CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

----X

June 29, 2009 Start: 10:05am Recess: 1:46pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

PETER VALLONE Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Daniel R. Garodnick
(acting chair)
Eric Martin Dilan
James F. Gennaro
Vincent J. Gentile
Melinda R. Katz
G. Oliver Koppell
Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.
David Yassky

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

Raymond Kelly Commissioner New York City Police Department

Jeremiah Quinlan Commanding Officer (Deputy Chief) Special Investigations Division

Michael Smith President and CEO New York Bankers Association

Roberta Kotkin General Counsel and Chief Operating Officer New York Bankers Association

Robert McCrie Professor Department of Protection Management, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Greg Braca President TD Bank, Metro New York

Peter Meyer Regional Vice President TD Bank

Bob Dunlop SVP, Director of Corporate Security and Investigations TD Bank

Carl Hum
President and CEO
Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce

Jack Friedman
Executive Vice President
Oueens Chamber of Commerce

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

John Schoolman Associate Director, Government Affairs Partnership for New York City

2	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:	[gavel]
---	------------------------	---------

Good morning, everyone, welcome to the Public 3 4 Safety Committee. Today's date is June 29th 2009. You are no imagining things, I am not Peter 5 Vallone, Jr. My name is Dan Garodnick, and I am 6 playing the role of Peter Vallone, Jr. for today 7 8 only, as the temporary Chair of the Public Safety Committee, at the request of Speaker Quinn, to 9 10 avoid any potential conflicts of interest. I want to thank Commissioner Kelly for being here today, 11 and for all of you in expressing interest in the 12 particular issue that we are exploring today, the 13 subject of bandit barriers. The NYPD reports that 14 15 crime in New York City is down in almost all categories; however, bank robberies are a 16 17 consistent problem that appears to be getting worse. In 2008, banks were robbed 444 times in 18 19 the City, more than one robbery for each day. 20 That is a 57 percent increase over 2007. And in 2009, bank robberies through March 11th increased 21 22 to 80 from 54 during the same period in 2008. 23 Intro 960-A, which is the bill that we're considering today, is a bill that requires banks 24 25 to install bullet resistant barriers that meet or

2	exceed Underwriters Laboratories level two
3	ballistics standards at all teller locations.
4	Level two barriers are stronger than the level one
5	barriers that most banks currently have, and can
6	deflect shots fired from a machine gun. The idea
7	behind the legislation is that bank barriers will
8	keep the bank and those in the bank safer, and
9	deter robbers from attempting bank robberies.
10	There are of course some very reasonable questions
11	about the necessity of the legislation, the cost
12	it will impose on banks, the uniformity it
13	mandates, and its likelihood to deter criminal
14	acts. Exploring those issues is the purpose of
15	the hearing today. The police department gives
16	many reasons for the increase in bank robberies,
17	and we'll hear from Commissioner Kelly in a
18	moment. The lack of bulletproof resistant
19	barriers, extension of daily and weekend banking
20	hours, decrease in security guards, and even lack
21	surveillance. Many banks, however, object to 960-
22	A because they question the effectiveness of
23	bandit barriers. For those banks that have them
24	today, they don't believe that they should replace
25	them with new level two barriers; and for banks

25

on the Council. [laughs]

2	without them, some claim that there is no evidence
3	that banks without barriers are subject to more
4	robberies. Airing these issues is the point of
5	today's hearing, and I look forward to testimony
6	from both sides, and to evaluating the evidence
7	and concerns that each side presents. But now I
8	am very honored to recognize my colleagues Oliver
9	Koppell from The Bronx, and of course the Chair of
10	this Committee, Peter Vallone, Jr., who are here
11	with us today. And Commissioner Kelly, of course,
12	it's an honor to have you, and whenever you are
13	ready, please go right ahead.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Mr.
15	Chairman, may I make a brief statement?
16	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Go right
17	ahead, I'm sorry, Council Member Koppell.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you.
19	While I'm not a member of the Committee, I am the
20	lead sponsor on the bill, and I won't speak at
21	length, Mr. Chairman. First of all I'm impressed,
22	I've never been at a Committee meeting that
23	started almost exactly on time in my seven years

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and in fairness to Chairman Vallone, the Public

Safety Committee always does. I'm keeping in that

tradition.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, I'm impressed. I appreciate very much Commissioner Kelly coming this morning. I have enormous regard for the Commissioner, not only because he supports my bill, but it was actually his suggestion that prompted the bill some years ago, as well as an incident where a staff member of mine, a friend of a staff member of mine, was--participated as a teller in a robbery where there was no bandit barrier, and she was terrified at being vulnerable. And it was actually that staff person who initiated my interest in this subject. believe that the bandit barriers are a discouragement to, to robbery, and a significant protection, especially to bank staff. interested to hear a comment this morning, I've had several discussions with people who oppose the bill. And I'll just mention one thing, 'cause I'd like to get the Commissioner's comment and his talk, and I would normally ask a question, but I'll mention it now, and that is some of the banks

allege that if you put the barriers it puts 2 3 customers at greater danger because the robber who cannot reach the tellers or other employees of the bank, it is alleged, are therefore likely to, or 5 possibly to take hostages among customers or 6 7 personnel of the bank that are not behind the 8 barrier. I'd like to get the Commissioner's thoughts on that, because that's the major 9 10 argument against the bill. I think most 11 interesting to me is the fact that many, many of 12 our banks, indeed while I haven't done a survey, 13 an official survey, I've done a lot of observing. 14 And my view is, or my observation is that most 15 bank, banks in New York City now have bandit barriers. And that in fact while there are 16 17 robberies in those banks, the largest number of robberies are actually in banks without the bandit 18 19 barriers. I think the numbers show that. I don't 20 want to prolong the discussion here myself, just 21 to say as I'm absolutely convinced that this is a 22 wise move that we make, I'm perfectly happy to 23 discuss things like standards of the, you know, of the barrier. It may be that we've gone too far in 24 25 that regard, I don't think so, but that's

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

certainly something to be discussed but I am
strongly in favor of requiring the barriers, and l
appreciate the Committee holding this hearing.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you, Council Member Koppell. And with that, 7 Commissioner Kelly.

RAYMOND KELLY: Thank you, Council Member Garodnick, Council Member Koppell, Mr. Chairman. I'm accompanied by Chief Jeremiah Quinlan, who is the Commanding Officer of the Special Investigations Division. Six years ago, we had the opportunity to discuss a bill, very similar to the bill on the agenda today. 442 of 2003 would have mandated that banks install bullet resistant barriers at all teller windows. At that time, New York City had experienced a dramatic increase in bank robberies, from 249 in 2002 to 408 in 2003. We examined the manner in which bank robberies were committee, primarily by unarmed individuals who presented tellers with notes demanding money, and developed a set of best practices to enhance bank security, deter robberies and assist in apprehension of perpetrators. To their credit, the New York

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bankers Association adopted the best practices, and disseminated them to their membership. voluntary implementation of those practices, combined with the increased public attention to the issue and the intense focus we placed on responding to and investigating these crimes, resulted in the decrease in bank robberies over the next several years. In light of this decrease, and the cooperation demonstrated by most of the banks in New York City, we did not ask that the City Council approve the bill requiring universal installation of bullet resistant barriers. However, 2008 saw a striking resurgence in the commission of bank robberies with the total of 444 for the year, an increase of 57 percent, compared with the 283 bank robberies in 2007. have taken several steps to address this disturbing increase, including convening a meeting of banking executives in January, to brief them on the key facts. We presented them with an updated set of the best practices, and a lesson plan intended to assist in training their employees in the proper actions to take during a bank robbery. We had hoped that this fresh focus on the steps

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that banks can take to better protect their employees and customers would help to reduce the incidents of bank robbery. This meeting built upon the already strong partnership the police department has forged with most banks operating in New York City, whose participation in the NYPC Shield Program and constant contact with our major case squad, have resulted in better and more timely information sharing, especially regarding the identification of bank robbers. As a result of solid detective work and substantial cooperation from banks which have suffered robberies, we have made 125 bank robbery arrests so far this year, eleven percent more than during the same time last year, including some key arrests of the perpetrators of multiple bank robberies. We can report that starting in April of this year, the upward trend seems to have reversed, with 39 bank robberies from April through June 23rd, compared to 111 for the same period in 2008. Not withstanding this welcome news, we must make permanent what could only be a temporary trend resulting from heightened attention to the need to strengthen bank security.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Although crime in New York City has reached historic lows, with major felony crime having decreased another twelve percent this year. continued incidents of bank robbery forces the contrary impression that crime is on the rise. Both successful and unsuccessful attempts to rob banks are classified as robberies. And many of these incidents are committed by petty criminals, substance abusers, or emotionally unstable individuals who take a chance, believing that passing a note will result in obtaining cash. Permissive practices by banks that do not use ballistic resistant barriers, or adhere to the other best practices, in fact encourage that belief. Another very important consequence of the commission of a bank robbery, whether attempted or completed, is the cost of police response. robberies represent a major drain on scarce police resources. We have designed special response plans, tailored to specific locations, so that, for example, if a branch near multiple subway stations were to be robbed, officers would respond directly to each of those subway lines, in addition to streets and highways in the vicinity

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the bank. Every bank robbery takes police officers and detective away from other crimes and quality of life conditions, both for the immediate response and for the sometimes complex and lengthy investigation that apprehending the perpetrator Therefore, we recommend that the requires. Council not only mandate the installation of ballistic resistant barriers, as required by Intro 960-A, but also further strengthen bank security in a number of ways that we will discuss. been argued that the installation of ballistic resistant barriers is not a total solution, that banks with barriers continue to be robbed. have always stressed that ballistic resistant barriers do not guarantee that a bank will not be Instead, they are essential ingredients robbed. in a comprehensive package of best practices that has proven to deter robberies in those banks that have adopted and adhered to all of them. Barriers hardened a bank as a target, and send a message that the bank is a secure location. The absence of barriers deprive bank tellers of the opportunity of safely walking away from unarmed robbers, and exposes tellers to even greater

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

danger in the presence of armed robbers. that banks without ballistic resistant barriers are far more likely to be robbed than those with barriers. Note that in 2008 TD Bank, or Toronto Dominion Bank branches, none of which have barriers, were nearly three times more likely to be robbed than Chase branches, which all have The presence of barriers, allowing the barriers. bank to employ a walk away policy, results not only in the lower incident rate, but also a lower rate of successful bank robberies, where the perpetrator is actually able to flee with cash. In response to our call for the use of ballistic resistant barriers in all banks, as part of the best practices, we have met with opposition from some banks. They take the position that the installation of barriers conflicts with their business plans, believing perhaps that they can gain a marked advantage over their competitors without them. For example, instead of installing barriers, Toronto Dominion Bank has hired NYPD paid detail police officers to guard their branches, a highly expensive option which is unsustainable over the long term. In fact, in

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2009, there have been four instances of Toronto Dominion Banks being robbed while the paid detail officer was at meal or on a personal break. most recent occurring last Tuesday on Columbus Avenue in Manhattan, and another the Saturday before in midtown. In fact, in the course of attempting to apprehend the perpetrator of the midtown robbery, the sergeant who was working on paid detail at the bank was injured as he followed the offender. This illustrates another course attendant to bank robberies: the possibility of injury to active police officers, which may deplete the uniform force, as well as injury to other security personnel seeking the safeguard the facility. Ballistic resistant barriers are highly visible and ever present. They carry essentially a one time cost for installation, with minimal maintenance expense, rather than the millions of dollars which would be spent each by the bank for a paid detail police officer or armed guard in each branch during every hour of the business day. Note that when the 2003 surge in bank robberies occurred, TD Bank's predecessor, Commerce Bank, similarly responded not by installing ballistic

barriers, but by deploying paid detail officers. 2 3 When the public attention on the issue waned, the use of paid detail officers became sporadic at best, confirming our belief that it is unrealistic 5 to expect the long term employment of paid detail 6 officers as a substitute for ballistic resistant 7 8 barriers. Because some banks have continued to reject this essential element of the best 9 practices, we now support mandating the 11 installation of ballistic resistant barriers, 12 which meet Underwriters Laboratory ballistic standards. Based on the concerns that have been 13 raised by the banking industry, we recommend that 14 15 the bill be amended to remove the requirement that the barriers meet level two standards, in the hope 16 17 and expectation that banks will take seriously 18 their responsibility to ensure the safety of their 19 personnel and the deterrence of this crime. 2.0 have some other suggestions regarding the specific 21 language of Intro 960-A. The bill imposes a civil 22 penalty for violation of the new requirement, but 23 does not specify how the penalty should be 24 enforced. We recommend amending the bill to allow 25 enforcement personnel to issue summonses for

2	violations, perhaps returnable to the
3	environmental control board. We also recommend
4	that the bill provide rulemaking authority to the
5	police department, to assist in implementation of
6	the law as needed. We would also like to
7	recommend revising the exemption in the bill for
8	banks where transactions are conducted primarily
9	by cash dispensing machines, to ensure that the
10	exemption applies only to ATM facilities and not
11	to locations where bank employees are present.
12	We'll be pleased to discuss these suggestions with
13	you further. I'd like to thank Speaker Quinn and
14	the Council for taking this timely action to
15	create legislation that helps to prevent bank
16	robberies and therefore to improve the security of
17	the people of New York City. Beyond ballistic
18	resistant barriers, however, there are some other
19	vital components of the best practices that we
20	believe should be mandated in New York City's
21	banks. We welcome the opportunity to work with
22	your staff on legislation that would incorporate
23	five additional requirements: digital
24	surveillance video systems properly placed and
25	directed, security training for bank employees,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the use of dye packs, the placement of obvious height markers, and conspicuous signage indicating that the premises are under video surveillance with recording. Taken alone, none of these elements will prevent bank robberies from occurring. Taken together, they form a powerful strategy to solidify our recent gains against bank robbery and to permanently enhance bank security for the safety of all New Yorkers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you, Commissioner. Let me note that we have been joined by Council Member David Yassky and Council Member Melinda Katz, both members of the Public Safety Committee. There are ques--I'm sorry, and also Council Member Dilan, sorry Eric. I'm going to start us off with a few questions here. thank you for your testimony and thank you for the additional suggestions to improve the bill and of course we are always willing and eager to work with you in ways to make New York City safer. wanted to just start off by taking a look at one of the comments you made in your testimony about banks without barriers were far more likely to be robbed than those with barriers. And you cited

2	the differential between TD Bank and Chase Bank,
3	saying that TD Bank was three times more likely to
4	be robbed than Chase Bank in a particular year.
5	Let's just go through the numbers very quickly so
6	we can use this as a formulation for our
7	discussion today. In 2008, it's my understanding
8	I think from your testimony that there were 444
9	bank robberies, and that was up from 283 in 2007.
10	Of the 444, can you tell us how many of them took
11	place in banks without barriers, as opposed to
12	banks with barriers?
13	RAYMOND KELLY: You have that?
14	[off mic: I have 47 percent last year] 47
15	percent took place in the banks without barriers.
16	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: 47 percent,
17	so 53 percent took place in banks with barriers.
18	RAYMOND KELLY: Right.
19	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: What is the
20	overall percentage of banks with or without
21	barriers in New York City? Just so that we can
22	compare that.
23	RAYMOND KELLY: Go ahead
24	Alright, that
25	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Identify

25

2 yourself before you--3 JEREMIAH QUINLAN: How you doing? 4 I'm Deputy Chief Jeremiah Quinlan, I'm the 5 Commanding Officer of the Special Investigations Division. And the Major Case and the Joint Bank 6 7 Robbery Taskforce, which investigate both armed 8 and unarmed bank robberies, report to me. I have stats for this year, but the last year, if it's 9 10 '08, I really don't have the exact stats. 11 CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So you have 12 the stats for this year in terms of the number of overall banks that have barriers versus those that 13 14 don't? 15 JEREMIAH QUINLAN: No, not the 16 exact. You know, the completion rate I have, the 17 number of barriers. RAYMOND KELLY: We can tell you 18 19 this: Chase has 275 branches, they all have bandit barriers; Citibank has I believe 136 20 21 branches, they all have barriers; Bank of America 22 has I believe 102 branches, they all have 23 barriers. The major banks, and when I say

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, well,

"major," well-known names, have barriers.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the question that I'm trying to get to, I'll tell you exactly what I'm trying to figure out here is, I want to figure out the overall balance in New York City of banks with or without, and then compare it, frankly, with the number of robberies which you gave as 53 percent with barriers and 47 percent without barriers.

RAYMOND KELLY: Okay, I just want to point out a distinction, too, it's important, because when I said it in my prepared remarks, robberies and attempted robberies are all counted as robberies. So you have to look at the, at the success rate. I talked about Toronto Dominion Bank, they have 70 branches. This year, so far, they've had 14 robberies, I believe, 100 percent success rate. In the robberies that happen at Chase, there is a roughly 50 percent success rate. We'll get you the exact number, of the number in Chase. Obviously, they have many more branches. Citibank has a 22 percent success rate. So, you have to look at that, as I say, we consider attempted robberies and robberies all in the same category. So that it gets skewed somewhat when you look at, you know, when you look at the, if

2.0

2	37011	don!+	1001	$^{-}$	+ho	success	rato
4	you	aont	TOOK	al	LIIE	Success	rate.

the numbers that you gave on 2008, the 53 percent of the robberies took place in banks with barriers, 47 percent in banks without barriers—that includes, as you just said, both attempts and success.

RAYMOND KELLY: Correct, correct.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Now do you, are you able to break that down even further to show us the overall success rate in banks without barriers. Taking, putting TD Bank aside for a second, because I assume that there are other bank--

RAYMOND KELLY: We have that number. It's here.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

RAYMOND KELLY: Jerry?

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: I--We looked at banks that don't have bandit barriers. This year Sovereign Bank had 16 bank robberies, 16 of them were successful, that's 100 percent completion rate. TD Bank had 14 bank robberies, every one of them was successful, that 100 percent completion

2.0

2 rate. And they don't have bandit barriers.

Metropolitan National had four branches, four bank robberies, no bandit barriers at any of those four banks, 100 percent completion rate. WaMu had twelve bank robberies this year, eleven of 'em were complete, one was an attempt, so that's a 92 percent success rate. We looked at Citibank, as the Commissioner said, Citibank has a larger number of branches, 136; when you look at their bank robberies, they had a total of nine this year, seven were attempts due to the walk-away policy, two were completed. Their success rate with bandit barriers was 22 percent. So you can see the difference in the banks that have bandit barriers versus the banks that don't.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, well, the numbers that you give on the, the banks without the barriers, and the success rate is obviously an impressive number, the 100 percent rate at those banks. I guess the question here is, you've isolated Sovereign, TD, Metro and WaMu. My question, well I have several questions, one of which is, is that all of the banks without barriers? Or are there more banks without

barriers other than those four that you said.

instance, WaMu, Washington Mutual, has been taken over by Chase, and they're in the process of putting, or refitting those banks with the barriers. So there's, you know, with all the takeovers, there's a process that's going forward. Sovereign Bank is looking to, I believe, move to that. And I apologize, we had discussions with them. Though, you know, you have the this takeover phenomena that's happening, so some banks don't have 'em, but are moving to get them.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

Well, the challenge that I have in trying to sort this all out is, I don't, it's hard for me to see the aggregate numbers here. I mean, you're giving some very significant examples, and those are, you know, rather compelling examples on the subject of the percentage of success rates in banks without the bandit barriers, but what's important for us, I think, is understanding in the context of the overall success rate for with and without. Now you gave 53 percent in 2008 for banks with barriers, and 47 percent without barriers, so

2.0

2.3

2	that's attempts and completion. Let's just do the
3	other years, just so we can compare them. What do
4	you have for 2007 on with barriers and without
5	barriers? And recognizing that this includes both
6	the successes and the attempts.

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Yeah, I don't have those stats with me, I'll be able to provide you with them at a later date.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. we'd like to ask for those, because--

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --this is, these are important facts for us in determining what will be an argument that we're going to hear in a few moments from advocates and from people who object to this, that their view is that the banks without the barriers are not robbed in considerably greater degree than banks with the barriers. And it seems that on the success rate, that part is clear, from what you've said. But in terms of the overall numbers in attempts and completion, it's almost 50/50.

RAYMOND KELLY: Well one, again, the major benefit that we see in these barriers,

and again this is not the panacea, we understand that. It's part of a comprehensive program. The major benefit is to give the teller the option to walk away. That's when you have the incomplete robberies, that's when they turn into attempted robberies. The teller has no option, because they have no cover, then you're going to have a successful robbery. And that just encourages more robberies. So, you know, that's why the completion rate is so significant. And that intuits loss of a certain extent when you look at the total number of robberies because attempts are included in there.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, let me go to that point that you just made, and then I'm going to turn to my colleagues. This is the question that Council Member Koppell had raised at the outset, which I think is an important one, about the walk away policy for tellers. How would you address the issue that some claim that walk-away policies increase the risk to customers in the bank?

RAYMOND KELLY: We haven't seen it. We haven't seen it. We've had over 2000

robberies, bank robberies here since 2003, and we simply haven't seen it. I mean, you have Chase that's adopted the policy of having barriers and giving the option to tellers to walk away. And again, it's the tellers decision. It is a, you know, an informed decision with training. But we just haven't seen that. Now, I talked to the president of Toronto Dominion, I met with him, he mentioned something in an example, that he had in Canada several years ago. I'm not saying you can't find an example some place in history, we simply haven't seen it in the City.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. Let-Before I turn to colleagues, let me just
understand one more thing you said in your
testimony about the paid detail. You said that
it's unsustainable, perhaps--Well, why don't you
address why you believe--

RAYMOND KELLY: It's extremely expensive. And it's just simply, and it's one of the reasons why Commerce Bank did not carry through with it. It started it when the heat was put on Commerce Bank in 2003, and then when the attention shifted, they stopped doing it. It's a

2	significant business expense, millions of dollars.
3	Right now TD has I believe 70 or 74 branches,
4	they're increasing the number of branches here.
5	They're open 7:00 to 7:00 seven days a week. That
6	is a very expensive undertaking that I would
7	submit to you, about maybe \$30 million, is not
8	sustainable.
9	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: But what if
10	they are willing or even eager to sustain it.
11	RAYMOND KELLY: You can't guarantee
12	it. Precisely what happened with Commerce Bank.
13	We had essentially the same conversations with
14	Commerce Bank, and by the way, Commerce Bank was
15	taken over by TD Bank, and many of their managers
16	certainly are still on board. The whole bank was
17	subsumed by TD Bank. This position that they
18	took, they deployed or asked us to deploy paid
19	detail. And then when the attention shifted, as I
20	said, they just stopped doing it.
21	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Now
22	RAYMOND KELLY: I mean, businesses
23	want to reduce the cost of business, and this is a
24	very expensive undertaking.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Now, did

2.0

they stop--

RAYMOND KELLY: Depending on the rank of the officer, they can charge, they cost \$40-\$50 an hour.

understanding is that they did not stop hiring guards for banks in the entirety, they may have lightened up on the number of paid detail, but that they have uniformed individuals in the banks. I guess my question for you is, one is that, is that not your impression? And also, if they did have uniformed officers, whether they're paid detailed or not, does that not have the same level of crime deterrents that we're looking for here?

RAYMOND KELLY: It has a deterrent effect, if they're there for the 12 hours. I just told you two examples in the last week, the officers take a break, and they weren't there, and they were robbed during that break. But again, you know, there are no guarantees that this program is going to remain in place, it's a significant business expense. These barriers, in our opinion, coupled with the other recommendations that we've made, just make common

2.0

sense.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, let's put aside the fact that human beings take lunch breaks, and that they take other breaks, and things like that. If you were to have a uniformed officer, paid detail or not paid detail, for an entire period of time in which a bank branch was open, would that provide the necessary deterrent in your view?

RAYMOND KELLY: Probably, if that officer was there for 12 hours straight, and that there was a guarantee that it was going to continue ad infinitum. As opposed to what seems to me to be a fairly logical approach, a business expense that would be a finite expenditure of money, and I think based on everything we've seen, make a location significantly safer than one without. All these other best practices and these ballistic resistant barriers.

any difference between having a uniformed guard who is armed, versus a uniformed guard who is unarmed in terms of its deterrent effect in your view?

2	RAYMOND KELLY: Probably. You say
3	uniformed guard, I'm not certain they ever had
4	uniformed guards, I think they had blazers, people
5	in blazers. And that's what you'll see these
6	days, is, you know, I think there is an aversion
7	in the industry to having people with sort of, you
8	know, or I'll call traditional police type
9	uniforms, you don't see them in, in banking
LO	facilities. But someone with a blazer, I don't
11	know if you, if the individual knows they're armed
12	or not, when they enter the location.
L3	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So, if I
L4	understand you correctly, if you had somebody who
15	was in a uniform
L6	RAYMOND KELLY: Police uniform.
L7	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Police
18	uniform, you think it creates a deterrent effect.
L9	What if it were a paid security guard, he's not a
20	in a blazer, but rather has the appearance as
21	private security guards frequently do, it's a
22	uniform but it is not a police uniform.
23	RAYMOND KELLY: I don't think it
2.4	necessarily identified by the universe of robbers

that we see these days, they're fairly low level

criminals, they may still go in and try to rob a bank. We don't want attempts to take place, you know, we don't want anybody to walk into a bank and think they can, you know, walk out with money as a result of a robbery. And I, to me, you know, the best practices that we put forward are the ones that are going to do it consistently.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, well I'm going to defer to some of my colleagues, but first before I do I want to recognize we've been joined by Council Member Gennaro, Council Member Gentile, and Council Member Recchia. And, there he is, and I'm going to turn now to my Chairman, Peter Vallone, Jr.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you,
Mr. Acting Chairman, and let me first say that
it's very unusual for me to be sitting over here
and watching the Committee go on, it's like giving
up the keys to the Cadillac for the first time.
But I can't think of a more responsible driver.
And I want to thank you for stepping in at the
behest of the Speaker. It's a lot of work to
Chair a committee at the last minute, especially
with such an esteemed panel of witnesses coming

before you. So thank you for doing that, and you're doing it very well. Just to follow up on some of the Acting Chair's points, I think the point he was trying to make about the total amount of branches actually is going to help you, when it comes out, if almost half of the robberies are at banks without barriers. My research shows that about 90 percent of the banks do have barriers. So, is that a figure that you would agree with?

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Yeah, what's going on now with the industry, is the banks that don't have barriers, as the Commissioner mentioned, are installing barriers. Wachovia is putting in barriers, Sovereign's looking at putting in barriers at I believe their 15 Manhattan locations. So the industry trend is going towards the ballistic resistant barriers.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: So if over half the robberies are at banks without barriers, but 90 percent of the banks do have barriers, that does support your contention that it's a much more attractive target without the barriers. So, let's play devil's advocate and figure out first of all,

25

2	the banks without the barriers that are the
3	targets of these attempts and these robberies,
4	have you also factored in other potential reasons
5	they may be robbed, such as the fact that they are
6	open 24 hours a day, 7:00 to 7:00, 24 hours, seven
7	days a week, 7:00 to 7:00, or that they are nearer
8	to public transportation and set in locations
9	which, where there's a large amount of foot
10	traffic. Has that been figured into the equation?
11	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Well, most of
12	my, most of my bank robberies occur in the midtown
13	area of Manhattan. The outer boroughs, the
14	numbers are a lot less, primarily in the area from
15	59 th Street down to maybe 34 th Street, that's the
16	bulk of them. Also, Lower Manhattan. You have
17	the transit system there, most of my bank robbers,
18	as the Commissioner said, are substance abusers,
19	petty criminals, they have drug histories, they
20	even have, when we looked even further, they had
21	fare beating summonses. They're not the Willie
22	Suttons of the world. Most of the time, it's a
23	note, probably 80 percent historically going back,

I'm been dong this since 2001, my bank robberies

are note jobs. In the armed jobs, it's not

2	always, it'sif the teller believes that they
3	have a weapon, a gunthis year we had 25 armed
4	jobs so far, 24 of them the teller believed the
5	saw a gun, either the gun was taken out and
6	displayed, or the person pulled back their jacket
7	to show a ; one was a knife. But most of them
8	are note jobs, most of them are in Manhattan, near
9	congested areas. The bank robber wants to get in
10	as quick as possible, and leave as quick as
11	possible, without causing a scene.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Are most
13	of the robberies of the banks without the bandit
14	barriers also occurring in midtown?
15	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Yes, correct.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: What
17	percentage would that be, when you say most? Like
18	70 percent, eleven percent, what do you mean?
19	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: In the high 60s.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: 60s.
21	Okay. You discussed the fact that there was a
22	huge increase in 2008, and then you did a lot of

Okay. You discussed the fact that there was a huge increase in 2008, and then you did a lot of enforcement, and it's down in 2009. What's behind these robberies, is, was it certain individuals?

Is it the economy? What do you think was behind

20

21

22

23

24

25

that increase? And now this decrease?

3 RAYMOND KELLY: I--the word is out that it's a relatively easy way to get money. 4 There's very little resistance, and again that's 5 why, you know, it--what it does is, this increase 6 I think besmirches the reputation of the City. We know, and robberies are down this year, yes, 8 robberies are down to record lows. But I don't 9 10 want New York to be the safest big city in America with an asterisk, "except for bank robberies." 11 12 These are, you know, the word in Riker's Island, 13 and other environments where this type of thing is discussed, is that it is relatively easy to walk 14 15 in with a note, - - unarmed, and walk out with 16 money. So, I mean, there's no great, this is not 17 necessarily reflection on the economy, this happened last year, you know, before the crisis 18 19 was in full bloom last fall.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Well, you mentioned that there, you made some key arrests of the perpetrators of multiple bank robberies. So we will hear, when you're finished, that it was those few individuals, and this is an overreactions to the actions of a few, who are now

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

last part again?

in jail. What would you say to that?

RAYMOND KELLY: Now that, in other words we've arrested the ones that—believe me, there's many more to take their place.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I believe you. Now, if you assume that they work, and you've made some very good arguments that they do, this would obviously be at a huge cost to some private businesses. I have a meeting at 12:30 which I have to leave for, and I'll be back, regarding roll down gates, and the reason the administration has had a problem, and it's been around almost as long as this bill, is because of the cost to private businesses. They're very small costs of putting these, eliminating the ones you can't see through with the ones you can see This is a huge cost. If this is a through. practice that works, what would you say to the argument that is a practice that should work also, say at bodegas, and other locations, which are the victims of a high percentage of robberies?

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: If this

RAYMOND KELLY: Would you say the

think it's well affordable for the bank, certainly

banks that are willing to put in a paid detail

24

25

2 regimen that, you know, costs several million 3 dollars a month.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Well,

let's go back to the paid detail. That's--if a bank decides to make a business decision that they would make more money with a paid detail than they would with bandit barriers, and we assume for a moment that they are of equal deterrent effect, I understand your concern with the fact that you had this agreement and apparently it wasn't lived up to. And you said there had to be some guarantee, what if the law was amended to make that a guarantee, to make it so that a bank would have a choice between a uniformed officer and a, or a bandit barrier, what would your position be?

RAYMOND KELLY: Well, it might give banks who were well meaning, and started on the efforts to put in these barriers and adopt other best practices, a disadvantage, might put them at a disadvantage. That's something that will have to be factored in, to that determination in the law.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Yeah, it absolutely is, and it's something that we would

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have to consider as lawmakers, but as one of the foremost public safety experts in the world, if not the foremost, would there be, would that be sufficient from a public safety standpoint, to guarantee either uniformed officer or a bandit barrier?

RAYMOND KELLY: Well, you say uniformed guards, you know, we were talking here about paid detail. Uniformed guard depends what uniform it is, the public recognize it, having an armed person there, the question is what's the level of training? You know, things can happen when you have armed personnel who are not sworn police officers. So, I would not use the term "armed guard" or "uniformed police officer" as being interchangeable. We're talking here about paid detail. If somebody is willing to guarantee that they will put in a uniformed police officer, twelve hours a day, seven days a week, and pay that, pay the cost to do that, that's something to be seriously considered by the Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I have a lot of questions, but I'll just ask one or two more because I know there's a lot of council

2.0

members here. So, you've already, when it comes
to amendments, and that's one that's being
discussed, the other one you've already, are not,
you've already eliminated the request for level
two as opposed to level one, which I think is
probably very good as it goes, as it relates to
costs for businesses that already exist. The way
you see this bill, would it give any cost to banks
that already have bandit barriers? Are there any
changes you're seeking in the bandit barriers that
exist? Or

RAYMOND KELLY: I think we should consider that, you know, grandfathering them in, if they have the barriers, I think they act as a sufficient deterrent, coupled with the other best practices that we urge them to adopt.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Okay, as I said, I probably have more, so put me back on the list, but I'd rather defer to some of my fellow council members. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
Chair Vallone. Now we'll turn to Council Member
Yassky.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Okay,

thanks. I'll be very brief. I just would urge, I would ask the Department, too, as I guess both acting Chair Garodnick and permanent Chair Vallone asked about the percentage of overall banks that have barriers, I think that, unless we know that, we can't really tell if banks are more likely to be hit.

RAYMOND KELLY: We have, I'm sorry, but we have 15, there's 1,500 banks in New York
City, there's a lot of banks. We did not go out
and look at each bank. We know that all 275 Chase
branches, they have the barriers; we know there's
136 Citibank branches, they have the barriers; we
know there's 102 Bank of America branches, they
have the barriers. You know, we can give you in
big gulps.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I'm just saying it, it--right.

RAYMOND KELLY: And if you need that, we will get you a specific count. We'll send people out today and start counting. But there's different, you know, we used the major names.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Well, since

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 43
2	half the banks have, that are hit have barriers,
3	and half don't
4	RAYMOND KELLY: Well, when you say
5	"hit," again, I think it's important
6	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I took your
7	point about success.
8	RAYMOND KELLY: You got to look at
9	the success rate, you got to factor that in.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Well, I
11	guess I'm, you do have to factor it in, but you
12	have to give it the proper weight as a factor.
13	What I heard you say before was, since they're,
14	bandits are more likely to be successful at a bank
15	that has no barrier, than at a bank that does have
16	a barrier, then you, what I think your exact words
17	were, it stands to reason that people will go
18	after banks without barriers more frequently.
19	That may or may not be true, I mean, Iand the
20	numso the numbers will tell us, if indeed there
21	are more incidents at stores with barriers, or
22	without barriers, than at stores without barriers,
23	with barriers.
24	RAYMOND KELLY: It is true, it's

based on, you know, proportion. Depends on number

of branches you have. Obviously, we talked about-let's say, the Toronto Dominion Bank has 70
branches, Chase has 275 branches. I said in my
prepared remarks, that based on the number of
robberies that you have at TD Banks, it's three
times more likely that they'll be robbed than
Chase.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: It sounds like it's three times more likely that a TD Bank than a Chase bank, that I get. That may or may not be true for, you know, non-barrier versus barrier overall. I just don't know, it may turn out to be true.

RAYMOND KELLY: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I just, I don't want to base policy on it, on the claim that it makes you likely—you know, you're more likely to get hit if you don't have a barrier, without the data to back that up. So, I would ask for that, number one. And then my only real question for you is about why you think that banks are, the banks that are, I guess the fair word is "refusing," because you've given them, you know, I commend the Department for doing a best practices,

Precinct, for instance, we have a very elaborate

response plan, which I talked about in my prepared

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

remarks. We have, when a bank robbery happens, we cover subway stations, we go to Central Park, we will go virtually every unit on patrol in that precinct is responding in some, way, shape or form to that robbery. Let's assume the robber gets away, then the Major Case Squad, we only have 30 detectives in the Major Case Squad. They spend most of their time going after bank robbers. it is a major drain on our resources. You know, we're not in the position to tell businesses how to run their business, until it impacts on a police department that is down 5,000 police officers from where we were in 2001. So, every point, or every place where we are using our resources, we're taking a hard look at. And this is, this is one of 'em. This takes a lot of time, and a lot of effort. And we believe that adoption of these best practices, obviously centered on these ballistic barriers, will reduce bank robberies, and therefore reduce our response and our dedication of significant resources to investigate them, and try to arrest people after they happen.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Okay.

Alright, look, I'm not tryI don't want to put
words in your mouth. I think that yourwhat I
take from your testimony is, you're clear that in
your opinion the barriers will prevent robbery,
certainly attempt, at least completions and
probably attempts, is your belief. And that the
banks that are declining to do it, they must know
that, I guess, in your opinion, but they
nonetheless are choosing not to do it, 'cause
it's, they think it has a, it hurts their business
in other waythat's what I'm trying to figure out
is, I don't want to be robbed either. I mean, as
a, so I would think I would do everything, if I
were a bank owner, I would do everything I could
not to be robbed. I'm trying to understand why,
you know, once they've given full information, why
we think they're not capable of acting on that.
RAYMOND KELLY: The majority of
hanks in the City are moving to the adoption of

RAYMOND KELLY: The majority of banks in the City are moving to the adoption of these ballistic barriers. The small number have not. One bank in particular, which is here, lobbying and making an effort to prevent the enacting of this legislation. I don't question their motives, they have a business plan, they

2	have a view of how to do business. An openness, a
3	7:00 to 7:00, seven day a week operation, and
4	that's fine. But as I said, it impacts on us. It
5	impacts on our resources. So, I believe if you
6	talk to other major banks, and the security
7	personnel from those banks, they believe that
8	these barriers are a major deterrent to bank
9	robberies. And again, you have to look at the
10	success rate. You know, it's important, yes, you
11	might have an attempted robbery, but the
12	individual runs out the door without any money,
13	and the teller is safe, their employees are safe.
14	Nobody has the ability to jump over a counter, for
15	instance, with these barriers, if they're properly
16	installed. So, for whatever reason, this one bank
17	in particular, is resisting. I did meet with the
18	CEO, and again I don't question their motives,
19	they think it works for them, and it worked for
20	them in Canada, apparently. This is New York.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
23	Council Member Yassky. Now the sponsor, Council
24	Member Koppell.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for your testimony. I think that while I'm convinced, and some numbers that Council Member Vallone mentioned, as many as 90 percent have barriers, but I think that because we use the statistic of 47 percent and 53 percent, it is, I think, significant to know exactly how many banks there are in New York City. You said about 1,500. And then it would be important to know what percentage of them have barriers, and what percentage do not. If the number 90 percent is true, then it's overwhelmingly clear that since 47 percent of the robberies were in banks without barriers, if 90, if only ten percent of the banks have no barriers, then 47 percent of the robberies are in ten percent of the banks. And then as a sponsor of this bill, I say, you know, the argument's faded away. But since you're not sure, I realize that if you compare Chase and TD, that's a strong argument. But the strongest argument is if we knew the totals. So if you could get the totals to me or to us, I think it would be very, very useful. The other thing is, and again, this is the, you had said you have no experience that shows that these robbers would turn to hostage

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Injury?

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Injuries to the tellers, anyone on the floor. In other words, what's the distinction with barriers or not

2.0

2.3

2	barriers	as	far	as	the	injuries	that	happened
3	during a	rok	oberv	7 ?				

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: We don't have,

we don't see--

6 COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: You don't

7 see-

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: --I mean,
injuries happening one way or the other. We're
saying is, if you have a barrier, the teller is
protected. If you have no barrier, obviously the
potential for injury to a teller, certainly if the

robber is armed, is greater.

understand that, I guess the real question is, you know, on the one hand, we're talking about if there's barriers, the tellers will be safer, and the other side is going to come up and testify that that puts people in the lobby. The workers that are there, the administrative staff and the customers at risk. And then on the other side, your testimony is that if we have the barriers, the tellers are safe, and they can walk away. So I guess my question is, there doesn't seem to be a lot of stats on either side of it. It seems like

22

23

24

25

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 52
2	in either case, there isn't injuries, at least in
3	our city.
4	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: That's right,
5	there isn't. We have banks with barriers here,
6	and we don't have that, that experience. But I
7	think if you, common sense, in terms of protecting
8	your employees, would argue that they're better
9	protected if behind these ballistic shields.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: No, no, I'm
11	just trying to like circumvent the argument that's
12	going to come after you, basically it's going to
13	be
14	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: We don't have
15	the experience data.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: You don't
17	have that experience data. Okay. Do me a favor,
18	just, can you go through what exactly happens now,
19	even with barriers, the tellers give over money
20	with dye packs, or do you find that in general

JEREMIAH QUINLAN: Some do, some

don't. It depends on the bank policy, as far as

dye packs are concerned. It's one of the things

that we recommend banks consider in our best

they just walk away now?

practices.

2	practices.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: And then,
4	what happens as far as the follow up and catching
5	the robbers? Is there a different percentage with
6	the barriers, without the barriers? Do you find
7	that the experience is different with each?
8	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: It's not really,
9	the barriers are not a factor, whether or not we
10	arrestwe arrest people primarily based on
11	cameras and pictures. And one of the
12	recommendations that we make in the best practices
13	is number one, we use, you know, digital cameras,
14	that they be properly positioned. That, if
15	possible, you take a picture of the queue, people
16	waiting in line. Also, have a camera positioned
17	where you take a picture of people exiting. And
18	these are recommendations.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Right.
20	JEREMIAH QUINLAN: That we'd like
21	the banks to take a serious look at. And many of
22	them have.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: The robberies
24	that occur, do you find that it's a high

recidivism rate, or do you find that it's

different robbers throughout the years?

RAYMOND KELLY: The recidivist rate is roughly around 16 percent, that's people that have been convicted and sentenced for bank robbery, and released and subsequently go back. Most of the people are, you know, the rest of that 80 plus percent are new people, a lot of them, like I said, are emotionally disturbed, they're low level drug users, substance abusers, gamblers. Somebody mentioned the economy, we have people that are gamblers, I haven't seen anything with the economy.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: And I guess,
I just want to get back to, I think it was
Councilman Yassky, or someone has asked the same
question, and I guess I'm a little unclear about
it. If we require the police to be, or an armed
guard to be in the bank, or we require the bandit
barriers, I guess what you're saying is that's
human nature, you're not always going to have an
armed guard. But in general if there was one for
the entire time that the bank was open, you think
the percentages would be better or not?

RAYMOND KELLY: We want it to be a

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deterrent. We don't, we don't want people to walk in and think they can rob a bank. So, obviously, a uniformed police officer in a bank is that sort of deterrent. If you make the requirement or threshold an armed quard, I don't know the level of training--obviously we do have training here in New York State. Are they in uniform? Are they not in uniform? Are they wearing a blue blazer? Did the individual know that they're armed? is the level of training? Banks are, I think, reluctant to have people who are armed, quite frankly. They'll often hire retired police officers, 'cause they assume they have, you know, they have the appropriate training. But something less than that, I think, they might be reluctant to do that. So, there are gradations of, you know, preventive measures, as far as personnel are That's why, to us, the ballistic concerned. barriers and the adoption of these best practices, makes sense. We want to see the numbers go down. And they did in fact go down when we, when there was attention paid to it, in 2003. And now, they seem to be going down again. But it, you know, it ebbs and flows. We want to see it consistently

low.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: I guess the
issue really becomes, you know, if the bank, I
guess, again, not that I want to agree with
Councilman Yassky so often, at least in this
forum, I guess it's okay. But the question really
becomes, no one wants to get robbed. So I guess
the question becomes, is that if the money is
turned over, and it's an expense of the bank's, I
guess, it's not insured and it's not guaranteed by
the government, and they know that the percentages
are better with the barriers, I guess the question
becomes, "Why do you think" and you are the
foremost expert, I think, in public safety in the
country
RAYMOND KELLY: Why do we care?

RAYMOND KELLY: Why do we care?

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Why do you

believe some of the banks don't want to do this?

RAYMOND KELLY: I think you have to

ask them. You're going to be hearing from them.

They're doing a, kind of a full court press here.

So you have to ask them, as to why they--this is a business, this is, the bank that resists this is

the second biggest bank in Canada: Toronto

2.0

2.3

2	Dominion Bank. They took over Commerce Bank,
3	which also resisted. So, they have branches in
4	Florida and other states, here in the United
5	States, and they're a big operation. So
6	obviously, they have a philosophy and approach
7	behind it. I'm sure you'll be hearing about it.
8	This is New York City.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: I've never known you not to have an opinion.

RAYMOND KELLY: This is New York

City. Well, I--I think it's almost illogical.

So, I don't know, it's adherence to apparently a philosophy that they think works for them, in other locations. We don't think it works for them, absent a full time, paid, uniformed police officer, twelve hours a day; which they have so far committed to. The question is, does that make business sense? I don't think so. And unless it's mandated, just like their predecessor bank,

I'm concerned about the policy drifting.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: And I know that that is one of the amendments that we are talking about in general on this Committee. So I thank you for your time.

have best practices in the bill.

25

officers, it's paid to the City.

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: Okay, so
3	that bank pays the City a certain amount, and
4	then

RAYMOND KELLY: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: --the

Department then in turn pays the officers for their time.

RAYMOND KELLY: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: Okay, thank you. First, I just want to also check with, because I'm not sure, I've never seen an instance where this City or this legislature has ever had the authority to regulate banks, I thought that was a function of the State. And I would imagine that we had vetted that. But just for my purposes on this, 'cause I'm not sure which way I'm going to go on this bill, I'd like to know one, does this Committee and this Council have the authority to enact this regulation? I saw on the bill that the Police Department and the Buildings Department are responsible with enforcement. So if we're regulating the buildings, then I think the bill belongs in another committee, quite frankly. But that's for action behind the scenes. I'd like to-

COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN:

I would say,

25

Commissioner, respectfully, when we asked for the data, the answer was we didn't' have it. That's-that's what--

RAYMOND KELLY: Well, I'm not certain what--

21

22

23

24

25

2.0

2.3

	_	_	
)	_ d	h	т —
<i>'</i> .	data.	because	

RAYMOND KELLY: Well, we'll get that data for you, sir.

that I'm making a clear decision here, the right decision. I think the intent of this bill is well intentioned, I think that it does make it safer, but if 90 percent, again 90 percent of the banks that operate in the City currently use bandit barriers, why do we need to mandate this, if the trend is for the banks to do this on their own anyway?

RAYMOND KELLY: Because it's being resisted by certain banks. And as Councilman Koppell pointed out, a disproportionate, the robberies that occur in banks that don't have the barriers, versus those that do.

COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: Okay, but you said based, and again this is based on your own data, that 53 percent of the banks with barriers have robberies, either attempted or successful. Doesn't that--

RAYMOND KELLY: You have to look at success rate, too.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 65
2	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: Yeah, but
3	RAYMOND KELLY: Because as I say,
4	attempted robberies is what
5	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: I heard the
6	argument as well. But even an unsuccessful
7	robbery, doesn't that impact on your business, as
8	well?
9	RAYMOND KELLY: Impacts on the
10	data. Impacts on us, we have to respond to it.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: Sure.
12	Whether it's successful or unsuccessful.
13	RAYMOND KELLY: We respond to it.
14	In other words, if there's an attempted robbery,
15	takes place, and the person
16	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: You're
17	required
18	RAYMOND KELLY: That's still a
19	crime.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: You're
21	required to respond to it.
22	RAYMOND KELLY: And we respond, and
23	we do the same deployment that I described to you
24	before.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER DILAN: Okay.

have no doubt that, that they will. I--I'd just like to say that banks, I personally bank at a

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bank, and for me it makes no difference whether the bank has a bandit barrier or not bandit barrier, but just for your information, I personally bank at a bank without bandit barriers, that use uniformed security personnel. It's not a paid detail, it's security quards, they still exist in this City, more in the mom-and-pop banks than the larger commercial banks. But I happen to like to use the small mom-and-pop bank, and I think it's, in my opinion, I think the Department has to clearly make a stronger argument at this time, and I'm again, I'm not influenced either way, but if we're going to move to mandate, I think the Department has to make a stronger argument as to why this is one, a drain on City resources, if you're responding to unsuccessful attempts anyway; and in terms of safety, I think it protects the teller, I think there's no doubt that it protects the teller, but there's nothing that can prevent say a robbery in progress, if they go after the customers, and maybe, you know, maybe the teller doesn't care, but they can also go after a loan officer who's a colleague of a teller that's not protected by a bandit barrier.

2	So these are potential risks, I know a lot of them
3	are scenarios, and they're scenarios that
4	thankfully don't get played out often. But I
5	think the need for more data before I act on this
6	is necessary. Thank you, thank you, Mr. Chair.
7	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
8	Council Member Dilan. And let me just put some
9	formality on what exactly I think would be useful
10	in terms of the numbers that we're all clear. And
11	I think Commissioner, you're hearing from a number
12	of council members, and you were willing to bring
13	this data to us, and we appreciate it. But the
14	five year sample, the overall number of bank
15	robberies during that five year period, and then
16	within that category, the robthe attempted
17	robberies of banks without barriers, and the
18	robberies with banks without barriers, and then
19	the attempted robberies of banks with barriers and
20	the successful robberies of banks with barriers.
21	Right, so
22	RAYMOND KELLY: We got it. Okay.

RAYMOND KELLY: We got it. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: That's what

I think would be useful, because then we can

compare it to your overall numbers of 53 percent

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to 47 percent, and actually do it intelligently
here, and I think that will instruct us
significantly. Let me turn to Council Member Jim

5 Gennaro.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman. Pleasure to see you, Commissioner. I was tempted not even to ask questions at this point. I'm really just going to reinforce some of the points that were made by Council Member Dilan, and the Acting Chairman. You know, regarding the need for data. And as I look at what has been put forward, based on what Council Member Koppell has said and what you had said, regarding 47 percent of the robberies, attempted or successful, taking place in what may only be, you know, ten percent of the branches, that seems very compelling. Yet, I have information about a survey in 2005, conducted by the New York Banking Association, stating that back in 2005, about 89 percent of bank robberies occurred in branches with bandit barriers, and I'd assume that four years ago less banks had bandit barriers. So that would be quite a number of robberies or attempted robberies taking place in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

banks that did have barriers. And I think that underscores the need for a multi-year stream of data, to let us see what's really going on. And I think--

RAYMOND KELLY: Say that again, underscores what, sir?

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: I think that the fact that while the 2008 data seems guite compelling, the 2005 data sort of argues the other way, and I think this underscores the need for why we need to make an intelligent assessment of which way to go in. Because one of the things that we're also balancing here, Commissioner, is that notwithstanding the fact that there's a belief that barriers can make a very significant difference, right now there are lots of banks with barriers that people aren't shy about going in, and making an attempted robbery. It's your assessment that the overall robberies will decrease, but people are not afraid of walking into banks with barriers and passing notes. so, I think we have to, you know, get all this body of data, in order for us to really make an intelligent assessment here. Would you care to

respond to that, Commissioner?

RAYMOND KELLY: I'm not sure what your question is.

We've kind of, you know, laid out a case for, you know, why we need the data, to sort of go forward and in a thorough manner. And this is what I think we're seeing here today. Also, one thing that, let me just switch over a little bit, is that we're operating under the assumption, or at least you are certainly, and others who, we favor the bandit barriers, that once all the banks have barriers, there'll be a real decline in the, you know, total amount of attempts, that took place.

RAYMOND KELLY: With the other best practices, as well, yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Right.

But, again, but this hearing's about barriers, and what we're looking to mandate is barriers. And we're working under an assumption that when all the banks have barriers, there'll be a lot fewer attempts on banks. we don't really have anything to kind of base that on, because right now, there's a lot of people who are willing to go into

banks with barriers, and pass notes.

RAYMOND KELLY: Well, we do have something, we do have the--people will go and do it, yes, but the teller is able to walk away in banks with barriers, so their success rate is less. And we think that will impact on people's willingness or desire to go in and to attempt to rob a bank. If they know that the, you know, that the teller is protected and they have a walk-away policy.

wish once again to reinforce what's been put forward here about the, you know, need for the data stream, that the Acting Chairman has laid out. I think that'll be helpful to us, and we'd be most appreciative if that information could be provided, and I thank you for your willingness to do that.

RAYMOND KELLY: Okay, will do.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you,

Commissioner. Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman.

RAYMOND KELLY: We'd like to see a copy of that 2005 survey? Because in my conversations with Bankers Association, they did

2	not know how many banks had barriers and didn't
3	have barriers. So, I'd like, we'd like to get a
4	copy of that.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Oh, sure,
6	sure, I've got some information here. We'd be
7	happy to make that available to you, Commissioner.
8	RAYMOND KELLY: Okay.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: We should
LO	help each other with information.
11	RAYMOND KELLY: Okay.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
L4	Council Member Gennaro. And in a moment I'm going
15	to go to Council Member Gentile. Before I do, I
L6	wanted to just follow up, Commissioner, on the
L7	subject of the walk-away policy, something you've
18	mentioned several times in your testimony in
L9	answers to questions, even if a bank were, if we
20	were to mandate the inclusion of bandit barriers
21	in every bank, we can't here mandate that they
22	also include a walk-away policy, isn't that right?
23	RAYMOND KELLY: That's correct, and
24	we have not proposed that at all. It's a decision

that the teller has to make. Banks can train for

2	it, certain banks do. But that's not something,
3	that's a decision that an individual has to make,
4	based on their own situation, their own comfort
5	level.
6	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So I guess
7	the question could be that in those situations
8	where banks which do not want to have a walk-away
9	policy, but put in the barriers, they could still
10	see the hundred percent success rate if they just
11	decided instead of walking away, to actually turn
12	over the money. Isn't that right?
13	RAYMOND KELLY: Sure.
14	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, so
15	this is, we're assuming, we're assuming that along
16	with bandit barriers, banks will also incorporate
17	a walk-away policy. For this to be successful.
18	RAYMOND KELLY: To consider it,
19	consider it.
20	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: I'm sorry,
21	say that
22	RAYMOND KELLY: Consider it. It
23	depends on the individual situation. You can't,
24	it can't be every time, we understand that.
25	Depends on the circumstances. Now, I don't think

go on, it's a very healthy program.

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: But I guess

23 CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: I quess 24 what I'm getting--

So, lots of locations.

22

25 RAYMOND KELLY: You're concerned

So, he's saying that 70 percent of the bank

robberies, which over the last several years, and

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I don't know how many, we don't have the actual survey in front of us, occurred at banks that had bandit barriers. So, is this, is this something you're--

The percentage has RAYMOND KELLY: gone down. Let's assume that's a valid survey, the percentage has gone down, we said basically 50/50 I think, 47/53 is what we talked about before. But we also think that the success rate is important. What they're talking, anybody who walks in, attempts to rob a bank, and is rebuffed, that's considered a bank robbery. So they may do that at a, at one of the locations, and the willingness of the teller to not comply is, we believe, directly related to the existence of a barrier. They can walk away, they can duck, they can do other things, maybe notify management. But if you have no barrier, you really have very little option but to, but to give all of the money.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: So you're saying that those are included in these statistics.

25 RAYMOND KELLY: Yes, yes, sir.

RAYMOND KELLY: Yeah, London is a

RAYMOND KELLY: I'd like to, we'd

totally different crime problem than New York has.

they're saying that, they're saying that the

like to see the study. And again, we don't have

that -- it has not happened here, let's put it that

activity, the violent activity increased.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

study, yes.

way.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Okay, well they, actually they do cite instances here in the City, that have happened, and I'll just point them out to you, and get your reaction.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: And may interrupt you for a second, Mr. Chairman, I am the main sponsor, but I have to go next door to vote, so I'll be back.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: We'll see you soon. Go ahead, Council Member Gentile.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE:

And they give the NYPD 61 numbers on these cases, too. On April 23rd of 2003, at a Chase Bank at 165-40 Baisley Boulevard, in Jamaica, a suspect walked into the bank that was equipped with bandit barriers. He put a knife to the neck of an elderly female customer, and then demanded money from the teller. The suspect was apprehended by Roachdale Security, a private security firm, that provides security for Roachdale Village, a nearby residential housing apartment complex. That was in 2003. Also, they mention in 2003, in May 12th of 2003, North Fork Bank at 145-15 243rd Street in

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Jamaica, at 3:10 p.m., two suspects entered the One of the suspects approached the first teller window and held up a note announcing a robbery. The teller who was behind the bandit barrier locked her drawer and walked away, as we have talked about. The suspect approached the next teller window and the employee at that station hit the alarm and also walked away. The suspect then shouted, "Don't walk away, come back, I will kill somebody." He then took an elderly male, threw him to the ground, and the other suspect then placed his arm around a customer's neck and forcibly removed the customer's pocketbook. Both suspects fled the branch. And again they provide the 61 number for that incident. So, we have at least two incidents that happened within the last number of years here, both in Jamaica, that suggest that violence increases, and the risk of injury increases, if you have these bandit barriers. RAYMOND KELLY: Look, we're a big

RAYMOND KELLY: Look, we're a big city. I can't say that this would never happen, but we've had at least 2,000 bank robberies since that period of time. I mean, you follow that

logic, then we'll take down all barriers. That
they cause, they cause violence, is, you know.
Whereas, major banks, Chase, Citibank, Bank of
America, are moving in that direction. Chase is,
when they took over Washington Mutual, which
they're doing now, is installing these barriers in
these banks. So these are people who do this for
their business. So, can you find an example of,
you know, in a City of now 8.4 million people?
Yeah. You know. I don't dispute that. I don't
know, I'm not familiar with that case. I don't
dispute it. But, you know, anything is possible.
We're playing percentages here. And we think that
in terms of percentages, that these barriers will
make both the public and the employees safer. And
reduce the potential for bank robberies.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: But you

can see, clearly you can see how a walk-away policy, being protected by bandit barriers, could infuriate the person who would otherwise just hand it to someone.

RAYMOND KELLY: You know, you could make any example, you know, and again, following that logic, we wouldn't have any of these

2	barriers, we'll take 'em down. I mean, I don't
3	think you're proposing that. Major banks are
4	moving in this direction, to install them. So,
5	can you find an example of just about anything?
6	Yes. Certainly in a city of this population.
7	But
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: But what
9	you're, what you're proposing is that by putting,
10	by mandating them, we also potentially,
11	potentially, put the public at risk, not the
12	tellers, but the public. Potentially.
13	RAYMOND KELLY: You know, in the
14	example you're giving, yes. But I think that is
15	very, very small percentage. Don't forget, we've
16	had lots of robberies in banks, as you said, 70
17	percent, with the bandit barriers.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Mmhm.
19	RAYMOND KELLY: You know, we don't,
20	we don't see this to any great extent. You went
21	back to 2003 to get those examples.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Well, I
23	didn't get them, they were given to us.
24	RAYMOND KELLY: Well, I'm sure they
25	did a lot of research.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 87
2	you are now proposing that the banks do not meet
3	the level two standards? That's an amend
4	RAYMOND KELLY: Yeah.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE:
6	suggesting that the level one standards are
7	sufficient?
8	RAYMOND KELLY: We're suggesting
9	that they grandfather them in.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: If they
11	put up new
12	RAYMOND KELLY: Yes, right.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: If they
14	put up new, they wouldn't have to take down the
15	level one, the level one barriers.
16	RAYMOND KELLY: No, they would not.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Would not
18	have to do so, okay.
19	RAYMOND KELLY: Right.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Okay,
21	great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
23	Council Member. And just on that last point, so
24	in prior years, we have had the conversation about
25	the adequacy of the existing bandit barriers, the

2	level one bandit barriers, and you have pointed
3	out some of the issues with them, whether it's
4	height or other elements. So just so we
5	understand you today, at this point you feel that
6	the level one existing barriers for banks that
7	have them today, do not need to be changed.
8	RAYMOND KELLY: That's correct.
9	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, thank
10	you. And I'm going to go back to our Chairman,
11	Council Member Vallone.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you.
13	Commissioner, just to be clear, when we bring up
14	these arguments, and we ask you to address them,
15	it doesn't mean we support 'em, just as you know,
16	it means we've been given them, and we'd rather
17	you address them now, than they not be addressed
18	later on, and you don't have to come to all of our
19	offices or anything. So when we ask you to
20	address these arguments, we just, we think you,
21	we're giving you a chance to do this now.
22	RAYMOND KELLY: Yeah, sure.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Doesn't
24	mean we agree with them, we're just doing our job.

And the requested info that we request, we may

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just very well get that in a few minutes from the banking industry, and I believe, as I believed before, it's going to help you. A 50, 50-70 percent of bank robberies, depending on what time period, occur in banks with barriers, and we get information that 90 percent of the banks have barriers, that's I think hugely in your favor. these numbers, when we get them, I don't believe are going to hurt you. You mentioned a drain on resources of a bank robbery. And I had mentioned before about potentially doing this with bodegas, but I think the argument that I wanted to have fleshed out a little bit more is how different your response is to a bank robbery than it would be to some more, other sort of robbery.

RAYMOND KELLY: It depends on the type of robbery. You'll have a past robbery, if it's on the street, a, you know, one-on-one situation, radio car will respond and get a description, put it on the radio, and depending on the type of neighborhood it is, they may, officers may go to a subway station, they may go to a location where they think someone may fit that description. So it depends on the nature of the

robbery. And as far as bank robberies are
concerned, because we certainly saw it as a, you
know, a bigger problem, particularly when it went
up 57 percent last year, we put in place a
strategy, a very structured response. Certainly
as Chief Quinlan said, in the areas of midtown
Manhattan, and in the 19^{th} Precinct on the East
Side of Manhattan. So, there would be a response
to subway stations, perhaps a, as I say, response
to Central Park. Sometimes people will go into
the park, the detectives will respond. The Major
Case Squad will, if they're available, if they're
out, they'll respond. So it's, it's more
structured than to, let's say, a one-on-one
robbery in the street.

mentioned best practices before. First, we'll just go back to a point the Chair made. Other than level one, level two, are there any changes you'd be requesting to banks that already have this system in place, or is every sort of bandit barrier grandfathered? Are you requesting any other changes? Height, anything like that?

RAYMOND KELLY: We are, we're

2.0

2.3

relying on the good faith of the banks to protect
their employees and their customers. And I think
that's something that we can discuss with the, you
know, with the Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Okay.

RAYMOND KELLY: You know, common sense to prevail, if they have the barrier and they're working now, fine.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: And you mentioned best practices that you'd hope to see in this bill. They're not in there now. And since we have you here now, what would you recommend be placed on - -

RAYMOND KELLY: It was in my prepared remarks. What we said is, a, sort of comprehensive video program that incorporates digital cameras, believe it or not. Some banks, they still don't have digital cameras. Digital cameras, well focused, cameras that are not obstructed; cameras that also, as I said before, maybe we'll take pictures of the queue, of people lining up to get to the teller, exit cameras. We talked about height markers that are visible. We also talked about training, a four hour training

2.0

program. We put together a curriculum. They
don't have to use that curriculum, but we'd like
to see those, the principles incorporated in the
training of their employees. Signage, signage
that says that there are cameras operating, we
believe that act as a deterrent. We also want
banks to examine the possibility of using dye
packs. We like them. It helps us identify people
right after they've done a robbery.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Well, in your testimony, the only specific language suggestions are regarding the civil penalty and revising the exemption for bills, for banks where transactions are conducted primarily by cash dispensing machines. But you'd actually like the bill amended to include that by law, those best practices?

RAYMOND KELLY: Recommendations. Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Okay. And the last thing I have, I introduced a Reso, I think we worked together on it, back in, we passed it, the whole City Council, in 2003, I believe, which wanted to, which asked the State Legislature

2.0

to increase the penalties for bank robbery. Right
now it's an E-felony, with a note, which means
there's no mandatory jail time. And we asked for
it to be a C-felony, I think you supported it
then Would that helm?

RAYMOND KELLY: Sure. Absolutely.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you,

_ _ _

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
Chair Vallone. Just a couple of last questions
from me, and then I think we're going to hear from
the Banking Association. Commissioner, just to
understand, in response to the question from
Council Member Vallone, you said you thought that
the best practices should be included in the bill,
but as a recommendation?

RAYMOND KELLY: Yeah, we'd like to see them not mandated. Perhaps the camera, but believe it or not, as I say, you know, the state of personal cameras are much cheaper these days then they have been in the past. We'd like to see sort of state-of-the-art cameras in the, in all banks, properly focused, you'd be amazed. You'll see them in front of Christmas decorations and

2	things that you simply just can't see, see the
3	customers. We think attention has to be focused
4	on that. But we would certainly be willing to
5	have the best practices enumerated as
6	recommendations, as opposed to be being mandated.
7	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. And
8	as to the camera, that falls into the category of
9	best practices that you would suggest, but not
10	require.
11	RAYMOND KELLY: Yeah, right.
12	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, and
13	then I just wanted to finish with just some
14	clarification on the issue of what is floating
15	around as potential amendment to the bill. The
16	issue of whether we could require either a bullet
17	resistant screen, the bandit barrier, as
18	previously defined, or a security guard present
19	during all hours in which a bank
20	RAYMOND KELLY: Security guard?
21	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Yeah,
22	security guard, I want you to address that point.
23	RAYMOND KELLY: No, I
24	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: During all
25	those hours in which the bank's open for business.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Explain what, which scenario you think would be 2 3 appropriate there, and which one would not, if you 4 had a security guard, and how would you define? RAYMOND KELLY: I don't, this is 5 the first time I've heard about this, the 6 7 amendment might to be floating around the Council, but I haven't heard any proposal about a security 8 The paid detail is the alternative that is 9 quard. 10 being used now, but TD Bank. So, security guard gets kind of fuzzy when you, you know, trying to 11 define it and what level of training that 12 individual has, whether or not that person is 13 If we're saying for all time, a bank is 14 armed. 15 going to lock themselves in to having a paid 16 detail, a uniformed police officer there, during 17 the hours of operation, hey, that's something to be seriously considered by the Council. Anything 18

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Is there nothing that we could set forth as a definition of a security guard, which would make it as powerful a deterrent as paid detail? In your opinion.

short of that, I think it's too, it's too

ephemeral, too fuzzy.

RAYMOND KELLY: Not in my mind.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 96
2	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.
3	Okay. With that, I see no other questions from my
4	colleagues
5	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well,
6	could I ask one question, just before
7	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Sure,
8	Council Member Koppell.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Just so I
10	understand. If you have even a paid detail in the
11	branch, and the robber without a guard, passes a
12	note to the teller, the teller would not at that
13	point have the option of walking away, even if
14	there was a police officer in the bank, would
15	they?
16	RAYMOND KELLY: Probably not. You
17	know, depends on where the police areI mean,
18	there's a thousand different scenarios, but yeah.
19	I mean
20	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But in
21	other words, when there's a barrier there, the
22	teller can feel confident that they're not going
23	to get shot. If there's no barrier there, even if
24	there's a police officer there, the teller
25	couldn't walk away, she couldn't rely, the police

let me interrupt you for one second. Let's make sure you mic is on, and if it's, if it is on, let's make sure it's pulled nice and close.

24

25

)	MICHAEL	SMITH:	Ttla	on	מזיז
4 I		SMITH.	lt's	on	now.

3 CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Ah, there 4 Even better. Why don't you start again? MICHAEL SMITH: Good morning, Mr. 5 Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name 6 7 is Mike Smith, I am the President and CEO and of 8 the New York Bankers Association. With me today 9 is our General Counsel and Chief Operating Officer 10 Roberta Kotkin. On behalf of the banking 11 industry, and its more than 200,000 employees, we 12 thank you for this opportunity to comment on Intro 13 960-A, a proposed ordinance which would mandate the installation of bandit barriers at all New 14 15 York City bank branches. As we have said before, 16 and will say again, security is a top priority for 17 all the banks in New York. Our Association and its member banks have worked closely and 18 19 cooperatively with the New York City Police 2.0 Department and law enforcement in general to 21 decrease bank robberies and the crime in general. 22 We have a tremendous amount of respect for law 23 enforcement in this area, and particularly the NYPD. Our collaboration has been successful in 24 25 achieving a significant reduction in the number of

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bank robberies during 2009, without the imposition of one-size-fits-all approach to bank security, such as that set forth in proposed 960-A. Since the New York Bankers Association strongly supports allowing each bank the continued ability to best determine and implement security practices tailored to best achieve its security goals, we oppose this legislative proposal. Our association is comprised of all the commercial banks and thrift institutions that do business in New York State, or New York City, also. Might add that's approximately 50 banks, ranging in size probably from about \$100 million to over a trillion dollars in assets. And each of those institutions has very elaborate security procedures, but as was noted in the earlier statements, I might add, that this is a diverse industry here in the City of New York. It's, and one that takes obviously its duties very responsibly as it relates to bank security. In 2003, during the last economic downturn, and a corresponding increase in bank robberies, a similar bill was considered and tabled. We believe that the facts are even stronger today against imposing such a burden,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

both because the number of robberies per branch has actually decreased since 2003, and because now, an even larger majority of New York City banks have bandit barriers. And yet these same bandit barrier locations continue to be the victims of a majority of the bank robberies. Although 2008 saw an uptick in bank robberies, the total number of bank robberies committed per branch was actually lower than the number committed in 2003, despite the fact that more than 400 additional branches have opened in the City, since 2003. A total of 1,300 branches, over 1,300 branches, were located in New York City in 2003, and a total of 400 bank robberies were committed that year. That's about, on a per branch basis, that's about a .31 percentage. In 2008, there were 1,707 branches. I know that's been discussed, and by the way I'd like to add that in banking, you've got the bank, and then the branches are part of the overall bank. And so we'll use branch, it could be Chase, for example, has over 400 branches with Washington Mutual acquisition. So, in 2008, there were 1,700, over 1,700 branches, and 444 robberies in New York

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

City, a per branch robbery rate of .26. To date in 2009, these statistics are down by another 30 percent, which is this trend continues, means more than 100 fewer bank robberies in New York City in 2009 than in 2008. And we certainly hope that trend continues. We believe this reduction in the rate of bank robberies is due at least in part to the arrest of several serial, note-passing bank robberies, which was the case in 2003, the case throughout all of our analysis, is we're dealing with serial, note-passing, non-violent crime, is the vast majority of the robberies. Moreover statistical data confirms that bandit barriers are not a panacea. According to several member surveys which we have conducted, more than 70 percent of the bank robberies which occurred in New York City over the last several years occurred at banks that had bandit barriers. Our recent data just for this particular period of time, the five months of '09, shows that number at around two-thirds. But when you take into consideration that the--we have about 1,300 branches in our survey, of our banks, and we'll provide you the name of those banks, along with the number of

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

branches, we'd be more than happy to provide that to the Committee. We feel that since the number of our banks reporting are so dramatic, that these numbers really will hold up to scrutiny. Thus the belief the passage of Intro 960-A would act as a significant additional -- over the la--pardon me. That these robberies occurred over, two-thirds occurred, over the last several years, at bandit barriers, banks that had bandit barriers. as was stated, and in the questioning earlier, we do not believe that this will add a significant additional deterrent. We are, and our members are, committed to the bank safety of their customers and employees, and the citizens of the City of New York. And we are extremely pleased that vast majority of these crimes are nonviolent. We rely, our members rely on a broad array of bank security measures, all of which are set forth in the bank security best practices, which we developed in conjunction with the NYPD in 2003, and which is attached to the testimony. Since that time, we have maintained an ongoing, constructive dialogue not only with the NYPD, but also with the FBI, and with Nassau and Suffolk

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

County Police Departments on bank robberies. In fact, in January 2009, we worked cooperatively with the New York Police Department to coordinate a bank security summit at police headquarters, which we, along with a number of our member banks, attended. However, we believe that banks should have the flexibility to differentiate their security measures based on their individual risk factors and business plans. The overall effectiveness of this strategy has been borne out through the years. As a result, we are strongly opposed to any legislative proposals, such as 960-A, in which specific security measures are We believe that the Introduction 960-A mandated. is particularly objectionable because it not only mandates one particular measure that may or may not be more effective than others, but also would require the expenses, expensive and unnecessary refurbishment of almost all New York City branches, including the vast majority of branches which hare already equipped with bandit barriers. Now I know that point has been, you've raised those question in your earlier testimony, and we recognize that there's interest in taking care of

that particular problem. Stated before, most 2 3 branches in New York City already have bandit barriers. And as a result, for example, the 4 recent acquisition by JP Morgan Chase of 5 Washington Mutual, many more branches are being 6 7 retrofitted at the same time, at the very time, 8 with bandit barriers. I might add that Chase now, JP Morgan Chase, I think will have about 410 9 10 branches in this City of New York, post-merger. We believe that the specifications of this bill 11 12 are such that they're clearly unnecessary with the trend line here, and I know that was noted earlier 13 Moreover, the minority of branches in the 14 also. 15 City which do not rely on bandit barriers have an array of other effective security tools which we 16 17 believe are equally effective at deterring crime. And I know you have witnesses following me. 18 And 19 it's more in keeping, and it may be more in 20 keeping with the bank's own individual business 21 plans. This - - appears to be well-founded as 22 confirmed in the U.S. Justice Department 23 publication, "Problem Oriented Guides for Police Problems" specific guide series, which is noted in 24 25 the testimony. That guide states there is no

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidence that every bank or branch needs to adopt the same rigorous and expensive crime prevention practices, practices that can sometimes make a branch look like a fortification. Instead, different branches face different robbery risks, even those are quite, even though they might be quite near to each other. Importantly, the burdensome provisions of Intro 960-A that require bandit barriers, not only to be installed in every branch, but also to meet specific underwriting laboratory levels, such as level two, and be constructed in such a manner to cause and prevent an individual from breaching the partition, would require the vast majority of our bank branch barriers, banking barriers, to be retrofitted. And I know that has been a part of your questioning. I submit that our arguments within our testimony as arguing that that not be the case, that there not be this level two implementation. It is our understanding that there has been no evidence to date in which the thickness and level and strength at the level one partitions, that they were proved ineffective. Yet, under this legislation as written, they would

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

all have to be replaced. Moreover, the requirement that barriers be constructed to prevent breaches could be interpreted to require partitions that reach to the ceiling, resulting in new and costly ventilation systems, and the creation of possible conflicts with the New York City Code, Fire Code. Yet the presumed marginal additional safety benefits are at best speculative. Our Association, and its members believe that the most effective deterrents to bank robbery remain vigilant surveillance--over 90 percent of our banks in our survey have digital cameras, and that is the, that is in the best practices and that was a subject matter of earlier questioning. Effective communication we believe is extraordinarily important because what we're dealing with here are serial robbers, which are going from branch to branch, using the mass transit system of the City of New York, and crisscrossing across the City, and we need to have effective communication. We had such with the Apple system that was put in post-2003; we need to work with NYPD to even, to upgrade that even further, where we could have total connection

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

between NYPD and all of our banks and their branches. Aggressive investigation of bank crimes leading to the apprehension and conviction of perpetrators, and the reaffirmation and strengthening of criminal, current criminal robbery statutes, which I know, and I believe is not within the jurisdiction of the City Council, but we urge that we take a look at our criminal statutes. The fact that so many of the bank robberies are committed by serial robbers, clearly illustrates this point. During an April 5th 2009 National Public Radio broadcast on NPR, both the New York Police Department and FBI asserted that three robbers were responsible for most of the bank robberies in New York City in 2008. robberies were note passing, as they said, nonviolent, serial, in which fortunately no one was hurt, and I emphasize no one was hurt, and the only damage done was to the victimized banks, who by the way pay for this loss. Since the apprehension of several of these serial perpetrators, the bank robbery rate has dropped dramatically. However, unless the penalties for committing this crime are increased, so you do not

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have conversations among criminals as to this crime, all the bank security measures in the world will not deter criminals from attempting to rob banks in the future, particularly during times of Bank robbery is a serious crime, which stress. causes trauma for all the people involved in the branch, customers, and employees alike. It is an attack against commerce and finance, and the citizens of the neighborhoods of the City of New York, including seniors who rely greatly on their branches. At least five states have recognized this fact and passed tough new laws that identify bank robbery as a specific crime. We would urge that New York do the same, sending a strong message to would-be bank robbers, that there are serious consequences for those who attempt this This action, we believe, would be far more crime. meaningful, far more effective, than the mandating of bandit barriers or any other particular security measure. If the Council were determined to move ahead with 960-A, as been enacted, or as you are considering, we would urge that a number of modifications be made to incorporate the element of flexibility into barrier mandates:

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

grandfathering of existing branches, which already have such barriers; use of uniformed guards and cash dispensing machines as an alternative to barriers; and a recognition that the penalties for this serious crime should be made stronger, so that punishment will be an effective deterrent. In conclusion, we pledge to continue our work with the New York Police Department, the Mayor, and with you, the New York City Council and this Committee, to reduce the rate of robberies, bank robberies in this City. We would also urge that banks in New York City continue to be allowed to rely on flexible, multifaceted approach to security. This approach, along with effective communication between banks and law enforcement, and increased penalties, we believe, is the most effective means to ensure the continued decrease in 2009 in bank robberies, while protecting the safety of our customers and our employees. you for this opportunity to testify today, and stand ready for questions and providing any further information.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you very much, Mr. Smith, and we appreciate your

2	testimony. Just to add an element of drama to the			
3	hearing, I will note that a bank was just held up			
4	on 89 th Street, in my district, an HSBC Bank. I do			
5	not know whether it had bandit barriers or not.			
6	MICHAEL SMITH: I think			
7	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: But			
8	MICHAEL SMITH: I think HSI			
9	believe they do.			
10	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: You believe			
11	that they are a bandit barrier bank.			
12	MICHAEL SMITH: I said I believe			
13	that.			
14	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.			
15	MICHAEL SMITH: To my knowledge,			
16	but I won't			
17	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Alright,			
18	well it's obviously, you know, one of the			
19	continuing concerns that we have about what's			
20	going on, regardless of what the numbers are			
21	showing at this particular moment in the year. On			
22	the subject of the level one versus level two, it			
23	sounds, most of your testimony sounds like, was			
24	the concern about making the retrofit or change to			
25	the existing barrier. So you must've been			

2.0

2.3

heartened by the Commissioner's comments that he
felt that there should be a grandfathering of
existing harriers in this legislation

MICHAEL SMITH: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. How many, are all of the 1,707 banks in New York City members of your association?

MICHAEL SMITH: A certain number are not, but the vast majority of banks and branches are. I believe ours, our number of branches represented in our survey is about 85 percent of all the branches in the City of New York. So there would be a number of banks, wholesale banks, limited purpose trust companies, some foreign institutions, but on the retail side it's, our Association represents the vast majority of the banks.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. So, we're trying to get a handle on some of the numbers that you heard us asking Commissioner

Kelly about, on the subject of the number of banks that have barriers versus the number that don't.

You noted in your testimony that I think you said the large majority of banks have bandit barriers

branches and the banks and what we would commonly consider a bank, that you could walk into, and that could be subject to a robbery, what are we calling those? Are we calling those--

24

25

bank, we're talking about corporate headquarters

25

Number of years.

with bandit barriers.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MICHAEL SMITH: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Do you dispute the statistic that the Police Department gave as to last year's numbers? And they only gave us for last year, and they said that 47 percent of the robberies and attempted robberies took place in banks, sorry, branches, without barriers, and 53 percent with. Does, is that consistent with your understanding for last year's numbers at least?

MICHAEL SMITH: We just conducted a survey knowing there, that there was going to be a hearing. And also to going back to the beginning of this year. First of all, I'd like to state

20

21

22

23

24

2	that, as I said at the outset, we represent in our				
3	survey about 1,300 of the 1,700 branches. And our				
4	statistics are holding. Now if you go back over				
5	several years, we used the number 70 percent, but				
6	currently we're at about 66 percent. Roberta				
7	conducts these surveys for us, with the banks, so				
8	we would hold at 66 percent today. Now, they,				
9	the, obviously the New York Police Department, and				
10	I know you've requested that information, and we				
11	would be more than happy to talk with them and				
12	with the Council about the, where we are in terms				
13	of the exact numbers, because we do not have the				
14	exact number of crimes. Both the FBI and the New				
15	York Police Department collect this data. And				
16	this is whether it's successful or not in terms of				
17	a robbery.				
18	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Right, the				

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Right, the attempt versus the actual robbery.

MICHAEL SMITH: Exactly.

ROBERTA KOTKIN: I will say this.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Please

identify yourself before you start.

ROBERTA KOTKIN: Oh, Roberta

25 Kotkin, General Counsel and COO. In all of our

2	surveys, and we pretty much represent, I think,			
3	all the banks that don't have bandit barriers.			
4	So, our numbers would be even larger on the banks			
5	that do have bandit barriers if you include non-			
6	members. But our surveys have consistently shown			
7	at 65-66 percent of the robberies have, were at			
8	bandit barrier. The only 53 percent we had was			
9	the first quarter of this year. And that has gone			
10	back up toand that was 53 percent, so it did			
11	seem to be consistent with the Commissioner's			
12	numbers. But that was only a three or four month			
13	period. Annually, it's well over 60 percent, of			
14	our, of the, the surveys that we conduct.			
15	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. That			
16	number 53 percent we had for the 2008 overall			
17	number, and you're saying you saw that number			
18	ROBERTA KOTKIN: Ours is, was			
19	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: For first			
20	quarter 2009.			
21	ROBERTA KOTKIN:was higher.			
22	That's correct.			
23	MICHAEL SMITH: First quarter.			
24	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, so			
25	MICHAEL SMITH: Then they went			

ROBERTA KOTKIN: I think on a pure statistical basis, yes.

MICHAEL SMITH: Yeah, sure, on a pure statistical basis, sure.

25 CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Oka, okay.

21

22

23

24

2.0

2.3

And how do respond to the Police Commissioner and
the Deputy Commissioner pointing out the success
rates of the non-bandit barrier banks? They gave
the following numbers: Sovereign Bank, 100
percent success rate; TD Bank 100 percent success
rate; WaMu 92 percent success rate; Metropolitan,
100 percent success rateand then contrasting
that with Citibank where they said, as a bandit
barrier bank at around 22 percent for success.
How do you respond tothose numbers are
4

MICHAEL SMITH: I think--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --

significant numbers to me. How does the Banking Association respond to that?

MICHAEL SMITH: Well, first of all we're dealing with rates as a percentage, the crimes as a percentage of the number of branches at each institution, so the num--you know, if you look at the net numbers of all the robberies, you have to splice out this rate issue. There was discussion of the walk-away policy, and the bandit barrier. I might add, which we have discussed with the Council even going back to 2003, that it is totally a discretionary policy. And it's a

2.0

policy that it's discretionary whether the bank
employs it or not, and they have that discretion,
but number two at the employee level. And we do
not advocate, and I believe the Commissioner
joined in this, walk-away. So, that may be an
element of it. I don't know, Roberta, if there's-

ROBERTA KOTKIN: Well, I think the success is in those banks where, where it's not successful there has been a walk-away, because of the bandit barrier. However, there is tremendous disparity in our banks, and very strong feelings, there are some banks that say they would not exercise that policy under any circumstances, because they're concerned about the safety of the people on the other side of the bandit barrier, the customers and workers who aren't on the side where the teller has walked away.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: But that's not even an option in the non-bandit barrier banks, correct?

23 ROBERTA KOTKIN: Oh, uh-huh.

24 CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

25 MICHAEL SMITH: Except there was a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

discussion, Mr. Chairman, and in the bill there is this alternative, and I know that may come up in further questioning, about cash-dispensing machines, and I know that the Commissioner mentioned this in his testimony, about making sure that that was just an ATM facility. It's my understanding that there are, you could, you know, very well use a cash dispensing machine that's not "an ATM" as an alternative. That's where the teller does not have actual access, except for that amount that's been approved by the debit card or by a code, to be actually dispersed to the customer. That's an example. Stepping back for a second to your original question -- We, and to emphasize, we strongly suggest that mandates, specific mandates, be not imposed on an industry that clearly has the protection of its customers and its employees. And that there may be technological changes, there may be misallocation of resources where you're diverting attention away from a specific security procedure. And so we, we strongly would recommend, and we will, we are committed as an association, all of our members, to working with you and with the NYPD, on anything

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that is effective. And we do believe, and I think you will be hearing from a witness, from one of our banks, who's going to testify as to what they're doing where they do not have bandit barriers.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Last question from me before we go to my colleagues is, do you believe that bandit barriers are effective in deterring robberies?

MICHAEL SMITH: I--I think that that question, first of all, we do not profess ourselves, we are not criminologists or bank security. You will get a--there is not an agreement. It is one of the security measures that is employed by a number of banks obviously, and there are those who would argue that it is a deterrent. But we believe that it is clearly not a unanimous opinion. And number two is there are other alternatives to the bandit barrier. And I know that there was discussion about hostage taking and the possibility of a problem with people who are on the other side of the barrier. There are a significant number of bank employees and certainly customers on the other side of that

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 barrier, who are conducting business. And so,

3 that's a concern of everyone in our industry.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

Thank you for that. Chair Vallone.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you, again. I asked Police Commissioner Kelly to address your concerns, and now I'm going to ask you to address his, just as the Acting Chair did. You started off by talking about how much crime, how much bank robberies are down, all crime is down tremendously, so it's not all that indicative of anything. Ray Kelly said that, that there's a huge percentage of bank robberies which are occurring where there are no bandit barriers. Your testimony says, and even a large majority of New York City banks have bandit barriers, and yet they continue to be the victims of the majority of the bank robberies. Of course they do, because they completely outnumber the ones without the bandit barriers. So, how do you explain the fact that 90 percent of the banks have bandit barriers, but anywhere from 53 to 70 percent of the bank robberies are occurring at the banks that don't, which means that ten percent of the banks.

you guys explain that?

3 MICHAEL SMITH: I think that we 4 have an element, a criminal element, that is going 5 around the City and they see, they're looking, they have a specific objective in mind, and if it 6 7 says bank or branch on it, they may be going into 8 those facilities, irregardless of the existence of a bandit barrier. And that's why in our 9 10 testimony, and I think it's been proven and the 11 fact is, more than happy to share this with the 12 Council, but there are a number of states that have specifically, we do not have, in our New York 13 14 State law, to identify bank robbery as a specific 15 And the local police department has the crime. onus of dealing with that crime. And we think 16 17 that if this creates this kind of a situation where we are today, that we think that these 18 19 individuals should not be spending less than a 20 year, I don't even know what the numbers are, but 21 we certainly anecdotally have heard of bank 22 robbers being let out. Now, under federal statute 23 it's my understanding, they cross a state line or 24 engaging in this crime on an interstate basis, the 25 penalty under federal law is pretty stiff.

Well, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE:

don't disagree with you at all. We need much tougher laws up in Albany. I've been asking for it since 2003. Chances of Albany doing anything are remote, and albeit actually taking, making any sentence tougher. That's one of the toughest things we have ever come up against, having Albany make any crime tougher, because that's where all good criminal legislation goes to die. And I've sent a Reso up there calling for this. Ray Kelly and I are probably not all that hopeful of that happening, and therefore he's now moved to Plan B, let's call it that, since nothing, since we can't assume Albany will do anything good. But that is the best option, I agree with you. put these guys in jail for a long time, and then we won't have these bank robberies, and you wouldn't have to, your industry wouldn't have to spend the money that it may have to spend under this bill. I know that you have made the argument that some of these banks were robbed more often because they're open more hours, or because their location. But Ray Kelly said that, or his Chief said that most of these robberies of all banks are

occurring in midtown, which would sort of mitigate that argument. How do you respond to that?

MICHAEL SMITH: First of all, I don't believe we, our numbers break down the location of these robberies. So, we would certainly welcome seeing, you know, the demographics of the robbery. And it might go back to the fact, and I wouldn't want to conjecture on this, in terms of the location of branches and the mass transit system, etc., etc. I think it's, it'd be best, probably, to look at the data and be able to respond after that.

appreciate you doing that, and getting back to,
I'm looking at, I guess you'd have to make that
request. Getting back to this committee, which,
with that information. One of the Commissioner's
other main arguments was the success rate, which I
wasn't aware of until today actually of robberies
which occur at locations without bandit barriers
as opposed to the ones that occur with bandit
barriers. And he said, I think to quote him, the
word is out on Riker's that these are easy marks.
And he's not saying that 'cause he feels that way,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he's saying that because he knows for a fact that the word is out on Riker's. How would you address that argument?

MICHAEL SMITH: Really? I--we heard that five years ago. And our response, it would be the response today, that shouldn't be the word on Riker's. This should be a serious crime, in terms of, you know, the intimation is that this is an easy job. And it's a major crime, it has tremendous impact emotionally on everyone in that facility, and those on the street, and we think it should be held at that level, even though it's note passing, serial, a nonviolent crime, which we think is thankful. And that the downturn in crime, and the fact that it's nonviolent is something that we, we should say the local police, NYPD, and the banking system, should be regarded highly for that result. And the fact that the numbers are down, and just like they were down in 2003 when we had our summit meeting and our best practices, they're down again this year, after our summit meeting and our discussion of best practices. And what can be done effectively to respond. And we've submitted not only our

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony against the specific features of 968, but also suggestions as to what could be done if you were to proceed.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I don't disagree at all, again, that this should not be the case, that Albany should be taking action. They won't. But we'd be na

ive to think that the policy of allowing the robbery to happen and the robber to walk out of the store, as bank policy, doesn't contribute to that notion on Riker's. obviously that's something you're working with Ray Kelly on, and you have been in the past, but I think both of those things are leading to that notion being out there. We discussed the fact that Ray Kelly came in today, and I think he was very amenable to grandfathering in almost anything, I hope, that banks have at this point. Is there, other than level one or level two, are there any other concerns that, any other things that you want to make sure that the City Council grandfathers?

MICHAEL SMITH: Mmhm.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: While we, while you're here today, you can make that

argument.

3	MICHAEL SMITH: Well, as I			
4	understand the testimony of the Commissioner, he			
5	was seeing the other, the best practices as			
6	recommendations, but on his mandates, I think that			
7	was correct. We have suggested that for those who			
8	do not have bandit barriers, given we have, you			
9	know, the ballistic one grandfathering, that			
10	securityuniformed security guards, and cash			
11	dispensing machines, be allowed. We think that			
12	they make sense, and I certainly would defer to			
13	those banks, and I know you're going to be hearing			
14	from an, one of our members, on the use of			
15	security guards. But we think that uniformed			
16	security guards should be allowed			
17	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Before			
18	MICHAEL SMITH: And I heard the			
19	police			
20	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Before we			
21	get to the amendments you want			
22	MICHAEL SMITH: Right.			
23	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Let's			
24	stick to the grandfathering part first			
25	MICHAEL SMITH: Okay.			

2.0

2.3

2	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE:just so
3	that I keep it straight in my head. Are there
4	things that exist now, at banks, that have the
5	bandit barriers, that you want to ensure are
6	grandfathered in. Let's assume the Council
7	doesn't

MICHAEL SMITH: We think that all existing barriers, and I can't speak, because we'd have to go back, I can't speak to the ballistic one, and the--we know the ballistic two, which is assault rifle type, which there's no indication that we've had that kind of robbery in New York. But we would be looking for a grandfathering of all existing security measures as they relate to the bandit barriers. And I think that's in the testimony.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Is there a height issue that's out there that you've been discussing, that I'm not aware of?

MICHAEL SMITH: Yes, the height issue would be created by the 960-A in its current form. We believe that crea--by the language of the proposal, you would have to deter someone vaulting the barrier, which would mean

the general business. I know there's some

business groups that'll be appearing, but I think

24

25

that question was asked earlier today, and that issue is what about other establishments in the business community that provide cash, and that whether it be through an ATM, a non-bank ATM, half the ATMs in New York are not banks, bank owned.

And we think that that's a very valid question.

But that's something that we would defer to the business, general business community, and to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: This is your chance to give some guidance to the Committee as to how you would want the legislation drafted, because it just popped into my head, but I'm, I know I see some of these small, I don't think it's called a branch, but when you go into, I don't know, it's not Eckerd's any more, who bought it out, I don't know, RiteAid, it's one of those places, and they have little bank booths with a person actually in it, not an ATM, but an actual person in these little bank baby branches, whatever they're called.

MICHAEL SMITH: Well, I think the, what we've discussed internally, we would certainly want to come back and discuss further with you is, is exactly what the type of facility,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the definition of facility we're talking about here. Because there are banks that have facilities within retail stores, but there are non-banks that are in retail stores, also. you know, it's not a, it is a very diverse, very elaborate system out there, that everyone uses the word "bank" in a generic term, or those who are handling cash in a generic term, that they are a bank, that is not true. There are different entities operating in the general commerce area, whether they're licensed or not by the banking department, and that's discussion right now under legislation that's been proposed in Washington. And I might add that in the federal law, there is a federal bank protection act, which stipulates bank security plans, bank have a security officer, the plan has to be approved by the Board of Directors, and that the onus for security falls on the bank and they're examined for their compliance with that security program.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Alright, we're going a little beyond my question, so let's, now let's get to what you wanted to speak about before, amendments. If this bill goes forward,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ray Kelly discussed, or was asked questions about an amendment regarding paid detail. And his position, I believe, and it was kind of tough to get it out of him, was that he was, he may support a paid detail, but nothing less than that. What's your position?

MICHAEL SMITH: We have pro--we would argue that it should be uniformed security guards with a proper definition attached to that. The industry historically as a group, has been opposed to armed quards over the years, and that excludes, by the way, paid detail. I'm not including that -- that would change matters. But historically, with violence and security the number one priority inside the branch, we have not, as an industry, nor on a national basis, armed security quards as, is pretty much to my knowledge, out of practice. So we are in favor of an option of uniformed security guards, we think that that is reasonable, until proven otherwise.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Okay. And obviously, you would support City Council's resolution to increase the level of felony on bank robbery at the state level from an E-felony to a

at this point, but I would see no problem in making the available, because our interest is clearly to provide you with all the information.

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: When you

2	talk about branches, do you, are you including the			
3	justas a branch, a location which is somewhat of			
4	a recent development, that just has ATM machines,			
5	is that a branch?			
6	MICHAEL SMITH: No, no it's not,			
7	it's a, to be considered a branch under the bank			
8	law, we're not including ATM machines. There's a			
9	significant number of ATM machines outside of the			
10	branch.			
11	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Now your			
12	counsel said that the most recent statistics are			
13	that 66 percent of the robberies were in branches			
14	that had bank bandit barriers. Is that correct?			
15	MICHAEL SMITH: That's correct.			
16	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Alright,			
17	so then if I can state it the other way round, 34			
18	percent of the robberies were in branches that did			
19	not have bandit barriers. Is that correct? In			
20	your recent survey.			
21	ROBERTA KOTKIN: Right.			
22	MICHAEL SMITH: That's correct.			
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: And that			
24	represented ten percent of the total number of			
25	branches surveyed.			

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:

Even

25

2.0

		branches	
harriers			

4 MICHAEL SMITH: Right.

ROBERTA KOTKIN: Yes, I mean, there is a statistically, yes, but as Mr. Smith said, many of the banks that do not have bandit barriers, happen to be open seven days a week, and longer, so I think that they will testify that that has a significant reduction on that actual statistic, and makes it much more benign.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I see.

Well, unfortunately I have to leave, I'll come
back, and I have, I leave a member of my staff
here to hear that testimony. I don't want to
ignore it. But I think that the bottom line is
very significant to me. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you very much, Council Member Koppell. And we now have no additional questions from members of this Committee for you, so we thank you very much for your testimony, and we look forward to working with you on this and many other issues to come, so.

MICHAEL SMITH: Thank you.

)	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:	Thanks.
′ . 1	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	- CALIDILI

3 MICHAEL SMITH: Thank you very

4 much.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Next up is
Robert McCrie, of the Department of Protection
Management at John Jay College of Criminal
Justice, and we welcome you Mr. McCrie, professor.
[pause, background noise] Dr. McCrie, we welcome
you. We have a copy of your extensive testimony
here. We'd like to ask you to put it into a
three-to-five minute discussion. We will
certainly follow up with you with questions, but
if there's a way to do that, we would be most
appreciative.

ROBERT MCCRIE: There is. Mr.

Chairman, and I'd like to commend you and the members of the Committee for addressing this issue. I'm here in support of it. I have been a specialist in security management since 1970, and during this period of time, I've followed bank crime all along. In response to a question that somebody made earlier, there is a bank crime statistics report, which the FBI refers to, and I refer to it later in my report. My statement is

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

organized around four points. First, how did bullet resistant barriers become a consideration for bank security? Next, do they have any utility? And is there any research about their use? Next, why does this measure have particular applicability for the City of New York? I'll try to shorten that. And finally, how may this proposed law be improved? A few moments ago, the, you learned that there was the Bank Protection Act of 1968 passed. And this law mandated that the control of the currency surveil banks to make sure that they would meet certain anti-robbery standards. And these included surveillance systems at the banks, robbery and burglar alarms, training on what bank employees should do during robbery, lighting of the vault after hours if it was visible from the outside, tamper resistant locks on doors and windows, and a security officer for each bank. Now, notice in this list of requirements by this federal act, which is still in effect, thought it's undergone a lot of change, there's no reference to these bullet resistant barriers. In fact, from the, despite the passage of this legislation, in the years 1973 to 1977,

the number of bank robberies in this country 2 3 increased by 90 percent. So, many banks on their own turned to the use of bullet resistant glazings, or plastic partitions, as a means to 5 protect tellers, and to reduce robbery. 6 7 materials for this weren't haphazardly chosen. 8 Standards have been carefully developed by a venerable independent standard setting 9 organization. UL, Underwriters Laboratories, had 11 been interested in security since the 1920s, 12 established its own security committee back then. In particular, the standards for bullet resistant 13 materials is ANSI/UL 752, that prefix ANSI refers 14 15 to America National Standards Institute. It means 16 that this standard has been used for many years, 17 it has been, undergone through a great vetting process, and is now established uncritically. 18 19 Materials that meet UL 752 provide protection 2.0 against attacks. Our discussion today only 21 concerns the use of these barriers in banks, or 22 bank branches. But utility also has been 23 demonstrated in such establishments as check 24 cashing businesses, ticket office, post offices, 25 subway stations, bus terminals. And they're also

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

used in access control applications, in computer facilities, police stations, so-called correctional institutions, liquor stores and after-hours retailers, and hospital offices. the years since the Bank Protection Act has been published and promulgated, physical and procedural measures have changed. And these reflect mostly the changes in technology. They allow banks lots of added, of latitude in operating their own businesses, and don't mandate particularly something rigid. Thousands of financial institutions on their own, in their own communities, across the nation, and other nations, have installed burglar resistant barriers without any legal requirement to do so. But are they, are they any good? What's the research on this? 1979, Virginia Commonwealth University and United Virginia Bank, jointly conducted research on this very topic. The FBI and the Security Commission of the Bank Administration Institute aided in this research, which was conducted by James Willis. And I provide a reference to this. This is one of the few printed, independent surveys on this topic. The survey studied crime banks in

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Virginia; also tellers were queried in banks, both which had barriers and which didn't have them. And the research also included a survey of 150 bank customers. And the findings: first that bullet resistant barriers do serve as a valuable deterrent in the crime, to the crime of bank robbery, compared with those branches without the barriers. Next, that customer reaction to barriers is positive, and barriers posed no real problem affecting customer relations. employees react favorably once they experience working behind barriers. To the statement "Your personal security is improved with the use of bullet resistant barriers," 91 percent of the respondents agree. Mr. Chair and Committee Members, there's a fourth point as well, that I didn't include in here, and that was concerning And the study determined that bank, these bullet resistant barriers were much more economical than the use of private security quards. The banking industry could do a much better job of supporting research on this, and related issues, and make their finding readily available. But the Willis research shows that

such measures do deter bank crimes. Now, these 2 3 bank barriers have not stopped bank robberies. 4 Nobody would expect robberies of financial institutions to drop to the zero range, because of 5 the installation of bullet resistant barriers. 6 Tellers or cashiers have control over lots of 7 8 cash. Therefore, inherent risk of victimization always is present. But incremental improvements 9 10 that are not unduly costly or complicated to 11 provide, are salutary and should be pursued as a 12 public policy. Now why is this matter 13 particularly important to us? The FBI defines robbery in a particular way, as I say in my 14 15 statement, and robbery is the third most important 16 of the eight index crimes that the FBI reports on 17 a semiannual basis. On a national level, robbery has trended down over the past two decades, from a 18 19 high of 680,000 in '91 to last year 445,000. 20 That's surely positive. But look what's happened 21 here in New York City: the scale of improvement 22 has been prodigious in crime mitigation. Robberv 23 has dropped precipitously, and I show that in my 24 table here, going from 100,000 in 1990 to 22,000 25 some for last year. This decline in serious

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

robbery, in crime, including serious robbery, over an extended period of time, is a great human benefit. It's genuine, it has attracted global fascination, and the desire by countless law enforcement organizations elsewhere to replicate "the New York Miracle" in their communities. Yet bank robbery is only one out of many kinds of robberies. In fact, bank robberies have constituted only two percent or three percent of all robberies nationally, in recent years. 2.1 percent last year. This crime, of course, obtains far more attention from the media, numerically, because of a number of reasons, that I won't go into, that are obvious. Table Two, that I include, shows that bank robberies have declined substantially in mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations since '91; they've been uneven in credit unions; we're here mostly because of our interest in commercial banks, and the pattern here has been uneven. In '08, it showed a national increase in bank robberies of 1.1 percent; however, here in New York City, as you learned from the Commissioner earlier today, and you know from previous reports, that a 57

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

percent increase in 2007, '08, that's in comparison with 1.1 percent nationally. New York City has about three percent of the nation's population, and it's the location for about eight percent of the nation's bank robberies. Therefore, while we have driven crime down generally, robbery down generally, this component of robbery last year went the other way. In this circumstance, there needs to be a way of improving it. Now, how may this law be improved? Well, I'm a professor, so I've got to find some nits, and one is the use of bulletproof glass is dated and not appropriate, and I've understood that you've already addressed that. I'd like to note some complaints about this bill, however, from a major component, the New York Bankers Association. president of this Association sent a measure, sent a letter to Christine C. Quinn on April 15, and was, it's available on the NYBA's website, and pretty much the same statement was heard in the preceding speaker. And here are the objections, first the problem isn't serious enough to merit the measure, because the number of bank branches is increasing, which actually decreases the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

potential of an incident. Prior to the past 18 months, the worst year was 2003, when 408 bank robberies occurred, or 0.31 robberies per branch. A number of changes were made and last year following the decline, it rose again to 444; but because the increase in the number of branches, that should be looked at as a success of the local economy. The incidents have dropped to 0.26 robberies per bank. But this is a sophistic argument that overlooks the fact that the situation deteriorated so seriously last year. This crime can't be allowed to grow because of arguments that more bank branches equals fewer robberies per branch. The second objection is And NYBA's statement argues that this would be an undue burden on the banking industry. Let me refer to what I mentioned a moment ago about that standard, UL 752. It has actually ten levels of bank resisting materials. The lowest, level one, protects against three shots from a nine millimeter, full metal copper jacket ammunition with lead core. And the highest, level ten, protects against a .50 caliber single rifle shot from ammunition filled with lead core.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

variation. The proposed bill calls for UL level If some banks have already install eleven one in recent years, at the request of the Police Commissioner, the bill supporters might give them some reprieve, and the Commissioner came to the same conclusion early with his remarks. And that's because the differences between level one, level two, level three, level four, are shades of difference, and not consequential to the current risk. And finally, bandit barriers don't work because 70 percent of the robberies in such equipped facilities as it is, that was in the statement, this comes from "several member surveys" which NYBA has conducted over the last several years. I've not been able to find these surveys on the NYBA's website, or in a wider search of the web. I understand that they may be provided to us. In any case, they represent only the members of the NYBA. Nonetheless, no proponent of this measure is likely to argue that this measure will eliminate bank robberies entirely, only that it will reduce the incidents with the have-nots. By compelling them to have this low cost measure, coupled with the passage of

this measure and other deterrent activities incidental to the bill, bank robberies in this City will be reduced. The banking industry has contributed so profoundly to our current recession through its support and sale of subprime mortgages and loans within the securitization of loans and credit derivatives, and the banking also has reduced the importance of security executives and managers in their daily operations since the 1980s, I'll speak to that if you want to. And so they can't be turned to as credible authority for improving their own physical security. I'll answer any questions if—

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Great,
thank you very much. Thank you for your
testimony. I have just a few questions for you,
sir. You noted in your testimony that the number
of bank robberies in New York City were up last
year from its prior year by 57 percent, and that
they were up only 1.1 percent nationally. You
also cited the fact that New York has three
percent of the overall population, but eight
percent of the bank robberies. You want to just
tell us what's going on here exactly? Is this a,

2	is there something particular about New York, or
3	is this something related to the absence of bandit
4	barriers? Is it the proximity to good
5	transportation options? Something we pride
6	ourselves on in this City? What's going on here?
7	ROBERT MCCRIE: It sounds as if
8	you've got good insight as to what those
9	explanations might be. We have a concentration of
10	opportunity for bank robberies to occur here
11	because of the large number of bank branches in
12	geographic area.
13	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. So
14	let's talk about the bandit barriers. As somebody
15	with knowledge of what is going on more broadly
16	than New York City, how prevalent are bandit
17	barriers in branches nationally? Is this
18	somewhere where we've heard statistics of that
19	vast majority of branches in New York City have
20	them, maybe 90 percent or more. Is that similarly
21	the case with branches nationally?
22	ROBERT MCCRIE: It is not. There
23	is no national standard as to what the
24	installation rate of the bandit barriers is

nationally. In some areas, local banking

2.0

associations in Texas, for example, have noted a
high level of installation there. But nobody
knows what the figure is nationally. It's not
collected by any organization I know of. I might
say however I've just returned from Italy where I
visit many banks and didn't see one without a bank
barrier or something much more serious, a bandit
barrier, so that a customer had to go in through a
kind of a trap before being entered in to the bank
itself.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: And how are the numbers on bank robberies in Italy?

ROBERT MCCRIE: I don't know.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

There is an alternative floating around out there, which would allow banks to either have a barrier, what we're calling a bandit barrier, but perhaps colloquially, and perhaps that's not the precise terminology; or to allow for there to be uniformed officer in the bank, from your level of expertise and your professional background here, do you believe that such an alternative would create the appropriate level of deterrent?

ROBERT MCCRIE: There's really no

2	science to guide us here, but there's common
3	sense. The common sense is that a uniformed
4	security guard provides extra eyes and ears and a
5	physical presence that would logically deter bank
6	robbers. He or she would look at the customers as
7	they come in; additionally presumably there would
8	be cameras recording the presence of these
9	customers as well. And perhaps give a friendly
10	greeting and it would be enough to determine, to
11	deter rather, people who had the intention of
12	robbing that institution.
13	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Do you see
14	any distinction between a uniformed security
15	guard, as you just termed it, and somebody who is
16	an official representative of the New York City
17	Police Department?
18	ROBERT MCCRIE: Considerable
19	difference. Yes. And a considerable cost
20	difference, as well, of course. The

21 CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: And what is 22 the difference?

ROBERT MCCRIE: The uniformed police officer represents a much more serious risk for a note passer than simply a security guard

does.

3	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Do you
4	think thatSo, let me just make sure I understand
5	where you come down on the question of allowing a
6	bank to have an option. Would you give them an
7	option if they were going to bring in an NYPD paid
8	detail for all of the hours that the bank is open?
9	ROBERT MCCRIE: I would, as long as
10	there's no backsliding on that commitment, that
11	they're, it doesn't mean that for one hour per
12	shift there's nobody there because of lunch breaks
13	or whatever.
14	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Understood.
15	Now how about if you were to give them the same
16	option but not with paid detail, but rather a

ROBERT MCCRIE: Well, that would be a deterrent as well. Again, as I say, we've got no science to guide us.

uniformed security quard?

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. But would you regard that as an appropriate deterrent to a bank robbery? I mean, we're considering an option here which would give an option, which would give an alternative to bank. Either put in

2.0

2.3

the barrier or put in a uniformed guard. Do you
believe that uniformed guard, putting aside having
that guard as an official representative of the
New York City Police Department, would provide an
appropriate deterrent to a bank robbery.

ROBERT MCCRIE: I believe it would be an appropriate deterrent. I don't think it's an equivalent deterrent, but it's appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

Would you use the word "satisfactory"? A satisfactory deterrent? Is it enough deterrent.

ROBERT MCCRIE: It's an

improvement. The Committee has come up with a specific idea, I'm in favor of that idea, the security guard idea is an additional deterrent, as well, that's also worthy of consideration. But I think a more economical, cleaner kind of proposal is to have the bandit barriers, and additionally have uniformed security guards, or paid detail, if the bank chooses to.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, two last questions, we, I realize that we're under a little bit of a timeframe here. The appropriate height for these barriers? Is there an

[pause, background noise]

25

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Gentlemen,
thank you, we're passing around your prepared
testimony. Before we go any further, I want to
make a disclosure myself, in that I do have a bank
account with TD Bank, for whatever it's worth.

MALE VOICE: That's terrific.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Since we're all in the spirit of disclosure these days, that obviously would not impact the way I evaluate this issue in any way, but I am a client. And whenever you're ready.

GREG BRACA: Good afternoon, my name is Greg Braca, and I am the President for Metro New York for TD Bank. We appreciate the opportunity to continue the discussion about 960-A, as well as the safety and wellbeing of our customers and all of our employees. Before I begin with my prepared testimony, though, I do want to make a couple of comments. Sitting through and hearing some of the dialogue, a lot of it's come down to percentages and effectiveness. And I want to add a couple things. Clearly TD Bank was raised a number of times, as far as the number of robberies, and I do want to make some

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

distinctions. If we are talking about percentages, and clearly we look at this data very carefully, our hours of operation are open in many cases almost twice as much as many of our local competitors, and if we're looking at robberies per store, or per branch, wouldn't we then look at robberies per hour of operation? And in fact, given we have built all of our stores within the last seven or eight years, and we've built them in all high profile locations, not on side streets but all on corners, near easy transportation, it's a much more complicated issue than simply looking at how many times you were robbed per the number of stores you operate. It's a far more complex issue than that. So, with that being said, when we look at per store hours of operation, clearly our store hours swell in many cases from 73 stores, if you're to look at comparable hour of operation, to nearly 150. Continuing with the testimony, a top priority we focus on every day is the wellbeing of our customers and our employees. In addition, no organization New York City is more interested in stopping bank robberies than we are. These are both very crucial issues, where the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interests of TD are identical to those of the citizens and the government in New York City. So let me make three points. First, I'm proud to say that TD Bank has a perfect safety record in New York, where not one customer or employee has ever been injured or taken hostage at any TD Bank in New York City. Others may equal that record, but none can surpass it. Each of our offices provides about one million transactions a year, operating seven days a week in high volume locations. Despite our business model, that makes New York City offices among the most active in the world, we have no evidence that it creates any risk to public safety, but there is evidence that if we have to install bandit barriers, it could increase the risk of hostage taking or injury to our Second, as our consultant, University customers. of Pennsylvania Criminologist, Dr. Lawrence Sherman, has advised us in 2002, there is no clear evidence that bandit barriers reduce the number of robberies. We have commissioned him to do a new study in Manhattan in 2005, which reached the same conclusions. Thus, two U.S. studies show that bandit barriers don't work. After a review of the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complete evidence gathered by Dr. Sherman, I'm sure you will agree with the proposed legislation, does not meet the minimum legislative standards for a positive impact. Third, we believe there are far more effective ways to reduce the risk of robbery per transaction. The idea of bandit barriers, quite honestly, have been around as long as there've been bank robberies. Our own business model has cut the rate of robbery per bank office in half since 2003, largely by investing in these other measures. They include the use of uniformed security, which has better U.S. evidence of deterring bank robberies than bandit barriers. And that we therefore recommend the Committee, if it decides to adopt any bill on this issue, it would be in the public interest to allow banks to spend more money on quards than bandit barriers would ever cost, as an alternative to using bank barriers. We would also suggest that there are new and modern techniques to deal with bank robberies, such as cash dispensers, instead of tellers having access to the full amount of cash they're accustomed to using. These are all better solutions, in addition to what you'll be hearing

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

shortly from us, is the investment in state-ofthe-art cameras and digital cameras, that can provide police officers with real time information and real quality pictures on the robbers. Clark, President and Chief Executive of our company, TD Bank, accepted the NYPD Commissioner Ray Kelly's invitation, and met with him earlier in 2009. Our Chairman promised that TD Bank full cooperation on this issue, and also ensured that TD Bank would be a positive outlier as far as robberies going forward. In fact, if you look at data from March on, with the full compliment of paid detail, cameras installed, and what we feel are the best practices, we've had two robberies in the last four month. One occurred where we caught the robber, who was a career criminal. Now, I'll ask our president, my president, Peter Meyer, to read a brief summary of the written testimony we submit to you by Dr. Lawrence Sherman.

PETER MEYER: Thank you, Greg.

Ladies and Gentlemen, please let me make these four points in absentia. I have prepared extensive written testimony with data analyses that directly address these issues. These

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

analyses may be summarized as follows. First, TD Bank has a perfect safety record in New York City, from using other security besides barriers. Second, the rate of robberies per bank office has fallen by 50 percent since 2003, both citywide and at TD Bank offices. Third, bandit barriers may increase injury to and hostage taking of customers. Fourth, there is no clear evidence that the bandit barriers reduce robberies. mean by clear evidence is a study that meets the standards the U.S. Department of Justice adopted in meeting its Congressional mandate to use rigorous scientific methods in assessing what works and what doesn't to prevent crime. The effect of bandit barriers has never been tested in a rigorous enough manner to meet those standards. Even my own 2005 study, done at the request of TD Bank, fails to provide clear evidence on this question. What is 100 percent clear is that TD Bank has never had a customer or employee injured or taken hostage in a bank robbery. This perfect safety record spans the equivalent of 340 office years of doing business in New York since 2001, with 73 offices now operating. These offices are

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

safe despite the robberies that inevitably occur in big cities, largely because TD has made safety its top priority. The evidence from other countries that violence against customers increases after bandit barriers are installed, is a useful reminder that TD Bank has only one way to go in its safety record. In Germany, for example, there were no hostages taken in bank robberies in the six years prior to the widespread introductory of bandit barriers. In the next six years after bandit barriers were introduced, the percentage of robberies with which hostages were taken soared to seven percent, usually by taking customers or employees hostage the minute the robbers walked in the door. The occurrence of violence against customers in New York and elsewhere in the U.S., in banks with bandit barriers, is also an important issue that should be researched carefully to avoid implementing security measures that increase hostage taking and injury. preparing for your vote on this question, I would be happy to answer in writing any questions you may wish to pose to me. Let me conclude by saying that the best study of bank security done to date

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

has found that security guards reduce the
likelihood of bank robberies, but bandit barriers
do not. Thank you. I'd also like now to
introduce Bob Dunlop, TD Bank Director of
Corporate Security and Investigations.

ROBERT DUNLOP: Good afternoon, and thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address this Committee. My name is Bob Dunlop, I'm the Senior Vice President and Director of Security for TD Bank. Prior to joining Commerce Bank, now TD Bank, I was a member of the New Jersey State Police for 30 years. And prior to my retirement, I served as, joint roles as both the Executive Officer and the Deputy Superintendent of the New Jersey State Police. My bio's attached with my written testimony. Please let me expand, if you will, on Dr. Sherman's testimony, by describing what has happened in banks here in New York, in regards to bandit barriers, which was, which has never happened in New York City at any TD Bank. And at the risk of being redundant, this information was provided by Councilman Gentile earlier, but I think I'd like to reinforce it. This information, we gleaned from the New York

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

City Police Department reports, as was stated earlier. Both incidents happened in Jamaica, Queens, and in both cases the banks had bandit barriers installed prior to the robberies. And in both cases, the criminals took customer hostages. This kind of even that I describe had not, to my knowledge, ever occurred at a TD Bank in New York City. Again, on April of 2003, in Jamaica, New York, a suspect walked into a bank that was equipped with bandit barriers, he put a knife to the neck of an elderly female customer, and then demanded money from the teller. The suspect eventually was apprehended by private security. In May of 2003, at another bank in Jamaica, New York, two suspects entered the branch, one of the suspects approached the first teller window and held up a note announcing a robbery. The teller who was behind the bandit barrier locked her drawer and walked away. The suspect approached the next teller window and the employee at that station activated the alarm and also walked away. The suspect then shouted, "Don't walk away, come I will kill somebody!" According to bank back! officials, he then took an elderly male and threw

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that gentleman to the ground. The second suspect then placed his arm around a customer's neck and forcibly removed the customer's pocketbook. the suspects fled. These incidents are not confined to New York. Thankfully, they are relatively infrequent in the United States, although not in Europe, where bandit barriers are far more common. Our search for incidents of hostage taking in the United States revealed several other events, which are recounted in full in the appendix to my testimony. In August of 2008, two bank tellers were threatened with being shot at through bandit barriers at a San Francisco credit union. Two days later, the tellers were taken hostage as they approached the bank. were then forced to open a vault and gave the robbers in excess of \$76,000. In July of 2008, at another location in Long Branch, at a different bank, a customer was held up at gunpoint and threatened with death, while telling, while tellers behind a bandit barrier gave the robber money, gave the robber money to avoid injuries. In November of 2007, a Milwaukee bank customer suffered a gun being pointed into his back by a

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

robber demanding access to the area behind the bandit barriers. When admitted, a robber held a gun to the employee's neck and threatened to shoot her until he was given in excess of \$90,000. As a security officer, these are the kinds of incidents that I fear will happen in our own bank if we are forced to install bandit barriers in every branch. That is why I have worked closely with Dr. Sherman since 2002, to make sure that we're doing everything possible to protect our customers and employees. This included my commissioning Dr. Sherman to conduct the study regarding bandit barriers in Manhattan back in 2005. One of the concerns I have is that the customers are, you know, our branches, as you know, are very busy. We have more customers on the floor that are not behind bandit barriers, and employees, than we do behind the bandit barriers. I am fearful that if we resist, if we put up bandit barriers and we start to have our tellers resist the bank robbers' demands, that we are going to get into a situation which sooner or later, someone is going to be injured, taken hostage, and possibly killed. That is my fear with bandit barriers.

2	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you
3	very much, gentlemen. Let me just follow up with
4	a couple of questions and recognize that we've
5	been joined by Simcha Felder, Council Member from
6	Brooklyn. You noted that you, that you've not
7	seen any injuries to tellers or customers at a TD
8	Bank, and that's a point of great pride. And I
9	think we all recognize and appreciate that.
10	Commissioner Kelly, when he was here, he was
11	giving some statistics about the level of success
12	of the robberies at various banks around the City.
13	And he said at Sovereign Bank and WaMu and TD
14	Bank, as several banks which have a 100 percent
15	success rate for robbers who are going in, and
16	trying to, and making an attempt, I guess he's
17	saying, that they are making successful attempts
18	at TD Bank 100 percent of the time. How would you
19	respond to that?
20	ROBERT DUNLOP: Well, Chairman, as
21	you know, you can do a lot with statistics.
22	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Good, help
23	us out.
24	ROBERT DUNLOP: Yes. So what he
25	didn't tell you is that in 40 percent of the

2	robberies that we've had, our tellers have given
3	out dye packs, and in many of those cases,
4	resulted in the arrest of the robber. So I think
5	that you have to take that into account, also.
6	What, I think what the Commissioner was referring
7	to was that when they do the walk-away policy,
8	which I believe would put someone, customers at
9	great risk, they consider that a success.
10	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Correct, I
11	think they do, because they gave the example of
12	Citibank as having a 22 percent success rate when
13	there's an attempted robbery. And that is
14	presumably because of the walk-away policy,
15	somebody hands the note, they walk away, and then-
16	_
17	GREG BRACA: Yeah, but here
18	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: I guess
19	somebody just is, gives up, at that point.
20	GREG BRACA: Just to respond to
21	that, and I've been in banking for 25 years, and
22	you know, I've seen all sorts of measures tried.
23	The problem with the walk-away policy, one, is
24	generally that individual's going to continue, and
25	we've seen in multiple cases where they didn't get

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it one branch, so they went in a store and tried the next bank. So what you have is you wind up having multiple incidents, rather than dye pack given out, the robber leaves, it explodes, and it's easy to catch the -- So now what you have is you have multiple incidents in a given day from an individual trying to get the score they were looking for, one. The second problem from a management standpoint, of the walk-away policy, is it becomes very difficult when you have in many cases part-time employees, 18-19 year old students in some cases as tellers, and you're asking them to make the determination, "Is this a safe time to Is this a not safe time to walk away?" walk away? From our standpoint, we're never going to employ the walk-away procedure, because we don't want our local teller making that one-off decision, "Does this individual really mean business, or is this just a relatively harmless--" and I don't know if there's such a word--"not passer?" CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, so,

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, so, if I understand you correctly, you would qualify that 100 percent "success rate" at the TD Bank branches by saying that of the 14 that took place,

2.0

2.3

that was the number that Commissioner Kelly gave,
I assume that was a 2008 number, 40 percent of
those involved a dye pack that was added to
whatever was handed over, and resulted in the
apprehension of the robber? Is that what you're,
is that what I'm hearing you say?

GREG BRACA: Well, 40 percent is the number of dye packs that were handed out. I think what we have to do is back to you and determine how many times that translated into rob-into actual apprehension.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, so, okay, then let me step back for one second then.

So, of the 14, you got a dye pack in there in 40 percent of the--so, let's say five or six times, and then what happened, we don't, we're not certain as to what happened after. Maybe they were apprehended, maybe they were not.

GREG BRACA: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

Alright, on the subject of hostages, because I-you all spent a fair amount of time on the point
that if you have the barrier, you are potentially
putting customers at risk because of the potential

of hostages. You gave a couple of examples and we heard a couple of examples here. Sounded like those were hostage situations which took back, took place in 2003, at least in one or both cases, I don't remember. But how common is this? A hostage situation where there is a bandit barrier present? And let's just do this, you know, mechanically here. In 2008, of the robberies in bandit barrier banks, how many of them involved a hostage situation?

ROBERT DUNLOP: The problem with that term is this: banks don't publicize that.

And if it's not called into the paper or if it's not brought out in a police report, you're not going to get that. I know another security director that I had talked to, just recently had, this is back in February I believe, had a armed suspect come into his store, had, or the branch, that had bandit barriers. The man immediately went up and grabbed the first person that was there, who happened to be an employee, outside the bandit barrier, took her with a gun and got behind the bandit barriers. So, this is, I can't give you statistics 'cause I think you're going to have

2 a very tough time finding--

on, just to qualify something. We don't have statistics on the hostage--or instances. But we do have NYPD's own statistics in 2008, that there were a higher percentage of armed robberies, which is reported, armed robberies, at branches with bandit barriers, than branches with not. And our concern is that, that is a trend that we would not want to see continue.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Let--if you have those numbers, let's talk about the armed robberies at bandit barrier banks versus non-bandit barrier banks.

GREG BRACA: We have that.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. Do you--can you share that with us now?

GREG BRACA: Do you have that?

ROBERT DUNLOP: Yeah, I do. First,

let me say that, in regards to the number of robberies that occurred at branches with bandit barriers, you had asked several witnesses in regards to, the New York Police Department provided a document to the executives that

2.0

2.3

2	Commissioner Kelly met with, which indicates that
3	64 percent, in 2008, let me be very specific on
4	this, on 2008, 64 percent of the bank robberies
5	were at branches with bandit barriers. And I'd be
6	willing to share with you that presentation for
7	you.
8	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: That's
9	fair, I think that's consistent with the testimony

fair, I think that's consistent with the testimony we heard from the Bank Association, as well.

Although, Commissioner Kelly had 53 percent as his number, in fairness. But, okay, so we realize there's some differential there. But let's talk about the armed versus the non-armed at the bandit and the non-bandit banks.

ROBERT DUNLOP: Okay. So, let's take the 2008 numbers, which were provided to us by the Police Commissioner. So, in 2008, of the 444 robberies, 64 of those were armed. And 380 were unarmed.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, and I'm sorry, so that's of the overall number, 444 in 2008, 64 were armed and 380 were unarmed?

ROBERT DUNLOP: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. And

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

break that down for us between bandit barrier and non-bandit barrier banks.

ROBERT DUNLOP: Alright, I'm asking

John McCluskey to find that for me. [pause,

background noise] If you, if you could hold out,

I'm, I'll ask John to keep looking if we can.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, you look at that. And let me just go back to the earlier question, because I just want to make sure that we have a general understanding here, that we don't, we can't really point to the stats on the subject of hostages, for any conclusive determination here. I know that there's anecdotal evidence, but we don't really have a lot of stats that we can point to, to say that of the robberies, armed or not, in bandit barrier banks, we're seeing a higher number of hostages. Right? I mean, we don't even know how many hostages were taken in the last five years in banks with bandit barriers. Do we have that number? We don't, right? And so, this is an important one for us 'cause we're, you know, you're making a reasonable point about the concern that we would all have about what happens if you have an armed individual

2.0

2.3

on the outside of a bandit barrier, what are they going to do in that situation, but we don't have the stats to back up what exactly does happen in those situations.

GREG BRACA: Well, I would answer that in a couple ways. You really don't get better than zero. We've been operating as a company for years--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: For you, for you, but you have no bandit barriers.

GREG BRACA: No, but this is the argument I guess we're making, is that you don't get better than zero: no hostages, no employee, no customer has gotten injured. And from our standpoint, with all of the data that's been presented to us, there is no clear empirical data that bandit barriers actually solves the problem, one. Two, it's a solution that's been around for as long as there's been robberies. And three, we have no incident of violent action in any of our New York City branches. And that's a formula we think we don't want to mess with. We do think there are alternatives, and we think there's the guard, we do think there are technologies that we

quite frankly as a company have just spent several million dollars, including upgrading to digital cameras in all of our stores, so we give real time data to the police on a real time basis, in a CD-ROM. So I mean, those are the sorts of things, there is no panacea or quick fix here with these situations. And I think what we're trying to say is we're trying to do it in a way where our customers and employees remain as safe as they've always been.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: But, and this is my last question, and we're going to Council Member Koppell, but wouldn't you acknowledge that TD Banks and other non-barrier banks, are being, are seeing attempted robberies in higher percentage than in banks with the barriers. We looked at, we have statistics here which now tell us that 90 percent of the banks in New York approximately have the barriers, and that it's about 50/50 or so, between the banks that are being robbed with the barriers versus without the barriers. So, that would suggest to us that, you know, a considerably higher percentage of those without barriers are being pursued. Isn't that

fair?

3	GREG BRACA: Well, we might
4	fundamentally disagree a little bit, because
5	there's a sort of double counting going on. When
6	we talk about 90 percent of the bandit barriers,
7	of the banks have bandit barriers, that's all
8	banks with any sort of bandit barrier. When you
9	start talking about 53 percent of the banks that
10	got robbed with bandit barriers, those were only
11	bandit barriers that met a certain code or they
12	were a certain height. Ourand our study, as
13	well as the New York Bankers Association, would
14	say that it's probably upwards of two-thirds of
15	the total robberies occurred in branches with
16	bandit barriers, that's number one. Number two,
17	we do think, as remote as it may seem, given some
18	recent statistics, this is about public safety,
19	zero, we're zero, nobody's gotten injured, no
20	one's gotten hurt, it's about getting the
21	individual out of harm's way, and then finding the
22	best possible way to track 'em down.
23	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, I,
24	thank you for that, and I would just add the point
25	which is that I think you're right, that

2	individual gafoty is switigally important have
∠	individual safety is critically important here.
3	We want to right, find the right balance, though,
4	so that we're dealing with police resources and
5	overall resources, to make sure that we're not
6	inviting problems. And there are alternatives
7	that we're looking at, obviously, and we know that
8	TD Banks is interested in alternatives which would
9	allow for you to have an option. But I'm not
10	going to carry on any longer, I'm going to Council
11	Member Koppell.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you.
13	And I apologize, but I have another Committee
14	meeting, so I'm going to have to leave again, but
15	just to, I heard you saying you have a zero injury
16	rate, even though you don't have barriers. Now,
17	you have how many, 76 branches now, in New York?
18	GREG BRACA: 73.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: 73? Okay.
20	Citibank has about 136 branches. Do you know how
21	many injuries they've had to their customers or
22	their staff from robberies? Citibank?
23	GREG BRACA: I do not.
24	ROBERT DUNLOP: I don't have that
25	statistic.

Τ.	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAPETT 101
2	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But
3	there's no, you have no showing of any hostage
4	taking at Citibank. You showed one hostage taking
5	at Chase, but none at Citibank. So can we say
6	that Citibank probably also has a zero record,
7	just like you do?
8	GREG BRACA: we don't know that
9	information.
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: You don't
11	know. Now what about Bank of America? Do they
L2	also have a zero record?
L3	GREG BRACA: We don't know.
L4	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay. But
L5	since we don't know whether there was any hostage
L6	taking there, we have no record of any, presumably
L7	they could come in and say the same thing, that
18	you do. So they could say, "Look, we have bandit
L9	barriers, and we have a zero record. So that
20	shows that our practice is good." And you say we
21	don't have it. It seems to me that the absence of
22	hostage taking doesn't prove very much, because
23	the only way it would prove a lot if there was a

lot of hostage taking at the banks with bandit 25 barriers. Now there's one example of Chase, you

23

24

25

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 102
2	gave one example, but they have 275 branches. You
3	can't make too much of one hostage taking.
4	GREG BRACA: Isn't one too many?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Yeah, one
6	is too many, but I would suspect that if you read
7	your further narrative, you'll see that there were
8	instances, banks with bandit barriers, your own
9	narrative points out where there was a bandit
10	barrier, they took a hostage to get around the
11	bandit barrier. So, I don't know. It just
12	doesn't seem to me, one example proves anything.
13	And Citibank could come here and say the same
14	thing you say. I just
15	GREG BRACA: Councilman, if I may,
16	could I just
17	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: It doesn't
18	prove one way or the other.
19	GREG BRACA: You missed the opening
20	comments I made when you walked in, but I would
21	just add though, that if you took our 73 stores,

branches, that you refer to, we would make that argument that the only comparison, or only data being used, is number of branches per robbery. We would argue, isn't it really about hours of

2.0

operation, and isn't it really about volumes of transactions, and what's the incident of robber based on transactions and hours of operations.

And we would make the argument that in many cases our stores operate almost twice as many hours as many of our competitors, and we would also make the argument that our 73 probably operate the hours of about 140 plus stores of normally competitors.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Let me just ask you this, why do you think that 90 percent of the branches have bandit barriers? Could you speculate for me, why?

ROBERT DUNLOP: Because they, I think I can give a self--feeling, a feeling of confidence for the people that are behind the bandit barriers. And I think that that's done, some of these bandit barriers may have been put up for employees. When you get to a crowded operation like we have, where we have many, many customers on the floor, and also employees, and are not protected by the glass, then we're very concerned. And I think you have to look at some of these other banks and see what their

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But that's

2 transaction volume is, and ask them those

questions as to why they decided to put it up.

a very interesting point, I think, and I appreciate your mentioning it. The, you have a 100 percent safety record, it's true, and that's good. But you also have a high percentage of instances where the robbery involved a credible threat to the teller. The teller is obviously the most likely object of the robber. And though that may not cause a physical injury, it may indeed cause a psychological injury, that doesn't exist at least to the same extent to a teller behind a bandit barrier. Now what's your answer to that?

ROBERT DUNLOP: I believe that the physical threat is accentuated when someone resists a robber. In all my career in law enforcement and before that, into the present day as far as I know, police officers train folks not to resist robbers, because they're, it could escalate into a violent situation. In this particular case, what we're saying is that our folks are trained to cooperate and get the robber out of the bank. We don't want anyone injured.

∆nd	wego	ahead	T ' m	SOTTV
And	WE GO	aiicau,		SOLLY.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: No, go ahead. I'm sorry.

ROBERT DUNLOP: Part of it is, I
think one of the main things that we do, is we
have excellent, state-of-the-art camera systems,
which will identify the facial features of the
robber. We use the other, I'm not going to go
into the safety measures that we do use, but we
use enough safety measures that certainly can help
law enforcement apprehend these robbers.

must admit, if you're a teller, and I don't care what age they are, but let's take a 21 year old young woman, who's standing behind a counter, and someone comes and passes a note and says, "I'm robbing the bank, give me the money or else," that's pretty frightening situation, isn't it?

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: And if they had a gun, it's even more frightening, much more frightening, if they show a gun.

ROBERT DUNLOP: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But if

ROBERT DUNLOP: Yes, it is.

2.0

2.3

2	they're behind a bulletproof barrier, it's not so
3	frightening, is it?

ROBERT DUNLOP: No, but here's the, here's the equation. The idea of the bulletproof barrier is, I think proponents of the barrier, say that goes hand-in-hand with a walk-away policy.

Because if the robbers know there's no walk-away and you're going to get the money anyway, there is no absolute deterrent. Our view of that is, we are not, to your example, we're not going to put this 21 years old lady in the position of determining, "Is this a real bad guy, or is this just sort of a bad guy?" and we're going to determine whether that person's going to walk away or not.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But I don't think the police would recommend a walk-away policy unless there's a bandit barrier.

ROBERT DUNLOP: Well, that's what we're talking about, though. The point is--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But what I'm saying to you, first of all, if you--no, there's nothing in the bill that says, "If you install a bandit barrier that you have to do the

walk-away." If you decide for your employees you don't want to do it, that's fine.

ROBERT DUNLOP: I think, I think
the Commissioner, and I think the NYPD, would
agree that the real deterrent, as far as actual
numbers of robberies, walk-away goes hand-in-hand
with bulletproof barriers. If you don't have a
walk-away policy, quickly, I mean, they testified
in the fact that the robbers know what's going on.
They get together in prison, they talk about who's
the easy victim. If there is no walk-away, what
is the effectiveness on number of robberies,
they're going to come in and get the cash, anyway.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: All I can say is, I put myself in the place of the teller, and as far as I'm concerned, if I was a teller, I would be a lot happier working in a bank that had a bulletproof barrier.

GREG BRACA: What I'm trying to do is put myself in the place of, I've got branches in New York City that do 100,000 plus transactions a month. And I'm putting myself in the place of our customers and all of our employees. And I think what we're trying to focus on, there are

best 21st Century practices that get at the heart of the issue. And I think if, when we have fully rolled out what we've done over the last four months, look at our results for the last four months, they're best in class in the entire industry. And we could talk about them over line, we're not going to talk about them in public here, but they're best in class practices, that have resulted in best in class performance over the last four months.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
Council Member Koppell. Council Member Gentile.

Mr. Chairman. It seemed to many of us here that the Commissioner, in speaking about the possibility of having uniformed duty, paid duty officers in the bank, which you do, I suppose, is a viable alternative. It seemed that he was suggesting that, but he also seemed to suggest that he couldn't be certain of the bank's commitment to continue to have those paid duty officers in place over the long period of time. So, it seems to me that that's a sticking point for the Commissioner in this case.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GREG BRACA: I'd be happy to address that. And basically there's a couple things here. We are committed to best in class stats around bank robberies and best in class practices on a go forward basis, as long as we do business here. So that's number one. Number two, we, while we believe, we agree with the New York Bankers Association, that we don't believe this should be, get the industry through a legislated mandate on one particular way to deal with this issue, because we do believe it's a complex issue. And there are different issues, depending on different banks, and their operating models. what we would be supportive, if some bill had to get passed, is that we do believe there should be and/ors because bandit barriers are not going to be the final solution. I think we all agree there's going to be bank robberies with bandit barriers. We believe that there are better solutions, including uniformed guards, cash dispensers behind the tellers, where they don't have cash drawers. By the way, that gets out there pretty quickly, too, that there is no access

to cash from the tellers. Best in class cameras

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that get digital photos, that we can really help the police catch these guys. We think there are best in class solutions that get to the real heart of the matter, not just bandit barriers.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: So are you suggesting that any amendment would expand on the alternative of having paid guards? And other best practices you're indicating?

GREG BRACA: Again, we believe that you can't legislate best practices, but if we were going to have a solution and a bill was going to get passed, you really need to look at an and/or and a menu of options because different banks have different issues. They really do. You have banks operating on the second floor, down in basements. You have 'em operating in super markets. You have a whole host of issues you're dealing with here, that aren't as simple as a one-size fits all approach. And we do believe, quite frankly, that uniformed guards are one of the best practices, and significantly cuts down not only on the occurrence, but helps with apprehension.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: See, but the argument has been, that has been made here

2	several times this morning, is that the armed
3	guards are so prohibitively expensive over a long
4	period of time, that if you just made the
5	investment in the barriers, one time investment,
6	you'd have, you'd be, you'd have at least some
7	security at that point. What's your reaction?
8	GREG BRACA: We heard that, too,
9	but I think that's a business decision, each
10	business is going to have to come to grips with
11	and determine what's best for its own business.
12	And clearly in our case, we've been willing to, at
13	this point, spare no expense in making sure we
14	have best in class stats. But we do think you
15	need to give businesses the option of how to run
16	their organization.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Thank you,
18	Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
20	Council Member Gentile. Now, Chair Vallone.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Actually
22	that last question was what I was going to ask
23	about that. In your business decision, if you
24	decided to do it that way, to spend the money

because you thought you were making more money,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and thereby employing more people, by using paid detail. But, so let me just ask one quick question, 'cause I know we have to get out of this room, actually, and I missed most of your testimony, so I don't want you to repeat it. again, to address what Ray Kelly said, since I asked him to address what you would be saying. Let's assume you're correct, that the public is safer with--the public is safer with the bandit barriers, even though they'd be marginally safer because there's one hostage taking situation in ten years. But let's assume it's safer. Kelly said the word is out that you're an easy mark, because you can walk into your bank, get the money, and your policy is "Let 'em leave." says the public's not safer, because they now have to respond to more bank robberies, and that takes police away from the rest of their duties, even if those duties are trying to find the robber a week later by taking detectives off the case. So how would you respond to that?

GREG BRACA: I'd respond that I am supporting and paying to have 73 New York City police officers, in full uniform, at all of my

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

stores throughout the five boroughs. My response to that is, I'm actually paying to have more cops on the street, not less. That's number one. Number two, my second response would be, is that we've had two robberies in four months with what we consider to be our fully implemented best practices. Two in four months translates to roughly whatever the number is on an annualized basis, you know, six over a twelve month period of time. And in one of those two incidents, we actually helped with our private security, apprehend a career criminal. So our answer is, to that question, is that we think that there are best practices, there is cash dispensers for the tellers, which limits the amount of cash that the crook can get. Two, we have uniformed security, and three, digital state-of-the-art cameras. think that combination starts to really present a powerful--and we've seen it over the last four months. Best in class stats over the last, since been fully implemented.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Well, I think it's a very good point. Just occurring to me now that these stats, for the most part,

2.0

2.3

reflected a period of time before you started
using paid detail. When did you stat using paid
detail?

GREG BRACA: Paid detail wasn't fully rolled out until the first week of March. So we have almost four months of full data on either security or paid detail. That coupled with a several million dollar investment in digital cameras at all of our New York City stores, along with cash dispensers for all tellers.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: So, how do the stats compare to the four months prior to paid detail, and the four--and your other improvements to the four months after?

I'm sorry, I was--

ROBERT DUNLOP:

GREG BRACA: The four months prior.

Well, we can significantly say we've seen a

dramatic decrease in the number of attempts, and

no matter how you measure 'em, attempts, success

rates, in the immediate four months, or on an

annualized - - . Dramatic, dramatic improvement.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I think we'd be interested in getting those statistics when you get a chance, because as we decide

2.0

whether to amend the bill, that would be very helpful. And I've got a--you would also support my resolution to increase the level of felony for bank robbers, correct?

interesting comment, because even on our meetings with the Police Commissioner, I think we're all lockstep on the fact that if you just look at the 2008 data over the 2007, that they'll say there was a 57 percent increase in the amount of robberies year-over-year for the entire industry, the biggest percentage of that increase was repeat offenders. Repeat offenders. 62 percent I think is the number where repeat offenders that accounted for the increase. So we think we need to change the sentencing.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
Chair Vallone. And with that, we're going to
thank you all for your testimony. We appreciate
your presence here today. I think that there were
a couple of stats that we requested, including the
armed versus unarmed, so if you could provide
those all to us as a Committee as a follow up,
that would be most appreciated.

CDEC	BRACA:	דור ו הדעד	~~+	+ h om	+ ~	~ 1 1
UAND CALD	BRACA.	we ll	966	CHEIII	LO	all.

3 Thank you.

Next up is Carl Hum from the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Linda Baron from the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce, Jack Friedman from the Queens Chamber of Commerce, and John Schoolman from the Partnership for New York City. Let me apologize in advance, we have to put you guys on the clock because we are being pushed out of this room. So I hate to do that, but let me apologize in advance. And--whoever's ready can go right ahead and get started, so we can get it moving.

[off mic]

CARL HUM: Good morning, Acting
Chair Garodnick, Chair Vallone, and also the
distinguished members of the Committee on Public
Safety. My name is Carl Hum, I am the President
and CEO of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. To
my left is Linda Baron of the Staten Island
Chamber of Commerce, and to my right is Jack
Friedman from the Queens Chamber of Commerce.

Lenny Caro of The Bronx Chamber of Commerce, and
Nancy Ploeger from the Manhattan Chamber of

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commerce could not be here today, but have given their permission to associate their chambers with our testimony this afternoon. Together, our chambers represent the five borough chambers representing business communities in all five boroughs, and boast a combined membership of 5,000, well over 5,000 dues paying members. you for this opportunity to testify before the Committee on Intro 960-A. We appreciate and applaud the Committee's continuous efforts to make our City safer and to institute business practices to promote security for the wellbeing of employees and customers. On its face, Intro Number 960-A would seem to do such; however, as well intentioned as the bill may be, Intro Number 960-A does little to promote security, and rather represents a potential floodgate to government intrusion upon business practices that should be left to the discretion of that community. Government's mandatory installation of certain business practices should only be required and made mandatory when preferred outcomes that benefit the public are produced. To be sure, preventing bank robberies and promoting the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

general public safety are worthy and laudable qoals. However, it is worth highlighting that 90 percent of the bank branches across the five boroughs already have some form of bandit barriers. Yet, as we heard this morning, despite this high rate of bandit barrier installation, robberies, although declining in frequency from this year compared to last, were still not prevented. With these facts in mind, one would have to conclude that the installation of bandit barriers to the remaining ten percent would do little to nothing to prevent further robberies; indeed, this morning, and part of this afternoon, we have heard no conclusive empirical evidence that bandit barriers would prevent any further robberies. Perhaps what would prevent future bank robberies is the required presence of uniformed security guards and lengthier sentences for those convicted of bank robberies. For the reasons stated, we believe Intro 960-A amounts to nothing more than unnecessary government intrusion upon our banking community's business practices. Bills like Intro 960-A are well intentioned, but carry the unintended consequence of adding operational

25

2	burdens to our business community, which is
3	already challenged by the myriad of rules,
4	regulations and taxes imposed by government. At
5	this particularly sensitive time for our business
6	community, we must make sure, and I'll wrap up
7	here, we do all we can to make sure that the
8	business community thrives. It is no secret that
9	our environment this time right now is considered
10	as business unfriendly; in fact, New York State
11	ranks almost dead last, 49 out of 50 states, for
12	its business unfriendliness. An Intro like 960-A
13	would only burnish our image as a unfriendly,
14	business unfriendly region. Again, thank you for
15	this opportunity to testify today, and we'd be
16	happy to answer any questions that you may have.
17	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you,
18	Mr. Hum, we'll go on todo any of the other
19	Chambers have specific testimony, or? Okay, Mr.
20	Friedman, go.
21	JACK FRIEDMAN: Rather than be
22	repetitive, Queens Chamber represents dozens and
23	dozens of banking members, and they're all in

agreement on this issue. Just to echo a call,

said it's not pro-business when government gets

involved and starts dictating what the proper
business model is for a bank. It just doesn't
make a lot of sense. There are many, many, many
security measures that have been used by banks,
whether it's TD Bank or other banks, and these are
experts, they want to protect their employees,
they want to protect their customers, that's in
the bank's best interest. So again, we would
urge, please don't pick any one-size-fit-all
solution, it's just never a good idea for
government to do that.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you.

Hi, I'm John Schoolman, with the
Partnership for New York City. And not to echo
what these guys have already said, we would also
have the Council recommend that in the
legislation, possibly mandating that the NYPD work
with specific bank branches on their specific
safety needs. Different neighborhoods, different
places, with a lot of mass transit may need, you
know, they may need certain types of features,
where other ones that don't have a history of bank
robberies, may not need certain things. This
would I think allow the, kind of the best use of

2	all of our technology, all of the best practices,
3	to kind of go forward and kind of, you know,
4	really tackle this issue effectively. Thanks.
5	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you
6	very much. Seeing no questions from my colleagues
7	here, I will just ask one, and then we're going to
8	be done. Which is, the numbers that we heard were
9	that 90 percent of the bank branches have the
10	bandit barriers, and about 50 percent of the
11	robberies take place in banks without them. Does
12	that give any of you any pause about what we're
13	inviting in the banks, without the barriers?
14	CARL HUM: First off, the, I think
15	there was some dispute as to what the percentage
16	is. So let's be clear
17	CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, at
18	the highest it was 60, 60 or 66 percent, orbut
19	either way, it should be in some parallel, right?
20	66 percent of the
21	CARL HUM: In either situation,
22	though, both statistics cited said that over half
23	of the robberies were done in branches that had
24	bank, had bandit barriers.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: That's

correct, but it should be 90--right, if 90 percent of the branches have bandit barriers, then you would assume that if there's a fair distribution, 90 percent of the robberies would take place in those branches, and that ten percent would take place in the rest. You know, if the overall number of branches that have 'em is 90 percent, and there was a fair distribution among all branches, then you would see 90 percent of the robberies taking place in those branches.

CARL HUM: I would argue--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: We saw that there's a higher number, as a percentage basis, of the branches without barriers. And my question for you all is, does that not give you any pause or concern?

CARL HUM: Well, I would argue the other way, in fact, in saying that if 90 percent of the branches are out there already have bandit barriers, and yet over half of these crimes are being perpetrated at places with bandit barriers, it would seem inconclusive to have any of the remaining branches to install bandit barriers to prevent any further robberies. I don't

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

necessarily think that it should be proportional, but rather, but the fact that over half of these crimes are perpetrated in areas that already have bandit barriers, which seems to prove the point that it doesn't make any difference.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Go ahead, yeah.

JACK FRIEDMAN: I just wanted to throw one more thin in there. I wouldn't get too hung up over the 34 percent attempts into the branches, because we're not taking consideration several important factors. One is the new best practices that are being put in effect, which are not taken into account with these statistics. So, things that TD Bank are doing, for example, have resulted in tremendously lower number of robbery and robbery attempts. And that's not taking into account the statistics from 2008. And the second thing that TD Bank pointed out, where their branches are located, the hours that they're open, you can't look at these things equally. So, the 34 percent attempt set number's just not a viable statistic when you take into the other things into consideration.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay, we're going to let you have the last word, since we have to leave here. We thank you all very much for your testimony and for your presence. And with that, it was an honor to sub in for my Chairman today, and with that this Committee is adjourned.

[gavel, background noise]

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

Signature

Date August 4, 2009