1	COM	MITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM	1
2	CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YOR	o v	
3			
4			
5	TRANSCRIPT OF 1		
6	Of t		
7	COMMITTEE ON JU		
8		December 12, 2018 Start: 1:22 p.m.	
9		Recess: 3:14 p.m.	
10	HELD AT:	Council Chambers - City Hall	
11	BEFORE:	RORY I. LANCMAN	
12		Chairperson	
13	COUNCIL MEMBE	ANDREW COHEN	
14		ALAN N. MAISEL DEBORAH L. ROSE	
15		ERIC A. ULRICH	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 2
2	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
3	
4	Insha Rahman Program Director at the Vera Institute of Justice
5	Aubrey Fox
6	Director at Centre for Justice Innovation at the Criminal Justice Agency, CJA
7	Dawit Getachew
8	Criminal Defense Attorney and the Associate Special Counsel to the Criminal Defense Practice At the Bronx Defenders
9	
10	Joshua Norkin Staff Attorney with the Legal Aid Society Special Litigation Unit
11	
12	Dave Long Executive Director of the Liberty Fund
13	Sarah Cassel
14	Program Manager at the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, MOCJ
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2.4	

2

[gavel]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Good afternoon. I'm 3 Councilman Rory Lancman, Chair of the Committee on 4 the Justice System and I'm Chairing this hearing 5 examining recently established or expanded programs 6 7 designed to mitigate the damage of our existing money bail system. We are joined by Council Members Debi 8 Rose from Staten Island and Alan Maisel from 9 Brooklyn. today on Rikers Island there are thousands 10 11 of inmates who are free to walk out the door to their 12 freedom, back to their families, their jobs, their 13 schools but only if they come up with the money to 14 pay their bail. Our current money bail system is an 15 abomination and no doubt future generations will look back on it with the same disdain that today we look 16 17 back on debtors' prisons and the practice of putting 18 people in stocks. Although the legislation should abolish money bail, our district attorneys should 19 20 stop seeking money bail and our judges should cease setting money bail, city government is not without 21 2.2 its own leverage at limiting the scope and impact of 23 money bail. Today we will examine two such efforts funded by city tax payers, one specifically at the 24 initiative of the city council. The first is the Vera 25

2	Institute for Justice's bail assessment pilot and the
3	other is the Criminal Justice Agency's newly expanded
4	bail expedition or BEX program. Between, between the
5	two, we are seeing huge potential for rewriting the
6	traditional bail script. New York's current bail
7	statute allows for nine possible forms of bail to be
8	set and it requires that the that bail be set with
9	consideration of a defendant's financial
. 0	circumstances. The different kinds are cash bail, the
.1	commercial bail bond, a credit or debit card, an
.2	appearance bond where the defendant promises to pay
.3	the whole of amount of the bond if they fail to
. 4	return to court, or a surety bond where another
.5	person like a friend or family member makes the same
. 6	promises on behalf of the defendant. Both appearance
.7	and surety bonds come in three types; secured,
. 8	partially secured, or unsecured which can require
. 9	collateral, a small refundable deposit to the court
20	or some indication of ability to pay the full amount
21	in the future like an expected paycheck if the
22	defendant fails to appear but will require little to
23	no money up front to secure release. However, until
24	recently only two forms of bail were regularly set by
25	the court; cash and commercial bail bond and rarely

if ever did anyone ask a defendant if he of she could
actually pay the bail that was being set. That is why
so many people spend time on Rikers Island for
seemingly small amounts of bail; 500 dollars or a
thousand dollars. For many New Yorkers 500 dollars
may as well be five million dollars. Cash and
commercial bail bonds are the simplest for courts to
set but the hardest for defendants to pay. They leave
defendants scrambling to pull together the full bail
amount immediately to pay in cash or relying on
commercial bail bond agents who at best charge
nonrefundable fees and at worse take tremendous
advantage of vulnerable people in need. Vera's bail
assessment pilot along with its previous efforts to
increase the use of so-called alternative forms of
bail is demonstrating how a little information can go
a long way. By performing a quick interview and
documenting an individual's income and expenses
including housing, child care or child support,
medical bills, student loans and basic necessities
Vera calculates how much money a defendant can afford
to pay and makes an on the record on the record
recommendation to the judge. More than just the
amount. Vera also emphasizes the availability of so-

2	called alternative forms of bails like partially
3	secured or unsecured bonds. These options require
4	little or no money up front allowing a defendant to
5	avoid a life destabilizing pre-trial stent at Rikers
6	Island but full payment if the defendant does not
7	return to court. Vera's results have been promising
8	in the Bronx where they have been operating since
9	March and we are excited that they have recently also
. 0	launched in Queens. The BEX program has existed far
.1	longer but it has recently taken an even larger role
.2	in Vera reform efforts. The criminal justice agency
.3	helps those with bail set and navigate helps those
. 4	with bail set navigate a complicated system. CJA can
.5	now hold an individual at the courthouse for up to 12
. 6	hours while trying to get in contact with friends or
.7	family who might be able to post bail before an
. 8	individual is sent to Rikers and put through a long
. 9	expensive and often unnecessary intake process. With
20	the expansion of the BEX program, CJA has also
21	increased its ability its eligibility threshold to
22	help those with bail of up to 5,000 dollars. The data
23	from these programs demonstrate how relatively minor
2.4	interventions can significantly change outcomes for
25	those with bail set making defendants more likely to

be released quickly, decreasing our jail population
and focusing attention on the injustices of our
current cash bail system. Maintaining and expanding
these important programs, building upon their
successes and learning from their collected data will
help countless people while educating the public,
prosecutors and especially judges about the essential
reforms we need. I look forward to hearing today from
organizations and advocates devoted to working
towards a new conception of bail about their efforts
and how the city can help. With that we look forward
to hearing testimony from our friends from Vera and
CJA, if you would raise your right hands so we can
swear you in and we can get to your testimony. Do you
swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is
the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?
Terrific, do you want to go first?

INSHA RAHMAN: Little... oh, there now it's working, I turned the light on. I've never been known to be quite but still. Good afternoon and thank so much for this opportunity to come and speak with the Council about the... about our bail assessment work.

Now we launched this project because we were curious about three key questions. The first was what would

judges do if they had individualized specific
information about a person's ability to afford bail
when making their bail decision. The second is what
would judges do if they were provided with
information about the forms of bail that a person
could afford beyond cash or insurance company bail
bond. And the third question we were curious about is
what impact that would have for individuals who are
accused of a crime and their ability to make bail and
go back to their homes, their families and their jobs
and preserve their presumption of innocence while
fighting the charges against them. And so earlier
this year we launched the bail assessment pilot in
the Bronx where we've been operating for a little
over six months and then more recently in Queens and
we are in the day arraignment part on Tuesdays and
Thursdays in the Bronx and on Wednesdays and, and
Fridays in Queens and we actually started this
project based on another study that we had done with
the Office of Court Administration over a year ago
where we encouraged public defenders to ask for
partially secured and unsecured bonds and we trained
judges on these so called alternatives, I will call
them more affordable forms of bail that are easier

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

for people to afford and what we found in doing that study where we tracked 99 cases over the course of three months in which judges sat unsecured bonds where the defendant actually didn't have to pay anything to be released, it was a promise to pay if the person didn't appear in court or if judges set a partially secured bond where the person was responsible for paying ten percent, no more of the bail amount and then they were released with the understanding that if they didn't come back to court and bail was forfeited then they would be liable for that remaining 90 percent. And so we followed these 99 cases for over a year to find out what happened when judges actually used these forms of bail and to our knowledge this was the first time that an effort had been undertaken in such a sort of robust way to get judges to actually use these forms of bail building upon the work that certainly our public defenders at the Legal Aid Society, Bronx Defenders, Brooklyn Defender Services, and other offices across the city have been working on for years to get judges to consider all nine forms of bail available under our bail statute. And here's what we found in this study is we found that when judges set unsecured and

partially secured bonds, people were able to afford
bail at much higher rates and that comes as no
surprise to any of us as being able to afford ten
percent of a bail amount or simply a promise to
return to court is far less onerous for a person than
having to pay the full bail amount or to go a bail
bonds company where even if you put only ten percent
down that's ten percent of the bail amount that your
family will never see again, ten percent that's
essentially lost. The difference with partially
secured bonds is that money is actually paid to the
court but its returned at the end of the case
regardless of whether the person is convicted or
acquitted, or the case is dismissed. So, that's money
that's essentially a deposit but is returned. And
what we also found is when judges use partially
secured and unsecured bonds basically the sky didn't
fall down, people returned to court at the exact same
rates that they do if they make the full money bail
amount or a an insurance company bail bond and also
no there were no increases in re-arrests during the
pre-trial period. And from our court observations
during this three month study what we also found is
that the reason why judges would consider a partially

secured or an unsecured bond is when they actually
secured of an unsecured bond is when they actually
had a little bit more information about the case in
front of them and so we noticed that when public
defenders said your honor, I've spoken with my client
and this is how much they earn in a week and this is
the two jobs that they're working and this is how
much they pay in transportation and child support and
this is how much they pay to in rent every month
that's when judges actually set these alternative
forms of bail in part because I think they were moved
by the information that was specific and
individualized to that particular case. And so,
building off of that we launched this project in the
Bronx and Queens to see if we provide that kind of
individualized, specific information in front of a
judge every single time they are making a bail
determination what actually happens. And so, I want
to share a little bit of data from our first six
months of operation in the Bronx. This data set
includes 112 cases and it ranges from misdemeanor to
felony cases including some violent felony cases. We
have no restrictions on the kinds of cases that we
will take and assess and provide this information to
the court in part because we believe that somebody's

ability to afford bail doesn't change based on
whether you're charged with jumping the turnstile or
you're charged with something much more serious and
so this is available to anybody who is at risk of
having bail set. And here's how the project works is
our bail specialist sits in the front row of the
courtroom and if the defense attorney picks up a case
and thinks I think this is a case where bail is
going to get set they come and speak with our bail
specialist and she conducts an interview in the
interview booth in the arraignment court room with
the individual, with the defendant and she asks a
series of 30 questions and we'll be submitting in our
testimony the bail calculator that is used to ask
these questions and they essentially ask questions
about the person's sources of income from their
employment, their sources of in, income from public
assistance and then their financial obligations such
as rent, child care, food, transportation, the things
that you need to get by and based on that information
we calculate a monthly disposable income that's
available to this person and from that which
proportion of their disposable income should go
towards bail payment and the reason that we developed

this particular calculator and this particular
formula is because we firmly believe and the research
suggests that when people do have to pay for an
emergency such as paying bail or for a debt all of
their disposable income should not go towards bail
payment because inevitably that's coming out of money
that they otherwise would spend on rent or on food or
on other necessities and so we were very careful to
actually work with a social science research lab at
Duke University to make sure that we were calculating
a person's ability to pay appropriately so that while
it certainly would still be squeeze especially on
families in the Bronx, which is one of the poorest
congressional districts in this country, it wouldn't
be so much of a squeeze that bail was unaffordable
for individuals as we know it currently is in our
current practice. And so, of those 112 cases that we
have assessed so far, here's what we found. One sort
of shocking statistic at least to me and I was a
public defender in the Bronx so this should actually
come as no surprise but it still really floored me
was that over 50 percent of the individuals that we
assessed had no ability to pay and in fact many of
them were operating in the red and that shouldn't be

surprising again given sort of the circumstances that
people in the Bronx are in and how many people are
not employed or underemployed but still I think
that's an important statistic for the City Council to
hear thinking about the future of money bail and
whether or not money bail feels fair even if it is
done in a individualized and considered way. Of the
folks who had no ability to pay, our bail specialist
asked, do you have any body else who can make bail
for you and in cases where people said yes I do have
somebody, here's there's contact information, our
bail specialist's job is to persist in getting a hold
of that person before the case is called in
arraignment to give that person a fighting chance to
actually be able to make bail if bail is in fact set
and what we found is when there's somebody whose
dedicated job it is to get a hold of friends and
family members we actually succeed. In cases where we
had a contact information for somebody 90 percent of
the time we were able to contact that person and see
if they're able to help with bail and so again for
the practice and Aubrey and I have spoken about this
before, for the practice of arraignments and making
sure that we are getting a hold of friends and family

members who can help with bail I think this is a
really important finding for us. Now of folks who had
some ability to pay, another statistic that really
floored me was how little bail people can afford even
when they have some ability to pay. And so in the
cases where we did assess people as having some
ability to pay bail by and large we actually assessed
the person as being able to afford a partially
secured bail because they had a little bit of money
right now but they would have money coming in usually
through a job that they would get a paycheck in two,
three weeks and therefore they could pay ten percent
now and would be on the hook for that other 90
percent but if the judge set that full bail amount
that would be beyond what they could afford in that
moment at arraignments. And so what we found on cases
where we assessed the parson as being able to afford
a partially secured bond the range was from 50
dollars partially secured bond to 8,000 dollars
partially secured bond meaning there was somebody who
had five dollars available to them now and did have
the other 45 dollars they could get that over the
course of a couple of months but if the judge
actually set 50 dollars cash bail which is an

absurdly low amont for judges to set mind you but
even if they did that would be too much bail for this
particular individual for this particular individual
which is why we recommended 50 dollars partially
secured bond. On the other hand there was a family
that was in court and they did have 800 dollars
available to them and also had income coming in and
they could afford a, a greater amount and on a
particular case which happened to be a very serious B
felony charge the assessment was that this person and
their family members could afford an 8,000 dollar
partially secured surety bond. So, again that shows
the range of the different kinds of recommendations
that we're making to the court in doing this
assessment. Now what impact does it have on judges to
actually hear both the amount of bail that somebody
can afford as well as the forms of bail they can
afford. What we found is in the cases where we did an
assessment and we provided that information on the
record, in almost a third of those cases judges in
the Bronx sat a partially secured option and for
those of you who have been in the Bronx courtrooms
for a number of years you know that that's a very
recent phenomenon and I do attribute it to the

2	incredible advocacy from the defender community in
3	the Bronx who have really taken up this program and
4	used it relentlessly when we are there on Tuesdays
5	and Thursdays and it also speaks to the willingness
6	of the bench in the Bronx to actually hear new
7	information and do arraignments in a different way.
8	Before we started the program in the Bronx in April
9	we actually trained all of the criminal court judges
10	and it's a fairly new bench there and they were
11	wonderfully open and willing and asked great
12	questions about how does this calculator work, what
13	am I supposed to do with this information, what if I
14	sat bail at an amount higher than what tee calculator
15	assesses, they had very good questions for us about
16	what does this mean for their own practice as judges
17	and we really are grateful for the partnership of the
18	Office of Court Administration as well as the
19	supervising judges in the Bronx and Queens for
20	helping us to launch this project in the ways that it
21	has been for the past couple of months and we hope to
22	continue and to expand and really build upon the
23	foundation that we have laid. Finally, of those cases
24	where partially secured bond options are set what we
25	know is that it gives people a fighting chance to

actually make bail. In cases where a partially
secured bond option was set in the pilot, 86 percent
of individuals made bail which is a pretty remarkable
statistic compared to citywide otherwise the ability
of people to make bail when cash bail or insurance
company bail bonds is set and we actually have a
comparison number for you in our sample which is of
the cases where individuals were only given a bail
option that was cash or insurance company bail bond,
the more traditional options, 57 percent made bail
compared to 86 percent. And so that really tells us
that we are onto something as long as we have a money
bail system providing [coughs] excuse me this kind
of individualized information and making that become
part of the bail record is incredibly important to
New Yorkers and the ability to actually afford bail
and to be at liberty pre-trial. Now we are following
all of the cases that we have assessed throughout the
pendency of those cases to be able to say something
about court appearance as well as case disposition
and pre-trial re-arrest, all factors that we know are
really important the functioning of our justice
systems as well as information that the City Council
cares about and I think is really instructive to

these forms of bail and how they're used. And I'll
stop with just three, three points that I would like
the Council to consider in where do we go from here.
For one, I think that we, we know now from the data
that this is something that works, it moves judges,
it moves the culture of the courtroom in terms of
bail and how bail is used and it's something that we
should figure out as a city as long as we have a
money bail system how do we make sure that every
single bail decision is made only after a judge has
the ability to consider a person's financial
circumstances and the forms of bail that are most
appropriate for this person. The second thing is how
to make sure that judges and public defenders as well
as district attorneys are familiar with all of the
forms of bail and that they are open and receptive to
its use, its been in our bail statute since 1971 but
we know that its only in very recent years that
there's been any traction at all and we've made some
headway but there's a lot of headway left to be made.
And so the City Council should invest in that
training in oversight and accountability to make sure
that judges have to consider these forms of bail and
that its part of the routine practice of bail

_	
2	decisions in the courtroom and then finally I want to
3	go back to the statistic that I raised about 86
4	percent of people being able to afford bail when a
5	partially secured option was given. That's still 14
6	percent of New Yorkers where in theory a judge set a
7	partially secured bond because they wanted this
8	person to make bail, right, otherwise they might have
9	defaulted to what they usually do which is that a
10	cash or an insurance company bail bond option, yet
11	that's still 14 percent of New Yorkers who given that
12	opportunity for a more affordable form of bail
13	couldn't actually make it which I think again goes to
14	the question of how much utility and how much
15	fairness can we truly get out of the cash bail
16	system. Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Be, before we move
18	to BEX I just want to just get the numbers right on,
19	on your program [cross-talk]
20	INSHA RAHMAN: And Council Member
21	[cross-talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So [cross-talk]
23	INSHA RAHMAN:we'll be submitting those
24	numbers to you, we've shared them with your Council

so...

# COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 1 2 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay... [cross-talk] 3 INSHA RAHMAN: ...you do have them but 4 yeah... [cross-talk] 5 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you. Thank 6 you. So, there were 133 assessments, the 133 7 defendants that you assisted? 8 INSHA RAHMAN: Yes. CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay and... [cross-9 10 talkl 11 INSHA RAHMAN: Higher now, yep. 12 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...70 percent of them had bail set? 13 14 INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah... 15 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, in 133 cases 16 you said to the judge what's in... this is what this 17 person can afford, or this is a mechanism that they 18 could meet so in 70 percent of the cases some form of bail was set, the other 30 percent were released on 19 20 their own recognizance or there was a supervised release? 21 2.2 INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah. 23 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay, of the 70 percent that were... where bail was set 30 percent of 24 those were partially secured bond?

# COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 1 2 INSHA RAHMAN: Yes. 3 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: While insurance company bond and cash, parenthesis 55 percent was the 4 most common, common combination of bail set, I... so, 5 just explain that, that math for me I don't 6 7 understand? INSHA RAHMAN: Sure, sure it doesn't add 8 9 up to 100... [cross-talk] 10 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right... [cross-talk] 11 INSHA RAHMAN: ...so the remainder was 12 where judges sat insurance company bail bond, cash bail and credit card bail. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it, so of the ... 15 of the 70 percent 30 percent of those had partially 16 secured? 17 INSHA RAHMAN: Yes. 18 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: The other 70 percent had some combination or ... of either cash, 19 20 which might have been cash that you set... [cross-talk] 21 INSHA RAHMAN: Full amount, right... 2.2 [cross-talk] 23 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right but ... [cross-24 talkl

INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...based on your recommendation, right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

INSHA RAHMAN: Yes, although the, the number of cases in which judges set exactly the amount and the form assessed is low, of this sample it was five cases in total where judges sat bail at the exact amount assessed and in the form of bail. One of the fascinating things we have found here is that we are seeing judges agree more to set partially secured bonds, we have not yet I, I would say broken the barrier of judges setting lower amounts of bail. In a handful of cases judges have been willing to do that but what we are seeing and our hunch and we're looking at this in the data is that judges might be setting a lower amount of bail than they originally would have set so instead of say a thousand dollars bail maybe they're willing to set 750 or 500 but what they are willing to do as a concession if you will to hearing this information, is to set a partially secured option and our hunch is that of the 86 percent of folks who are able to afford a partially secured bond they're stretching more than our assessment would suggest or recommend but they are in fact being able to make that form of bail. One thing

I also want to clarify Council Member is of the cases where we did an assessment there are a handful of cases where we actually did not go on the record or that information wasn't given to the judge because it was clear from the arraignment proceeding that the judge was going to release that person and so there is a... that... what you always have to account for given that we have defense attorneys being the gatekeeper is there might be a defense attorney who believes this is a case where might get set when in fact bail wasn't set and if it looks like the case will be ROR'd we certainly will... won't inject... you know interject with, with information if not necessary. CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it. So, what's this... more than two thirds of the participants in

bail set cases were able to subsequently post the bail?

> INSHA RAHMAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, the other third even with whatever the court was willing to do they couldn't meet that, right and, and why not since you were recommending to the judge something that the defendant could meet, are those... the, the third of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

# COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 1 2 the cases where the judge said I don't care what you 3 say? INSHA RAHMAN: Yes, there's a, a 4 significant number of cases in which judges sat 5 higher bail than what was assessed and certainly that 6 7 third falls into that category. 8 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, I, I know 9 we're just getting into it... to the... to the... [cross-10 talkl 11 INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah... [cross-talk] 12 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...meat of it, sorry, 13 just indulge us. So, why... what were the reasons or 14 the rationales that either were expressed or you... 15 [cross-talk] 16 INSHA RAHMAN: Uh-huh... [cross-talk] 17 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...could, you know ... 18 [cross-talk] 19 INSHA RAHMAN: ...we can observe... [cross-20 talk] CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...observe or infer 21 2.2 for why the judge would say too bad? 23 INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah, I don't want to pine 24 just yet because we're sort of in the process of

sorting through the data but I wonder if the cases

where judges were more likely to set bail higher thar
the assessed amount have to do with charges or with
prior histories, right and we're collecting that data
for each and every case; prior convictions, prior
failures to appear, current charge and my hunch is
that if we look at more serious charges, at felony
cases that's where judges are perhaps less likely to
go along entirely with the assessed amount.
CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And so, you know
you talked about it and this is very important and,
and frankly a motivation behind the council funding
this program, we're talking about moving the culture
of, of, of the courtroom [cross-talk]
INSHA RAHMAN: Uh-huh [cross-talk]
CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:and getting judges
away from using money bail as either a form of
punishment or, or a form of preventative pre-trial
[cross-talk]
INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah [cross-talk]
CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:detention for,
for, for its own sake… [cross-talk]
INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah [cross-talk]

25 being moved and, and I know you said that the

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Is, is that mindset

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

data will be forthcoming and, and you've got to do your own analysis and more time has to spool out...

[cross-talk]

INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...but at least with those cases where, where the judges were open to and, and did set bail according to your recommendations is that culture changing?

INSHA RAHMAN: It is and what we're seeing is we're tracking cases by a judge and there are judges who are setting partially secured options because that's what the assessment suggests and also on days where we are not in the courtroom we're hearing those judges are actually setting partially secured bonds even when there is no Vera assessment being put on the record, that to me is actually huge culture change. It is giving people a chance to post bail in forms that they never had a chance to even just two, three years ago so that part of the culture change is truly happening in the Bronx and it's not just one or two judges but in fact several judges, I think there's a lot more work to be done to sort of keep that pressure and that feedback loop on judges to actually show here's what happens when you sort of

go beyond traditional bail practices and use these
alternative forms of bail. The other piece of culture
change that is almost, I would say as important as
the judges, is the defense bar and in the Bronx we
have seen the defense bar just really take this on
wholesale in a way that Queens because Queens is a
different courtroom, it has different culture, it has
definitely been more of a lift and so again what,
what would address that I think it is much more
oversight, much more training, much more
accountability, we're certainly talking with our
colleagues on the defense bar, advocates so how can
that pressure be applied from all places, we're
certainly doing it from within the courts but where
can there be pressure elsewhere as well.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, so the, the courtroom culture is influenced by the defense, the district attorneys, the, the judges, maybe the court officers... [cross-talk]

INSHA RAHMAN: Sure...

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Is... you, you had focused... you had... you had mentioned the defense in, in Queens, are you... are you... is this project not

being embraced by legal aid and Queens law associates and whatever private attorneys show up?

INSHA RAHMAN: Its being embraced in, in that they invited us in to come do trainings, we've shared materials, the sort of the uptake has not been quite as robust as in the Bronx and I think there are a lot of reasons for that. One is in Aubrey and I spoke about this very recently is CJA's supervised release program has been longstanding in Queens and I think has a lot of trust, Queens is I would say and I say this with some love that was the very first courtroom I ever practiced in as a student attorney, it's, it's a little provincial and people do what they know and are comfortable with and so we're speaking more with CJA to figure out how can we use their credibility in Queens to help this become part of the drinking water as much as supervised release is there.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Uh-huh and, and then culturally... well let me just ask you directly, are you satisfied with the cooperation that you're getting from the district attorney in the Bronx and in Queens, are you satisfied with the cooperation

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

that you're getting from the, the judiciary in the Bronx and in Queens?

INSHA RAHMAN: As to the district attorneys, yes, we spoke with both the Bronx DA's office as well as the Queens DA's office in launching and we haven't gotten any push back or anything that causes any concern. With the judges its... this program has been up and running for longer in the Bronx and we are really grateful for how much they've let us try this out and in fact have it become part of the culture at least in the days that we're there. I think there's more work to be done in Queens and we're working with Judge Johnson, the supervising judge to make sure that again in six months we see ourselves in a place that we are in the Bronx.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah and I want to ask you about the particular concern that the defense community had a, a valid concern, I, I understand it that your presence and the availability of reduced bail in some shape or form might actually induce the court to set bail more often because... [cross-talk]

INSHA RAHMAN: Yes, because we're...

[cross-talk]

2.2

2 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...well there's...

3 [cross-talk]

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

INSHA RAHMAN: ...available, right and...
[cross-talk]

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

INSHA RAHMAN: ...there's, there's that information, there's always that sort of option. So, we, we worked very closely with the defense bar to come up with the defenses attorneys as gatekeeper model which is the model of supervised release as well and we think that is working effectively although I would love for you to pose that question to our friends from the defense bar who will be testifying after us. I think that is one really important safeguard and we are not sort of picking and choosing cases or sort of suggesting to the defense attorneys hey do you have this case, this particular charge or whatever we're just not doing that in part because we really do want to respect the autonomy of the defense bar and which cases come to us. With that said we might try and be a little bit more proactive so that there aren't cases that we're missing or that defense attorney doesn't get to

ignore us or forget about us so that's a that's a
it's a difficult balance and one that I don't think
we have figure out just yet. The other the other
thing though is one of the concerns was what if
somebody actually has a pretty high ability to pay
and is has a lot of resources how do we make sure
that we're not making an assessment of their ability
to pay that is above what a judge would set on that
particular kind of case, that's a very real concern
as well and so what we did to make sure that that
wouldn't happen is we actually did an analysis of the
bail setting on by charge based on Department of
Correction data for both the Bronx and Queens and we
created essentially a range of if we know that on
for example turnstile jumps the sort of 75 percent
of bail in the Bronx are set at a thousand or less
and we decided that third quartile sort of cutoff
would be our cutoff based on charge so that just
because somebody could afford say 4,000 dollars
partially secured bond on a turnstile jump that we
wouldn't make that assessment because we don't want
to have the unintended consequence of inflating bail
amounts or actually sort of changing the culture in a
way that we don't intend to change it. I will say

happily that I don't think that we've needed to pull
out that maximum bail chart that we created ever in
the Bronx because it really speaks to how little in
the way of resources people who are coming through
the Bronx have, I have the feeling we'll be using
that chart a little bit more often or consulting with
it in Queens where we've seen in the cases that we've
assessed there just more range and availability of
resources to defendants who are charged there.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: The last one, what's, what's the lowest cash bail that you have recommended and has been set?

INSHA RAHMAN: Cash or partially secured bond?

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Both.

INSHA RAHMAN: I don't know what the lowest cash bail is because we don't recommend it often, people don't have that much cash. The lowest partially secured bond is 50 dollars, the person had five dollars in their pocket.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And that person went home?

1	COMMITTEE ON OUSTICE SISTEM
2	INSHA RAHMAN: We don't I don't actually
3	know if that person was able to make bail, but I can
4	pull that out and I'll let you know.
5	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: If not [cross-
6	talk]
7	INSHA RAHMAN: If not that really says
8	something [cross-talk]
9	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:that person went
1,0	[cross-talk]
11	INSHA RAHMAN:right [cross-talk]
12	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:to Rikers Island
13	for five dollars.
14	INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah. So, here's the thing
15	is that was our assessment and that case I don't
16	believe the judge sat bail at that amount and in the
17	form of bail, I'll look it up though and I'll, I'll
18	let you know.
19	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, I'd love to
20	know what the lowest amount is. Okay
21	INSHA RAHMAN: Of, of what judges sat in
22	terms of… [cross-talk]
23	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah and that
24	[cross-talk]

2 INSHA RAHMAN: ...bail amounts... [cross-

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...someone made and what the lowest that was set and what wasn't made.

 $\label{eq:insha} \mbox{INSHA RAHMAN: Yep. I will look that up} \\ \mbox{and I will get back to you.}$ 

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Great. Okay, great. Sorry.

AUBREY FOX: It's okay, so first thanks to the council for the opportunity to talk about my agency's bail expediting program and for your support of our program. So I work at the New York City Criminal Justice Agency, I think you're familiar with what we do but we have staff who work 24/7 in each of the city's five main courthouse buildings and two community courts and we provide a, a range of pretrial services to defendants, everything from we interview nearly every arrestee before they see a judge, we make release recommendations to the judge and try to promote release on recognizance. We are the agency that's responsible for notifying every defendant of their upcoming court date to try to keep New York City's already very high court appearance rates as high as they can be. We do a lot of research

and data collection, I'm going to share some of that
data with you today and then we operate this bail
expediting program which as Chair Lancman pointed out
now works with defendants who receive bail of 5,000
dollars or less. So, I wanted to make kind of five
main points here and there's more detail in the, the
written testimony but I wanted to draw out what I saw
as some of the, the highlights that you might find
interesting. We have been operating since 1977 as an
agency and our goal since our founding has really
been to try to reduce the use of money in making pre-
trial decisions and so one thing I one thing that I
think is really remarkable is if, if you look back
either a few years or a few decades and I would
describe this as a piece of encouraging context bail
is actually used far less often than it was in the
past so even if you compare say to 2013, in 2013 for
a case that was continued in arraignment meaning the
defendant was arrested and they had their first court
appearance in arraignment judges sat bail a total of
52,000 times in 2013 but as of mid-December we're
looking at judges setting bail only about 30,000
times in 2018. So, that's about a 40 percent

reduction in the use of bail which is a significant drop in, in the six period.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, but there have been fewer arraignments, no?

AUBREY FOX: So, a big part of that drop is the fact that the number of cases coming into the system... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And what, what percentage of cases are judges setting bail and how does that compare between... [cross-talk]

AUBREY FOX: Yep... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...2013 and 2018?

AUBREY FOX: Great question, so there's been a 30 percent drop in continued cases so that is the largest contributor to that drop in total bails set, however, as a percentage of cases continued at arraignment bail was imposed... has been imposed 23 percent of the time in 2018 versus 30 percent of the time in 2013 and what has taken its place is greater use of release on recognizance and supervised release and so what you find this year which I think is really remarkable is that for the first time since we've started gathering this data and I would imagine perhaps the first time in New York City history

you're three times more likely to get a release on
recognizance at arraignment than you are to receive a
sentence of bail so New York City really does stand
out as a as a city that relies far more on a release
on recognizance, it does not require you to pay bail
to secure your release than any other city in the
country and I think that there are a lot of reasons
why that's true but I it is important to point out I
think that bail is being used much less frequently in
the system. So, a little bit about our program as, as
Chair Lancman pointed out we work with defendants
citywide who have bail set at 5,000 dollars or less
and just in terms of the big picture and I think this
could be described as in a one sense discouraging
news but also in another sense slightly encouraging
news. If you look at the percentage of people who
have bail set at 5,000 dollars or less, how many how
many of them pay bail at arraignment, how many of
them are able to pay bail and get out before they're
ever transported to a jail facility and we've seen
that proportion increase since 2014 to what it is
this year, 16 percent. So, if you get bail set at
5,000 dollars or less citywide 16 percent of those
defendants are able to pay bail at arraignment and

2 never set foot in a jail facility. So, that speaks...
3 [cross-talk]

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: That was for what, 2017... [cross-talk]

AUBREY FOX: That's, that's for this year, I'm giving you... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: '18...

AUBREY FOX: ...year to date figures, that's up from 11 percent in 2014 and 13 percent in 2016. So, I think how you view that statistic depends very much on your perspective. I think it speaks to the fact that as Insha pointed out people have real difficulties paying bail so to have 16... only 16 percent of the people able to pay bail of 5,000 or less at arraignments I think shows how difficult it is for people to pay bail immediately but we are seeing increases from as recently as 2014 and keep in mind that if about 15,000 people a year are getting bail set at 5,000 or less, a one percentage point increase means 150 more people paying bail at arraignment and being allowed to go home without ever having to set foot in a jail for that case. So, it depends on your perspective, but I think it, it's a kind of dose or realism about how difficult it is to

have people pay bail even small amounts of bail at
arraignment but also how we have been able to make
improvements through things like investments in BEX
and Insha's excellent program. So, another point just
to kind of echo something that Insha said is if you
kind of dig into the dynamics of what drives
someone's ability to pay bail at arraignments a lot
of it really does have to do with whether or not
they have someone, a contact they can provide, a
surety who can pay bail on their behalf and as with
Insha's program what we do is if they provide us with
a name of a contact we work very hard to get in touch
with that person and help them come in and pay the
bail and if you look at some of the detailed
information about how our program operates and boil
it down to what appears to be driving most of bail
payments essentially about half of the people who are
able to give us the name of a surety, another words
someone who can come in and pay their bail, pay their
bail either at arraignment or within two days and
only about a quarter of people are able to do so if
they don't give us the name of a surety, a contact
person that they can call. So, I think that
underlines the importance of not just people being

able to identify a surety but some sort of resource
whether its Vera or the Criminal Justice Agency
trying to reach out to that person and walk them
through this often complicated process of paying bail
and we have a lot of examples of kind of the
individualized attention that we, we pay to sureties
that that makes the difference between their ability
to pay bail on behalf of a family member or a friend
versus not pay bail. I also wanted to speak about
this unique power that CJA has which is the power to
issue a hold on a defendant and so CJA is the agency
that has the authority to place a hold with the
Department of Corrections that would prevent the
defendant from being transported to a local jail and
firstly I wanted to say that Local Law 124 that was
passed last year has been enormously helpful to us
and its helpful to us because we've seen real changes
on the ground in boroughs as a result of that
legislation being passed. The first and most obvious
change is that we have more time to work with
defendant's surety to allow for payment of bail and
what that means is that even when we don't ask for an
extended hold in each borough that we operate in the
hold time at a minimum is four hours where in the

past it might have been two or three hours, in	
Manhattan it's six hours and so that allows us to	
have more options to work with defendants because	
often we might call a surety and they would say I	
need more time to get my to get money or to be abl	Le
to come to the courthouse and so that has been	
tremendously helpful. And we've seen in our own	
statistics we, we carefully track the number of tim	nes
we issue a hold with Department of Corrections and	
whether or not when we issue a hold the defendant i	ĹS
able… our defendant surety is able to pay, and the	
defendant is able to go home before being transport	ted
to a jail. Roughly speaking we, we have we issue	
about 2,000 holds a year that that number, that rav	V
number has stayed the same even as the number of ba	ail
cases has gone down significantly and about 70	
percent of the time when we issue a hold the	
defendant is able to pay their bail, our defendant	
surety is able to pay their bail at arraignment. We	∋,
w3e do not know, we cannot track what happens for	
those 30 percent of instances where a hold did not	
result in bail being paid at arraignment, it could	
either be and most often is because despite the	
surety's pledge to come they're not able to make it	-

in the amount of time that is given to them, there
are a handful of cases where it may have been the
results the, the lack of successful bail payment at
arraignment may have been the result of a
miscommunication with the Department of Corrections
but my sense is that that really is a small number
and so getting back to the importance of Local Law
124, what we have seen since its passage that this
year we're on track to issue more holds and to have a
slightly higher hold success rate than we did last
year and because as I had started by saying there are
so many fewer cases in which bail is being set, the
fact that we're issuing the same number of holds I
think is really a, a testament to the fact that we
have much more power to issue holds than we did in
the past. So, just a few points of where we plan to
go in the future with the program, we, we now collect
data in a much more real time basis and so there's a
perhaps somewhat bewildering at first flowchart in
the back that describes some of the really detailed
data that we capture about every stage of the bail
payment process and how effectively we are, are able
to operate and it helps us because it allows us to
identify potential bottlenecks and things that we're

not doing accurately. So, for example, we, we collect
sureties from defendants through either the pre-trial
interview or post arraignment second interview and we
want to make sure that every time we collect a
surety, we have a member of staff call that surety
and we do so about 90 percent of the time and we know
we can do better than that. We are also working with
the city on an expansion of the BEX program which
would allow us to serve all defendants aged 16 and 17
regardless of bail amount so we think that would be
an important expansion of our program and, and
opportunity for the city. So, I think I'll stop there
but just I wanted again to thank you for the
opportunity to testify and I'm happy to answer,
answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright, let me just go back to Vera for a minute and then I want to talk about BEX. I don't know if I saw it... if I'm missing it but do you have any data on the, the, the return rate for the people who have benefited from the, the pilot?

INSHA RAHMAN: We don't yet because it hasn't been in operation very long, I mean we can start to get data on folks who we assessed in April,

2	May, June, they've probably had at least one if not
3	more court dates but we're going to get that data
4	from the Office of Court Administration in one big
5	administrative data dump in the next couple of months
6	but we can certainly do that a little sooner given
7	that of course that's a question that we all we all
8	want to know.
9	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right and is the
10	program scalable, we're about to go into [cross-
11	talk]
12	INSHA RAHMAN: Uh-huh… [cross-talk]
13	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:budget season
14	[cross-talk]
15	INSHA RAHMAN: Great question [cross-
16	talk]
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:and you know the
18	council fought for this money and [cross-talk]
19	INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah [cross-talk]
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:and it seems like
21	it's going well, could you bring it to… [cross-talk]
22	INSHA RAHMAN: Could we bring it to
23	scale… [cross-talk]
24	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN:all [cross-talk]

# COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM 1 2 INSHA RAHMAN: ...yeah, that's a... [cross-3 talkl 4 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...you know five ... 5 [cross-talk] 6 INSHA RAHMAN: ...great question... [cross-7 talk CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...boroughs... [cross-8 9 talkl 10 INSHA RAHMAN: Yep... [cross-talk] CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...every arraignment 11 12 like how do we do that? 13 INSHA RAHMAN: It's a great question and one that we are talking actively about because we 14 15 want this to be part of the infrastructure that 16 already exists, we don't need to have Vera be 17 everywhere, that isn't a good use of us or of 18 resources and money. So, one idea is to have the existing supervised release providers given that they 19 20 are in every single shift in each borough be the folks who sort of also do this. We've actually found 21 2.2 certainly in the Bronx and in Queens that there are 23 cases where the supervised release provider might actually say hey this case we can't take it, the 24

person is too high risk or isn't charge eligible will

2.2

you guys do your assessment so we're actually finding
there's a natural kind of sync there and maybe
there's a way to actually make it formal and have
another existing provider who's in the courtroom be
the person who does this assessment. We would like to
finish out the course of our pilot which is another
year, certainly been speaking with your staff about
that but we need to think about how to scale this for
as long as we have money bail I do think that this is
something that should be in every courtroom for every
arraignment shift and I think the most obvious way to
do that is through the existing providers who are in
each shift already.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right, because Vera is not in the business of providing this service, you're piloting it and providing the analysis.

INSHA RAHMAN: That's exactly right.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: And you know originally this kind of got started with a bill that we had which would have given CJA the responsibility for collecting this information etcetera and then through conversations and negotiations it was agreed that well let's, let's do this pilot through Vera and, and see how that, that works.

2.2

INSHA RAHMAN: Yeah and a couple of thoughts about that, one is the way the bill was originally drafted was that CJA would do it as part of their interview that they do for every single person arrested and we think that the defense attorney as gatekeeper is really important if 70 percent of cases are just getting ROR'd anyway... [cross-talk]

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

INSHA RAHMAN: ...we don't want judges to have information that might actually tip the scale towards more bail being sat so that's a, a... sort of a natural caution to actually doing it that way. The other thing is we have 30 questions, it takes six to seven minutes max but that is I think about four minutes more than Aubrey would say his folks downstairs for every single interview could, could manage so we would have to think carefully about if this were to roll out to scale how do we do so in a way that doesn't compromise the individualized nature of the assessment because we actually think that matters, if it starts to look kind of rote or without that individualized consideration I bet the impact

2 that it will actually have on judges will begin to diminish.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it ...

INSHA RAHMAN: And Council Member I wanted to... [cross-talk]

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

INSHA RAHMAN: ...answer your questions, my wonderful staff who are here who are the sort of brains behind this operation and hold all of the data, that case that you asked about where we had assessed the person as being able to afford a 50 dollar partially secured bond it was a case where the district attorney's office requested 3,000 dollars bail, we had put our assessment on the record and the judge ROR'd that particular individual. So, that's what happened... [cross-talk]

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

INSHA RAHMAN: ...there and one thing that my staff reminded me is of those 30 percent of cases where we've done an assessment and people are ROR'd or released under supervision what we found is that judges we think hear the amount of bail somebody can afford and it is so low that they're like well I don't really want this to keep them in, at least

that's what I'm assuming is the, the thought process
behind it which is why I think we're seeing a fair
number of cases where we've done an assessment and
provided this information actually lead to an ROR
decision and I think I shared this with you before
and I'm happy to share it on the record but in our
first week of operation we were in the Bronx, I
actually was the person who did the assessment and
went on the record and it was a judge in front of
whom I had practiced and who I have a very nice
relationship and we put on the record what this
particular individual could afford in terms of the
bail amount which was 80 dollars partially secured
bond and the judge calls me up and off the record is
basically like it's a little absurd that we're
talking about 80 dollars partially secured bond,
that's an absurd amount and I said well with all due
respect it's a little absurd that we're talking about
cash bail for a woman who has none and that little
interaction ultimately she was released, I think that
little interaction meant something, right, because
that judge had to actually confront the decision that
even if I set a low bail, 250 dollars, 500 dollars
which is usually the going rate for the lowest bail

possible at least in the Bronx that that would have kept this individual in and I think judges are forced to confront that question head on, is this a case where I want this individual to remain in jail pretrail or is this a case where I'm comfortable with this individual being at liberty and I think that is the value of what this information presents is, is having to confront that question.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: A 100 percent having the, the, the court confront what it is... what it is doing and giving consideration to what a person really has and can afford and, and what does it really mean to just throw out 500 dollars or a thousand dollars like it's nothing... [cross-talk]

INSHA RAHMAN: Yep... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...and the, the big impetus for this was to get the system to, to, to confront and to... and to reconcile with what its doing to people for these seemingly low amounts of... low amounts of, of, of bail. So, for BEX you're constrained by the 5,000-dollar bail amount, are there substantive constraints based on charges?

2.2

2.2

AUBREY FOX: No, any, any person who gets bail 5,000 or less regardless of the charge would be eligible for our program.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, what if anything... how, how if any... any way would you... would you want to be able to expand the BEX program, right because unlike the Vera pilot project, it's not two days a week, its not you know just in a couple of courthouses, this is citywide, 24/7, right?

AUBREY FOX: Yep.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: You have the 5,000-dollar jurisdictional limit, if that were lifted what would be the, the impact, would the... would the difference be, be marginal, would it... would it create a different dynamic that wouldn't be helpful... [crosstalk]

AUBREY FOX: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...why, why a 5,000-dollar cap, is that... is that useful at this point?

AUBREY FOX: Well I think there's some tradeoffs if you go to the higher amounts. One is its probably a, a little less likely that they would be able to pay bail so there's a... kind of resource issue and benefit issue. The other one is that we, we have

2.2

chosen not to work with the bail bonds industry so the higher the bail amount the more likely that you would bring a bail bonds person into pay the bail and we don't see ourselves as facilitating that process but it is something that, you know we can certainly consider because I do think there's a real value to all the work that we do and it really comes down to kind of the minutia of the process and the personal relationships we have in the courthouse to try to move things along so... I mean I, I think there's cost of benefits on either side but it's something that we'd be willing to take a look at.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it and I know in your... in your written testimony you gave the figures for people returning for their... for their court appearances who have been ROR'd, it was 88 percent in 2018?

AUBREY FOX: Yeah and that, that's a...
that's a high standard, it means that 88 percent of
defendants given a ROR showed up for every single
court date.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay. And that wouldn't include... among the other 12 percent it might include someone who missed a court date but then

showed up subsequently,	it's not	it doesn't mean
that 12 percent of them	had to be	tracked down
[cross-talk]		

2.2

AUBREY FOX: Correct and keep in mind that the best... the best we know from the national... the national average is about 23 percent of defendants fail to appear for a court date so we're, we're twice as good essentially as... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Do you have any... do you have any metrics on the people who were... what's the term, fully served by, by the BEX program like they, they weren't ROR'd some bail was paid, someone came and helped them pay it like what's their return rate?

AUBREY FOX: So, we'd have to take... [cross-talk]

 $\label{eq:chairperson Lancman: So, so what... like} % \[ \text{Like participated... [cross-talk]} \]$ 

AUBREY FOX: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...in the... in the mass bailout with the RFK foundation, right, one of the knocks against it was well if someone else is paying bail for the person they don't have the same interest in returning and now that's somewhat

different than the, the other person paying bail is their family member as opposed to just random stranger but still curious, one of the things we have heard is this encourages people being released on bail that is supported by someone other than the defendant themselves so do you have any information on the return rate?

Well generally speaking we, AUBREY FOX: we do know that low amounts of bail do not seem to, to do better than an... a release on recognizance at promoting court appearance so its hard to set the ... that dollar amount with specificity but you, you could say that for a person who has bail of 5,000 dollars or less its, it's a relatively small amount of money and so we do not see that a similarly situated person, defendant with the same characteristics who just happened to have gotten ROR versus 5,000 dollars bail, we would not expect them to perform differently in terms of their court appearance rate, what we don't know is if you go to the much higher levels of bail what would happen if you were to ROR that person versus set that bail amount.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.2

AUBREY FOX: So, essentially it does not appear that low amounts of bail does anything to improve court appearance rates relative to a release on recognizance.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, what, what kind of metrics or, or data reporting is MOCJ requiring of, of each of you pursuant to, to the funding for these programs?

AUBREY FOX: I mean we, we share a lot of the information that you're seeing in front of you, we do monthly reporting and MOCJ reviews the figures on a monthly basis and you know we're working on kind of an annual report of what you're seeing 11 months of data.

INSHA RAHMAN: And we're still

negotiating the, the terms of our contract but our

understanding of what we would be reporting is number

of cases assessed, you know bail setting, bail

payment, return to court as well as case disposition

and pre-trial re-arrest those are all metrics that

we'll be tracking over the course of this pilot.

AUBREY FOX: And, and just to add one more point to you, the, the standard we're using for the... what we report to the city is fairly high, we

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM
2	want to make it clear that there are some people who
3	even if our program didn't exist they would pay bail
4	anyway, right, so we're trying to understand the, the
5	kind of unique impacts of our program so we, we
6	intentionally exclude for example those defendants
7	who, who pay bail kind of immediately or at
8	arraignment. So, for example, they might have a
9	family member sitting right there in court who raise
10	their hand and say I'm ready to pay bail right now
11	and there are in fact, you know a substantial number
12	of people who do that so we're only looking at those
13	people for whom they're not able to immediately pay
14	bail and we meet with them immediately after
15	arraignment and we try to provide them with some
16	assistance.
17	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, so you don't
18	operate BEX doesn't operate in Staten Island?
19	AUBREY FOX: Not at the moment.
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Why is that
21	[cross-talk]
22	AUBREY FOX: I mean well we, we've been
23	running BEX for several decades now, we expanded to

use to only operate in Bronx and Queens so interesting comparison to Vera until 2010 when we

24

2.2

expanded to Manhattan and Brooklyn but we're, we're certainly happy and we're... we've been... we're starting to look at what it would take to build the program in Staten Island.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Has there been any objection from the Staten Island DA or OCA in Staten Island like who... [cross-talk]

AUBREY FOX: No objection, I think the... I mean the issue for us is the... there's kind of a sunk cost to operating BEX, you know the... we depend on the fact that we have a substantial number of staff deployed in the courthouses where we operate and on top of that we build the BEX program so it's just a question of whether we're able to vest the, the resources that we would need to be there kind of all of the time basically.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, at a recent hearing we heard complaints that people were not being held and were being put on the bus and sent to Rikers Island not only in violation of, of the city law but in, in, in making it impossible for, for BEX to, to work its magic so what's your experience with the holds that you are, are requesting for people being honored?

AUBREY FOX: Oh okay, so… citywide where,
where we're operating, as, as I said, you know we, we
do track the proportion of times that, that when we
place a hold the defendant is able to pay bail at
arraignment and that has stayed at a fairly high
proportion, around 70 percent and ticked up a little
bit recently. We do work to resolve individual
instances where there's some kind of miscommunication
with the Department of Corrections and we've issued a
hold that the person is put on the bus and I and I
will say that no system is perfect but what I've
found is that in general I, I would say Department of
Corrections is much more responsive and much more
aware of their obligations and responsibilities and
so we have much clearer kind of lines of
communications with them so when there is an issue
we're able to bring it to their attention and they do
take these instances seriously and, and its important
to us and I'll say this even to folks in this room
that, you know we get information from social media,
we hear about individual instances where people have
concerns about holds not being respected and we
follow up on all of them so its really helpful for us

to get information wherever we can where people have concerns about individual holds.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright, well thank you very much for your testimony and thank you for the good work that you... that you do.

INSHA RAHMAN: Thank you.

AUBREY FOX: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay, so now we'll hear from some public defenders; Dawit, sorry... I can't read the last name, I'm sorry, the Bronx Defenders; Joshua Norkin from Legal Aid and Dave Long from the Liberty Fund, not all defenders.

[off mic dialogue]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Good afternoon. If you raise your right hand so we can swear you in, do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth

[off mic dialogue]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you. We can just go from my left to right and that'd be great.

DAWIT GETACHEW: Good afternoon Chairman Lancman and members of the Committee. My name is Dawit Getachew and I am a Criminal Defense Attorney

and an Associate Special Counsel to the Criminal
Defense Practice at the Bronx Defenders and I want to
thank you for the opportunity to testify today. the
Bronx Defenders is a community based and nationally
recognized holistic public defender office dedicated
to serving the people of the Bronx and we represent
over 28 individuals 28,000 individuals every year
providing criminal defense, family defense,
immigration representation, civil legal services,
social work support, and other advocacy to indigent
people in the Bronx and the Bronx and beyond. The
Bronx Defenders promotes criminal justice reform to
dismantle the culture of mass incarceration. As the
end of 2018 approaches, the need to fix New York
City's broken bail system is no longer up for debate.
The consensus among New Yorkers is that people should
not stay in jail simply because they cannot afford to
pay for their freedom. And to this end, I understand
that various stakeholders, including the City Council
have taken steps over the past year to address some
of the obstacles that the current bail system erects
against our clients and their families. The Bronx
Defenders welcomes these efforts and we appreciate
the opportunity to provide some of the feedback on

the measures that have been implemented this year. In
particular, we hope to relay our experiences, as
public defenders, with the use of the alternative
forms of bail; the bail assessment project
implemented by the Vera Institute, Institute of
Justice and the BEX program. Now I, I do want to
start with really reiterating the significance of
these alternative forms of bail. Such programs and
providing the alternative forms of bail payments
specifically dramatically increases the likelihood
that people will avoid pre-trial detention while
fulfilling the only purpose for bail, ensuring their
return to court in the future. Now specifically
alternatives like partially secured bond ease the
bail payment process, increases the chance that
clients will be released from court and avoid jail
time altogether. In contrast, the process of securing
the service of a bail bonds company generally
requires time and virtually guarantees that clients
will be held in for additional hours if not days for
bail to be posted and this delay obviously disrupts
the lives of our clients while also cost New York
City taxpayers by needlessly keeping people in jail.
I, I do want to give the example of one of my clients

this year, John who was arrested on felony charges.
By any measure John was eligible to be released on
his own recognizance, he had no criminal record or
prior failures to appear in court, he was born and
raised in the Bronx and he was employed, and he lived
in the Bronx with his wife and two children and
family who were also present in the courthouse for
support. Now during the interview prior to the
arraignment, it was clear that John was very worried
that he would lose his job if he didn't show up to
work the following morning. He was more concerned
about the prospect of not being able to financially
support his family more than spending the night in
jail and in that case, you know the court did end up
setting bail but also provided the option for a
partially secured bond in the amount of 10,000
dollars with a ten percent deposit. As a result of
that, John's brother was able to step in as surety
following the arraignment and posted the required
amount immediately and John was released shortly
thereafter. And the important thing to note is
although John's family came to court with some amount
of money it was not enough for the cash bail that was
also set in the case and furthermore the… John's

arraignment occurred it was late at night during
night arraignments approximately around after 11
p.m. so the option of going to a bail bonds company
was not really feasible without risking that John
would be transported to Rikers and potentially
staying for an extended period of time. So, the
court's decision to set a partially secured bond
ensured that John was able to reunite with his family
that night and averted a potential job loss. Since
then John has appeared on all of his court dates
while maintaining his employment and the ability,
ability to support his family. The outcome in John's
case however remains unusual for many of our clients
because cash bail and insurance company bond are
still the primary and often the only options that are
made available to them. We recognize that there have
been there's been an uptick in the use of
alternative forms of bail, we're seeing that judges
are setting partially secured bond and credit card
bail in an increasing number of cases and defense
attorneys also regularly request the court to
consider partially secured bonds as an option if the
court decides to set bail. Likewise, Vera's bail
assessment project has increased awareness about

partially secured bond among judges, attorneys,
clients and their families. Although these trends are
encouraging there continues to be significant inertia
against normalizing the use of alternative forms of
bail. The use of unsecured bond is virtually unheard
of, furthermore it's rare that judges will set
partially secured bond without a specific request
from defense attorneys. Even worse, many judges
hesitate or outright refuse to provide it as an
option when asked by counsel. And in many of these
cases the, the decision to do so that is not provide
an alternative is effectively remanding our clients
as they wait for the case to proceed. Now the
reluctance to fully embrace partially secured bond
has become more apparent in light of the efforts by
the bail assessment project. Since the pilot began
earlier this year the Bronx Defenders attorneys have
referred a number of cases to the project which has
conducted an independent assessment of our client's
ability to pay bail and make recommendations to the
to the court as to the appropriate time type and
amount of bail based on their findings. Now as Insha
stated earlier, the majority of our clients that we
refer to the project were found to have no ability to

pay bail and, you know in the cases where the project
found that clients had some resources the bail
assessment project always recommended partially
secured if bail was to be set. However, we, we saw
that despite these recommendations often times bail
was set only as cash bail and insurance company bond
and sometimes its credit card bail and I and I
think what they stated earlier the numbers reflect
that and while some judges did occasionally set
partially secured bond we found that the amount was
often higher than when what our clients were
assessed to afford by the project which pretty much
defeats the purpose of providing an alternative form
of [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, what you're saying is the court was ignoring Vera's recommendation?

DAWIT GETACHEW: At times we certainly felt that the, the actual amount that was recommended by Vera was not accepted by the... by a... by the judges that would often... more... pretty much... and... with the exception of a very few cases they usually set it at a much higher amount than what Vera recommended.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: The... did they ever... does the court ever explain itself? Oh no, I'm not doing that because X, Y and Z or is there any reason that you can discern or any, any, any principled reason or, or, or recurring theme?

DAWIT GETACHEW: Unfortunately those conversations we haven't been able to have with, with the... with the judges however I, I do think that it has to do with the general culture of the criminal courts which has been sluggish in terms of changing the usual... changing the practice of setting the usual amounts and types of, of bail, you know we are faced with this culture that's resistant to change when it comes to bail setting practices and, and, and the case of trying to determine why a judge would set a higher amount is often very difficult at arraignment when attorneys are waiting for the next case to come up and it ends up being pushed aside and we... and judges continue to the next case so that opportunity is not there. However, what's useful about having these recommendations is the advocacy efforts continue once bail has been set after and following court dates such as during, during bail reviews or writs which we have had certain experiences of it

referring to the recommendation that was proposed by
that was made by Vera as part of our advocacy to
reduce the amount of bail that was set in during
bail reviews. So, we do think that is helpful and I
do want to reiterate that the point that Vera made
or about having the assessment and the tools to be
used at the discretion of defense attorneys, I think
its important that the these this tool is used in
conjunction with having conversations with the
criminal defense attorneys who have the initial
interaction with our clients and based on their the
information that they have can speak to the
necessity of having this assessment and with respect
to the question that you raised earlier which, which
was does it induce judges to perhaps set bail because
the tools were presented in court on the record and
its hard to say unfortunately there's certainly no
measurement on the motivations of the judges however
I think based on the conversations I've had with the
attorneys I think one the way one person explained
it is I'm not sure if it helped but I certainly do
think that it didn't hurt. So, I, I think the general
sentiment among defense attorneys is like this could
be useful and we have seen that in some cases it, it

is it has been useful to really have the record be
presented to the judges about their ability our
client's ability to, to pay to pay bail. Now I do
want to add another thing which was there's also a
sentiment that whenever partially secured bonds are
set usually a surety, a family member has to step in
and a judge has to take a, a brief moment to swear
them in and review the associated paper, paperwork
that's provided and this brief procedure usually
takes a few minutes and it's something we've actually
seen courts conduct with bail insurance commercial
bail bonds companies and that's generally treated as
an annoyance that's that interrupts the regular
court proceedings instead of something that's an
important part of the court system so there is this
reluctance to adopt it fully into the day to day
operations. In addition, we've seen that our clients
continue to face other obstacles while attempting to
navigate the process, the paperwork associated with
partially secured bond can be daunting for our
clients and attorneys and other advocates have had to
step in to assist them with the process, we're also
concerned that the inquiries by some judges when
people seek to post, post bond can be arbitrary,

there have been instances when judges have required
excessive and unnecessary documentation as proof of
income and assets erecting another set of obstacles
for our clients and possibly extending the time that
our clients remain in jail. I do want to turn to
briefly about the BEX program, it we want to note
that, you know we, we feel that the Criminal Justice
Agency provides an important role in ensuring that
our clients will not be turned over to the Department
of Corrections and facilitating bail payment by
contacting friends and family members and we also
want to note that the CJA has been interfacing with
the bail funds and we've been informed that they now
place holds on, on all bail fund eligible clients
without CJA checking for sureties. I think that's a
critical step, we do have the bail funds have been
playing an important role in our courts and we do
think that this type of cooperation is essential in,
in ensuring that people are actually bailed out even
when they don't have family members who cannot pay
bail because these bail funds do in fact step in. And
we've also seen an increased willingness on the part
of DOC to honor courthouse holds for our clients,
nevertheless we have, have noticed that occasionally

2	clients slip through the cracks and are shipped off
3	to Rikers due to some oversight. For example, in one
4	case where an attorney placed a hold on a client who
5	had partially secured bond set at his arraignment
6	because a family member was coming to court to place
7	bail was still transported to Rikers and
8	unfortunately no explanation was given as to why this
9	occurred but based when I spoke to the attorney
10	about this she speculated that her client shared the
11	same first name and last name as another person who
12	was also arraigned around the same time and that we
13	don't have additional information and I, I we do
14	believe that its necessary to figure out why certain
15	things happen because while an administrative error
16	can and do occur the stakes are certainly far too
17	high to simply brush it aside and say that this was
18	just some administrative error. So, I do want to end
19	that with brief recommendations, specifically we do
20	think that raising awareness of additional forms of
21	bail as Vera has been doing is an important piece of
22	changing the culture, furthermore encouraging judges
23	to set alternative forms of bail that are less
24	onerous than insurance company bonds and really to
25	impose the least financially burdensome conditions

necessary to ensure the people of that people return
to court is important. We also recommend that there
are steps to be taken regarding simplifying the
paperwork and procedures required for alternative
forms of bail. We do support expanding the use of
independent assessments like the bail calculator
implemented by the bail assessment project to
determine a person's ability to pay bail and really
working with the defense to ensure that the client's
ability is actually presented to, to the judge prior
to making a decision about bail. And lastly, we do
support that the providing additional resources for
bail facilitators so you as you heard earlier Vera's
work based on communicating with, with family members
and clients and friends is an essential piece of
ensuring that people come to court and bail is paid
as soon as possible so that clients do not are not
transported to Rikers and we do believe that these
are not radical recommendations, they are sensible
and, and real steps towards improving the current
bail setting practices. However, we do recognize that
the problems that are facing the current bail system
are longstanding and deeply structural, so we are in
need of comprehensive solutions if we are to address

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the tremendous hardship that is in inflicted upon New Yorkers by the criminal just... legal system. So, I thank you for the time, if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you.

JOSHUA NORKIN: I'd like to start by introducing myself, my name is Joshua Norkin, I am a Staff Attorney with the Legal Aid Society Special Litigation Unit. I focus on bail reform and I want to thank not just Council Member Lancman but the City Council as well as all of my colleagues in the room. As the testimony from both Vera and the Criminal Justice Agency indicate, in the absence of legislative reform in Albany this city has taken tremendous strides to... and changing the bail system relatively dramatically I think in the past several years and so I think this conversation is an important one because I think it is about what can we continue to do to ensure that downward trend continues especially if we don't get legislative reform in Albany this year. And I'd like to just start by saying that this conversation can't be had without acknowledging the people that are impacted by the system and earlier this year as part of our work

we wrote to incarcerated clients in upstate facility.
prison facilities asking them how bail impacted their
lives and we heard back, you know tremendous stories
from them that were totally heartbreaking and show
how even though the system has made progress there
continue to be individual instances in which
unaffordable bail is set on people that places that
places those people's rights at in jeopardy and one
client wrote to us that bail was set at 25,000
dollars and as the father of four and someone who
only collects SSI disability there is no way I could
afford to take that money out of my kid's mouth and
still consider myself a decent man. Another, a 19-
year-old teenager wanted to know where he was
supposed to find 50,000 dollars to buy his freedom.
Another wrote to us and told us that bail was ransom.
So, today the use of money bail in New York City's
criminal courts while potentially better and it's not
as devastating as it once was, still renders the
presumption of innocence barely recognizable. And in
October of this past year, just over a year ago in
2017, we released a study with the Human Rights data
analysis group that shows that those individual
clients that continue to have bail set on them at

arraignments are 34 percent more likely to be
convicted simply because bail was set and it's for
these reasons that the Legal Aid Society has long
supported the greater use unsecured and partially
secured bonds in New York City's courts. While the
legislature passed an expansive statutory scheme in
the 1970's aimed at reducing the jail population its
never been fully utilized to its full potential.
These forms of bail are clearly geared towards our
clients, our clients with no disposable income and
they are the types of bail that we will need to rely
on as an in between when judges are not willing to
release people individually. And so one of the things
that's come up at this hearing is sort of this
intersection of the alternative forms of bail as well
as assessments about our client's ability to pay any
bail set whether that's cash, partially secured bonds
or insurance company bail and I think the underlying
theme here is some type of judicial oversight or
some I think inquiry into whether or not judges and
the bench and the judiciary recognize, recognize what
their roles and responsibility are. The Legal Aid
Society has long supported efforts of the City
Council as well as Vera and of course the Criminal

Justice Agency to take it to four strategies to take
into consideration; our client's ability to pay
monetary bail when its set and over the past two
years the Legal Aid Society itself has been engaged
in systemic litigation trying to force the
judiciary's hand in terms of considering arguments,
constitutional arguments that impose a requirement on
judges that they consider our ability our client's
ability to pay and seek out less restrictive
alternatives before setting that amount of bail. Our
opinion in our opinion a New York City judge who
sets monetary bail and incarcerates presumptively
innocent individuals without making an inquiry into
their ability to pay and without seeking out those
less restrictive alternatives violates the equal
protection clause of the United States constitution.
Such illegal practices are still endemic to bail
setting in New York City's courts. Supreme Court
juror's prudence establishes clearly that an equal
protection in an, an equal protection principle that
are all too frequently ignored that the state may not
incarcerate somebody because of their poverty unless
it first inquiries into the reasons that that person
may not be able to pay and without seeking an

alternative to incarceration. For over two years
we've raised these arguments in the city's courts,
we've raised them in every borough of New York City,
we've presented them to both the appellate divisions,
we've taken them to the court of appeals and we've
taken them to federal court. Our staff in the trial
offices has consistently challenged the setting of
secured money bail beyond what our individual clients
can pay. Our arguments have largely been ignored by
the judiciary and discarded by judges on the bench.
While there is little the City Council can do to
impact judicial practices directly, the Vera ability
to pay pilot represents a promising start. What we
would encourage the City Council to do is and is to
continue to hold these hearings and to continue to
think about how to place judge place pressure on
judges and actors in the system to set partially
secured and unsecured bonds in amounts that our
clients can pay and to recognize that when these
courts rely on these types of more flexible forms of
bail not only will they continue to ensure that the
appearance rates that Mr. Fox touted here earlier
will stay that high but it means that more people
will be released in accordance with, with

constitutional principles. By presenting judges with
more information about our client's ability to pay
and for the City Council to call for a fuller use of
the existing bail options the city will take a large
step towards fulfilling the promises of the equal
protection clause in guaranteeing that all of the
citizens coming through the criminal, criminal
justice system will be treated equally and fairly by
the law. I will say one final thing and this didn't
made it into our testimony but I do want to tell the
Council Member this, which is that at the moment I, I
raise that we have been filing litigation in all of
the boroughs challenging the setting of money bail as
being unconstitutional, often our opposing council in
those in those writs of habeas corpus tends to be
the local district attorney's office. I'd like to
take out the opportunity to point out that the
respondent in each and every single one of those
cases is actually Cynthia Brann, the Commissioner of
the Department of Corrections. Why corporate council
or the city's council does not intervene or state a
position in these cases I'm not entirely sure other
than to say that it seems that this is just a pattern
in practice of how these cases have been handled over

the course of the past however many centuries but I
think it is fair to point out that we have repeatedly
sued effectively the city of New York over these
practices and we have repeatedly met opposition, we
have not filed a writ or challenged a monetary bail
decision that a district attorney has not opposed in
this city.
CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Say that again?
JOSHUA NORKIN: What's that?

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Say that last part again.

JOSHUA NORKIN: We have not filed a writ...

there may be one floating out there, but I don't

think we have filed a writ or a legal challenge in

this city in which the district attorney has not

opposed in some way, shape or form.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: But, but who's representing... when, when you say the, the district attorney has not opposed... is the corporation council that's responding, I don't... I want... [cross-talk]

JOSHUA NORKIN: What I'm saying is that when we file a writ habeas corpus... [cross-talk]

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

2.2

2	JOSHUA NORKIN:and what as I explained
3	which we've been doing systematically the respondent
4	that is listed on that proceeding, which is a civil
5	proceeding under Article 70 of the civil procedure
6	laws the respondent in those proceedings is the
7	Department of Corrections, its Cynthia Brann and the
8	responding attorney, the person who has showed up to
9	represent the city's position or Cynthia Brann's
10	position in those writs of habeas corpus has been the
11	local district attorney's offices [cross-talk]
12	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Right [cross-talk]
13	JOSHUA NORKIN: So, I would imagine given
14	the position of the City Council as well as the Mayor
15	of New York City that the City Council's position on
16	the setting of money I'm sorry, that the city of Nev
17	York's position on the imposition of money bail is
18	dramatically different than those of the local
19	district attorney's offices.
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it, thank you.
21	Sir.
22	DAVE LONG: Chair Lancman and members and

DAVE LONG: Chair Lancman and members and staff of the City Council thank you for the opportunity to present my views to this Committee. My name is Dave Long and I'm the Executive Director of

23

24

the Liberty Fund, the first citywide city council
funded charitable bail organization in New York City.
Our mission is to reduce the number of New Yorkers
subjected to pretrial detention. The Liberty Fund is
distinct from other charitable bail funds in this
city because of our work because our work happens
directly in arraignment courts every night of the
year, from six p.m. until court closes, usually
around one a.m. We began operation in August 2017 and
to date have posted bail for 614 men and women. I
have included with my testimony today a summary
report of our outcomes from our first year. Today, I
will offer three points that I hope will inform the
conversation about the future of bail. First, as long
as cash bail is required for misdemeanors, it is
crucial that we continue to fund and support the work
of charitable bail funds. The Liberty Fund and the
other charitable bail funds in New York City, Bronx
Freedom Fund and Brooklyn Community Bail Funds, are
keeping people who have not been found guilty of
misdemeanor charges out of our correctional system.
Instead of the trauma and disruption of going to
jail, our clients leave court, return home to their
iobs, their families and their lives. Second, through

our experience providing on the ground intervention,
the Liberty Fund has gained insights into the social
service needs of the bail and the ROR population. We
intervene at a crucial moment, immediately after bai
is set and before a person boards the bus to Rikers.
After we post bail, we voluntarily offer service
referrals. In our first year, over a third of our
clients requested assistance with housing,
employment, substance abuse, mental health,
immigration, entitlements and other services.
Clearly, this demonstrates a gap in our criminal
justice system. And that leads me to the third and
most important point, in any post bail reform world
the Liberty Fund can be an important partner in
providing social service interventions. As the bail
reform movement progresses, the Liberty Fund should
be leveraged into an intervention to fill social
service referral gaps in our criminal justice system
Going forward, we can help people meet their basic
needs, make their court dates and ultimately help
prevent future involvement with our criminal justice
system. In conclusion, the work of the city's
charitable bail funds has demonstrated that removing
pre-trial detention for misdemeanor offenses is more

2.2

efficient and less disruptive in people's lives. As we move forward, we will continue to promote, promote a more fair, humane and effective criminal justice system from all... for all. Thank you for your time today.

each of you just describe what interactions your respective organizations have with the bail facilitators or from, from the bail assessment project or the... or the BEX folks and, and whether those are good and meaningful and, and productive and whether or not there might be some improvements you can identify?

DAWIT GETACHEW: So, I'll start with the bail assessment project and you, you know the way that has been implemented has been really good, they have... Vera reached out to us and has been working with the Bronx Defenders and, and informing us what their roles are and has been very open to hearing what the concerns are and... at arraignments being present and available is, is always an important piece and ensuring that clients are able... are comfortable with having another person present asking them questions in the back and upon doing that, upon

making presenting their findings to the attorney
leaving it to the defense to make a decision about
whether or not to present it to present it on the
record has been a crucial part of like the working
relationship that we've had with Vera. So, I do think
that that's, that's been helpful. In terms of with
the bail facilitators we have less of a direct
interaction, we usually communicate with them in
terms of asking, asking them to place holds for our
clients because w3e believe that someone is coming to
pay bail. We do occasionally go downstairs to where
our clients are being held but we do not have any
interactions with our clients at that point. The
they you know DOC will not let us speak to them if
their bail has been set so the only place that the
only individuals that we can speak to have been the
bail facilitators and generally they have been
helpful although the outcome is until recently as we
have found in many occasions that our clients are
still transported to, to Rikers and we don't have
information about like why that has that that has
happened or understand, you know what, what can be
done better. So, I, I do think that there's always
room for improvement, we do think that bail

2.2

facilitators, the presence of bail facilitators within the courthouse having additional interaction with the defense attorneys is a significant piece because the contacting families takes time, clients may be more likely to tell their attorneys about... you know what, what sort of contacts they have and we can ask additional questions that could be helpful to the facilitator so we do think that having the resource... providing resources for additional bail facilitators whether that's with CJA or directly with defense organizations is something that can be useful.

think I mentioned this at the beginning of the... my testimony but the work that both Vera and CJA have been doing I think is incredibly important and we're entirely supportive of. I don't know if there's a lot to recommend in terms of improvement, I think as miss Rahman mentioned the pilot program is still... they're still learning about it and its still in its infancy and we're still waiting to get statistics back on it. I think to their credit so far, it's worked well, and I think the way that its set up has worked well, you know with BEX and with the Criminal Justice Agency I will say... you know I'll say that we speak pretty

regularly with the Criminal Justice Agency. We spoke
with folks there just yesterday about an issue. In
terms of BEX, you know one thing that I have
mentioned in the past and I think its worth still
considering is trying to make more information about
it publicly available and that might be true with the
Vera pilot as well. I think one thing that tends to
happen in the fast paced world of arraignments and
just, you know the defense bar generally is that
there are so many competing issues that our attorneys
have to deal with, that clerks have to deal with,
getting the information down on paper, doing
trainings and doing sort of repetitive trainings
becomes important to let that information sink in. I
think in the past, you know I have heard instances
where people are attorneys in the courtroom were
either confused by the parameters of what the BEX
system was or who the bail facilitators, facilitators
are and so, you know I certain we've certainly said
we'd open the door for everybody to come in and do a
training or help develop materials that might be
helpful, you know to, to sort of facilitate or
promote the program and I think that's all to say
that these are relatively minor things. I mean that's

not a big ask and I think the real the real issue
here in which, you know I tried I hoped I conveyed
in my testimony is that I don't really think this is.
this is not the issues in here is not CJA, its not
Vera but it's, it's, it's always at the end of the
day convincing that judge sitting in front of you and
making sure that that judge is informed about what
these programs are, what the setting of bail means,
you know and trying to convince those judges that
making that inquiry into somebody's ability to pay
and then using something like an unsecured bond that
to me right now is the is the target, target
audience and I recognize the City Council has got
limited control over that but I think what I would
say is that, you know if its Vera or CJA that's the
messenger and they need, you know either additional
resources to do that or more funding to support those
programs I think that's an entry point that the City
Council considering can consider to help.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Does the Liberty

Fund interact with either the Vera or, or BEX folks?

DAVE LONG: Yes, very much so, I mean since we're in all the boroughs we wouldn't be able to really do what we do without the help and

assistance of CJA, they have been tremendously
helpful right from the start in providing guidance
and resources and, and assistance and assistance
whenever we need to so, you know we, we interact with
them nightly and their staff. I've met with Vera and,
and CJA on, on various different components of bail
reform and, and all of the defense counsels also
defense counsel organizations, Legal Aid, and Bronx
Defenders and all, all of them included have been
extremely helpful in helping us get to the point that
we are at. I would say based upon the hearing from
last week one suggestion I would put forth is that I
believe you that you suggested a, a work group, a
bail reform work group to the Department of
Corrections to expand that group to involve as many
players that are testifying today and entities would
I think be helpful so they can hear more information
about what's going on, on a daily basis in court.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it and, and just to... I think that you both talked about it but I just want to be clear, both at a public defender organizations, you're, you're satisfied that the way this... the Vera bail pilot has been set up that we're

5

25

2 not inadvertently exposing people to bail who would 3 otherwise not have bail set, we, we... [cross-talk]

4

is... this is like the age old concern with trying to

JOSHUA NORKIN: I mean this is a... this

6 move the system from, you know basically cash and

7 insurance company bail to partially secured and

8 unsecured bonds, right, the ROR population as both

9 the pre... you know as both CJA and Vera mentioned in

10 New York City is so high that any risk seriously in

11 any bail reform whether that's state legislative

12 reform, City Council reform or even these, you know

13 | smaller pilot program reforms inadvertently cutting

14 | into that ROR population by doing something like

15 this. I think it's fair to say that we probably don't

16 have enough information as Miss Rahman said about

17 exactly what the program is doing or how judges are

18 utilizing it just yet, the sample size is pretty

19 small comparatively to the number of cases that come

20 through New York City criminal courts every year and

21 so I think, you know the best way... you know the best

22 thing to say about it is that its, it's a real

23 concern, it would be a concern whether or not Vera

24 was in that courtroom or not as the city transitions

away from the, the current system and I think it's

1	COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE SYSTEM
2	something that you, you've got to keep an eye on and
3	I think that's one of those things where these
4	hearings are important, the constant reporting of
5	data, full transparency as is important because it's
6	something that you know we, we're really sort of on
7	the brink especially if you look at misdemeanor cases
8	in New York City where release rates are close to 90
9	percent, you don't want to dip into that ROR rate by
10	starting to set bail on people or having more people
11	inadvertently detained because we try to do something
12	that was righteous and it had the adverse effect.
13	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright, thank you
14	all for your testimony.
15	JOSHUA NORKIN: Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: So, now we'll just
17	have some questions for MOCJ if they want to come up
18	and the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice.
19	[off mic dialogue]
20	CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Alright, good
21	afternoon… [cross-talk]
22	SARAH CASSEL: Hi, good afternoon

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: ...just swear you in. 24 Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to 25

[cross-talk]

give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

SARAH CASSEL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Thank you. Just state your name for the record?

SARAH CASSEL: My name is Sarah Cassel,

I'm a Program Manager at the Mayor's Office of

Criminal Justice.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay and my understanding is that MOCJ doesn't have testimony for us but you're available here to answer questions that we have?

SARAH CASSEL: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Terrific. So, could you describe for us what coordinating MOCJ either arranged or participated in amongst the public defenders, Vera, the district attorneys in the Bronx and Queens and the, the judiciary in, in the Bronx and Queens to, to get people ready for the pilot?

SARAH CASSEL: I can't speak to that program in particular, I'm prepared more to talk about the BEX program. I know that our office is in touch with all of those parties about a number of

2.2

bail initiatives and I imagine that that one is
included.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Oh, so, so… is there no one from MOCJ who can talk about the bail assessment project? No?

SARAH CASSEL: No.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay. Do you have any thoughts or opinions on the recommendations or the suggestions for expanding BEX that were raised by CJA today, in particular the issue of eliminating I guess the threshold requirements for 16 and 17-year olds?

SARAH CASSEL: Yeah, it's definitely smoothing that we're actively talking about and, and are starting to implement.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay. Alright, well the focus of our interest with MOCJ is really with the Vera project so we would like to get information from MOCJ in particular about what kind of dialoguing and training that has been done if you know for judges when it comes to interacting with, with the Vera bail project and with using the alternative forms of, of bail and what metrics you are examining and what conclusions if any you have reached or

observations you have made, I, I don't want to say conclusions because the project is not even close to being finished? Who, who at MOCJ is responsible for the, the, the Vera project?

SARAH CASSEL: So, Vera is telling me that Mariam Popper is on that... on the programmatic side and Irmali I think is probably on the contract side, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Got it. okay. So, you heard the exchange with, I guess it was Legal Aid who said that when the writs are filed, and Commissioner Brann is the, the defendant it's not the corporation counsel that is appearing on the other side, its, it's the respective district attorney's office, do you know why that is so?

SARAH CASSEL: I'd have to defer to someone else in the administration to... regarding those legal issues.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Yeah, so why is it that CJA is the only entity that is allowed to place a hold while someone... they track down someone who can help pay a bail, why, why can't a public defender do that or, or a, a bail fund?

2.2

1 2 SARAH CASSEL: I'm not sure, I think 3 that's the, the court practice, I'm not sure if that's statutory... [cross-talk] 4 CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: I, I just can't 5 hear you, I'm sorry. 6 7 SARAH CASSEL: I'm sorry, I'm not sure if that's statutory or a court practice but we can look 8 9 into that.

CHAIRPERSON LANCMAN: Okay and... alright, thank you. That concludes our hearing. We are very, very happy to, to hear that the Vera bail project and, and that the expansion of BEX are contributing to mitigating the evils of, of cash bail and we hope that you think hard about how you'd like to potentially scale the pilot if you think that its necessary to get to a place where we can say this thing works and, and here's how we should bring it citywide. Thank you all very much.

[gavel]

21

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

# 

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



Date

December 27, 2018