1	COMMI	ITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM	1
2	CITY COUNCIL		
3	CITY OF NEW YORK		
4			
5	TRANSCRIPT OF TH		
6	Of the		
7	COMMITTEE ON JUS		
8		September 27, 2018 Start: 10:09 a.m.	
9		Recess: 12:11 p.m.	
10	HELD AT:	250 Broadway-Committee Rm, 16 <sup>th</sup> ,	Fl
11	BEFORE:	RORY I. LANCOUNCIL MEMBERAN	
12	COUNCIL MEMBERS	Chairperson	
13	COUNCIL MEMBERS	ANDREW COHEN	
14		ALAN N. MAISEL DEBORAH L. ROSE	
15		ERIC A. ULRICH KEITH POWERS	
16		KEIIII I OWEKO	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 2
2	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
3	Hemangi Pai Senior Trial Attorney in the Brooklyn Adolescent
4	Representation Team, BART, at Brooklyn Defender Services
5	Dawit Getachew
6	Criminal Defense Attorney and Associate Special Counsel at the Bronx Defenders
7	Joanna Weiss
8	Co-Director of the Fines and Fees Justice Center
9	Lori Zeno Executive Director of Queens Law Association
10	Elena Weissmann
11	Director of the Bronx Freedom Fund
12	Dionna King Policy Manager with the Drug Policy Alliance
13	Khalil Cumberbatch
14	Associate Vice President of Fortune Society
15	Ilana Turko Senior Counsel at the Mayor's Office of Criminal
16	Justice
17	Towaki Komatsu Appealed an Order of the Civil Court
18	
19	Ras Omeil Morgan President of Comm-Love-Unity
20	Robert Brodie
21	Corrections of Accountability Project
22	
23	

[gavel]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: GOOD MOTHING
everyone. Good morning everyone. I'm Councilman Rory
Lancman, Chair of the Committee on the Justice System
and today we are here to discuss the hidden costs of
our justice system and how they impact outcomes,
reentry and successful reintegration for indigent
criminal defendants. The collateral consequences of a
criminal conviction for even a minor crime have
become well known. When an individual tries to
reenter society, they might have difficulty getting a
job, be excluded from housing, lose custody of their
children or access to education and student loans or
even face deportation but less well known are the
monetary costs that the justice system itself imposes
on people. The court system levies a mandatory
surcharge on every conviction or guilty plea to cover
cost court costs along with fees for crime victim,
victim assistance and DNA database upkeep. Fines are
imposed as a sentence either in addition to or
instead of jail time and are added on top of court
surcharges. The minimum is 25 dollars for minor
offenses, but the maximum can be many thousands of
dollars Panalties and assessments are naid to

outside agencies or organizations like the Department
of Motor Vehicles which charges 750 dollars over
three years for any DWI offense or for determining
at determining eligibility into a program. Lastly,
restitution to victims can be mandated by the court
based on the facts of the case up to 10,000 dollars
for a misdemeanor or 15,000 dollars for a felony with
an additional five percent surcharge, surcharge going
to the court system. This is not a problem just
hitting those convicted of serious offences, a
violation which is not even a crime, costs a
defendant at 120 dollars in court surcharges and fees
before even calculating in a fine for the actual
charge. The starting point for a misdemeanor is 250
dollars including a DNA database fee even if the
defendant's DNA is already on file and these are just
the baseline amounts. For parole or conditional
release, release add another 50 dollars per month to
reinstate a suspended drivers license, add 100
dollars for work release, add a ten dollar a day
reporting fee, on and on and on. Even programs
offered as alternatives to incarceration or treatment
mandated by the courts can come with onerous fees
putting them in reach for only some. For any person

these costs would start to add up quickly but for
those struggling to get back on their feet after an
arrest or time in jail, these debts can cut them off
at the knees. Last year, 2017, there were over
452,000 different fines, surcharges, restitutions, or
various fees charged in New York City criminal cases
totaling almost 100 million dollars, but it doesn't
even end there. If someone doesn't pay it opens up a
whole new world of collections, over 103,000 civil
judgments were ordered for nonpayment in 2017. Such
judgments come with a nine percent interest rate and
can lead to damaged credit, suspension of a driver's
license, garnishment of wages, seizure of a car or
other property or revocation of a business permit.
Parole can even be denied, revoked or extended just
for nonpayment. For those trying to reintegrate into
society court fines and fees can bar their way and
even that is better than those who have warrants
issued against them, over 11,000 last year or
committed for nonpayment. In 2017, 161 people, more
than half of them from my home borough of Queens,
were committed to custody in what might as well be a
modern-day debtor's prison. It is not enough to decry
the high cost of injustice of justice for those who

can least afford it and it's not enough to call on
Albany to make changes to mandatory fee statutes for
indigent defendants and fund our courts in ways that
don't make them rely on fines and fees. The city
itself has an impact, our prosecutors have an impact,
where diversion opportunities or alternatives to
incarceration are offered many of which are
administered by the Mayor's Office of Criminal
Justice we must make sure that defendants are able to
participate. Where classes such as a batter
intervention or DWI program are mandated by the court
or made a necessary precursor for a defendant to see
their child or regain their driver's license, money
should not stand in the way. For example, one program
requires 16 sessions at 50 dollars each plus an
additional orientation fee, should completion of a
program hinge on the ability to find 850 dollars just
to participate? Just as important is who we choose to
prosecute and for what. A study by the Bronx
Defenders found from that from 2009 to 2013, before
this city and its DAs made their first attempt to
reduce marijuana enforcement, court fees and fines
assessed for low level marijuana possession totaled
approximately 11 million dollars city wide. How many

fewer of those individuals are being arrested today?
How many of them are receiving a violation and
tomorrow how can we make that number zero? How much
more can we reduce the effect of our criminal justice
system on largely black and brown people that cycle
through it? With every arrest we choose not to make,
with every case we choose not to pursue, we can
reduce the cost of justice for everyone. I look
forward to hearing today from the Mayor's Office of
Criminal Justice, public defenders, advocates, and
others about the impact of this system here in New
York City and ideas for how we can improve on it.
With that we're going to swear in our witnesses and
we'll hear your testimony. So, if you can raise your
right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
that you give today will be the truth, the whole
truth and nothing but the truth?

DAWIT GETACHEW: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Terrific. Unless you have some other idea why don't we just start from, from my left to, to right, please introduce yourself and, and let's hear your testimony. You have to hit the, the button, the red light.

2	HEMANGI PAI: Thank you. My name is
3	Hemangi Pai, I'm a Senior Trial Attorney in the
4	Brooklyn Adolescent Representation Team known as BAR'
5	at Brooklyn Defender Services. BART is a specialized
6	unit with dedicated attorneys and social workers
7	representing young people ages 14 to 24 who are
8	charged with crimes from petty, low level crimes to
9	serious felonies in Brooklyn. In my almost eight
10	years at BDS, I've represented hundreds if not
11	thousands of young people; these young people are
12	poor, mostly black and Latin X, most of their cases
13	end with a plea which includes fines and fees. Fees
14	including mandatory surcharges that are routinely
15	imposed without any assessment of a client's ability
16	to pay. The consequences of nonpayment for our young
17	clients are dire; ruined credit, denial of access to
18	housing, inability for college loans, and employment
19	discrimination. I have hundreds of stories of young
20	people who've been disproportionately impacted by
21	fees and fines, but I'd like to share one example
22	that I think best illustrates the consequences our
23	young people face. My, my client and we can call her
24	Katherine, was charged with theft of services for
25	entering the subway system without paying. She

doubled up in the turnstile with her friend, she was
immediately arrested and because she didn't have any
identification on her she was processed, taking to
central booking and then brought to court. When I met
her in weekend arraignment on a Sunday night she was
terrified. She was offered a plea to disorderly
conduct, a violation of the law, not even a crime and
she agreed to take the plea and then she was saddled
with a surcharge of 120 dollars that she did not
have, that her family did not have. She was 17 years
old, was in high school and lived in a shelter with
her mother and siblings and at that moment she had a
choice to make about the surcharge; should she ask
for time to pay or ask for a civil judgment to be
entered. She asked the court for time to pay and the
case was adjourned for about eight weeks for her to
pay. Katherine didn't know how she was going to pay
the surcharge, but the alternative was so much worse.
If she had asked for a civil judgment there would
have been a default on her credit report at the age
of 17. This young girl who's just starting her life,
who was planning to go to college, maybe one day
hopefully move out of the shelter into her own place,
who would apply for loans and jobs could not afford

to have a judgment on her credit report for seven
years, from 17 to 24, a judgment that would prevent
her from taking out financial aid, from getting an
apartment, from getting medical insurance, from
getting employment, from so much more. So, she chose
to ask for time to pay. Katherine's family pulled the
money together to pay, it took them some time and
they had to ask for an extension which meant
Katherine had to come back to court more than once
after that first date. The money they used, the 120
dollars, was money that her mother pulled from the
needs of their household; from their clothing, their
food, necessities for the other children and that
money could have been used for something so much more
productive for that family. It could have been used
for something so much more productive for Katherine;
for school books, for college applications, for
anything else instead it was money that she had to
pay because the surcharge is mandatory, cannot be
waived and because the alternative was so much worse.
And this was all because she doubled up in a
turnstile, because she could not afford two dollars
and 75 cents for the subway fare. Now this is just
one of hundreds of stories I could share with you

about all the negative impacts of fees and fines on
our poor clients. Young people from middle class
families who can afford to pay the court costs on
their behalf face a mere inconvenience while people
from poor families face what is in many cases a
longer lasting punishment than the sentence. She
received time served in this case and had to come
back at least two times to deal with the surcharge. I
list a number of recommendations in my testimony and
I urge the Council to do the following: compile and
publish a publicly available list of all the fines,
fees and surcharges imposed on New Yorkers by the
Criminal Legal System; require reporting on the
number of New York City residents who are
incarcerated or had their driver's license suspended
because of their inability to pay a fine, surcharge
or fee and the number of civil judgments issued
against defendants by the courts sometimes even in
their absence. If the court imposes any user fees on
criminal defendants, the council should eliminate
them or allow judges or clerks to waive them for
indigent people. Additionally, the city should
eliminate other costs imposed on incarcerated people
and their families such as JPay services, charges and

fines for alleged infractions in city jails. The city
should address or I'm sorry, assess current criminal
debt collection practices with particular attention
to the practices of private debt collection agencies.
Often there are little to no enforceable regulations
when people attempt to seek recourse against these
entities for abuse or misconduct and the Council
should join advocates to call on New York State… on
the New York State Legislature to eliminate or
significantly limit most court fines and fees and
call for broader discretion for judges to waive them
for indigent defendants including calling for the
passage of A7 A9786S7917, a bill that passed in New
York State Assembly earlier this year that would
authorize judges to waive certain surcharges and fees
for a defendant under the age of 21 under certain
circumstances. Brooklyn Defender Services strongly
believes that people should never be incarcerated due
to failure to pay criminal court debt especially if
the court has not made an ability to pay
determination. People should never be saddled with a
civil judgement for failure to pay criminal legal
debt absent a court determination that they are not
indigent, i.e., able to pay without unreasonable

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

hardship. Fees and fines should be tailored to an individual's ability to pay and court should be allowed to reduce or eliminate such fines and fees based on a person's change in circumstances. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you.

Good morning Chair and DAWIT GETACHEW: Chairman Lancman and members of the Committee. My name is Dawit Getachew, I'm a Criminal Defense Attorney and Associate Special Counsel at the Bronx Defenders and I'm grateful for the opportunity to testify about this important matter. The Bronx Defenders is a community based holistic, public defender office dedicated to serving people of the Bronx. The Bronx Defenders provides criminal, family defense, immigration representation, civil legal services and social services to approximately 28,000 Bronx residents every year. Now for many of our clients the financial penalties imposed as a result of an open criminal case or a conviction are perhaps the most common forms of, of punishment levied against them by the criminal legal system. plead guilty regularly face fines of... or monetary sanctions including fines, mandatory surcharges, and

court fees, program costs that can add up to
staggering sum far beyond their ability to pay. For
those who choose to fight their case, just the act of
appearing in court numerous times waiting for their
day in court, has significant financial costs in the
form of lost wages, school absences, transportation
and childcare expenses, which further strains the
resources of individuals already living on the
economic margins. I agree with my colleague from BDS
who stated with the respect to the mandatory court
surcharges, which are imposed whenever people are
convicted of an offense and represent which
represents the largest pool of money that's extracted
from people involved in the criminal justice system.
For example, a guilty plea to the non-criminal
violation of disorderly conduct, which is one of the
most common dispositions across the city carries with
it a mandatory court surcharge of 120 dollars and
this year alone the Bronx Defenders, the clients that
we have represented have taken over 1,700 pleas to
disorderly conduct for a total of over 200,000
mandatory, mandatory court surcharges and this
represents just a fraction of these costs both in the
Bronx as well as city wide. I would like to highlight

a particular area that has that hasn't been
addressed specifically the cost of treatment services
or programs that often serve as an alternative to
incarceration, which can be a significant financial
burden to many of our clients. This is especially
true for people without health insurance and those
with limited English proficiency. For example, Angelo
a Bronx Defender's client and a father of seven was
arrested and pled guilty to a family offense rising
from his struggle with alcohol addiction. The
condition of his sentence required him to complete an
alcohol treatment program as an alternative to
incarceration. Now Angelo sought a free or low cost,
cost treatment program because although he was
employed, did not have insurance and it would have
would have been difficult for him to pay for these
programs which can cost up to 50 dollars per session
or more. Now we conducted an exhaustive search for a
free or sliding scale program offered in Spanish that
could also fulfill the conditions of the sentence,
the only program that, that was available was in a
different borough and was untenable due to the hours
it offered treatment. Unable to complete the program
and unable to pay the cost for a more convenient one,

Angelo cannot comply with the mandated conditions. As
a result, he was resentenced to seven days of
incarceration. Now Angelo is not alone, many of our
Spanish speaking clients are disproportionately
impacted by this financial burden of the criminal
justice involvement. Now this financial burden is not
limited to fees that are assessed after people enter
a guilty plea, the fees begin to accumulate as soon
as people step into the courtroom. For example,
individuals who are accused of DWI offenses are
ordered to, to undergo an alcohol screening and
assessment as following arraignment. The cost for
these screenings' cam range anywhere between 75
dollars to 150 dollars even for those with health
insurance, the costs only escalate if individuals are
found to be in need of treatment. More significantly
fees for programs and services can also be a
significant barrier to a meaningful resolution of a
case. Often our clients express a desire to actually
participate in programs during the pendency of the
criminal case to address the issues that may have
brought them into the system in the first place.
Prosecutors and defense attorneys also turn to these
programs with an eye of a more favorable resolution

to, to a case. I'd like to tell you about a young
client of mine as an example, Glen who… he was
arrested for a misdemeanor and Glen had expressed an
interest in attending a program to address sexual
behavior issues while his case was open, the
prosecutor in the case also believed that it would be
helpful for the purposes of reaching a, a plea
agreement. Now there's no question that these types
of programs play an important role of rehabilitation
and support, long term concerns of public health and
safety however such treatment programs can be very
expensive beyond our client's abilities to pay. Some
of these programs can cost 50 dollars a session for a
period that'll last several months or even longer and
in the case of Glen we were unable to find any
programs that actually accepted his insurance and
could accommodate his work schedule. The option to do
a program such as Mustard Seed was out of pocket was
simply impossible for someone with his income. Given
that he was unable to do a similar program the court
sentenced him to probation. Now this was a moment
that was a missed opportunity for all parties for
people to address long term issues that could have
helped everyone. Now we would ask that expanding the

2	access and availability of programs at low at low or
3	no cost to individuals especially those programs
4	which are serving those who might be deemed as
5	unpopular is extremely important, it would not only
6	ease the financial burden to low income individuals
7	but also it's also good public policy that addresses
8	important public health and safety concerns.
9	Financial sanctions that disproportionately punish
10	the poorest amongst us and the interest of raising
11	revenue has no place in our justice system. The Bronz
12	Defenders finds it encouraging that the committee
13	the committee's inquiry into this issue and we're
14	eager to support your efforts to address the
15	obstacles faced by the most economically vulnerable
16	New Yorkers. I thank you for the opportunity to
17	appear before you today and your attention to this
18	subject.

JOANNA WEISS: Good morning. I want to thank you for your interest in fines and fees and for creating a forum to discuss how we can stop punishing New Yorkers for their poverty. My name is Joanna Weiss, I'm the Co-Director of the Fines and Fees Justice Center, we're a national organization that seeks to eliminate fees in the Justice System and

make sure that fines are equitably imposed and
enforced. Fines and fees are hurting New Yorkers and
they're hurting New York City; they make our
communities less safe, they perpetuate and exacerbate
poverty and they extract millions of dollars from our
most vulnerable communities and particularly from
communities of color. A lot of the fines and fees
that we've discussed this morning are state mandated
and in my written testimony I go into detail about
some of those and ask that the council advocate for
an end to this state-imposed fines and fees
particularly the end of drivers license suspensions
for outstanding fines and the use of mandatory fees
and surcharges. But I want to focus this morning on
some of the things that I think that the council can
do without the assistance of Albany. First, in all
five boroughs prosecutors and courts are offering
diversion programs and alternatives to incarceration
for people who are accused or convicted of crimes but
really don't pose a danger to society. Inexcusably
and perhaps illegally, many of those diversion
programs are only available to people who can pay the
cost and fees associated with them. For example, in
Staten Island there is a DUI diversion program where

if you participate in this program, it's a 90-day
program, at the end you will avoid incarceration and
you will not end up with a criminal record. However,
that program costs up to 14 dollars a day. So, if you
have access to up to 1,260 dollars in 90 days you can
participate in this program and leave the system. For
people who can't afford to pay they're incarcerated
and end up with a criminal record. The vast majority
of justice involved people are indigent and they are
disproportionately people of color. Diversion and
alternatives to incarceration are good for everyone
and the council should ensure that all diversion
programs are offered for free or at a minimum they
should be free for anyone who can't afford to pay so
that they don't have to choose between important
diversion programs and the financial security of
their families. New York City also imposes a 30
dollar per month DWI probation supervision fee. Now
this isn't a fine or a punishment that's meant to
deter DWIs, this is a tax and it's an extremely
regressive one that tries to charge the cost of the
justice system to the so-called users. User fees have
no place in the justice system. The justice system is
a core government function that serves all of us and

2	should be funded by all of us and so the council
3	should, should abolish any and all probation fees.
4	Third, the council should also abolish fees that are
5	charged to people who are currently incarcerated in
6	New York City, including money transfer fees, fees to
7	access voicemail, fees for disciplinary tickets and
8	ensure that no one's commissary is ever garnished to
9	pay off fines and fees that they can't afford. We
10	call on Council to eliminate all discretionary fees
11	that imposes in the justice system, fees that under
12	state law, the state may but doesn't have to impose.
13	Last month the city of San Francisco became the
14	first… [cross-talk]
15	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: The city, the city
16	may… [cross-talk]
17	JOANNA WEISS: That the city may [cross-
18	talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:that doesn't have
20	to impose… [cross-talk]
21	JOANNA WEISS:but does not have to
22	impose, yes, thank you. Last month the city of San
23	Francisco became the first city and county in the
24	United States to end the use of all discretionary
25	fees, including probation, including supervision

fees. Alameda County and several other counties in
California are considering following suit. We ask the
City Council for New York City to follow San
Francisco's lead in equitably funding the justice
system and abolishing these fees. And finally, in
addition to eliminating the fees that I identified in
this testimony, the council should also follow San
Francisco's lead and create an office for economic
justice. That office would identify all of the fines
and fees that this city imposes, collect relevant
data and work with the council, the Mayor's Office
and city agencies to eliminate discretionary fees,
reduce racial disparities and make sure that fines
are proportionate to the offense and to a person's
ability to pay. An office for economic justice could
also help the city overcome one of the biggest
hurdles that we have in grappling with the impacts of
fines and fees on the people of New York City and
that's the availability of data. We ask the Council
to ensure that going forward that going forward this
city will track and transparently share data on the
imposition of fines and fees. I include in my written
testimony some of those data points that I think we
should be tracking as a city. The city for the

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

office for economic justice should also pilot graduated economic sanctions or day fines. The Fines and Fees Justice Center would be very glad to support... to provide any assistance to the Council or to a newly created office for economic justice to implement means adjusted fines. For example, at the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings at no point in that process is a person's ability to pay ever considered. The office for economic justice should also investigate all fines and make sure that they're not disproportionately issued to people of color and they should investigate all allegations of perverse incentives to issue fines such as those alleged in a recent lawsuit by 12 New York City police officers. I want to thank you for the opportunity to address these important issues and again reiterate that the Fines and Fees Justice Center stands ready to help the Council to implement or... any of the reforms that I discussed.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you all for you... for your testimony and particularly the, the examples that you brought forth of individuals who were negatively impacted by the, the system that we have in place and, and particularly

2	also for your, your focus on things that the city
3	can, can do itself. Later we're going to hear
4	testimony from, from MOCJ and we're going to ask then
5	their thoughts on, on, on those things but let me
6	let me ask go through some of, of the suggestions
7	that you had in your in your testimonies. In your
8	in your and I guess this is for the public defender:
9	but, but maybe you have experienced as well, have,
10	have you asked the court or, or, or individual
11	programs to, to waive the, the, the costs of
12	participating in these… in these programs, is that
13	something that is that is that is ever considered,
14	do some programs do that and others don't, tell me
15	about any efforts that you've made to say, hey, my
16	client just can't afford XYZ program what, what kind
17	of relief can he or she get?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEMANGI PAI: So, in my experience I have asked the court to consider a program... consider waiving fees unfortunately the court doesn't have a lot of authority I don't think to do that because it's the program itself, right who charges the client whatever they charge the client. I've had many conversations with various programs... providers asking if they can reduce the fee, set a sliding scale,

2	anything like that, many of them require health
3	insurance which often our clients don't have so
4	they're eliminated from doing the program or
5	ineligible for the program to start off with and
6	those that require payment up front sort of have,
7	their sliding scale is at minimum 50 dollars, right,
8	that's the least amount that they will accept and
9	that is a lot of money for our poor clients who, you
10	know can't even sometimes afford \$2.75 for a subway
11	fare so there's not a lot of we, we try, I mean I
12	can speak for the people in my office, we try, we try
13	to push back on that but there's not a lot that we
14	can do to change provider's minds when it comes to
15	billing, right and so that's, that's difficult for
16	us. There are and, and when it comes to the to the
17	surcharges we are not in a position well we've asked
18	for surcharges to be waived and courts have
19	repeatedly said no.
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Do, do the courts
21	have the authority to waive the surcharge?
22	HEMANGI PAI: No.
23	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: No, okay.
24	HEMANGI PAI: And particularly with

felonies there's absolutely no… there's not even a

2.2

civil judgement so, you know you're doing of state time may be... and you're working in and of state prison for two cents an hour all... half of your money is going to, to... most of your commissary is going to paying your fines.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Uh-huh...

HEMANGI PAI: If your mom puts 20 dollars in your account, ten of it is going to pay your fines and surcharges.

pawit Getachew: Uh-huh. With respect to your question regarding waiver of surcharges my understanding is New York State law allows deferment of surcharges but not remission or waiver of those surcharges and that was actually legislation that changed over the years, I believe it was in the 90's where judges actually had the authority to waive such fees however that be... for various reasons that and including being the ideas of being tough on crime and raising revenue which is an important piece here led to changes in the law.

HEMANGI PAI: If I could just say one other thing, I think in the context of youthful offender we've had success, when a client is afforded youthful… a youthful offender adjudication there is

2.2

not even a crime.

some waiver but that... I mean I, I would... I would ask
the council to consider a resolution on raising the
age for youthful offender adjudications because there
are some instances where we can get some of the
fines, fines and surcharges waived because of
youthful offender but that doesn't apply in the
context of a disorderly conduct where that's not even
implicated because it's a violation of the law and

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Is it common for it to be explained to defendants who are pleading to these low level offenses who at, at the moment might just be grateful to, to put this behind them in, in their mind or they're not pleading to the felony, they're pleading to the misdemeanor, they're not pleading to the misdemeanor they're pleading to the violation that, that there are these, these fees that... and surcharges that are going to come, come with it?

HEMANGI PAI: Yes, in my practice every time I speak with a client about taking any kind of plea I tell them about all of the consequences including the surcharge that is attached and what that... you know what the consequences are like in my,

2.2

taking a plea.

my example with, with my client Katherine there was a conversation that I had with her, if you take this plea there's also a 120 dollar mandatory court surcharge, I can't... the court cannot waive it, you can ask for time to pay, these are the consequences if you don't pay and you know we always take that into consideration when we're... when we're negotiating a plea and when we're speaking to our clients about 

 $\label{eq:chairperson lancman: Let me... and yes sir.$ 

DAWIT GETACHEW: Just to add to that while we generally advise people about the consequences of not paying the mandatory surcharge what's particularly difficult is for example in DWI offenses which have numerous sorts of, of fines as well as civil penalties that makes it difficult for defense attorneys to properly and fully advise to the full plethora of like financial consequences that may occur, we may tell them about the fines and surcharges that are being assessed by the court but not necessarily what the program is going to be charging them, what DMVs going to be charging them, how long that process is going to take and that is

2.2

certainly something that's going to be significant
as for fulfilling the conditions of the sentence.
For example, installation of an ignition, antilock
device costs money for installation as well as
monthly, monthly maintenance, the, the amount is
decided by individual businesses that actually profit
of the installation and maintenance of the IAD and it
can be very costly for individuals so… some
individuals pay up to 90 to 100 dollars a month for
maintenance of these machines as well as additional
costs that are associated with installing and
deinstalling the these machines.

HEMANGI PAI: And even in, in the context of traffic infractions like driving without a license there often is a fine attached like a 75 dollar fine when you take a plea to vehicle and traffic law section 509 which is driving without a license and then there's a surcharge on top of that and in my experience and what I've learned is that when you go to pay the amount at the... at the cashier's office the first amount that comes out is the mandatory surcharge so if I... but the... but the amount that attaches to potential jail consequences is the 75 dollar fine so you if you're poor and you have 75

_	
2	dollars and you would like to attach that to your
3	fine so you can pay off your fine which could
4	potentially if you don't pay it land you in jail for
5	15 days its not going to that first, it's going to
6	the mandatory 88 dollar court surcharge and you're
7	left with the fine.
8	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, so the so
9	if you've got 100 bucks in your pocket the first 88
LO	dollars are going to the surcharge which if you
L1	couldn't pay the surcharge the… not paying the
L2	surcharge… failure to pay the surcharge doesn't
L3	result in a warrant, correct?
L4	HEMANGI PAI: No, it results [cross-
L5	talk]
L6	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: It's the fine
L7	[cross-talk]
L8	HEMANGI PAI:in a civil judgment.
L9	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, it's the
20	fine and it's the restitution [cross-talk]
21	HEMANGI PAI: Right [cross-talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:that will result
23	in, in, in a warrant.
24	HEMANGI PAI: In our experience, yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah. Have you had clients, are you aware of people who are... who are in a program and then cannot make the 50 dollars a month or whatever it is and then they are... they're kicked out of the program?

HEMANGI PAI: Yes, I, I think some providers try to work with clients on that but there have been... I've had maybe... you know I've, I've done hundreds of cases, but I can think of at least three in the context of, you know an intervention program maybe in a domestic violence situation where the client is unable to pay and their sessions are suspended until they're able to make payment. In the DWI context it's similar where they're... where they owe a tremendous amount of money and their services may be suspended keeping them coming back to court for longer and longer and longer to resolve their case and then we have instances, many instances especially with programs such as Mustard Seed and others where there's a requirement for insurance and if you don't have insurance and often times our poor clients do not have insurance they are ineligible right at the gate, right at the door so they don't even have the opportunity to begin the program and,

2	and as my colleague here said, a much needed program
3	for everyone in the community, for everyone involved.
4	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, I mean it's
5	very troubling the story that you told about the, the
6	young man who was arrested for [cross-talk]
7	HEMANGI PAI: Uh-huh… [cross-talk]
8	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:for I think it
9	was public lewdness and is this yours [cross-talk]
10	DAWIT GETACHEW: That's mine [cross-
11	talk]
12	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:testified he
13	wanted to participate in a program and he was offered
14	to participate in a program and he couldn't do it, so
15	he got a year probation, who, who, who wins there? We
16	call that a softball, you're to swing [cross-talk]
17	DAWIT GETACHEW: It's very it's like you
18	are absolutely right… [cross-talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Swing hard [cross-
20	talk]
21	DAWIT GETACHEW:I, I do think that
22	especially when it comes to programs that such as
23	this which may be deemed as unpopular but certainly
24	very necessary, the options for our clients are very,
25	very limited precisely because of the reasons that my

2	colleague just stated but more importantly the, the
3	sheer financial cost for these programs even when you
4	have insurance it's incredibly expensive, 50 dollars
5	a session, some sessions it could be multiple
6	sessions a week or at least at the minimum once a
7	week and, and these programs last several months or
8	six months to a year so it can have a tremendous
9	impact, impact on our clients and we do have
10	experiences where clients have been unable to
11	continue because they cannot afford to pay the, the
12	out of pocket costs for these programs [cross-talk]
13	HEMANGI PAI: I also… [cross-talk]
14	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And then and then
15	sorry, and then what happens to them like they're
16	back into the, the criminal proceeding and they're
17	going to get some kind of some kind of sentence?
18	DAWIT GETACHEW: The determination ends
19	up before the court and it really depends on a lot of
20	factors and the advocacy that's being presented may
21	perhaps our roles as defense attorneys at, at those
22	moments is to figure out other options as best as we
23	can. It's possible if probation is mandating these
24	programs or parole is mandating these programs they

can certainly be a violation if they're not complying

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

with, with, the orders and there's often very little that our clients can do in those situations.

HEMANGI PAI: And the reality is they're facing a jail alternative in most of those situations because those are mostly... not, not all, all the time but often post plea cases where there's a plea taken and there's a jail alternative handing over the person's head so that if they don't complete the program then there is a likely chance depending on which judge you're in front of, the circumstances of the case, all of that you can be facing whatever the jail alternative is, if it's a misdemeanor plea it can be up to year in jail because you're poor and you can't afford to do the program that you want to do. The other thing is just in terms of paying, when it requires a person who could have resolved their case right there in arraignments or on that particular day in court to come back to court to pay, they... in Brooklyn you have to... you're either paying with a money order so then you have to pay additional money to get a money order or you pay with a credit card and we're not sure exactly if there's a charge for a credit card, if there's a credit card fee. If there's restitution there is a five percent surcharge on the

2	restitution amount so there's just a there are also
3	additional costs that come with all of these fines
4	and fees such as maybe taking a day off from work to
5	be able to come down and pay so that you're not in
6	violation and who knows how long the line is that day
7	in the cashier's office, who knows how long the line
8	is in at security so you could be missing an entire
9	days' worth of work just to be able to pay, pay these
10	fines and fees.
11	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And the, the, the

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And the, the, the monthly probation supervision fee, could... I, I was surprised to learn about, about that one.

readily I was at the smart on crime conference at, at John J. College a couple of days ago and I confronted the Commissioner of Probation about that and she didn't feel free to speak about it when she was on the panel, she was talking about the progress that had been made in probation but it is a New York City bill that allows DWI probation to be charged 30 dollars a month for everyone who's... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And, and is it just

DWI?

2.2

JOANNA WEISS: Just DWI.

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Uh
3	JOANNA WEISS: And I will say in other
4	counties we can be proud in other counties everyone
5	under parole and probation is charged 30 dollars a
6	month but there's really no place at all for
7	probation fees.
8	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah. Are you aware
9	of instances where, where somebody couldn't make that
10	fee, what happens if they couldn't make the fee,
11	does the city eventually converts it a civil
12	judgement or they or they is are they are they
13	violated, what, what happens do you know?
14	JOANNA WEISS: I don't know, and I think
15	[cross-talk]
16	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay [cross-talk]
17	JOANNA WEISS:we need to know from the
18	Department of Probation what happens.
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right.
20	JOANNA WEISS: But because it's such a
21	disproportionate tax that are only hitting really
22	vulnerable communities and tend to be

disproportionately hitting communities of color we really shouldn't be having probation fees at all in a

23

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM
2	city that's as progress as interested in, in
3	progressive values and economic justice.
4	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right. Well thank
5	you very much, this has been very, very helpful, each
6	of you your testimony was very comprehensive and,
7	and, and I appreciate particularly the, the examples
8	of what the city could do to improve the, the system.
9	So, thank you.
10	HEMANGI PAI: Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: The Drug Policy
12	Alliance, the Fortune Society and the Bronx Freedom
13	Fund and then we'll break that up with MOCJ and then
14	have other folks testify. Is anyone who needs to… who
15	was planning to testify in any particular rush, this
16	is not going to be an excessively long hearing but,

you know we were try... Lori yes, you're in a rush? Oh, 17

that's okay so Queens Law Associates come on down. 18

19 Yeah, well you're in a rush so...

> COMMITTEE CLERK: There's only... there's only three seats, right?

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: We'll make another seat... [cross-talk]

COMMITTEE CLERK: Okay.

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: We got plenty of chairs. Alright, let's get everyone sworn in and we'll get started. If you could all raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

[panel affirms]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Terrific. Lori why don't you lead us off since, since you're in a rush.

LORI ZENO: Press it, oh okay there we go. One, I thank you very much Councilman for this courtesy and... but also, I thank you for being interested in this subject and, and being interested in what the city can do in order to make a difference. I know that I'm following the other public defender groups so I'm actually going to sort of... just sort of... okay, sorry. I just want to sort of pick up on some of the things that the other defender offices were talking about so I'm, I'm not repeating what they said. One of the things that ... well in Queens obviously... you know both criminal and Supreme Court our clients have to choose on a daily basis; can they pay or do they stay, you... and there are two different ways in which clients have to make that

2	choice, one is it the diversion way that the you
3	know the other offices were talking about the
4	batterers intervention programs, the pre-plea
5	programs and then there's the post-conviction fines.
6	Now with regard to the pre-plea programs I think that
7	the city can do a lot because the programs that our
8	clients are going to are already funded by the city
9	to give those services to their communities just like
10	we're funded to represent 30,000 people a year in
11	Queens County when they are charged with a crime so
12	when they come to our office and we then represent
13	them in court we don't charge them because we're
14	already getting funded by the city so, you know just
15	as these other diversion programs are being funded.
16	I'm not I actually don't understand why they then
17	are allowed to charge the client when they come in
18	for that service. So, in my opinion I think that
19	that's a place that can be, you know sort of looked
20	into and, and maybe there needs to be a little more
21	funding or… I, I… you know I don't know what their
22	issues are but… you know because it is true that
23	these programs are very prohibitive for our clients,
24	you know when you look at the people who tend to be
25	arrested, you know you're talking about, you know

African American, Latino communities, you're talking
about people with mental illness, people who are drop
outs from high school or you know they don't
they're not people that are wealthy, right and so one
of the examples I wanted to point out on say that
the, the vehicle and traffic laws, there's a section,
section VTL 511 that's you're driving with a
suspended license so there are two there's the 511A
and a 511B and C you know there's little subsections
so, you know what we use a lot is we, we're concerned
about a, a VTL 511 is actually a misdemeanor so it's
a there's a conviction, a criminal conviction versus
there's another subsection on the 511 that is not,
it's a violation and or traffic infraction but in
order to take a plea to that section the fee is like
500 dollars, right and but if you take it on the
other section and you get the criminal conviction
it's less so, for those people who can afford, you
know to pay those kinds of things they get this great
deal, right, they, they've done the exact same crime,
they've pled to the exact same thing but because they
have more money they get to pay the higher fine and
walk away without a criminal conviction and then the
other people if they're lucky and, and even can, can

pay that, you know they're, they're walking away with
a criminal conviction. So, it's not just whether or
not they have to stay in jail, it's really what they
plea to as well for the very same crimes. So, these,
these programs are they charge in Queens anyway
like you know I had my social worker, you know unit
put together a list of these intervention programs
and what they're charges are and they range you know
they all have registration fees so that's usually
around 35 dollars but can be up to 65 dollars just to
registered for the program then you have an intake
fee after you've registered because somebody's going
to meet with you and find out your information, right
so that's going to cost an average of 70 dollars so
just to walk in the door you're it's 100 dollars
then if you're going to sign up for sessions whether
they're individual sessions or group sessions that
ranges between 25 and 50 dollars per session. Now
some of these programs are 12 weeks long, some of
them are 24 weeks, some of them are 36 weeks and you
know especially the programs involving DWIs, those
programs go on forever and the fees that you have to
pay in criminal court do not take into consideration
the fees that you have to pay through DMV as well and

2	summer programs have like to be even ROR'd , right,
3	you can put a monitoring device on and because the
4	people the person can't afford bail so you go and
5	you try to get them to give them a how about if we
6	monitor them or whatever, right, you got to pay ten
7	dollars a day to have that device on in order for,
8	for that to happen. Now, we in Queens have a
9	particular problem, you ask the other offices, you
10	know what do they do to try to reduce this problem
11	for their clients, right, so we, we try to find other
12	programs all the time that have lower fees, that have
13	lower you know they'll waive a registration or
14	they'll combine sessions, right, so that you can
15	instead of going one hour a week you can go two hours
16	a week and pay the same amount of money but cut your
17	fees in half because you're cutting your time in
18	half, right, even though you're still getting the
19	same number of hours. So, we do things like that all
20	the time and we'll you know we'll even go to the
21	DA's office and we'll say listen, you know this
22	client really should get this program but can't
23	afford it and there are times where we'll get a
24	scholarship, you know where the DA will call the
25	program and say listen, you know don't charge them or

2	whatever and they work out whatever they work and,
3	and that'll happen. It doesn't happen often, but it
4	does happen. However, there seems to be like a list
5	in Queens of the programs that have been vetted
6	through the DA's office, right, so they vet these
7	programs and then they get them together and then
8	they all decide what the fees are going to be. So,
9	you know if I'm program A, right and I come to the
10	meeting and I've been vetted and the DA's office
11	likes me and I say, okay, my fee to come into my
12	program is 25 dollars a session but, you know B, C
13	and D their fees are 50 dollars a session, the DA's
14	office says to me well if you want to be on our list
15	you need to increase and charge 50 dollars a session
16	like the other two groups
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I'm sorry, what,
18	what is the DA's office's [cross-talk]
19	LORI ZENO: I knew that would get your
20	attention… [cross-talk]
21	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:incentive what
22	is the DA's office's incentive in, in having higher
23	fees, the fees go to the DA's office?

LORI ZENO: No, they don't go to the DA's office, but the DA's incentive is to control the

24

2	programs that are selected or approved by the court,
3	right, to allow the clients to go. For instance, we
4	in my office we found a program where he'll charge
5	ten dollars a session and he'll double the sessions
6	so that instead of paying 20 for two sessions you're
7	paying ten and like that, right and but the DA's
8	office needs to vet that program so they'll vet it
9	and they find if they like it or whatever but for… I
10	don't really know why they do it to be honest with
11	you, I think it's only been in recent years that
12	that's been done but I think it, it enables them to
13	control who they choose to be a program and whether
14	or not they approve and, and then they don't want it
15	to be, well we're going to pick… 20 people are going
16	to pick this group because they're only ten dollars
17	and two people will pick this group because it's 25
18	dollars, right, so he wants it to even out for
19	everybody and then everybody is happy and then
20	everybody like that and so… [cross-talk]
21	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I see. So, the, the
22	DA might have an incentive in order to distribute
23	clients?

LORI ZENO: Yeah, and, and... to programs that they think are good enough... [cross-talk]

24

1	
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right [cross-talk]
3	LORI ZENO:right or that [cross-talk]
4	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: They don't want one
5	program under, undercutting other programs [cross-
6	talk]
7	LORI ZENO: Exactly [cross-talk]
8	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:too low, got it,
9	alright. Alright, good so let's we'll go along and
10	then we'll ask questions of everybody… [cross-talk]
11	LORI ZENO: Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, good.
13	LORI ZENO: Uh-huh.
14	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright
15	ELENA WEISSMANN: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: That's you.
17	ELENA WEISSMANN: Good morning. Thank
18	you, Councilman, for the opportunity to testify and
19	again for your interest in this matter. I'll try to
20	be brief, there's more details in my written
21	testimony but anyway. My name is Elena Weissmann, I'n
22	the Director of the Bronx Freedom Fund, we're a
23	community bail fund which for over ten years has
24	provided bail assistance to thousands of New Yorkers
25	in the Brenz and in Oueons who would otherwise he

incarcerated for their poverty. And today I'd like to
discuss the cost of justice for our clients and for
their loved ones, all of whom are directly impacted
by a system that criminalizes poverty and so I'll be
focusing on a stage earlier than the public defenders
which is pre-trial, not in terms of diversion but in
terms of the cost of paying bail. And we're excited
to see the city taking strides to end the unnecessary
and unjust incarceration and what I want to do today
is to talk about how the these administrative
reforms should halt the practice of extracting wealth
from New York City's most impoverished and vulnerable
communities. So, we were excited to see the council
make phone calls free from jail and to regulate the
exploitative bail bonds industry and I think that the
topics that we're talking about today are definitely
coming on the heels of that and we hope that the
council will use that same moral reasoning for other
modes of wealth extraction. And in particular what
I'm referring to is online bail payment, credit card
bail payment, cash transfers to people's commissary
accounts when they're incarcerated and posting one-
dollar bail. And I won't go into detail about the
first three of those but there it goes into, to

Τ	
2	depth greater depth in my written testimony but just
3	briefly there's a 2.49 percent non-refundable fee to
4	pay bail online, a seven percent non-refundable fee
5	to pay bail with a credit card and a 20 percent fee
6	to deposit money online in a commissary account. And
7	so, each of these methods are supposed to increase
8	access to paying bail and [cross-talk]
9	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I just want to do
LO	it, so it's a 2.9 percent fee to pay online…
L1	ELENA WEISSMANN: 2.49, yeah
L2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: 2.49, it's [cross-
L3	talk]
L 4	ELENA WEISSMANN: Seven percent [cross-
L5	talk]
L 6	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Seven percent
L7	[cross-talk]
L8	ELENA WEISSMANN:to pay with a [cross-
L9	talk]
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:to pay with a
21	credit… [cross-talk]
22	ELENA WEISSMANN:credit card [cross-
23	talk]
24	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:card

ELENA WEISSMANN: At a jail...

1	
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: At a jail
3	ELENA WEISSMANN: Yeah
4	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright and the
5	cash transfers to commissary count, there's what is
6	that?
7	ELENA WEISSMANN: I think it might be up
8	to 20 percent, that's like what people have told us,
9	I don't know I haven't seen a written policy of what
10	it is and it's less if you go… [cross-talk]
11	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Well we'll, we'll,
12	we'll ask MOCJ [cross-talk]
13	ELENA WEISSMANN:at the facility
14	[cross-talk]
15	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay [cross-talk]
16	ELENA WEISSMANN: So right, but you so,
17	each of these things are for paying online which are
18	supposed to increase ease of access and, and with
19	average bails around 2,500 dollars that could mean
20	238 dollars non-refundable and that really could mear
21	the difference between incarceration and freedom
22	especially when there's only 12 percent of New
23	Yorkers who can afford their bail whatsoever. So,
24	$I^{\prime}$ ll just skip over to the dollar bail system which $I$
25	think is easier to illustrate in person. So, this is

I think one of the most particularly outlandish fee
structures imposed by the courts, it's the, the one
dollar bail system and it serves a purpose, its to
track multiple cases at once, I'm sure you know but
what ends up happening and from our end what we see
is that we receive referrals almost every day for
individuals who are trapped in jail on a single
dollar and there are people whose other cases have
been dismissed or otherwise resolved and are now in
one, two or three dollars, these individuals often do
not even know that they could be released and even if
they do they might not have funds in their commissary
in order to self-pay it or anyone on the outside who
can make a trip to the jail and even for those who do
have the necessary commissary funds the Department of
Correction automatically docs the outstanding funds
and fees from their commissary before it can be used
for bail and I really think the dollar bail system
can underscore the need for systemic bail reform that
can halt the practice of incarcerating people based
on their financial access and so we urge the city to
explore creative solutions to that in the meantime.
And I know a lot of people have talked about kind of
waiting for Albany and, and I do think that absent

systemic reform that happens at the state level that
would end the criminalization of poverty in terms of
bail all together, a system that grants accommodation
to low income New Yorkers is imperative and I
understand that the New York Court System has an
existing metric for determining indigency and this
calculus we think should be extended to the
collateral cost of fighting a criminal case and what
that would look like was that if an individual is
deemed indigent and granted a public defender they
should also have their fees waived from online and
credit card bail payment, money transfers and dollar
bail. Access to cash however small the sum may seem
should not determine a person's liberty. New York
City council already demonstrated its leadership in
this field by making phone calls from New York City
jails free and by calling up the bail bonds industry
for exploiting those ensnared in the court system.
This proposal again comes on the heels of those
changes and its part of a trend towards a system that
humanizes instead of criminalizes. This conversation
must be underscored by an acknowledgement of the
broader cost born by individuals trapped in pre-trial
detention, their loved ones and our communities at

large. The bail system is the fuel for mass
incarceration and it's what makes these costs of
justice that I've discussed so pronounced. When
people are incarcerated on bail they can't afford
they risk losing their housing, livelihood, even
custody of their children. Their loved ones lose
hours of work, childcare and other responsibilities
when they spend time and money going to visit their
loved ones in a facility, attempt to post bail or
deposit money in their accounts. With the exorbitant
fees required for online money transfers and bail
payments many people are turned away from these
options even when they are a possibility. New York
New York already pays 116 million dollars every year
to incarcerate thousands of people for their
inability to post bail and we shoulder an even
broader cost in lost wages, shelter costs and most
importantly moral capital when these individuals are
locked up. Our work at the Freedom Fund is temporary
stop gap measure focused on harm reduction before we
reach meaningful reform. These proposed changes will
further mitigate the harm of a system that even
allows wealth-based detention while we focus our
long-term energies on fighting for systemic change.

So, thank you for your commitment to ending the criminalization of poverty and for hearing my testimony today.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you, sir.

DIONNA KING: Ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Sorry.

DIONNA KING: Yep. My name is Dionna King, I'm the Policy Manager with the Drug Policy Alliance. We are an organization that advocates for policy that advances attitudes around drug use and supports harm reduction in the instance of prohibition of drug use while promoting sovereignty of individuals over their minds and bodies. A lot of the issues that I wanted to focus on were already touched on by our... my allies, by the defender's organizations and people on this panel so I won't bore you by repeating all that stuff and you also touched on a lot of issues during your opening testimony so I just want to use this opportunity to highlight some of the things that the council can do to remedy some of these issues while also calling out the perverse nature of the criminal courts using low income, communities of color as a source of revenue to fund the courts. One of the things that hasn't

really been touched on in this morning's testimony
was just how much money criminal courts is garnering
from low income communities and how they categorize
that money. So, looking at the New York City's
Comptroller Report from 2016 they have under their
milestones that they were able to generate some
upwards to 30 million dollars from fines and fees
derived from summonses and the criminalization of
communities so I think it is a little reprehensible,
morally bereft to, to, to put that amount of money as
a milestone in the ways that the courts function, it
shouldn't be about the amount of money that they're
receiving to fund the courts but how they are
supporting public safety and the wellness of the
city. So, the fact that they are considering that an
area of, of success as opposed to a place of harm is
really problematic when we're looking at this issue.
Going forward like as someone who works specifically
in drug policy I'm really shocked to hear about the
amount of money that people are being charged to put
in the ATI diversion program, that's one of the
things that we always promote instead of putting
people in the justice system put them in areas where
they can better serve themselves and reduce the harms

of their behavior but if they can't enter those
programs based the amount of money that they're
charged for treatment or diversion programs in
general like that is a barrier in and of itself and
as my colleagues have said there's no the courts do
not have to provide any funding to make sure that
people can have access to those programs and there's
also the other problem, problems that a lot of these
programs aren't really measured for effectiveness.
The commercial sector is able to both pocket from the
courts by having people in these courts being, you
know sent to their programs without even
demonstrating any kind of functionality that these
programs are effective so you've touched on this but
the, the programs that exist in your community and
the fact that they are charging fees per day without
any kind of and also getting the funding
specifically from the city so they're both they're
being charged up people are being charged to enter
the programs but they're also the program are being
supported by the city themselves. My colleagues have
also touched on the surcharges and I know this is not
an area where the council can really intervene, this
is really a state issue but it is another challenge

where the state is really vocal about the fact that
they have been using this money as a source of
revenue when the, the city's not being funded by the
state… the courts aren't being funded appropriately
by the state, they're increasing the surcharges and
making that money from the, the people that are
entering the courts and this is problematic but I do
think the area where the council can take this issue
up is just determining how, how much the defendants
are going to have to pay in fines. Like recently
quality of life offenses, a number of them were moved
down from misdemeanors to, to become violations and
that is something that we support, it creates people
keeps people out of the criminal justice system and
away from arrest and incarceration but it keeps them
in the loop where they're going to have to keep
paying these fines and the city council does have the
space to determine like what those fines should be
and that's something that the drug policy recommends.
You enter… you get a specific fine when you come in
but inability to pay the fine you can that can lead
to an increase in the amount that you pay and that's
essentially the city charging interest on low income
community members as opposed to just considering the

fact that they're unable to pay and coming up with
different forms of restitution like community service
or fee waivers or anything else when there's an
indigent client that can't pay that particular fee
and I think the council should consider lowering the,
the fines overall like that's something that you can
do right now and not, you know charging people
increased fines because they demonstrate an inability
to pay. People shouldn't be charged interest for
being poor in the criminal courts. Another thing
that, you know even in writing this testimony that
kept coming up for me is just the lack of data in
this area. A couple of my colleagues have hit a on
this issue BxD, I don't know demographically who is
being hit with these fines, I can figure anecdotally
in just how law enforcement is practiced in this city
is that it's mostly going to be low income,
communities of color just that's the types of
communities that are targeted but the city is not
necessarily tracking who is paying, how much they're
paying and I think it's mostly problematic when it
comes to diversion programs that they're recommending
like what are the costs of these that's something
that Drug Policy Alliance would definitely support

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2	and would be a benefit to the kind of policy that we
3	promote on a city and state level just knowing the
4	harm. Another thing I wanted to highlight is just the
5	ways that we can work with prosecutors and judges to
6	inform them about the, the impact of these fees to
7	get them to work with clients to come up with
8	different forms of payment, different forms of
9	restitution, I think this is a, a moment for
10	traditional education for them to know ways in which
11	they can decrease the harm done to, to these
12	communities. A lot of these things are written in my
13	testimony and I won't it's very long and passionate
14	so I will spare you and go to Khalil. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you.

KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: Testing. Good morning, thank you to the City Council and of course to you Councilman for giving us the opportunity to talk about this very important issue. I too will follow the lead of my colleagues and say that my written testimony is also filled with fervor and, and, and many other words I probably can't say but I just wanted to kind of shy away... I wanted to move away from that in terms of taking the two and a half, three minutes that I have here today... [cross-talk]

1	
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Just one second, do
3	you have written testimony?
4	KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: I do but it's in my
5	bag somewhere. So… [cross-talk]
6	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Take a moment take
7	a moment to get it because it's very helpful to me
8	and I make notes and then I ask questions so… [cross-
9	talk]
10	KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: Okay [cross-talk]
11	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Go ahead. Yeah, go
12	ahead.
13	KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: Now?
14	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, yeah. Okay,
15	not helpful, I don't have my written testimony on me,
16	my apologies.
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: It's, it's okay
18	just… you'll get it to us.
19	KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: I will [cross-talk]
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay.
21	KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: Yes. I wanted to
22	just take some time to… as some of my colleagues
23	already have done is to tell a story about folks that
24	we serve at Fortune and how they're impacted by fines
25	and foos rolated to oriminal local system

involvement. So, I work at the Fortune Society, my
name is Khalil Cumberbatch and I'm the Associate
Vice-President at the Fortune Society and Fortune is
a 50-year-old organization as you know Councilman and
other folks in the room that services about 7,000
people annually on a plethora of services; housing,
employment, mental illness, substance abuse, so on
and so forth. We have delivered these services over
the past 50 years with the understanding that it
doesn't take one particular thing for someone to
become stabilized when they leave prison and or jail.
With that understanding we also know that there are
other systems involved that impede a person's healthy
and successful reentry and so for example, fines and
fees are one of those things. We have serviced people
who are still struggling decades after they have beer
convicted, after they served substantial amount of
times in prison and still have not been able to
successfully pay off restitution fees, other fines
and fees associated with their criminal conviction
and then when they are reentering are expected to
find a job and then use the income that they have
from that job to not only survive in a very expensive
city but to also pay off these fines and fees and

restitutions and we're not even including other
things like back child support, so on and so forth.
So, one of the stories that I would love to tell you
today is of an individual that we serviced at Fortune
Society who was assigned a, a restitution fee and
other fines and fees associated with his criminal
conviction, didn't have much family during didn't
have much family support during his incarceration and
so as it goes with most people that don't have family
support the money that they what little money they
earn while incarcerated from being involved in
programs or working they use that money to buy
commissary and other items related you know in, in
the commissary; food, cosmetics, so on and so forth
however when you have a mandatory surcharge you have
fines and fees and restitutions associated you're
your criminal conviction the money that comes into
your account there's a certain percentage that is
that is automatically withdrawn and so if you're
trying to pay off a restitution fee in and of itself
that is in the tens of thousands of dollars before
you even address surcharges and other fees that are
associated with the criminal conviction you can
already see that its almost insurmountable. This

individual came home about three years ago, we were
able to help him stabilize by finding some
employment, housing was not an issue for him. Well on
top of the restitution and fines and fees that he has
that he's trying to pay off, he also is required to
pay a community supervision fee, he's on parole and
there is a monthly fee that parole charges you to be
on supervision. That fee is five, 15- or 30-dollar
increments; if you're working you're expected to pay
the maximum amount which is 30 dollars and although
30 dollars may seem to many folks as a very
affordable amount when again when you have thousands
of dollars of debt related to criminal justice
involvement it's very difficult. This individual was
unable to make his monthly payments of 30 dollars a
month, he then had an unfortunate death in the family
and he applied he went to his parole officer and
told this person that he had a death in the family in
a different state in the U.S. and needed to travel.
One of the first questions that a supervisor in
parole will ask the parole officer when they when
they ask for someone to travel is has this person
been paying their supervision fee, the answer for
this individual was no and who knows what explanation

was given on why the individual was not able to pay
the supervision fee but in the end this person's
travel pass was denied. Removing the fact that this
individual was deeply hurt about this family member
dying, having to couple the, the experience of that
and being denied something as simple as being able to
just see the person, their body for the last time you
can imagine the experiences and the perception of
community supervision, court systems in general,
legal system overall on how quote, unquote fair it
is. This individual had left that experience feeling
as if there is a never-ending perpetual punishment
associated with his criminal conviction. I share this
example obviously understanding that a lot of it is
state level and that there are issues that city
council can't necessarily address. I also want to
highlight the fact that one of my colleagues
mentioned earlier that there is a role that district
attorneys can play and the role that prosecutors can
play in how they aggressively go after restitutions
and other fines and fees, in the end a judge is
responsible for that, but district attorneys and ADAs
have a role to play in that. I think overall what
we're talking about is monetary on surface level but

as some of my colleagues have mentioned what we're
really talking about is this perception that we
somehow have to continually punish people and
monetary and doing it monetarily is one of the ways
that that is achieved. So, I share this story with
you Council Member to one, highlight how it is more
complex than just a number given to someone because
again 30 is a relatively low amount of money to pay
for many people but when you have tens of thousands
of dollars of debt associated with a criminal
conviction it becomes even more difficult for an
individual to navigate that process and that there
are other long term effects that are associated with
those fines and fees that are not always measurable
by dollar amounts. Here we have an individual who
from my perception is trying as hard as he can to
stable his life to not go back to prison and at the
same time to lend to his community but for something
as small as a 30 dollar fee he was denied something
that would have meant a tremendous amount to him to
be able to attend the family member's funeral. So,
thank you for listening and I hope that, you know
Fortune Society will continue to be looked at as a
resource for the city council on how we could work

1 2

2.2

with district attorneys and judges in educating them on the long term impact that fines and fees have that are associated with criminal convictions on individuals but more importantly the impact that they have on their families and the impact that it has on

communities. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Well let me ask...

let me ask you and I don't... and I don't know if you know the answer but Fortune is a five borough organization even though your headquarters is in Queens, what is... can you say what your experience has been with the different district attorneys' offices in the boroughs and who have been more or less open to working with people or, or not, who's been less zealous or more zealous in, in, in going after people who owe fines or restitution?

KHALIL CUMBERBATCH: So, I can't... I don't have statistics to spout out about that, I know that as one of the members of the alternatives to incarceration and reentry coalition the Queens district attorney has been historically very difficult for the lack of a better term to work with in terms of not only simple referring people to ATI programs and more particularly simply referring

people to our ATI program where based in Queens
someone has a criminal charge in Queens whether they
live in Queens or not that is besides the fact but
most people with charges in Queens reside somewhere
in the borough and so here we are an organization
that is based in that borough and yet we still have
problems with referrals. So, I say that to be fair on
the record that I don't know what the numbers are in
terms of who is more zealous or not, I do know that
there are certain district attorneys who have found
more creative ways to use the money that they have
garnered from forfeit asiture [sp?] and other fines
and fees associated with criminal, legal involvement
and I think that that example in some respects could
be followed by other district attorneys across the
city.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it. Okay, you know I, I appreciate your, your laying out the different fees and, and, and surcharges because some of... you know seven perfect fee to pay with credit card at the institution, I remember when the city was doing online bail we were unhappy with even the 2.49 percent fee and we'll ask MOCJ about what the percentage is on, on the, the commissary

2	programs. The, the, the dollar bail just for the
3	record, we've got a bill, Intro 944 which would
4	require notice I think within 24 hours when someone's
5	one dollar bail case is triggered meaning that's,
6	that's the case that's left in the in the system
7	and, and then the, the, the figure that you gave in
8	your testimony was with bail payments averaging
9	around 2,500 that means an additional non-refundable
10	238 dollars might be diverted from, from, from what
11	people could otherwise that, that, that money for.
12	Math was not always my strong point but I'm going to
13	say that's probably somewhere that's a few
14	percentage
15	ELENA WEISSMANN: It's a 2.49 percent and
16	a seven percent.
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah [cross-talk]
18	ELENA WEISSMANN: If someone wants to pay
19	with a credit card [cross-talk]
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right [cross-talk]
21	ELENA WEISSMANN: Yeah [cross-talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, right,
23	right. And then you know we, we look at jurisdictions
24	around the, the country where Ferguson is a is a
25	spectacular example where the municipal government is

2.2

more or less funded off the, the backs of, of poor people mostly black and Latino and Ferguson probably mostly black because New York's budget is so large and the many, many billions of dollars, the 15 million or the 30 million dollars that you cite kind of gets lost in the shuffle but, you know we're, we're, we're doing similar things... [cross-talk]

ELENA WEISSMANN: Yeah.

You're from the Drug Policy Alliance, do you find that the participation in drug treatment programs are particularly onerous, I mean my understanding is they tend to be more expensive, more intensive and I don't know if you're prepared to talk about it what role does the availability of insurance or not insurance play in, in people's ability to participate in those programs?

DIONNA KING: I mean treatment... when you talk about treatment in drug courts it gets complicated, to start judges aren't the best determiners of what is effective treatment for a person and sometimes they partner with treatment providers that aren't best suited to provide care for a particular patient but because they have that

2	relationship between the provider they are not
3	necessarily considering the, the medical impact of
4	putting a person under treatment setting that's not
5	beneficial to them either because the type of
6	treatment being afforded. We've come across a lot of
7	judges that are reluctant to put someone in a
8	treatment setting where they're going to be offered
9	methadone or Buprenorphine or any kind of medication
10	assisted treatment because of their own biases
11	towards that and that is a violation of that person's
12	like medical needs and that is problematic but then
13	when you talk about the cost of it, if you are if
14	you're insured, if you have Medicaid which is
15	probably better the cost of going into the treatment
16	setting you can probably offset that but if you're
17	uninsured you're being placed in the treatment
18	setting that one is inappropriate for you or that's
19	unnecessary you're responsible for paying that out of
20	pocket cost. Another challenge when you when it
21	comes to criminal court and someone's substance use
22	is this sort of any kind of substance use is
23	considered addiction and problematic and a person who
24	has is using recreationally can be put in a
25	treatment setting that is not necessarily appropriate

for them because if the judge determines that they
have a drug problem as opposed to just drug use in
general and so now they're paying the, the cost to be
in a treatment that is not necessarily best suited
for them and we've had a lot of anecdotal information
from different treatment providers saying that they
have to keep a person in a treatment setting when
they don't have a drug problem so someone comes in
there and their only drug use is marijuana, it isn't
interfering in their life in any kind of detrimental
way but they have to be in a mandated program so
they're forced to stay in longer than they have to be
and then the treatment provider can't necessarily
work with them so you're taking a bed from someone
who is could be better suited for it and then that
person has to stay in the program and hit all these
metrics that are determined by the drug court in
order to get out of the, the proceeding so it's when
it that particular relationship is frack for a
myriad of reasons not just because of cost but also
just because judges aren't treatment providers and
they are given a lot of space to make decisions about
a person's care.

[off mic dialogue]

Τ	
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright, thank you
3	very much, it was all very helpful and very
4	informative and now we'd like to invite up MOCJ and,
5	and hopefully get some answers to some, some of the
6	questions that, that have been raised.
7	ELENA WEISSMANN: Thank you.
8	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright. Good
9	morning.
LO	ILANA TURKO: Good morning.
L1	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Let's get sworn in
L2	and get started. Do you swear or affirm the testimon
L3	you give today is the truth, the whole truth and
L4	nothing but the truth?
L5	ILANA TURKO: I do.
L6	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you. Now do
L7	you have written testimony for us or are you just
L8	or, or any do you have testimony for us or just
L9	would you rather answer questions at [cross-talk]
20	ILANA TURKO: No, I'm, I'm happy to
21	answer questions from Council.
22	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay, so I, I think
23	I would I would break down the, the, the issues for
24	MOCJ into two categories; one is what is MOCJ's role

and how does it fulfill that role in choosing these

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

providers of, of, of services who might charge fees and, and the second category would be the information that MOCJ has and, and collects regarding the various fees, fines and, and, and surcharges so, let's, let's start with the, the, the first one, what is... what is MOCJ's role in selecting and, and, and even contracting with the various programs that are, are used in the courts as alternatives to incarceration?

ILANA TURKO: So, I just want to introduce myself. My name is Ilana Turko, I'm Senior Counsel at the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice. As far as our role in choosing programs the... there's a series of programs that are... that run specifically through the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice as ATI or ATD programs that we fund, and the selection process is typically through a procurement. We also as you're likely aware run the diversion and reentry counsel which brings together many, many, many stakeholders from the Criminal Justice System including providers, individuals with lived experience, defense attorneys, and prosecutors to glean their expertise on all of the various providers. So, that is our role in terms of selecting providers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, about how many providers... when you say selecting providers, how, how many providers does MOCJ enter into a, a contract, contract with and, and provide city funding in some way, shape or form to?

ILANA TURKO: Sure, so MOCJ provides funding to support programs that provide alternative to incarceration services, there are 15 ATI programs and five ATD programs in family court which results in about a dozen providers. In fiscal Year '19 there was a total annual award of two and a... 21 and a half million to cover MOCJ's ATI portfolio and none of those ATI and ATD programs charge people a fee. None of those programs charge a fee however our office does fund one program, the Batterers Intervention Program which the current contracted provider is QCC PACK that is not included in our ADT and ATI contract but in a sense serves as an ATI as judges use the program as an option at sentencing rather than jail and this, this one program does in fact charge a fee.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And you, you, you said family court, you... do you... are these only programs in family court, I didn't understand where,

# COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 1 2 where... you, you had mentioned family court, it's just 3 not clear to me... ILANA TURKO: Sure, so there's 15 ATI 4 5 programs and... [cross-talk] CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right... [cross-talk] 6 ILANA TURKO: ...additionally five ATD 7 programs in family court. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it, so there 10 are 15 ATI programs in the criminal courts... [cross-11 talk 12 ILANA TURKO: Uh-huh... [cross-talk] 13 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...non-family court, 14 right? 15 ILANA TURKO: Uh-huh. CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And five ATD in 16 17 family court? 18 ILANA TURKO: Correct... that's my understanding, yes. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, okay. And, and those 20 programs in total are, are provided by 21 12 different providers? 2.2

one of those programs' charges a, a fee?

ILANA TURKO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright and only

23

2	ILANA TURKO: There's an additional
3	program that's not considered within that portfolio
4	that does charge a fee and that's the QCC PACK
5	program that's an abusive partner intervention
6	program for intimate partner violence.
7	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it. So, all of
8	these other programs that you've heard people testify
9	about where fees are charged [cross-talk]
10	ILANA TURKO: Uh-huh [cross-talk]
11	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:they are not in
12	any kind of contractual relationship with the city?
13	ILANA TURKO: That [cross-talk]
14	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Correct?
15	ILANA TURKO: They're not in a contract
16	through MOCJ.
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Do you know if
18	they're in a contract through other some other city
19	agency and they're getting funding from some other
20	city agency?
21	ILANA TURKO: I don't have those
22	specifics in front of me, no.
23	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay, would you be
24	able… so, from this hearing there's a number of
25	things that we would like MOCT to give us more

2.2

information on, right, so one of those would since
you're the Office of Criminal Justice in charge with
coordinating with the administration's policies on
criminal justice issues it would be very helpful if
you could figure out for us which programs are
present in criminal court and family court that are
getting funded by the city and which of those
programs charge fees and whether or not those
programs have sliding scales or somehow they're fees
are based on what people can pay.

ILANA TURKO: Certainly, happy to take that back to the office for a further discussion, I think this is a really important question. I should note that there are programs that are not within MOCJ's purview so we're happy to look into the issue because we, we think this is a really important area... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right... [cross-talk]
ILANA TURKO: ...as well.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah and, and I guess we're, we're... my next question would be, I... it sounds like there are programs that are brought into the criminal justice system that the city has no involvement with; the DA decides this is a good

program or the court decides the program. Does, does...
is MOCJ made aware of all of the programs that exist
in the five boroughs and which... obviously some are
funded by the city through MOCJ, it sounds like some
are funded by the city through, through other
contracting agencies and then there's this universal
program that, that have nothing to do with, with the
city. Do you know if MOCJ maintains any kind of list
or, or record of all these various programs because
they obviously play a very important role in the
criminal justice system here in this city?

maintain a list I, I couldn't speak to, I think again it's an important question and there are a lot of different venues through which the, the larger discussion and questions can be addressed, the diversion and reentry counsel. I think one of the previous witnesses was discussing counsel of all these diversion providers as well so yes, absolutely that's important.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, but, but we would... we would ask you and you know we'll reduce this to a letter but, but we look to you to figure out what's going on in the criminal justice system

and when you have figured that... by... that out by the way please let us know.

ILANA TURKO: And I, I think it's important to also distinguish that the courts at their discretion are ordering defendants into programs all, all the time and those are pleas that are negotiated sometimes between defense attorneys and prosecutors and sometimes it's after conviction and simply at the discretion of the judge so, I think it's a little bit of a moving target to be totally fair... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Uh-huh... [cross-talk]

 $\label{eq:ILANA_TURKO: ...so I just want to make} \\$  that distinction.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah... no, I, I understand it and I think that... I think most people would be surprised that that would have... I don't want to be too critical, what a... what a... kind of ad hock, Hodge podge system there is of providing programs and alternatives to people and, and possibly no... there's no one place where you can go to understand all of the programs that are being made available let alone

2.2

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM
2	their effectiveness and for the purpose of the this
3	hearing there, their fees and costs [cross-talk]
4	ILANA TURKO: And I'm, I'm [cross-talk]
5	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So… [cross-talk]
6	ILANA TURKO:very pleased to be here to
7	testify about the programs that MOCJ funds and runs
8	through our office.
9	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I understand. Just
10	so you know I think we have an interest, at least I,
11	I have an interest in, in imposing on MOCJ the
12	responsibility and I don't know if we can talk about
13	that just voluntarily or a bill of being opposing
14	the responsibility of seeing and understanding and,
15	and, and knowing and then being able to share all the
16	programs that are going on in city courts effecting,
17	effecting city residents. The one program that you,
18	you know that does charge a fee, the batter
19	intervention program, what, what are the fees for
20	that, do you know?
21	ILANA TURKO: So, there's I just want to

nt to make sure I'm 100 percent here... there's an initial intake fee of 30 dollars and each group session is then 25 dollars, the program does make available a sliding scale and in some instances a scholarship.

22

23

24

2.2

into the contract with the program that there will be this sliding scale and what the... what the metrics are for that and, and who might be so slid down the scale that they can't pay anything at, at all and... is that in the... in the MOCJ contract... [cross-talk]

ILANA TURKO: Yes... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah... [cross-talk]

ILANA TURKO: ...the contract does contain a provision concerning the sliding scale and at the bottom end of the income range it leaves open to the program at their discretion to determine the, the, the... I should say at the lowest end of the range of income which is 23,500 dollars the fee is five dollars per session and below that threshold's income level it's, it's determined on an individual case, yes.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, you know I assume we have these batterer intervention programs because we think that they are successful and productive and I know there's actually a lot of debate on, on that but, but we have the program so... we have to start from the principle that, that we think if they're worthwhile and as a practical matter

2.2

I think my understanding is in the direumstances
people are choosing that over some alternative
sentence which would which they would rather not
have to do, is it fair that, that people who are
extremely poor, below that 23,000 or whatever that,
that, that limit is that they might not be able to
participate in this program that benefits them and by
extension their families and society and because
they can't afford and why don't we as a condition of
the contract with, with the providers say anyone
below this threshold you just have to you have to
treat them and, and maybe we have to pay more on our
contract but, but at least people aren't being
excluded from a program because they're too poor?

ILANA TURKO: Right, I think that's a incredibly valuable, important point, I want to also bring your attention to sort of a new step we're taking with this program; first... to your first point I do think it's worthwhile to highlight the availability of a full scholarship and... in some instances for indigent defendants similarly I think our work in this area is quite progressive in the sense that we recognize that we want to constantly be rethinking these approaches and how effective our

2	programming is and to that end we're currently
3	working on the procurement and contracting process to
4	develop a new trauma informed abusive partner
5	intervention curriculum and implementation plan that
6	potentially moves away from an accountability
7	monitoring type of model which is the current
8	curriculum to one that centers on as I said a trauma
9	informed approach and attitudinal and behavior change
10	and the work may result in recommendations for this
11	trauma informed curriculum to be offered free of
12	charge if funding and program objectives permit.
13	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: A question arose in
14	the, the testimony about what is the, the percentage
15	what is the cut of the… for, for cash transfers to
16	commissary accounts, it was suggested it might be as
17	high as 20 percent, do you know what that is?
18	ILANA TURKO: I don't, I'm happy to take
19	that back to the office to get more details but that
20	was not within the scope of the hearing as we
21	understood it when we were preparing.
22	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay, well we'll
23	add that to the list of you could find that out for

ILANA TURKO: Sure.

us… [cross-talk]

24

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Great. It's... there's also been testimony and, and I think it was a 3 comptroller's report about millions of dollars in 4 fees and fines, etcetera coming into the city's 5 coffers, does, does MOCJ have a breakdown on 6 7 some... annual basis of all the, the revenue that is generated from fees and fines and other costs 8 associated with the criminal justice system, now... so, 9 now we're moving into the, the ... we're moving right ... 10 away from the programs and, and into the, the 11 12 information collection part of what I'm interested in

what MOCJ does and, and maybe could do?

ILANA TURKO: Sure, I think that all the questions about the mandatory fees and fines that are lodged within the courts are... it's a really important question and again we share concern over it but those court fees and surcharges that are assessed are collected by the state. Like I said we are very interested in this topic as well, but I don't think we have any of the data necessarily available and that might be something that the state would have available.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Uh-huh. Well I know that MOCJ and its role is coordinating the mayor's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

criminal justice policy and interacts with state actors on a regular basis whether it's the courts or the district attorneys who are kind of have an in between status, does MOCJ think that its' important to understand the costs that are being imposed on defendants in the criminal justice system in the five boroughs and looking at what that impact might be on, on them and the criminal justice system and maybe just as MOCJ has convened and, and doing task forces ... task forces on speedy trial issues or bail reform, maybe the cost of justice might be an issue so, does ... do you know if MOCJ has any objection to attempting to collect this data and be able to have a picture of how much is being collected in, in the city even if some of those things are being collected by, by the state?

ILANA TURKO: I think MOCJ is always interested in what inside data can provide to our work but as you know our director has testified at previous budget hearings including as recently as, as May of this year in, in great detail regarding the funding that flows through our office and what I'm here to testify about today is the scope that we were

2 provided which was the ATI and ATD programs that MOCJ funds.

an opinion whether or not the city should be imposing the 30 dollar a month probation supervision fee for, for DWI cases, it seems like we, we want to get away from adding burdens to people because of their poverty in the criminal justice system in many spheres whether it relates to bail or, or what it means to be stuck on Rikers Island and not being able to go to work, etcetera, why are we charging people

ILANA TURKO: So, I with great interest have also been listening to this testimony and I'm definitely going to take that concern back to our office unfortunately it's not something that I understood to be within the scope of today, but I do think it's important for us to discuss, discuss with the Department of Probation.

30 dollars to participate in a DWI program?

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay. Look who's here. Joined by Council Member Keith Powers who also Chairs the Committee on Criminal Justice, do you have any questions? Fire away.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Well thank you for, for hosting this hearing and I've... I was at another hearing on lead, so I apologize for, for coming late. I think some ground was covered here but... and I've, I've heard the... so far, the answers so I... but... so I may ... I may be expecting what the answers might be but I think you asked a question about bail and the cost of, of fees on... related to bail and paying bail through a credit card so I just wanted to... we've been looking at that issue as... well we've been thinking about that issue as well since it's come up, I know that maybe it came up already in the question but I just wanted to ask it so I can hear it, is there a position from the administration on whether there should be some relief provided to either all or, or a certain population around paying fees for credit card... posting bail through a credit card?

ILANA TURKO: I know that this is an issue that our, our office also believes is important to discuss, I don't know of any specific position that has been taken at this point.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Would you know when credit card bail was put into place?

2	ILANA TURKO: I don't know, are you… are
3	you referring to online bail or… [cross-talk]
4	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Well online bail
5	was put into this year, right and then and so
6	that's new and then you've been able to pay with a
7	credit card I presume for some period of time, is
8	that… [cross-talk]
9	ILANA TURKO: I, I don't know.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, so, so
11	online is new and what's the fee for paying online if
12	you… so, what, what is the fee for paying bail
13	online?
14	ILANA TURKO: I believe that was covered
15	by previous testimony, I don't have that information
16	available but I'm happy to report back.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, so and
18	what [cross-talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I think in the
20	prior testimony it was 2 [cross-talk]
21	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: 2.7 percent or
22	something like… [cross-talk]
23	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Well 2.49 percent
24	for online and if you show up at a facility it's
25	soven percent to pay with a gredit card

1	COMMITTEE ON COURTED DIGITAL
2	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, so if I pay
3	online, I'm using my credit card I pay 2.7, if I go
4	to the facility I pay seven percent on top of what
5	the bail… seven percent over the bail, I'm paying a
6	fee. The what can you explain the differences wh
7	you're paying seven and why you're paying 2.7 in the
8	two different places?
9	ILANA TURKO: Again I, I think that what
LO	I'm prepared to talk about today was about the, the
L1	cost associated with the ATIs and the ATDs that MOCJ
L2	runs through our office, so I don't have that answer
L3	available right now.
L 4	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Is anybody else
L5	[cross-talk]
L 6	ILANA TURKO: I'd be… [cross-talk]
L7	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Is anybody else
L8	here from the city that does have, have answers to
L 9	those questions?
20	ILANA TURKO: We, we would have to take
21	it back to discuss with other folks internally.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: okay, are you
23	prepared to talk about commissary and fees related to

ILANA TURKO: It depends on the question.

commissary... [cross-talk]

24

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: The... I think this has been a... I think a topic covered as well but fees on commissary, there's a bill before the city council now about... well some... part of it... some of it's about fees but also about returning money to people who have money in the commissary, I was wondering if there was a position for the administration on that bill?

ILANA TURKO: We, we don't have a position on the bill at this time.

and, and perhaps a, a topic for a hearing in the future. And the other... I think you covered some of the other topics, so I won't... I won't... it sounds like we need to do a follow up with, with MOCJ around this but I think... I wanted to thank the, the Chair for doing the hearing because I think we've heard from a lot of folks about extra costs related to incarceration obviously one concern is it's, it's, it's preventing people from getting out of jail when they have to pay more money than is already put up for the bail, of course bail on it's own is a... is an issue that we, we care about and, and, and reducing the use of bail but, but... cash bail but the... but also

1 2 the fees that then add up and, and, and could lead to worse outcomes because of that, I, I guess we'll do a 3 4 follow... I, I may have more questions in the future 5 but, but I would love to talk to you guys about the, the, the online bail and the credit card payment of 6 7 bail as an extra cost and I think there's an interest on I think probably with the Chair as well about 8 removing those costs from, from the folks. 9 10 ILANA TURKO: Sure. 11 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you. I have 12 one last question just to clarify, the, the, the programs that are... that are free of charge do any of 13 14 them require that the person participating have 15 insurance? ILANA TURKO: There are five of the 16 programs that do provide clinical treatment... [cross-17 18 talk] CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Uh-huh... [cross-19 20 talk] 21

ILANA TURKO: ...and will bill insurance or work with folks on enrollment in insurance but nobody will be turned away for inability to pay.

24

2.2

23

Τ	
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, if you, you
3	don't have insurance and for whatever reason you
4	cannot get insurance you can still participate?
5	ILANA TURKO: There's no fee.
6	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, okay good.
7	Good. Okay, thank you very much, we'll follow up with
8	some stuff.
9	ILANA TURKO: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright, our last
11	panel is the Corrections Accountability Project, Ras
12	Omeil Morgan and from Comm, Love, Unity if I'm
13	reading that right and I'm sorry I can't read the
14	handwriting, but I think it's Towaki Komatsu, I'm
15	sorry I just can't read the, the handwriting. There
16	you go. Are we ready? Let's get sworn in. If you
17	could raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm
18	the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the
19	whole truth and nothing but the truth?
20	RAS OMEIL MORGAN: Yes.
21	ROBERT BRODIE: Yes.
22	TOWAKI KOMATSU: Yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Terrific, thank
24	you. Why don't we go from left to right, please

introduce yourself and deliver your testimony.

2	RAS OMEIL MORGAN: Yes, blessed love and
3	give thanks to you Council Member. I am Ras Omeil
4	Morgan and I am with Comm-Love-Unity, it's an
5	unincorporated association that we started through
6	Medgar Evers College to celebrate and commemorate the
7	ending of slavery in the United States of America. I
8	am here to testify and to actually seek support of
9	the city of New York Resolution 181 through the
10	honorable Jumaane Williams and Mr. Cabrera if I'm
11	saying it correctly. The Resolution was proposed
12	this, neither slavery nor involuntary servitude
13	accept as a punishment for a crime whereas the party
14	shall have been duly convicted. The 13 <sup>th</sup> amendment to
15	the U.S. Constitution has a clause that is tied to
16	the cost of to what the topic of today addresses by
17	the city council. On to know that the city in terms
18	of addressing criminal justice has not really looked
19	at the root cause in terms of 1619 to today's date
20	which we're looking at 400 years of slavery in 2019
21	on the thought that seven years after the start of
22	slavery the city of New York was incorporated. So, in
23	being a victim to the criminal justice process I feel
24	as a current litigant in Eastern federal district
25	courts that the cost to the city becomes more in

terms of the injustice that person's that look like
myself and others of experience so the overall cost
becomes more to us as taxpayers because now more
litigation is going to happen as to the civil matters
for the false arrests, for the false imprisonment,
for the kidnapping and for the… for the basic
enforcement of slavery via the, the 13 <sup>th</sup> amendment.
So, I feel the council did something tremendous or
brave in even proposing an amendment to the United
States Constitution's 13 <sup>th</sup> amendment. With that said
we feel the city of New York should look into the
day that slavery should have ended December 6 <sup>th</sup> , 1865
should be a national holiday throughout the United
States but for it to reach the United States we need
to start it right here in the five boroughs in New
York City. So, we are inviting the city of New York,
the Mayor of New York and all well-wishers to come to
Medgar Evers College on December 6 <sup>th</sup> so we, we could
start the hearing because if we're not addressing the
root cause we're going to kick this ball down the,
the road for another generation to continue the
process that is being discussed here today. So, I am
here of one who has gone through the criminal justice
process, I am promoting prosy in my community and our

_	
2	organization is around bringing the community
3	information that they can use to help to defend
4	themselves not just to take an ACD as I had no clue
5	what that was or just, just the whole plea process
6	that eventually impacts a lot of immigrants, we're
7	not able to travel outside of the United States
8	because they'll take a plea for like a penal code
9	22105 marijuana possession which now is being
10	discussed to be decriminalized completely in the in
11	New York State and the United States so the city has
12	their work to do to correct a lot of the abuse that
13	has gone through and I feel the discussion is right
14	that the, the chair has started here today and it
15	needs to continue amongst the other committees
16	specifically what the honorable Jumaane Williams has
17	proposed and I would love to see that Resolution 181
18	pass the city council. Give thanks.
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you.
20	TOWAKI KOMATSU: Good morning
21	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: You have to
22	[cross-talk]
23	TOWAKI KOMATSU: Sorry. Good, good

morning. I recently read that you were going to be running to become the next Queens DA, so a question

24

is I was recently in the Bronx Criminal Court and
that was only after I got a letter from the IAB
essentially exonerating me of charges that were
frivolously filed against me last December. So, the
question is I had a conversation with the Bronx DA
apprising her of the fact that I had a letter from
the IAB to essentially ask her well if IAB is
exonerating me why do I still have to come to this
Bronx criminal proceeding and this hearing today is
about cost, the cost of justice, right? So, if you
could save taxpayer cash why not do so. The other
thing is in that particular case I was appointed two
defense counsels both of them refused to follow up
with me. I sent emails to those defense counsels,
didn't get a reply back within three weeks so if
you're funding I guess public defenders and people
who are seeking adequate representation are having
absolutely no follow up by their counsel how many
times do, do they have to actually fire their counsel
to get decent representation. Also, I got a copy of
NYPD reports in regard to that case essentially the
basis for that case, I was walking from my apartment
to a drug store, I was illegally stopped, seized,
assaulted and arrested in a public area. They've

fraudulently claimed that I was trespassing when I
was not, so they dropped the trespass charge, I then
you also proposed legislation in, in sorry, in
regard to body cameras, they were wearing body
cameras so that happened last December, I've been
looking to get that body camera footage since then,
there's been nothing done in that regard. So, if the
body camera footage itself exonerates me how much
longer I have to wait to get that body camera footage
to I guess present it to you during a hearing like
this and the last point is, in he was talking about
the Eastern district, Jack Langston, he's a federal
judge in the Eastern district. There was a case with
Cordero where he wanted to find out how often do you
police officers lie so my case is essentially one
about credibility, they're making claims out of
trespassing, they dropped the charge, they
essentially claim that I was stalking them, not true
I was asking for their badge numbers and they
wouldn't give it to me to make a complaint to the
CCRB. So, the point is how many more times I have to
keep coming to your hearings for I guess you to go
home, think about things and then propose appropriate
legislation so that people like me, people like him,

2 everybody who comes to your hearings don't have to
3 show up and testify too.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

ROBERT BRODIE: Hello, hello. My name...
[off mic dialogue]

ROBERT BRODIE: Oh, okay, thank you. Alright. My name is Robert Brodie and I'm, I'm here to speak on behalf of the Correction of Accountability Project, excuse me, I'm kind of hoarse and first I want ... I want to thank the council for allowing me the opportunity to speak today on behalf of how I feel about the courts of justice and what it means to me basically. Right... I'm one... like a lot of other colleagues that was up here I was formerly incarcerated as well, I was just released last year in November, right and throughout my whole incarceration, right, everything cost me when I went in all the up until now. At this present time I'm homeless, I'm living in the shelter, right and I got to pay 30 dollars just to be out and sometimes I don't have it and I have to go to my parents, my, my mother has to pay the 30 dollars for me, sometimes my brother has to lend me the money to pay the 30 dollars because it was a surcharge that was imposed upon me, it was mandatory and I had to sign a piece

of paper stating that if I didn't sign it I wouldn't
be released so I had to had to sign it in order to
get out, right, I mean I'm not I'm not complaining
because I, I want to get out, right and I'm doing
good so far, right and I'm going to continue to do
good as well, right. And I don't want to be redundant
because a lot of people have spoken about a lot of
things as far as surcharges and commissary is
concerned, right and it's kind of odd because we work
for six dollars in there for… every Tuesday you get
paid six dollars and the cost of commissary, right,
the prices are way more than six dollars, the things
you you got to eat and the money that the parents
send you is not worth it as far as the commissary is
concerned, all they got basically is junk food, junk
food and a lot of heart attack food because a lot a
lot of people be coming home catching heart attacks,
you know and another, another thing that their quick
chill, question, are you all familiar with the quick
chill is the meal that they serve you, it comes in a
big plastic bag, it goes inside of a big canister and
they feed people like that, that's how they feed you
and we all know anytime you put enough heat on
something, right, the plastic is going to get into

the food and this is what they eat up in there, you
know and so people there is not fortunate, they have
no money, send no money to support their needs and
they live, live like that, they're forced to eat
that, you know and this is why a lot of medical bills
in, in prison are going up higher and higher,
people's cancer, a lot of people in there die from
cancer and it's a known fact, right and I also want
to speak on like the parole supervision, right, now
they call it JPAY, right and we have to send the
money to Florida and I'm and I'm trying to figure
out if we're in New York why do we have to send the
money to Florida if we're in New York the money for
anything we got to pay it, of course it should be
generating in, in, in New York to help us the best
way they can and that's one of my questions why is it
going to Florida and if, if we in New York have to
pay 30 dollars a month and a lot of people that be on
parole selected for three years at the 1,080 dollars
they got to pay within the three years and all that
could be helpful to the people over here in the in
the United States, in New York but it's but it's
going somewhere else. I don't know why. I'm just

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 curious about that part right there and what like...
3 you know...

4 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: We are too, we're 5 going to find out.

ROBERT BRODIE: Yeah, because, you know answer to the master question maybe somebody can help and maybe we, we can look into that, you know because you know... and I want to speak on... it's kind of hard as far as prison is coming home and, and try to readjust back into society. For me for instance and I, I got to say I'm somewhat kind of fortunate because I have family that, you know helps me out but what about the people don't have no family, you know and they have to keep on paying and paying and paying and paying, paying for some... I'm trying to get my life together but yet, you know it's preventing me from getting my life together because I'm still paying 30 dollars which I don't have, I don't have it, you know and it's like a lot of soups, like I got over here now, I got that from the ... from one of the places that they give you free soups, you know and I'm, I'm glad they got programs like that because it helps me out, you know but a lot of people is not really, I got to say fortunate, you know and... I'm

Τ	
2	going to say I'm still out there trying to find me
3	some work and I'm adjusting pretty well, I got… I
4	got… I must say so, you know and… [cross-talk]
5	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I'm, I'm [cross-
6	talk]
7	ROBERT BRODIE:I'd just like to I'm
8	trying to say thank you for giving me the opportunity
9	to share what little experience I did have because
10	like I said, you know by a lot of things surcharges
11	and the restitution and everything was so I don't
12	want to sound redundant but I appreciate you giving
13	the opportunity to speak, what we have of the
14	Commissioner. Thank you very much.
15	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Good, well, well
16	thank you very much for, for coming and sharing
17	[cross-talk]
18	ROBERT BRODIE: And hoarse [cross-talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:your personal
20	experience, you got to get some teakwood honey that's
21	my recommendation.
22	ROBERT BRODIE: Okay, I'm going to take
23	your advice on that.

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM
2	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Oh, good. Thank you
3	very much, thank you all very much, I appreciate it.
4	That concludes our hearing, thank you all very much.
5	[gavel]
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

you

25

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

October 9, 2018