3

2				ADAM	SHC	OP:	Ву	not	ac	ccept	ting	only	or	ne
3	form	for	а	drive	er's	lice	ense	or	a	New	York	Stat	.e	ID,
4	yes.													

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Have you ever gotten an explanation as to why?

ADAM SHOOP: None.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And Mr. O'Brien, you mentioned earlier that the NYPD-- because you were-- you seemed to be opposed to the City Council codifying Krimstock, because the NYPD has been subverting it. Can you elaborate on that point, or?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Okay, well, just to give you— the examples I gave were they send these detailed discovery demands for, you know, tax returns and all that. That's not part of the Krimstock order. They just do that on their own. The settlement letters to people, like totally outside of the Krimstock process, that's not part of the Krimstock order either. And so an amended, you know, codified version of Krimstock would, you know, ban these types of, you know, communications to laypeople outside of the Krimstock process. That's what's, you know, kind of reducing the number of hearings that are actually held. Just to— also the— we're just

2 talking about the investigatory versus arrest 3 evidence. OATH won't hear cases. If the Bronx 4 Defender's client went to OATH and said we need a hearing because they're holding onto my car, they 5 won't consider. They won't do an investigatory 6 7 evidence claim because it's strictly speaking. It's not part of the Krimstock order. That's the type of 8 thing which you could just fix in a codification, and so I think the big, you know, the big changes would 10 11 add that and would, you know, bar the, you know, 12 outside Krimstock type of communications. 13 the order is set up, you know, it's supposed to be 14 the police seize a person's car. They give them 15 notice which includes an explanation of the process, 16 and then the person uses that notice to apply for a 17 hearing. So, now they're-- you know, what they've 18 done over the years if often they don't give notice, 19 or they'll give notice, and then they'll have these, 20 you know, these discovery demands added to it. 21 Anything that would kind of intercept the Krimstock 2.2 process from going forward as, you know, now there's 2.3 this overlay of practice, and so that's why the-- a new version of the codification of the order should 24 be aware of that and correct those type of diversions 25

_ _

2.3

from the Krimstock process, and then I think, you know, it would be, you know, much more effective. It would go back to being as effective as it had been.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I have a question

regarding not on the bills but on-- I remember reading maybe a year ago or two then Attorney General Eric Holder made a series of reforms around civil forfeiture. And I remember-- so my understanding was that even if a state had a law that prohibited civil forfeiture, the local Police Department could effectively collaborate with the Federal Government. The Federal Government would pursue this forfeiture and then split the proceedings with the local Police Department. That practice supposedly has been curtailed, but one of the exceptions was seizures of property by a joint taskforce, and it was not clear how open-ended that exception was. I guess a year later or two years later, do we know?

CHRIS ALEXANDER: DPA did a pretty
expansive report this year in California, and it
looked at these types of joint taskforces and the
types of resources that were split. The current
federal ruling is like New York City would be in
violation of that as it stands, but the current

2.2

2.3

understanding what

federal ruling does prohibit the type of distribut—
or the type of breaking up of resources that was in
practice before, but many municipalities are still
doing it with either through ICE or through other—
especially California was a look so there was a lot
of border issues there. So, you know, either through
ICE or through other drug enforcement officials. So,

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So there has—— has there been a dramatic reduction since those reforms? Like, I want to get a sense of how substantive those reforms were?

I can send along the report from California that goes

into a little bit more in detail.

CHRIS ALEXANDER: I'm not sure about the current, you know, how much those reforms have reduced the practice, but we can tell you, as I put in my testimony, that a lot of states have been moving to enact those reforms, at least codifying them, but not necessarily don't have the data to show the impact.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Council Member, I think that passage of 1000 might at least put us closer to understanding what's going on--

2 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing]

3 Yeah.

2.2

2.3

THOMAS O'BRIEN: since Attorney General Holder's action, because it was the common practice of NYPD to-- it was call "adoption." So, they would seize--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing]
Right.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: you know, a thousand dollars. They'd ship it to the feds and it would come back laundered in a sense that they, okay, here's your portion of the money, and they didn't really do many of their own independent forfeiture actions during that regime. So, I think it's really would be good to know, you know, whether what they've been doing since then, and so that's why I think some type of breakdown as the law would, I think, require, might illuminate that.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And then I have just a question about State Law. I know that obviously the laws on civil forfeiture vary widely from state to state. How does New York compare to the rest of the country? Are our laws more rigorous,

25 more?

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

because nominally it provides more process, and that's the interesting thing here that hasn't been touched on. The state-- we're not talking about a state forfeiture law when you're talking about Police Department seizures. They always operate under the Administrative Code. There are two big state forfeiture laws. There's one in the CPLR, and there's one in the penal law which is oriented toward, you know, drug forfeitures. So, the drug forfeitures, one in the penal law has good due process. So, that's ignored. And so the District Attorneys can pursue forfeiture through the CPLR, and then the counties, other counties of New York they mostly have vigorous forfeiture practices. limited to felonies, though. So, the basic breakdown is the prosecutor can go after felonies, and NYPD can go after, you know, property of other sorts as well. So, that's why I mean, it -- I don't know how much we would suffer really if there just were no local forfeiture program, since prosecutors have the authority to forfeit instrumentalities of the proceeds of the crime just like NYPD does, and they

also, they have a system of allotment when the amount

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I would say hard to say

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 171
2	of money they seize has to go to. In one ca you
3	know, the authorities, the local authorities. So, to
4	me that is more than enough for the purpose of having
5	some type of deterrent to, you know, to property
6	being used in crime. So, NYPD's is really overkill
7	on that, but it's
8	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] But
9	if I under it seems like if I understand you
10	correctly that the NYPD could choose the forfeiture
11	process? Like, there's one in penal law, one in CPR,
12	and then one in the Admin Code?
13	THOMAS O'BRIEN: I don't know if they
14	have the authority. I think that's just for
15	prosecutors.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Only for
17	prosecutors.
18	THOMAS O'BRIEN: Right.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, the NYPD is
20	bound only by the local process?
21	THOMAS O'BRIEN: Right.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: There's no
23	statewide process for law enforcement, for I mean for
24	the NYPD?

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 172
2	THOMAS O'BRIEN: No, but there is as I
3	indicated, there's the they would get a portion of
4	the forfeited proceeds done by the District Attorney.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Okay.
6	THOMAS O'BRIEN: Like a certain amount of
7	the forfeited money has to go to the Oasis Substance
8	Abuse Program. So, it's, you know the prosecutors
9	can't keep it all for themselves. They have to give
10	some to the localities.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Okay. I could ask
12	you questions all day, but I think that I'll keep
13	that as the extent of it. Thank you so much.
14	THOMAS O'BRIEN: Okay, thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: That shows your true
16	passion, Council Member.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I just want to
18	say I was late because I literally while texting ran
19	into a pole. So I was disoriented. So, that
20	otherwise I would have been here to question the
21	NYPD, so I apologize.
22	CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: We're glad you're

re better. Thank you. Thank you all for coming and thank you for your testimony, your presence, and thank you for the work that you do every day in our

23

24

25

7

24

25

2 city. Thank you. We will definitely follow up with

3 all of you. Thanks. Our last panel for this

4 afternoon is Debra Kriensky from New York City

Audubon. Thank you. Thank you for your patience.

You can begin. Thank you. Thanks again. 6

> DEBRA KRIENSKY: Thank you, Council

8 Committee Chairperson Gibson and esteemed members of

the Committee on Public Safety for holding this

important hearing on the use of all-terrain vehicles 10

11 in New York City. My name is Debra Kriensky and I am

12 a Conservation Biologist at New York City Audubon.

13 We are a science-based conservation organization

14 dedicated to protecting birds and their habitats in

15 the five boroughs for the benefit of all New Yorkers.

16 Nearly 10,000 people comprise the membership of New

17 York City Audubon. New York City Audubon strongly

18 supports Intro 834, a legislation to amend the

19 Administrative Code of the City of New York in

20 relation to the use of all-terrain vehicles, ATV's.

21 New York City's urban natural areas include beaches,

2.2 wetland, grasslands, and forests. They provide

2.3 critical year-round habitat for hundreds of important

bird species, including the New York State threatened

Common Tern [sp?] and the federally listed Piping

1 COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 2 Plover and Red Knot. Birds in turn provide New 3 Yorkers with ecosystem services such as seed dispersal, carry and removal, insect eradication, and 4 a deep connection to the natural world. Our concerns about ATV use in the City is the disturbance to birds 6 and their habitats during vulnerable times in their 8 life cycle, breeding and migrating. ATV traffic leads to the soil compaction and subsequent negative effects on vegetation. In a Minnesota study, just 10 11 eight passes of an ATV caused significant damage to 12 the plants. Driving an ATV through natural areas 13 also creates an opportunity for invasive plant 14 species to encroach. ATV tires provide mechanical 15 transport of seeds from invasive plant species. 16 Impacts to wetland habitat is even greater. ATV 17 passage has been proven to have detrimental 18 hydrologic and physical effects, destroying wetland 19 vegetation. In direct interactions between ATV's and birds, the birds will lose. Piping Plover chicks are 20 21 especially camouflaged on the sand and will often stand still when a vehicle approaches. Black Skimmer 2.2 2.3 chicks will lie down in tire tracks. Tar at all

significant effect in decreasing migratory shore bird

24

25

showed that vehicle traffic had a statistically

abundance and will cause birds to disperse a given
site. Vehicle traffic has also been shown to
decrease both the amount of time a shore bird spends
on mud flats and the amount of time they spend
roosting, all vital behaviors for the survival of
long distance migrants. One need only look at the
relative wasteland that is the west side of the Salt
Marsh Nature Center in Marine Park, Brooklyn where
ATV's have free reign and compare it to the pristine
marsh and grasslands of the east side where it's
protected from ATV incursion to understand what a
travesty is the use of ATV's in a wildlife sanctuary.
For all these reasons and the safety of park and
beach goers, New York City Audubon strongly urges the
Committee to give full support to Council Member
Cohen's proposed legislation. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you. You were

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you. You were right on time. Thank you. Thank you so much.

DEBRA KRIENSKY: No problem.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Just one question.

I know you're in support of Intro 834. From the

perspective of New York City Audubon, what has been

your experience with ATV's? Because I know Council

Member Cohen, his passion for this issue is because

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

it's very prevalent in his district, and you know, the northwest section of the Bronx, Upper Manhattan, Inwood and other places, and you know, obviously working on this bill he really wanted to see some movement in increasing penalties and really getting these dangerous vehicles off, you know, our streets anyway. So, what has been your involvement in terms of enforcement at your local precinct, or how has your organization been involved?

DEBRA KRIENSKY: So, I'm not exactly sure what our involvement has been in ATV's. I'm out in the field certain days of the year, and I have not had personally interactions with ATV's, but I know from my experience as a biologist, when we're out on the beach, for example, we have trained biologists walk in front of any vehicles to make sure that there are no birds in the way, and just seeing how careful we have to be and we know what we're looking for, it's understandable that someone who doesn't know what they're looking for, doesn't know what's there, doesn't care what's there, it could have pretty devastating results.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Thank you very much for coming today. We appreciate your

COMMITTEE	ON	PUBLIC	SAFETY

2 presence, and thank you for submitting testimony.

3 Thank you. As this hearing comes to a close, I want

4 to thank all of my colleagues for joining us today,

5 especially the prime sponsors of the legislation that

6 was before us, Council Member Dan Garodnick, Ritchie

7 Torres, Andrew Cohen, and Steve Levin, and certainly

8 want to thank the Speaker and the entire staff of the

9 Committee on Public Safety. Thank you to our

10 | Counsel, our Analyst for your work, and once again,

11 | we want to congratulate Laurie Wen and wish her all

12 | the very best in her future endeavors, and thank you

13 to the Sergeant at Arms for allowing the hearing to

14 run smoothly this afternoon. This hearing of the

15 | Committee on Public Safety is hereby adjourned.

[gavel]

17

16

1

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

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



Date September 22, 2016