CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

Jointly with

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

----- X

January 21, 2019 Start: 1:16 p.m. Recess: 5:20 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

BEFORE: Donovan J. Richards

Chairperson

Stephen T. Levin

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Vanessa L. Gibson Barry S. Grodenchik Robert F. Holden Brad S. Lander Antonio Reynoso Rafael Salamanca, Jr.

Ritchie J. Torres

Mark Treyger

Adrienne E. Adams Justin L. Brannan Fernando Cabrera Andrew Cohen

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Chaim M. Deutsch Rory I. Lancman Carlos Menchaca I. Daneek Miller Keith Powers Ydanis Rodriguez Paul A. Vallone

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

Edward Delatorre
Chief of Transit NYPD

Michael Clarke
Managing Attorney for NYPD Legislative Affairs

Molly Park
First Deputy Commissioner for DHS

Catherine Trapani Homeless Services United

Josh Dean Human.nyc

Giselle Routhier Coalition for the Homeless

Josh Goldfein Legal Aid Society

Kareem Walker [sp?]
Homeless

James Abro

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

Richard Hobbs Street Homeless

Wendy O'Shields

Richard Flores

Johnathan Sunshine

	4

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alright, good 3 afternoon. I am Donovan Richards from the 31st District in Queens, and I'm happy to Chair the 4 5 Committee on Public Safety. Today, we are joined by 6 the Committee on General Welfare chaired by Council Member Steve Levin, and I want to acknowledge other 8 members who are joined by us, Council Members 9 Vallone, Grodenchik, and Adams. And we will begin 10 this hearing now. We ask anybody who wishes to 11 testify to please fill out a slip with the Sergeant 12 of Arms, and you will get a chance to testify. We at the Council have an oversight responsibility for the 13 14 programs that the Administration has implemented. 15 This oversight responsibility is triggered when we 16 hear about new initiatives that give us concerns that 17 what is being said is not matching up to what is 18 being done, and when what is being done is not 19 consistent with the values of this city with respect 20 to today's subject matter, I have some serious 21 concerns. We are here to evaluate the subway 2.2 diversion program, which on its face sounds like 23 something I could get behind. We should be diverting 24 low-level offenses. If someone gets a summons, and 25 that person is homeless and living in poverty, it

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY makes no sense to fine them or to punish them in ways that will only exacerbate their poverty. That aspect of this program, I can get behind. What gives me pause is the way in which this program seems to deviate from its intended goals. I'm concerned that police officers are being directed to seek out these individuals, not because they have done something wrong, but because the law needs to be enforced against them, but instead because they look homeless and the officer is looking for a reason to give them a summons that they then offer to wipe away. that's what is going on, it's not diversion, it is coercion. My second concern is that I'm not sure that we even have the appropriate services to offer people to help them in meaningful ways. understanding is that people who choose the street over the shelter system know what the shelter system has to offer, and they don't want anything to do with it. So if all we're doing is giving them a choice between a summons they can't pay and a shelter they don't believe is safe, how can we believe that we are doing them any favors? My third concern is that this isn't a long-term solution. The services that are

being offered don't really get anyone off the

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY streets. Even if the person accepts the services, goes to wherever they are supposed to go, and gets the summons thrown out, how do we know that person isn't right back on the subway the next day? And if that's the case, then what are we really doing here. Look, I know that street homelessness in the subway system is a difficult problem that has vexed the City for many years in many mayoral administrations, not just this one. I'm not blaming you for trying. will blame you if what you're trying only serves to harass people without any likelihood it's going to I truly hope that this isn't just a way to get people out of sight and out of mind for a few hours, and today, I'm looking for answers that will convince me that is not the case. I want to add one more I'm frankly a bit surprised that my committee is here today dealing with the NYPD on this issue. My understanding was that the NYPD was trying to reduce the number of things that it has to do for us that officers aren't well-equipped to handle. not a criticism of the NYPD or the officers who are assigned to carry out the Subway Diversion Program, really it's not. You're following orders. You're the first line of defense for everything in this city, I

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY What I'm surprised about is that the Administration believes that the NYPD is the right agency to be doing homeless outreach. I'm guessing you're going to say that people who sleep on the trains are breaking the rules. Is someone taking up three seats really the best use of our officers' time? I thought we had recognized that wasting taxpayer dollars on low-level offenses was not the right answer for the NYPD. Cops should be fighting real crime and keeping us safe. Homeless people are not by-in-large putting us in danger, and certainly not the ones whose only offense is sleeping. should cops be on the front line in the fight against homelessness? Why should that be their responsibility? What homeless person wants help from someone with a gun and handcuffs? No matter how professional or polite or well-meaning that person might be, and again, I'm not blaming the NYPD. definitely not blaming the officers who are doing what they're told. I'm really asking the Administration why them. Isn't there someone else whose job this should be? I'm coming in here with an open mind, and I believe there are good intentions

behind the program, but there is a lot about this and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 it doesn't seem to make any sense. So I hope you all

3 have good explanations today as we begin this

4 hearing, and I'd like to turn it over to Chair Steve

5 Levin.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you very much, Chair Richards. And I want to welcome everybody here this afternoon to this hearing on the City Council's Committee on General Welfare jointly with the Committee on Public Safety. Again, I want to thank my colleague Chair Donovan Richards for convening this hearing and for his thoughtful remarks. this committee, these committees will examine the NYPD's Subway Diversion Program, and we'll hopefully get some much-needed transparency on how third policy is being carried out and hear form those who have been directly affected by it. Subway Division Program was announced as a pilot June 2019 and expanded two months later to all five boroughs. program targets those who are unsheltered in the subway system and who are observed to be in violation of the City's transit code of conduct rules such as not paying a fare, being "outstretched." According to the Administration, individuals engaged by the police who are deemed to be in violation will have

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

their summonses cleared provided that they complete an assessment with an outreach team, and receive a referral to shelter or services. The program also launched a Joint Crisis Coordination Center in which various city agencies use transit system wide live CCTV feed to monitor and inform the deployment of police and outreach workers for so-called "targeted interventions" for those who are observed to be unsheltered on the subway. It is apparent that this program has not actually helped the City's unsheltered individuals in the transit system move into shelter and services, but is rather a coercive and dangerously devised policy to move this population from public space and out of sight. Administration could have chosen to better spend these resources on more swiftly opening the previously committed 1,000 new and desperately needed safe haven beds or towards more permanent and supportive housing. I want to read a letter that was sent anonymously from officers in the NYPD's Transit Bureau assigned to carry out this policy which was sent over a couple of months ago. I'll read this into the record: "To whom it may concern: As dedicated officers assigned to the NYPD Transit

Bureau, we are writing on what we feel is a matter of utmost importance, the blatant discrimination against the homeless in NYC subways. The diversion program that is being advertised by the Mayor as helping the homeless could be nothing further from the truth. has found a willing partner in the leadership of the NYPD who have a history of only understanding numbers and intimidating its officers to complete the task. With the creators and believers of the program claiming success, the program is now being rapidly expanded into a version we fear is the worst yet. The homeless are now clearly being targeted as violators of transit rules and being treated differently than any other citizen. Using the technicality of not having identification or an address, the NYPD is using this as an excuse to have a legal interaction with homeless individuals. This is a drastic change compared to how we have treated the homeless in the past. What the public isn't being told is that homeless people are now being handcuffed, put over the radio as an arrest, and then brought into our transit commands. There, the homeless individuals are being coerced into services that could have been provided without having to handcuff and bring them

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

They're being threatened to accept services, and told that if they refuse, they will get a ticket, which most can't afford to pay-- or go to jail for a violation that the Manhattan DA has already made clear will be refused for prosecution anyway. isn't about helping. The most common violation called "outstretch" is the same violation committed to anyone who even lays their bag on another seat." I'm going to editorialize. It's also called, "man spreading," for anyone here in the audience who knows about that. This is something we have all done ourselves and witnessed every day. Those situations are not addressed in the same manner. Can you imagine somebody in a business suit on their commute home with their briefcase on the seat next to them and happen to have forgotten their ID that day, of it was a 16-year-old sitting in the stairway waiting for their train so that they could get to school. were be an uproar. We don't bother these people, because as officers we use discretion. The reason the same is not true with the homeless is that eh leadership has chosen to take that decision away from us. NYPD brass are using the diversion program as a new quota, implementing -- implemented through the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

usual fear-driven tactics to motivate its officers to complete the task. We are co9nstnatnly being threatened and told by immediate supervisors to get division. We are being boldly told how many to bring In addition, we now have forced overtime in a day. disguised as quality of life operation. They are being team-led by a supervisor to make sure that we are arresting a homeless rather an offering them services in the field. Majority of these arrests are being assigned. Why can't a police officer treat the homeless the same as an outreach team? Why are they now being treated differently? There is a clear double-standard at play against the homeless. CCTV for the diversion program that has claimed to be used for "rapid deployment of outreach to address client needs" is being -- is really being used to call our commands directly to dispatch us. We are then being specifically told by the command to bring that person in as a diversion arrest. In addition, most of the overtime is done in plain clothes to both try to please officers so they can excuse the action in their mind, and to have the ability to blend into the crowd so we can sneakily grab the homeless without attracting as much attention from the public.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

are even some commands that have pictures of homeless individuals that they are keeping tabs on right next to the pictures of wanted criminals, blurring the lines about what qualifies as a "bad quy" for the This shift is dangerous, especially for new NYPD. officers who don't remember a time before this. diversion program has become an obsession. We have lost focus on overall crime, especially counterterrorism, leaving citizens more vulnerable. Instead, we are unjustly criminalizing individuals who have done nothing worse than the average person in the subway, all because they have no home. isn't helping anyone. Treating the homeless in this manner is changing the morality of what it means to be a police officer sworn to protect all citizens, especially the most vulnerable. Many of us are conflicted on what we are being told to do, but we are forced to follow orders or face disciplinary action. This message is being sent anonymously, as we fear repercussions from our job. Please, let us know this message was received and brought to the right people, as this window of communication can't stay open for long. Ask the dedicated members of this Department if they feel what they are doing is right.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Ask the public. We are asking you to help challenge their word on this program for all to see. Let us know that we have solidarity. Yours faithfully." That was posted in a new website called, "Diversion is Coercion" that was put together by Human.nyc and Coalition for the Homeless. Obviously, it's very concerning that we'd be hearing this anonymously from NYPD officers. I have no reason to doubt that those truly were NYPD officers that sent that, even though it was sent anonymously. And either during your testimony or in your question and answer, I would appreciate a response to kind of all -- to all of the p9oitns that were raised in that letter, and certainly I can go back and quote from it during question and answer. So, I want to thank-- I want to thank those specifically those officers that have brought that to our attention, and I want to thank all the advocates and providers, and individuals that have been impacted by this policy for raising your voice and being here today. We look forward to hearing from all of you. And I'd like to thank the representatives from the Administration, NYPD, and DSS for being here today as well. We do want to get some clarity and transparency as it pertains to this

UNIDENTIFIED: [off mic] [inaudible]

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, okay, 3 alrighty. Okay.

[audience disruption]

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, alrighty,

[chanting]

2.2

2.3

okay.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, okay.

[chanting]

Want to thank—— I want to thank everybody. We're here to certainly hear from the Administration so that we can get to the bottom line and have some solutions to this issue. So, I want to thank everybody, and please refrain from approaching the desk, and everybody's going to have their opportunity to testify, and certainly if you want to carry the action like that when you testify, you're more than welcome to do that, but we're going to ask everybody to remain in their seats. Thank you.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Okay, good afternoon,

Chair Richards, Chair Levin and members of the

Council. I am Edward Delatorre, Chief of Transit for
the New York City Police Department. I am joined by
the Managing Attorney of the NYPD Legislative Affair

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Unit, Michael Clarke, and on behalf of Police Commissioner Dermot Shea, we appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today about the NYPD Subway Diversion Program. In 2019, New York City saw a record low in overall crime, even lower than the previous record low in 2018. We accomplish this while also greatly reducing the number of people arrested within the transit system. This doesn't happen by accident. It comes from our brave men and women dedicating their lives to serving New Yorkers and working with the communities we serve. Due in no small part to the vigilance of transit officers and the almost six million riders that use the system each day, we have also created a culture of safety on the subways that stands in stark contrast to where we were just three decades ago. In 1990 there were a total of 17,497 index crimes in our subways, compared to only 2,500 in 2019, or about 6.8 crimes per day. Building trust and partnering with those we serve has been a cornerstone of New York City's public safety success story and the neighborhood policing philosophy. That is why we introduced neighborhood policing into the New York City expansive subway Having the same officers assigned to the system.

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

same sectors results in those officers and neighborhood residents familiarizing themselves with one another and allowing those officers to gain unique insight into issues faced by residents in that neighborhood and how to address those issues. stands true in the subway system as well. More often than not, the same riders travel the same routes, and assigning the same officers to patrol certain stations and lines familiarizes these officers with riders and vice versa and the issues experienced by riders at particular stations. Today, every transit district is assigned NCO, or Neighborhood Coordination Officers. The NCOs are tasked with working with our MTA partners and members of the public to address the issues in the subway that are related to public safety. The NCOs and our Transit Officers take great pride in the stations they patrol and always see creative ways to keep the subway safe for all riders. With 27 lines and 472 stations, the transit system presents unique challenges for law enforcement. Each day, the men and women of the NYPD Transit Bureau charged with ensuring the safety and security of our subways rise to these challenges. Among these challenges is successfully connecting our

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

homeless population in the transit system with vital services they may require. Our officers work diligently to ensure that when we engage with individuals experiencing homelessness, we are able to offer them the support they need. In conjunction with the Department's Homeless Outreach Unit, we strive to connect individuals without a home on their terms and help them find shelter and vital services. We have partnered with our colleagues at DHS to create a street homeless joint command center to help address homeless street conditions by leveraging the entire city workforce in our effort to reach the homeless population. Additionally, our NCOs routinely work with fellow city agencies and nonprofits to help address issues of homelessness in their zones. Every day, officers provide information on the wide array of services available to homeless individuals with whom they have contact. worked with the experts in the field to ensure our officers understand how to interact with members of this population. We utilized these experts to training our training sergeants on best practices when interacting with individuals who are chronically homeless who then train each officer in their

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

In addition, roughly two-thirds respective commands. of our transit officers have received crisis intervention training, a four-day course which helps officers interact with individuals undergoing crisis or suffering from mental illness. Finally, we are working with DHS and the Bowery Residents' Committee to produce a video which will further highlight best practices. It is clear that the issue of homeless in the subways is one that must be tackled through innovative solutions aimed at helping this most vulnerable segment of our population. Helping people who are experiencing homelessness in turn helps our city as a whole. The subways have long been a refuge for people who find themselves without a home. the mission of the NYPD to ensure that all can enjoy their benefits of the MTA services in a safe and orderly manner. This means those using our subway system obey all applicable laws and transit rules while riding a train and when located in the subway station. I want to be clear, being homeless is not a crime. However, when you are homeless or not, -whether you are homeless or not, no one is permitted to create hazardous conditions or engage in behavior that violates the law or MTA rules. The better

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

approach, when appropriate, therefore, is to offer help to those who need it and would accept it. officers must strike a delicate balance between taking enforcement action and offering services or sometimes doing both. It is a balance that is achieved through compassion with an eye toward utilizing our resources to provide assistance to those in need while seeking to maintain the quality of our subways that riders have come to deserve and expect. Whatever the approach, it must address the condition observed or complaints received by our officers. The Subway Diversion Program was designed to offer help to people without a verifiable address by diverting them away from the criminal justice system and toward critical services. It represents a collaborative interagency approach that leverages the NYPD Neighborhood Policing philosophy to help those in need of assistance. Instead of finding themselves in the criminal justice system, they find themselves receiving services that will hopefully get them back on their feet. We have seen people take advantage of crucial services, of these crucial services. program's first five months, from July through November 2019, the NYPD encountered 1,296 individuals

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

who were eligible for the program. Four hundred individuals meaningfully engaged and had their summonses dismissed, with 305 individuals transported to shelter facilities, and 172 accepting full assessment of their needs. Effective policing in about more than-- effective policing is about more than just arrests and summonses. The men and women of the NYPD are dedicated to protecting and serving the residents of this city. In doing so, they are also committed to helping those in need. something our officers do whenever they put on the uniform. It is an important aspects of our Neighborhood Policing philosophy which as fostered us partnering with the communities we serve to keep crime at historic lows, improve the quality of life for all New Yorkers, and help those among us who are in need of help. Thank you for this opportunity to speak about this important program, and I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Now, I get to take a sip of water, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. You deserve it.

25

2 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: 3 afternoon, Chairperson Levin and members of the General Welfare Committee, and Chairperson Richards 4 and members of the Public Safety Committee. you for this opportunity to testify and speak on the 6 7 important work that New York City is doing to address 8 long-term street homelessness in New York City, including the recently launched Subway Diversion Subway Diversion is one of the number of 10 Program. 11 the elements of our overall citywide HomeStat outreach effort. It is at the core of the Journey 12 13 Home plan to end long-term street homelessness in New 14 York City. My name is Molly Park, First Deputy 15 Commissioner of the Department of Homeless Services, 16 and I will be presenting today's testimony on behalf 17 of the agency. Last month, the Administration announced its first-in-the-nation, six-point Action 18 Plan to end long-term street homelessness in New York 19 20 City over the next five years. The plan will increase 21 housing, mental health and medical services for unsheltered individuals, and enhance outreach 2.2 2.3 resources to deliver more urgent and rapid responses to unsheltered individuals in need. Our current 24

strategies have helped more than 2,450 individuals

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

come off the streets and into transitional programs and permanent housing since the launch of HOME-STAT in April 2016. By marshalling new and critical resources, the Journey Home plan will: Increase Safe Haven capacity by opening 1,000 new Safe Haven beds; Create 1,000 new low-barrier permanent apartments by working with partners across the housing and social services sectors; Deliver new health resources to people where they are, providing treatment through street medical care and behavioral health care, and building the trust needed for clients to come inside; Provide coordinated rapid outreach response through the Street Homelessness Joint Command Center; Leverage state-of-the-art outreach technology to better connect clients to the services they need to transition into housing; and expand diversion and outreach in our subway system. The Journey Home plan builds on the nation's most comprehensive street outreach program, the Department of Homeless Services' HOME-STAT initiative, with outreach teams canvassing the five boroughs and engaging New Yorkers who are unsheltered 24 hours a day, seven days a week, every day of the year. Through HOME-STAT, hundreds of highly-trained, not-for-profit outreach

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

staff, including licensed social workers, canvass the streets, proactively engaging New Yorkers experiencing street homelessness. Outreach workers offer services and assistance, while working to gain trust with the goal of addressing the underlying issues that may have caused or contributed to street homelessness in order to ultimately help these individuals transition off the streets. HOME-STAT also provides aftercare services, continuing to work with individuals as they make that transition to ensure that they get the supports they need to remain in housing and off the streets. Through HOME-STAT we have implemented current strategies that have helped more than 2,450 individuals off the streets and into transitional programs and permanent housing since the launch of HOME-STAT in April 2016; tripled the City's investment in street homelessness programs from approximately \$45 million to more than \$140 million before the additional investments for the Journey Home plan; tripled the number of emergency Safe Haven and stabilization beds dedicated to serving street homeless New Yorkers citywide from 600 to more than 1,800 today; tripled the number of outreach staff from fewer than 200 in 2014 to more than 550; built

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the City's first-ever "By-Name" list of individuals known to be homeless and residing on the streets to improve delivery of services to help them come off the streets. Outreach teams now know approximately 1,300 street homeless individuals by name and actively engage another 2,400 individuals encountered on the streets to determine whether they are homeless; increased joint outreach operations with the NYPD and partner agencies such as NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, the Fire Department's Emergency Medical Services, and the Department of Parks & Recreation to engage more New Yorkers and offer more supports. This Administration has dedicated millions of dollars to transit system outreach efforts, with teams out year-round on subway trains, platforms, terminals, and end-of-line stations, engaging individuals experiencing homelessness and offering a range of services to meet their unique needs, person by person. DHS partners with the MTA and Bowery Residents' Committee, known as BRC, to provide outreach and services in subway stations, with a focus on high-activity stations and end-of-line stations. To that end, all street homeless outreach

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

teams have access to: licensed clinicians who work with clients on the streets, provide on-going case management, and assess each individual for immediate risk/crisis during each encounter; psychiatrists who perform psychiatric evaluations on the streets, as needed, helping understand and better meet the individual needs of each New Yorker experiencing street homelessness; and substance use resources, including the ability to immediately connect clients to detox and other rehabilitation programs, and staff who are trained in naloxone administration. While BRC primarily focuses on high-activity subway stations, including terminals such Grand Central and Penn Station and end-of-line stations, the NYPD's Transit Bureau primarily focuses on subway cars and the overall subway system. Additionally, BRC outreach teams work in coordination with trained NYPD colleagues, including conducting end of line outreach to encourage New Yorkers experiencing homelessness to come inside from the subways and into transitional and permanent programs. As you just heard from the NYPD, this summer, the Administration launched the Subway Diversion Project, a collaborative, progressive initiative with the NYPD, the Manhattan

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

District Attorney, the MTA, and HOME-STAT outreach provider BRC to divert unsheltered New Yorkers from unnecessary criminal justice processes, and towards shelter and services. The program has now been implemented across the subway system. Through this Subway Diversion Project, individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness, meaning that they have no active legal address at the time of engagement and not residing in shelter, encountered by the NYPD in the transit system and observed by the NYPD to be in violation of New York City Transit Code of Conduct rules, such as violating Transit Authority sign, are being offered referrals to services in lieu of civil summonses. Participants who opt into the program complete an assessment with a BRC outreach team, receive a referral to shelter and/or other services, and have their summonses cleared in coordination with the MTA, ultimately diverting them towards shelter away from unnecessary formal court processes and helping more people come inside and out of the There is no one-size-fits-all solution to subwavs. the citywide challenge of homelessness. Our outreach enhancements are about continually strengthening our person-to-person engagement to get know more

2.2

2.3

unsheltered New Yorkers, understand their unique needs, and build the trust which will ultimately encourage them to accept services and come indoors, which can take hundreds of contacts and supportive conversations. Every engagement or every conversation represents progress in the right direction, and the more opportunities we have for engaging New Yorkers in need, the better. An individual who may not be ready to accept services today may be ready to make that transition tomorrow, and through enhancements like the Subway Diversion Project, we remain focused on increasing pathways off the street for these New Yorkers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you very much,

Commissioner. Is there any other testimony? I'll

ask a few questions, turn it over to my co-chair and
then turn it over to other Council Members for

questions. First question, who came up with this
plan? Who was-- where did this-- where did the idea
originate?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Okay, good question.

So, I got to take you back a little bit. So, going back to 2014, I was the Commander of Staten Island, and during my time there we had a problem with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

overdoses. So, there was no-- there was a lifesaving drug called Narcan, but nobody was allowed to use it, with the exception of only paramedics. Not even EMTs could use it legally at the time. the same time, we saw people dying. So, as the Borough Commander, working with our service providers and other partners, we came up with the idea that we could have a Police Department Doctor write a prescription for police officers to carry Narcan and start using it on Staten Island. So, it was January of 2014, we launched a pilot in the 120 precinct, and we had every officer in the 120 trained in how to use it and give a prescription so they could carry it legally. In the first three months on Staten Island in 2014 in the 120 we had three lives saved. was enough to say we don't need to study this, let's just move on it. It's working. By the summer of 2014 every cop on Staten Island had a prescription and had Narcan and began saving lives. That helped in a lot of ways. It helped create a culture in my offices to look at somebody who was in the throes of an overdose in a more compassionate way, and to take pride and pleasure in saving them. So, that was the beginning. Then Staten Island still has this huge

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

overdose problem. Why were so many people dying? So, again, meeting with other partners and providers on the Island got together with Mike McMahon, the District Attorney out there-- very forward-thinking as well, and we talked about ways to move forward on this overdose problem. So, Mike's initiative became what was known as HOPE. So, HOPE was a program that was developed in a room just full of a lot partners to say that people are being arrested for low-level narcotics with no meaningful outcome most of the time, and they're being criminalized, having criminal records, ultimately warranting many times, but at the end of it, it wasn't a meaningful outcome. So, the HOPE program, took us a while to get it going -- when we got the HOPE program going, what we actually had was what I believe to this day is a very meaningful outcome for people in the throes of drug addiction. People were early on with low-level possessions of narcotics, although they were arrested like they normally would have been, we were able to divert them immediately at the front door out of the criminal justice system where they never even had the case docketed. So, they were able to get a desk appearance ticket at the front door. They had seven

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

days to engage with a counselor, and then they had 30 days for the counselors to get back and say, yes, there was a meaningful engagement here. In all of these cases, the responsibility was on the counselor to come out to the precinct and engage the person or follow up with them to also let us know that this was actually going to work. HOPE is still alive and well on Staten Island. It exists in different forms throughout the City at this point I'm told. I think it was a real win and it came from thinking out of the box and trying to look at people in a more compassionate way and find a more meaningful outcome for their problems. I know from HOPE, anecdotally, I got calls back from people thanking us, and me in particular, I actually received calls from people saying, "It changed my life. Thank you." So, that brings us now to Transit. So, I'm transferred a couple years ago to Transit, and now I see something that I consider similar, different, but similar. see a homeless population or a population of people in Transit that don't have an address, and they are getting caught up in the system for no good reason as well, in my opinion, and I wanted to help us find a more meaningful outcome. So we began again meeting

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

with the Manhattan District Attorney and other partners that, you know, DHS, BRC, other people that deal with this very vulnerable population. the meetings went on, we realized that the HOPE model itself would not work here. First of all, it wasn't necessarily an arrestable DAT situation. Secondly, we're dealing with District Attorneys from all over the City. So, the District Attorneys themselves could not control this. so we had to find another way to take this meaningless encounter, arrest, away from the person without an address, give them an address, and then hopefully help them understand that, you know, the counselors could help them go further and get that whole summons expunged. So, what we did is we came up with the concept of -- and we got Transit Adjudications Bureau to work with us on this. That's the MTA court that handles the summonses. So we came up with the concept of anybody who is actually engaged at summonsable [sic] or arrestable [sic] now because they may not have an address, let me start by giving them an address. BRC agreed we can give them So, now, the people we engage out their address. there that had no address now have an address instantly. At that point, they're eligible for a

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

summons. They don't have to get caught up in the criminal justice system, unless they have a warrant. That's another piece I'll mention, I'll talk to you But so, at that point, you know, we can certify that they have an address and they can get With that, the same as HOPE, BRC had to the summons. be funded and staffed to have counselors respond to our police station to come and engage the person, pick them up, and hopefully take them back for some sort of an assessment. That, I believe, has been working incredibly well. Not everybody sits for meaningful engagement, but when we look back at HOPE, not everybody meaningfully engaged there either. we're talking about people who really need help and struggle to get it. I have a case back in, I think it was July 27th, I'll call it Mr. K. Mr. K was one of our early diversion. Mr. K came back the following day into the district and thanked the police officers for getting him help. As of early January, Mr. K was still in the Safe Haven somewhere in the system. We confirmed that with BRC. mean, we're not going to be able to help everybody, but I think giving the officers throughout the transit system a tool where they can do something

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 meaningful and help somebody, I think-- once again, I

3 go back to Staten Island HOPE where now they feel

4 | like they're' doing something meaningful as opposed

5 to leaving someone out there to fall victim to some

6 sort of other problems that they might have.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, Chief, I want to thank you for the work that you did in Staten Island on the HOPE program, and I know how impactful that has been. It led to, you know, a standing prescription for any New Yorker to be able to go into any pharmacy and get Narcan started with NYPD in Staten Island. So, that's in, you know, a span of about five years. So, undoubtedly not only does it save lives -- that program saved lives, but calling you know, now with kind of the more ubiquity of Narcan, you know, that is -- it's very far-reaching, and obviously the reports out this past year from the numbers in Staten Island and the impact the HOPE program has had is, you know, remarkable. So I want to acknowledge that. I wanted to ask, so one of the concerns that we've had is that, you know, I didn't-as the Chair of this Committee, I didn't know about this diversion program until after the pilot with BRC for a couple of months and over the summer, I didn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

know about it until it was fully announced in September, maybe, August, September. And asking around to people in the Homeless Services world, you know, none of the providers or people that are on the ground or advocates that work on policy, nobody had been consulted. You know, the big concern as Chair Richards says is -- I mean, we could talk, and we will talk about the -- how prudent it is to engage with the summons as a tool, but the fact of the matter is, there are no new services that we are offering people on the back end. So, we can have that interaction and most people that are sleeping on the train have had interactions with outreach workers. I mean, I talked to a guy a couple of weeks ago, and he was like-- had maybe 100 interactions with outreach workers. If the outreach worker doesn't have anything to offer them that they want, you know, that becomes a real challenge. So, certainly not, you know, taking away from the NYPD officers that are in the subway, it's just if we can't offer them anything meaningful in terms of housing in any way different, then I do see a problem there. So, actually, to that point, I want to be clear -- and this is for DHS. Are there any new services being offered to individuals

2 who are un-domiciled in the subway as part of this

3 program that were not offered before. Aside from new

4 Safe Haven beds, because that's not a new service,

5 per say-- it's an expansion of an existing service.

6 Are there new services available?

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Yes. So, let me pause on the Safe Haven beds. I actually think it is -- while it is a program that has existed, we have tripled what's been available, and we're adding another thousand units. That is in and of itself a major initiative that I think goes a very long way to addressing both what we see is a need and what we have heard from the advocate community is a need as well. We are creating a permanent housing pipeline that will serve-- that is designed to be lower barrier. Supportive Housing is a wonderful model. I am a huge supporter of Supportive Housing. Oddly phrased sentence, but you get the idea. does come with certain barriers. You have to qualify under [inaudible] requirements under-- with serious mental illness or substance abuse. If it is a congregate program you have to be able to meet the annual income certifications. So, there are some challenges there. We are going to create a lower

COMMITTEE	OM	GENERAL.	WELFARE	WITH	COMMITTEE	OM	PIIRLTC	SAFETY

2.2

2.3

barrier program for this population. We are expanding street medicine so that people can get healthcare, both physical healthcare and behavioral healthcare on the streets wherever they are.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Can I ask a question about that?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Has Care for the Homeless been engaged as a provider in that work?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: We've certainly been talking to them. This is—most of our outreach contracts have some healthcare embedded in them right now. Some of it's behavioral. Some of it's physical, and it's a little bit sporadic. So what we're doing is working with all of our providers to expand and make consistent what people can provide.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: BRC and Breaking

Ground have actual doctors and nurse practitioners
that are--

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

[interposing] Yes. They--

 $\label{eq:chairperson levin: able to go out and do} % \end{substitute} % \end{substitut$

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: They have some now and we're expanding what everybody is going-- we will be expanding what everybody has available to them.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: It should—— it would make sense to work with Care for the Homeless as a—— FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

[interposing] Yes.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: as an umbrella or, I mean, as a provider organization, but also the organization that has the expertise around healthcare for--

[interposing] They're absolutely part of the conversation. So, let's see. So, expanded—healthcare, expanded housing, expanded transitional housing options, I think all of those are new and important to unexciting. We entirely agree that it does take sometimes hundreds of points of contact before an individual is ready to come inside. We want to be there with services when the person is ready to come inside, but we also want to be able to provide some interim support, whether it be the healthcare, whether it's a drop-in center, whether

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And when are the thousand new Safe Haven beds going to be online?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It'll be over a period. The first ones will come on probably late spring early summer, and then going forward from there.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: How many are in the first tranche?

about 350 that are in progress right now. Not all of them will be in that spring summer, but spread over time. And we're looking at ways that we can do some-

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] I'm out of office in a year and half, or you know, give or take, so are you guys. How many Safe Hav-- of those thousand Safe Haven beds will be online on December $31^{\rm st}$, 2021?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: With the caveat that construction cycles-- construction cycles, I would say somewhere between 350-450 of those.

2 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay.

2.2

2.3

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I have certainly heard the feedback that this is a plan that extends beyond the Mayor's Administration. Any challenging problem requires long-term creative, ambitious thinking, and frankly, I wouldn't want to work for an Administration that gave up on the last two years of its--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Right, -FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:
[interposing] time period.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: but when say a thousand Safe Haven beds, by the time I'm out of office and you're out of office, or maybe not you but Bill de Blasio's out of office, it is-- we're looking at 350 to 450 online-- available?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Online, many more than that. I would anticipate the full thousand sited and in the development process.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, but those aren't' beds that we can offer people. So, if there's 2,178 individuals un-domiciled on the subway system as per HOPE count 2019, you know, that's still leaving a large gap of people that are not going to

have a Safe Haven bed available. I want to ask

about-- so I just want to get to the numbers a little

bit so far. And Chief Delatorre, you mentioned that

172 individuals have accepted full assessment out of

1,296 that were contacted. This was between the

pilots in November, I believe is what you said.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, actually, 477 meaningfully engaged.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Uh-huh.

CHIEF DELATORRE: So when we break that down, 305 are placed in shelter and 172 completed their assessment in case management.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, sorry, so when we say they completed the assessment meaning that they-what is the definition of-- I don't know what the definitions for these categories are. So--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] So, the NYPD does not define meaningful engagement, just as in the HOPE program. We leave that to our professionals, the social workers.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Sure.

CHIEF DELATORRE: My sense is it means sit down, have a conversation, and let's talk about

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

the issues affecting you right now. That's an assessment or the baseline for an assessment.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, the other 800 or so that did not have meaningful engagement, those people received summonses?

CHIEF DELATORRE: They did. Everybody receives a summons.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: But those summonses weren't cleared.

CHIEF DELATORRE: They were not cleared.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay. So, two-thirds, roughly two-thirds of the 296 got a summons; summons wasn't cleared.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Correct. Correct. 477.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: 477.

CHIEF DELATORRE: So, I consider the cup a quarter or a third full.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Sure, sure, right.

And then, so maybe DHS can answer what is a full assessment then?

Meaningful engagement is a term of art in the social service world, and to echo my colleague, we do rely

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

2.2

2.3

on BRC's determination to because different people
are in different places in their lives. What we are
looking for is some particular form of engagement.
It could be interacting with the medical personnel.
It could be that conversation and planning with an
outreach worker. It does not require entering into
shelter. So, I think there was a

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Okay.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

misconception at one point that you did have to enter shelter in order to have your summons cleared. That is not the case. So you need to participate in some form or another that the BRC social workers and outreach team deems as being engaged.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, and then what is full assessment? That is--

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] No, no, when defined the 172 individuals went into full assessment, what does that mean?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It means working with that BRC outreach team to do case management, to assess what they need and to come up

- COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 46 1 with a plan for how they're going to meet either 2 3 immediate needs, when they might be-- what they're looking for in shelter, if they're trying to get to 4 5 Safe Haven, assessing medical needs, do they have family they can connect with. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And all 172 of those are in shelter then? 8 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: But 300 did go to 10 11 shelter? So those two numbers might not be the same 12 cohort? 13 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: are-- so the 477 are the people, the grand total--14 15 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Yep, 16 right. 17 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: who accepted engagement. Those then break into two 18 19 slices--20 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Oh,
 - CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Oh, okay.

- FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: the 305

 people who--
- 24 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Went 25 into shelter.

2	FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Got to						
3	shelter and then they the remainder and now I'm						
4	not doing my subtraction in my head, but the						
5	remainder who accepted a form of services that was						
6	something other than shelter.						
7	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay. So, then,						
8	about- so 23 and a half percent of the individuals						
9	that were given a summons ended up going into						
10	shelter.						
11	FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: That's						
12	the						
13	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] 305 out						
14	of 12						
15	FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:						
16	[interposing] Out of 1,296.						
17	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: 96.						
18	FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I do						
19	want to clarify, they got to shelter.						
20	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: They got to shelter.						
21	FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Many of						
22	those people in fact did spend a night in shelter,						
23	but not everybody spent a night in shelter.						
24	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: How many spent a week						

in shelter?

2.2

2.3

2 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I don't 3 have that number.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay.

innovating very quickly and experimenting here. Our data systems have not caught up to all of our programs so that we have-- we have plans for being able to do some additional data management that we can't do right now.

mean, if you were to ask me like what's the measure of success, I would say people that stay in shelter for three weeks, for a month, you know, so that— or who are— are able to get into and have and be able to stabilize, but staying in shelter for a night or two nights is not a measure of success.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Well, I want to actually--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Sorry, but it's-- I mean, these are people that have probably spent nights in shelter before in their lives, right?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, since the start of this Administration, we've-- 2,450

2.2

2.3

people have come inside off the streets and remain inside. So that is something that we do track and assess.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Right.

specific to the diversion program, but across the board there's a number that we are very proud of. We absolutely believe that that is the gold standard. However, I do think the interim measure of a night or two nights or five nights in shelter is something that's valuable, because in that night, two nights, five nights, that is a hypothermia case avoided. That is somebody who is safe, safer--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Well, but sleeping on the subway is a hypothermia case avoided. It is. It is. It's 25 degrees outside. People are going to be on the subway. I'm-- so, okay, sorry. Changing gears for a second here.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, how many summonses for outstretch have been written? Do we have a-- do we have-- what we would like, and you might not have it right now, is month by month the number of summonses written for outstretch-- going

back to before this initiative and then through this initiative as it has been rolled out so that we can see how this initiative has actually impacted that overall category of summons, and then how many of these summons, I think you said, that 470-some-odd-477 were then cleared out, and the remainder then are-- remain in effect. That's, you know, that's a lot of summonses that are out there now. What happens if a summons isn't paid? It's a warrant

CHIEF DELATORRE: No. It's a civil summons in Transit Adjudication Bureau. It's the lightest touch you can have, basically. There is no warrant. I don't know what the fine is. It may be 50 dollars. I don't know, but it's-- there is no warrant attached to it.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, then there's no-

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] There's no criminalization whatsoever here. No. And we don't collect-- we don't get involved in any of that.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Are individuals being handcuffed when brought in? So, if there are 1,200

2.2

2.3

right?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

people that have been engaged, of those 1,200 how
many have been handcuffed?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Okay, so I can never tell you the answer to that question. I don't know. I can tell you that the very first diversion that took place was sort of an experiment. I was actually walking on a platform with some officers. There was a fellow laid out in a subway car. When the train stopped, the officers asked him to come off, and we talked into the Transit District. Now, at this point, remember I told you, I was trying to figure out how I could help this population, and everybody I was speaking to actually was telling me they'll never accept sitting with a counselor in lieu of a summons. They'll never accept it. I said if I can make him-give him-- make him eligible for a summons, why wouldn't he sit with a counselor for a few minutes and discus this for that meaningful engagement? this gentleman, we brought him up to the desk in the district. We happen to be in the same station. was walking into the district. We brought him up the He was a man in jeans. He had a bag, looked like a carpenter. He may very well have been. when we got to the desk he said, "I don't have an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

address. I'm homeless." So, I stopped everybody and I went over there, and I said, "Sir, can I ask you a question? If I was to offer you the opportunity to sit with a counselor instead of going through any of this, would you accept it?" He said, "Of course I would." That's when I knew that this idea, this concept we were working on was really not very different from the HOPE program in Staten Island, and people would rather have the engagement as opposed to that. Now, let me just also be clear that we're evolving here, and I may get some great ideas right out of this Council here today that I could take back and apply, but we're evolving and we're looking for more and more ways. One of the things that we noticed here is that people cannot be diverted if they have a warrant. They have to be returned to the court. That's the law. But there are two levels of There are the bench warrants, and then what warrant. we call the SAP warrants. So, we're very close to getting to a point where if you happen to have no address and I can give you address, but the only barrier I have is that low-level warrant, we're very close to the point now where we'll be able to engage the court system and have that SAP warrant

2.2

2.3

rescheduled for another day; relieve the burden of the warrant and hand over the whole warrant issue to the casework, to the BRC worker, when that person goes with them with the summons. So now the summons gets expunged, and the warrant gets delayed so that somebody can assist that individuals in getting the warrant cleared later. We don't have the authority of the NYPD to clear a warrant. And by the way, the other issue would be if we would try to stay with the client all night, it would just-- we wouldn't have the resources to appear in court the next day to clear a warrant.

there's a lot of concerns. One concern, in particular, around the summonses for Outstretch is that it would be applied selectively. There are plenty of people of the millions of people that ride the subway every day—— I'm one of them. I fall asleep on the subway. I'll fall asleep any chance I——— I have two little kids, so I will sleep any chance I get. I could be on a five—minute subway ride and I will fall asleep, and if I lean over and cover two seats, I put my chances of getting a summonses for that at 0.0 percent. I guarantee I will not get a

night in New York. It would be impossible. And so

it's-- how do you address that selective enforcement?

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

54

CHIEF DELATORRE: Alright, so the officers in transit encounter— have thousands encounters a day, and want to admonish and struck [sic] correct behavior over and over every day. But to capture a snapshot of these types of jobs that we're talking about— so through the JCC, you know, we monitor different cameras, and when we see somebody who appears to be in need for whatever the reason, could be a crime, it could be someone outstretched on a platform, when we see this we dispatch teams. And just to give you a sense, we started— we got up and running about September 10th

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of 2019, and from September 10th until the end of the year, we had 111-- excuse me, 1,117 of these types of jobs. Most of them could have overlapped, because the most obvious thing you'll see on a camera is someone laying on the ground. Most of them could have overlapped. Over the 1,117 jobs, 28 resulted in a diversion. That's about two and a half percent. So, of course the officers have discretion is my point, and 101, by the way, went to the hospital. We had one woman, I'll call her Mrs. K, who we had seen on the ground several times and had sent officers out several time to render aid, and one time when they went out, she actually was sweating and apparently convulsing, and the officers were able to get her to the hospital. This is a camera job, just someone laying on the ground that someone else might have assumed, "Oh, that's just someone who is undomiciled. Leave them. They sleep there every day." No, it's not the reality. The reality is you never know when someone needs help. So we go out there, we get her to the hospital, and the doctor said, "Good thing you brought her here. She was really in a state of trauma." So, we have these little anecdotal successes, but the bottom line is these are human

beings and they deserve the help. And we cannot

overlook-- we have to do what we can to help, and

that's the thrust of everything we're doing here. No

different than HOPE.

6 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Chief.

I'll turn it back-- I'll turn it over to my Co-chair.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And thank you.

9 We've been joined by Council Members Gjonaj, Miller,

10 Menchaca, Salamanca, Powers, Treyger. Miss anybody?

11 Reynoso and Cabrera. Yeah, I got everybody else,

12 okay. So, you still didn't answer the exact

13 question, Council Member Levin raised, I think, in

14 | his first question. Whose idea was this?

15 CHIEF DELATORRE: It was a collaborative

16 effort. The idea started on Staten Island, and then-

17 | -

1

7

8

18 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] NO,

19 no, no, I'm not talking about HOPE. I know all about

20 HOPE.

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHIEF DELATORRE: I will answer. It started on Staten Island, and then the concept, I sat down with my partners here that could help transit, DHS, District Attorney's Office, and that's where the idea evolved from.

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 57 1 2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I know what HOPE is, well aware. We the Council also funded part of 3 4 that program, too. 5 CHIEF DELATORRE: Yes. CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And this has 6 nothing to do with HOPE. This is totally separate. 7 8 So I just want to put that out there. So, you're saying you sat collaboratively as much as the Commissioners and others complain about societal ills 10 11 that the NYPD has to deal with, so you came up with 12 this idea, this particular program. The NYPD is-who's in charge? 13 14 CHIEF DELATORRE: I will say I was a big 15 part of the idea, okay? CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. Who's in 16 17 charge? So, NYPD's in charge or DHS? What's the 18 chain of command with this program? 19 CHIEF DELATORRE: Well, it's the NYPD 20 Transit Diversion. So, the NYPD--21 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] Okay. 2.2 CHIEF DELATORRE: is in charge, but not 2.3 without partners. So, we don't make this work

without DHS and BRC. So, I can't say that any one of

us is in charge. It's a collaborative effort to make

24

25

2.2

2.3

sure we put this together as best we can, and it often means stepping out of our lane and talking to BRC about their work product, how they're doing DHS, how we're doing over there. So, I'm learning a lot about these issues, and that's why I commented a little bit prematurely earlier. I'm learning a lot about the needs of this population and how we can best serve it, and that's why I said earlier, you know, anything I can take from here that can help us, I'm all ears on it.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And obviously, I mean, we are aware that the State Police are also ramping up in our subways. Is there any coordination or conversations happening with them around this program?

CHIEF DELATORRE: No, there are no conversations around this program.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Will there be conversations around this program?

CHIEF DELATORRE: I'm willing to talk to them about anything at this point. I can't say. The State Police are doing the end-of-line work right now, and we're doing what we do throughout the entire system. Currently, just so you do know, that JCC

Command Center I talked about, we do have a member of the State Police assigned there 24/7, but that's mainly to coordinate resources. We certainly don't want an incident of friendly fire. So we need to know where their people are whenever we're in the system, and we do our best to de-conflict so that we're not in the same stations at the same time.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right, and I just bring that up because obviously policies will need to align here and we don't want the Wild Wild West either in our subway systems.

UNIDENTIFIED: Juts to clarify, it's MTA.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I mean, MTA. I equate them with the state, but MTA.

CHIEF DELATORRE: It's' MTA, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Yes, MTA, state, all the same. Let me ask this question. So, if a person is summonsed, give a summons, they're brought back to your specific facility?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Generally, but at times we do-- we are able to engage them in afield if BRC's available, but generally they're brought back to the facility, yes.

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 60 1 2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So, if I got a 3 summons, would I be brought to your facility? Why 4 can't we--5 CHIEF DELATORRE: No, you won't get a summons and then get brought back to the facility. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. 8 CHIEF DELATORRE: People only brought to 9 the facility if we cannot identify them, and if you yourself had no idea, yes--10 11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] Okay. 12 CHIEF DELATORRE: we can identify you in 13 the field, you'd had to be brought back to the 14 facility to be identified. 15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right, and does the officer call someone from DSS to evaluate that 16 17 individual for services? Would they do that? 18 for instance, if a summons is issued on the platform, 19 would they then work with the Mayor or does DSS come 20 back to your specific --21 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Okay, so 2.2 we're trying to get there. Currently at the JCC we 2.3 actually have a DHS rep who sits there and dispatches

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And--

BRC directly to platforms for us.

24

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 1 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] That's 2 3 definitely a direction we're heading in, but we're 4 not there yet. 5 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And just go 6 through-- so these are civil summonses, correct? 7 criminal? 8 CHIEF DELATORRE: Correct. 9 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty. what kind of conduct? So, I know we talked about 10 outstretching. Can you speak to any other conduct 11 12 that--13 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Could be any quality of life type of stuff that violates the 14 15 transit regs and rules. It could be urinating, any 16 kind of transit rule regs that are observed. 17 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right. And one of 18 the questions I have is around mental health. So how 19 do you deal with individuals who have mental health 20 challenges? Are you giving them summonses, too? How 21 do you--2.2 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] No, no. 2.3 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: How do you--

no. So, going back to that control group of 1,117,

24

25

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] No, no,

2.2

2.3

2 101 people were taken to the hospital. They do not 3 get a summons.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And out of that 101 taken to the hospital, which organizations followed up with them?

CHIEF DELATORRE: I don't know. That's a Health + Hospitals question.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So, did those individuals end up right back on the train, or did they go in shelter?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Again, that's out of my purview, but two-thirds of my officers are CIT trained, Crisis Intervention, and they are aware of other resources and other referrals that can be made. That's part of their training.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: But there's currently no follow-up when they go to the hospital.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: If I could jump in here.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: When a client who is on the outreach caseload, whether it's for BRC or any of our other outreach providers, when they are admitted to the hospital, when we have any

\cap NT	CENTEDAT	שמת ביו דיו הו	ᅜᄺᄪᅜ	COMMITTEE	DIIDI TC	CAEETV

2 | transparency into it, which, you know, there may be

3 cases where we don't, but when we have any

4 | transparency into it our expectation and the terms of

5 the contract are such that the outreach provider

6 follows up with the hospital.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Expectation or is it mandatory.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It's mandatory.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, and what follow-up do you do to make sure that actually happens?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Again, there is--

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] An expectation?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: No, that was not actually what I was going to say--

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] Okay.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: When we know about the case, right, because people are mobile and may have an interaction with a hospital system that we at the City do not know about, but when it comes to our attention, we are checking in with the

2.2

2.3

outreach team to make-- to find out the disposition
of that case, and we are doing follow-up-- we
coordinate discharge planning wherever we can.

People have freedoms, right? If they choose to
discharge themselves, if they leave it does not
always happen in exactly the way we might like it to,
but we do work very closely with both the hospital

system and with our outreach providers to do the best discharge coordination that we can.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right. And let me

ask you a question back to the NYPD, are there specific train lines you're targeting where there's chronic complaints, or just the entire system?

CHIEF DELATORRE: No, we don't target, period. We have--

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] So, if you've got chronic complaints about a specific line?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Well, then the officers, the NCOs responsible for that line would be going and taking care of it like any other condition that's brought to their attention. So, a Neighborhood Coordination Officer is responsible for every single station, and every— at least a portion

2.2

2.3

of that line that goes through that sector, they are responsible ultimately for being the caretakers of the system, if you will, and the service providers.

NCOs a little bit, because I still-- and I take the train just about every day into the City. I've never encountered NCO officers in the subway. So, what sort of checks and balances-- I'm not saying they don't exist. But I-- as someone who rides the trains every day, what checks and balance is actually in place to ensure that--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Well, we had— we did have to ensure that encounter, we did have signs up in every station that actually identify the officers and the group station manager. So I go back to when I arrived in the Transit Bureau is about the same time that Andy Biford [sp?] arrived in New York City Transit. So we discussed the concept of finding an application for Neighborhood Policing in Transit. Biford was also restricting his people. so as it turns out, you know, working together we were able to structure it in such a way that every single station has two NCOs responsible for that station and their counterpart is what we call a Group Station

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Manager. The Group Station Manager is somebody responsible for everything in that station. doesn't matter if a lightbulb is out or service is being delayed or any other issues with the employees there, the cleanliness, everything. Those signs were up. They recently had been taken down because they have to be done over. There have been some changes in the Group Station Managers, but I did speak to Transit a few weeks back, and they are going to get them back up again. So, again, 472 stations, 500 trains running at any moment during rush-hour, 10 cars to every train. It's not easy to see your NCO, but if I have the picture of the NCOs and their email address and the group station manager in every station, then you should know who your NCO is if you want to. So, that's where we're going. So, we started out. We had signs up in every station. Unfortunately, Transit had to make some changes in their-- you know, with their Group Station Managers and superintendents, whatever it is. So they're working on it now, and we hope to have the signs back up very shortly.

UNIDENTIFIED: And correct me if I'm wrong. I believe you can look up your NCO online.

2 CHIEF DELATORRE: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I get that. But everyday subway riders are not doing that.

UNIDENTIFIED: Understood, but there's issues that you're seeing on your subway route, you can reach out to your NCO to help correct that.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, the key here is connectivity. We know it's the same people for the most part getting on the same train at the same station, getting off the same station. The key is, in the past you could call 311, you could call somebody and something may be done, but you want to be connected to the outcome. Now, you could be connected to the outcome. Now, you can meet the NCO and say, "Hey, I see a problem in this station." You know, and the NCO hopefully will say to you, okay, let's meet tomorrow morning, let's go over it together and let's see what we can do, or he may or she may actually have the answer when you contact them. But that's why we put them online and we put the email addresses there to make sure that everybody has connectivity to their NCOs.

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty, we could 3 debate this. Let me-- just last question. Do you

4 truly believe summonses are the answer to this issue?
5 CHIEF DELATORRE: No, I don't believe

summonses are the answer. I believe connecting them to services are going to be the beginning of an answer. And I don't believe that's the be-all end-all either, but I think it's a good first step. And my officers can make that connection to services. We never—we were never in a position on Staten Island to counsel someone and get them out of the throws of addiction, but we were in a position to connect hem iwht the experts, and that's our goal here, to connect them with the experts to have the most meaningful outcome.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, I will just disagree with you on this. I don't think summonses necessarily are going to change anything. I think the answer is ensuring that the shelter system is actually safe. And the question should be, and I guess my last question—I was supposed to have a last question five minutes ago is are you speaking to these individuals on why they're on the trains and not in the shelter system in the first place? So

2.2

2.3

what is the answer that they give you when you ask them why the train and not the shelter if it's safety?

5 CHIEF DELATORRE: That is one of the 6 answers I hear back.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Is that the number one--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] I haven't spoken to them personally--

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] You say that's--

CHIEF DELATORRE: but that is one of the answers we've heard.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Would you say that's the number oen answer you get?

That is one of the answers. I think there's a lot of issues, but again, I'm not the DHS expert, but if you don't mind me stepping in your lane, there's a lot of issues. Sometimes it's having, you know, having certain types of safe havens they might prefer. It could be certain geographical areas they might want to go to, and I think those are all the issues that are coming up in our conversations where DHS is

committee on general welfare with committee on public safety 70 actually trying to help resolve so we can get those accomplished meaningful outcomes.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: And if I could jump in on shelter security. We have invested very heavily in shelter security. We coordinate very closely with the NYPD that oversees security planning in all of our shelters. We-- starting a couple of years ago have a brand new staffing model where we use DHS Peace Officers that are directly overseen by the NYPD to ensure security at access points and shelters. It is something that we take extremely seriously, and I think we've made significant strides in that.

Way to go, because the number one answer will be safety, and while I hear what you're saying and I agree that the Administration has certainly taken some strides in this area, there's still a long way to go on this specific issue, and there's a reason people on the trains rather than shelter. With that being said, I'm going to turn it over to Council Member Adams. Followed by Adams, Miller, Grodenchik, Rodriguez, Gibson, Holden.

2.2

2.3

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you very 3 much, Chair Richards and thank you Chair Levin for 4 this important hearing today. Good afternoon and thank you all for being here today to testify before 5 these committees. I am a commuter, a Jamaica Station 6 7 commuter, and on a daily basis for the most part, fortunately or unfortunately, I find myself coming 8 down here to City Hall instead of being in my district. That said, I ride the E Train from end to 10 11 end for the most part. This morning my experience 12 was someone that was obviously homeless stretched out 13 in a car, in the first car, took up about three spaces and then someone directly across from him 14 15 about the same thing. That was fine. We just move on and we find someplace else to sit. 16 That was just 17 I'm going to shift gears a little bit when I 18 say that, the same Jamaica Station, approximately a 19 There was a video that went viral, month or so ago. 20 and it was a video that showed a mentally-challenged 21 senior citizen who I happen to have seen in the 2.2 station for I want to say a decade now. She is known 2.3 as "Grandma." She pretty much walks with everything that she owns with her at all times, and she is a 24

frequent -- she is someone that is frequently there.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Petty much, that's where she lives at Jamaica Station. The women's bathroom has been known to be her sanctuary for years and years and years. So, when I saw the viral video of someone that I've known to be called "Grandma" face-down outside of the turnstile with various individuals around her asking her who she wanted to speak with while she was handcuffed, and it was obvious that she was in a lot of distress as anybody would be. But because this was a woman who was a senior citizen it was particularly disturbing to me to see her taken down in this fashion. So, I guess my question would be what her crime was if you know, what her crime would Number two, typically our homeless institution handcuffed -- I don't know if this was asked -- if they are not being arrested. So, I'll just start with those two questions.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Let me start with a piece of the question, and then I'll turn over to my colleagues. So there are several things that I think are separate and apart from the diversion initiative that tie into your questions. So, first of all, again, in separate from the diversion initiatives, we have a presence with BRC at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

what we call end of line stations. So we do have a regular outreach presence at the stations that do tend to have higher concentrations of people experiencing homelessness because they are at the end of the line. We think that is a good opportunity to reach people. It is not part of the diversion effort. It is not tied into the transit violations that we have been discussing, but it is a separate form of the outreach. So that is sort of one piece that I wanted to mention in your initial comment about riding the E Train from end to end, because we agree with you that that is a place where outreach is very important. The particular incident that you're referring to was a healthcare-related outreach that where some of the-- I think the visual images where unfortunate and challenging, but I also say that it was an opportunity to get somebody who had-- and I don't -- it is not appropriate for me to get into real specifics on the record, but to connect somebody to There is an opportunity when somebody healthcare. has been deemed danger to him or him to others to connect people to the healthcare system even when they may opt not to go there. Again, I think there are ways that we learn from that incident that we can

2.2

2.3

do things that are differently, but it is important that we are connecting people to healthcare systems when they— even when they may not choose to do it themselves. So, again, with respect for people's privacy, I'm going to leave it like that on the record, and I will turn it over to my colleagues to speak about han—

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: [interposing] So, before we go there, I'm just curious, so you're saying that she was handcuffed because of what? Do we know? Because I didn't hear that in your response.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Sure.

The-- I'm trying to pick my words very carefully given that we are on the record and we are talking about a specific client case.

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Understood, understood.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: The-- it was-- we were-- looking to serve an individual for which there was concern that she was in danger in the process, and in the process of trying to connect the individuals to the healthcare resources she was handcuffed. As I say, I think it was-- it's an

2.2

2.3

experience that we learned from about how we can do that better, but it-- the connection there was to connect her to hospitalization because of a fear that she was a danger to herself or others.

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Okay. I still haven't heard of the crime committed. So, I'll go on to Chief. Do you have anything else for me?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, there was no crime committed in this case. This was a 958 removal, and the homeless outreach for the NYPD's unit that's dedicated to providing services for homeless, they were on the scene with clinicians, again, attempting to provide aid.

Thank you very much for that. And again, I'll just say that— and we were just discussing this. She's been around for at least 10 years. So it's taken us 10 years to get her— I haven't seen her since, by the way, in the station, and my hope for her is the best, of course, that she's getting the help she deserves, but for such a long amount of time. to me, she's always seemed to be so harmless and to see her taken down in this fashion was extremely heartbreaking for me, but I hope that she is

2.2

2.3

receiving the services that she deserves. Again, I would have like to have heard something a little bit different, maybe. She accosted someone, which I've always seen her to be very peaceful, maybe a little annoying because of the muttering and sometimes it could get a little loud, but still I would see no crime committed to have that happen to her to that extent. So I'm going to leave my comments there, and thank you for your responses.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

Council Member Miller, Grodenchik-- oh, Barry, then

Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. So, I don't want to just generalize it and kind of monopolize this to the southeast Queens which it appears to be here, but I also frequent and San Parsons [sic] and Arches [sic] station is in my district and as is Supton [sp?] Boulevard which is kind of the gateway to the City, and there is kind of a pervasive situation that occurs when it comes to our homeless population. I wanted to talk about— in the testimony we talked about best practices and what they are, and if in fact we are utilizing those best practices is— as my colleagues just mentioned the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

unfortunate incident that we all witnesses via social media occurred after nearly a decade after this woman inhabiting that location. How have these best practices manifest into serving, but serving, this population? And then for Chief, the NCO program, we see them underground, but there's a whole 'nother [sic] dynamic that happens with drug use and that they're serving people in that way, and at that particular location we have spent the last two or three years have been driven from upstairs to downstairs and between best practices and having very specific officers assigned who clearly understand-have an understanding for that particular station, how has that advanced our case here in serving these populations and making sure that folks are safe?

me start by talking about best practices. We have expanded the number of outreach workers serving both the subway and above ground from under 200 at the start of this Administration to more than 550 today. We have tripled the number of Safe Haven and stabilization beds. We have recognized that being able to provide healthcare is critically important, and so we're expanding both behavioral and physical

2 | healthcare that we can provide on this street.

1

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Through the efforts that we have invested in thus

4 far, we've been able to get 2,450 people to come

5 | inside and stay inside. We thinks that's real--

6 that's a measure of success. it's success that we

7 need to build on, and that's why we've put the

8 additional investments into the Journey Home plan and

9 we look forwarded to growing what we're able to do.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: And-- sorry. As mentioned, as Chair Levin mentioned earlier, is this the only provider that is participating in this program, particularly in the subways?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: BRC is our contracted outreach provider in the subways.

Right now there is— their contract is actually up for renewal and there's an RFP under review right now.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: [interposing]

Because I know that—— I believe it was nearly a year ago that I was contacted and that was through the New York City transit end that we actually came out with the provider and from midnight to 4:00 a.m. and tried to access some of these particular folks and ensure that they get some of the medical attention and other

How often are there--

2.2

2.3

2 services that were needed. But as far as I knew,
3 that was kind of a one-time event. Is it ongoing?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

[interposing] Outreach workers are out 24 hours a
day, seven days a week, 365 days a year.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Specifically with the medical team and other services that they brought that particular -- those two days, I have not seen those.

familiar with the specific service package that you're referring to, but yes, everybody has access to medical care, and medical professionals might not be out every single night, but every team does have access to medical care, and we are expanding what they have available to them, because we think that's a really important component of the service.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay.

CHIEF DELATORRE: As far as best practices goes, you know, this is—the diversion is not the first new way we're trying to help. If I can, I'll go back to 2018. At the end of 2018 we initiated—some of you might have heard about it,

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the End Rood Resources Centers. So at the end of 2018, and we focused on the E-Line and opposite ends of the E-line and Parsons/Archer as well, but we started down on Chambers. By the end of 2018, we had Transit build out a room, and you know, the history here is pretty simple. I was walking the station. I saw a big construction room there. I knocked on the door. The guy in the room said, you know, I don't really need all this space anymore. So then I reached out to Annie Bifron [sp?] and said, "Can you give us this space?" And he said sure. So he sent a They polished it up, made it nice, made team in. room for a coffee pot, and we began an initiative there. So, the end of the E-Line on both ends, or the end of any line generally is where they would stop to clean the train. So, when they clean the train, people have to get off. So at the end of the E-line what we would do is as people got off, we would meet them with BRC workers. And we had this room, this resource center, ready and open, that we were only open when we were there, and we had a coffee pot in there and we would offer the people that were standing on the platform that came off eh train the opportunity to go and have a hot cup of

a degree, but right now, giving the officers

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

3

1

4

5

Ŭ

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

throughout the entire transit system a tool that is reasonable and compassionate that they can use to help people, you know, I think it's going to help add to the outcome here.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Again, so what role are the NCOs playing, not necessarily from the vendor perspective from you guys that they're providing intel or whatever that is enhancing the experience of folks that we're trying to serve.

CHIEF DELATORRE: So, the NCOs are basically the quarterbacks. They request resources. They get supported by their boroughs. They get supported by the bureau. They-- depending on what the conditions are they should be calling out for help. They do meet. They have an NCO Sergeant who oversees it, and we have an NCO coordination unit in the transit bureau that they meet with regularly to discuss the issues that exist within their sectors. We go out and we take a look at their sectors to point out weaknesses we may see and congratulate them on successes they have made. So, they're quarterbacking. The bottom line is eh buck stops with them. They are responsible for everything that goes on there.

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 83 1 2 COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: And finally, what 3 would those recourses look like that would be available to them? 4 CHIEF DELATORRE: Oh, we have-- there's 5 many resources. We have borough taskforces. We have 6 7 BRC that'll come out. We have homeless outreach that 8 could come out if that's the nature of the problem, which I know it is at that station to some degree, but there are many, many resources that can come out. 10 11 COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Thank you. Thank 12 you, Mr. Chair and Mr. Chair. 13 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Going to go to Council Member Barry Grodenchik. 14

COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: Thank you,

Chairman. Thank you, Chief. Thank you Deputy

Commissioner for being here today. This has been in

place now-- we have statistics for five months now?

I read that right?

CHIEF DELATORRE: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: Just very broadly, what's-- if you had a magic wand to do more of, what would you being do more of, and maybe, what's not working so well?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

CHIEF DELATORRE: Okay, so there's a couple of things. I think like I said, we're improving on different ends. One is if I could have delayed/rescheduled the low-level warrants yesterday, I would have. There were hours of concern in getting this done, and that's probably the next big goal I have is to-- we have collectively to get this lowlevel SAP warrants rescheduled so that the person who's standing there saying, "Yes, I want help," can be taken directly to help, not have to go to court and answer a SAP warrant and potentially wind up back in the system the next day. So, that's the big one that we're looking for right now. On the other end we have to continuously look at quality control and see what we can do better. We're in discussions all the time with BRC and DHS, as to those who don't engage, is there anything they can do better on their end, and that's what we're hoping to get. My goal here is not to have a single summons sitting out there, to have every single one expunged and some sort of outcome attached to the people that we engage and move them off the process completely, down that exit ramp if you will, where they can simply get help.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1 COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: Commissioner, 2 3 anything you want to add to that? 4 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Yes. Αt the end of the day, homelessness is a lack of 5 housing. We have a tremendous need for affordable 6 7 housing in this city. I've worked on the housing 8 side of the equation. I, you know, we continue to innovate and look for new solutions to that. I'm particularly excited about the fact that we have new 10 11 permanent housing resources in the Journey Home 12 action plan, but if we're pulling out the magic wand, it is--13 14 COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: [interposing] 15 I don't have one. I want to make that clear, but--FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: 16 17 [interposing] at the end of the day, an affordable 18 housing problem. 19 COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: And Chief, 20 these SAP warrants, is that something that could be 21 done administratively? Excuse my ignorance, I just--2.2 CHIEF DELATORRE: Unfortunately, no.

gone through it with the Manhattan DA and MOCJ they can only be done by a court or somebody administratively attached to the court, and

2.3

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

currently, there's nobody with that authority who's working overnight. So we have to work on a solution to this, and that's what we're trying to get to now.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Heading to now Council Member Gibson, Holden, Menchaca.

Gibson, Holden, Menchaca, Gjnoaj.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Chairs. Good afternoon everyone. you for being here. So, I have a couple of questions. I'll try to get through them as best I can. Chair Levin at the beginning of this hearing asked about some of the different organizations that we've been working with as we prepared for the roll out of this, and so he as the Chair was not really a part of the planning and neither were any of the other Council Members. So, I guess I generally am concerned about who we involved and included before this plan rolled out, understanding that homelessness on our subways has been an issue that we've been grippling [sic] with for quite some time. And so if we are to announce an ambitious plan, we obviously want to get it right. And so the pilot that was

2.2

2.3

done, is it my understanding that the pilot was done last summer of 2019, is that correct?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yes, it started in July of 2019?

6 COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: And when did it 7 end?

CHIEF DELATORRE: It went into a full roll-out by November.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okay.

CHIEF DELATORRE: And now it's still continuously rolling out. Rolling out is not simple. It's a matter of getting officers trained in the other counties. It's a matter of BRC staffing up to handle us to be able to come out to the districts and respond there. And then also in some cases it's a matter of having BRC having locations within those boroughs to make it simple and quick. The idea is they have to get to us in less than an hour to service their clients.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Well, I guess were the findings of the pilot ever released to the public? Was there a list of recommendations that could be shared with the Council? And I guess, the reason I ask that is during the summer season when

2 | the weather is really hot, I wouldn't expect that to

3 be the best time to do an analysis of homeless

4 individuals sleeping on the subway. That's just my

5 logic, and so that's why I ask the timeframe and what

6 were the results of that pilot that led to this

7 ultimate announcement of this plan.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHIEF DELATORRE: Okay, so the pilot-- I go back again to HOPE on Staten Island. The pilot was proving to help people, and rather than delay helping more people, the decision was made to move on it, collectively BRC, DHS, and other people that were involved, the District Attorney's Office as well. all saw value to it. You know, if you can help one person by getting somewhere. So, we saw value to it. People were getting help. I told you about earlier about oen fellow who actually came back the following day and thanked us, and come January he's still residing in a Safe Haven. So, the idea was that to delay it would delay helping more people, and if we could move forward with it, it was a common sense approach to say there are people here getting caught up in the system for no good reason who can have a better outcome. Let's get them the summons, the civil summons that they can have expunged, and let's

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

get them that outcome. Not 100 percent, but like I say, my goal is to get 100 percent involved.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okay.

CHIEF DELATORRE: You know, to get 100 percent expunged.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okav. Ι understand, and I think because someone asked the question, and I guess I just don't agree with the idea of giving individuals summons with the expectation that they're going to pay the summons and have the ability to pay a summonses or respond to it at al. And I quess when you think about homeless New Yorkers, single adults that are living on the subway and living in our streets. There are underlying reasons of why they are homeless to begin with. And in order for a plan to be effective, it has to be comprehensive in recognizing what those underlying route causes are, unstable hosing, insufficient housing, current shelter conditions today for single adults that are not satisfactory to any of us, lack of supportive housing which we do not have enough of, not enough Safe Havens which we are now starting to address, but also the mental health and therapeutic services and social workers, and trauma-informed

Council has worked very closely with the NYPD and we

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

will continue to do so, but if you think about the

1

2

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

3 | work we've done in Cure Violence, the New York City

4 Crisis Management System is led by DOHMH, not by

5 NYPD, because we believe that a holistic approach to

6 gun violence gets to the root causes of why young

7 people are involved in violence in the first place.

8 So, I don't see that in this plan. I don't see the

9 healthcare lens that I believe we should be focused

10 on, and I would love someone to help me understand

11 how we get there.

12 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: There
13 were a lot of really important things in there. Let

14 me jump in and try and address them. I want to start,

15 actually, though, with the shelters. We are--

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: [interposing]

Shelter conditions?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Shelters availability overall. As you know, we are in the middle of the Turning the Tide plan. We are working very hard to site and open new shelters that meet the standards that we all want to see. To be very frank, siting the single adult shelters has been challenging, and I really welcome the opportunity to work with everybody to show the compassion that is

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

92

adult shelters as well. That came out of Thrive. It is something that we continue— meet on regularly with the Department of Health and on this larger effort there are regular— and by regular I mean essentially weekly interagency meetings to make sure

connect to healthcare resources. There are social

workers in all of our family shelters and many of our

24 that we are getting the perspectives of all of the

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2 different agencies that touches incredibly

3 complicated issue.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. So, the only thing that I would add to that in terms of I know BRC has a contract with the City to provide services, and as that contract is currently up for renewal, it would be my hope that the Administration would look at all of the other advocacy groups on the ground that are doing this work every single day. Ιn my district of the Bronx, 170 is right outside my office on the four train. I have not been engaged by BRC. They have not contacted my office. When I have issues in my district with street homelessness, I call BronxWorks. BronxWorks is in my district and I have them on speed dial. They know the clients in my district. I don't know that BRC does, because I just never see them, and so my question is, how are we going to engage other organizations that are on the ground like Coalition for the Homeless? The Bronx delegation supports Coalition for the Homeless. have a mobile van every night that starts in Hunt's Point and goes throughout the Bronx and feeds street homeless individuals. I don't see anyone else doing that, and these are the types of things that are

2 happening on the ground, but in order for you to

3 recognize that, they need to be given access to these

4 | contracts, not one multi-million-dollar contract to

5 one organization that has to serve a large population

6 but look at other organizations that are already on

7 | the ground doing this work and give them an

8 | opportunity. We don't even know if they've been

9 engaged in this process, but they're the ones that

10 work with the clients every single day and understand

11 their needs.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, just to clarify, BRC is the contracted agency working in the subways, but we have contracts with--

COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: [interposing] Yes, I understand that.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

different organizations including BronxWorks for above ground outreach. So we absolutely—BronxWorks is a valued partner of ours, as are a number of other different not-for-profit organizations. They're absolutely part of the conversations around expanding the healthcare initiatives, about the new Safe Havens, about the permanent housing. So, we value

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

our nonprofit partners, not just BRC, but all of them very much.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER GIBSON: Okay, thank you.

5 Thank you, Chairs.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Good point.

Council Member Holden, followed by Holden, Menchaca,

Gonad.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Chief, I want to just get an exact number if you can, as close as you can, because you said roughly two-thirds of our officers, transit officers, went through the crisis intervention training. Is there a number that you could give me rather than just two-thirds?

CHIEF DELATORRE: No, I don't have the number right now. I'd have to get that.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright, because that's important. I mean, I think by now all should have been-- have gone through that training. It's a four-day training, because there's one-third out there that haven't had any training whatsoever, right?

2.2

2.3

CHIEF DELATORRE: Well, they get other training. That's not the only training, but certainly that's a very valued training.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Right.

CHIEF DELATORRE: But there's turnover.

There's officers coming and going. There's new

officers being hired. So we always have those other

caveats that can complicate being at 100 percent, but

of course, we'd all love to be at 100 percent.

if you have individual on the subways that keeps coming into your-- the contact with officers. That means, seven, eight times some random attacks here and there, but so what happens? What do you do with that individual? Let's say six or seven cases where this individual has been, you know, either breaking the law or causing disturbances.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Well, we actually recognize that we have to make contacts with people a lot more than that quite frankly, and we do. The idea is that the officers handle it with compassion and that they call out for the proper resources to deal with it. So, in a case where there's a mental illness, then the officers—we might seek out a

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

it.

clinician team to come out, but we'll also talk to BRC. They are trained in this type of stuff, and that's why they're there. But they would have to, you know, seek out the proper resources to address

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: But-- so you-- I want to bring up Kendra's Law. You know about Kendra's Law. How many times was that recommended? mean, the police can say this person, individual, seems to be mentally ill based on their training, and if they just give it over to BRC, how do we know that they're following up? Because Kendra's Law is very, very important where you could actually get that person medication. They'd have to go to a doctor. If they don't, they could get committed if they're not following through, because we see the same person coming in an doubt of the system, and it's just the revolving door. The person, you know, -- you're picking them up. They're going in, but we're not sure. You know, are they getting the necessary help?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Kendra's

Law is a court-ordered required treatment that is

applicable in a fairly narrow slice of cases. Right?

Somebody who is in and out of shelter, in and out of

healthcare treatment that--

2.2

2.3

the subway system, that is somebody who we want to approach with compassion, approach with repeated authors of services, try and identify different kinds of services that we can offer whether we can connect an individual to a safe haven, whether there's

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: [interposing] No, but that wasn't my question.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Right, I quess--

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: [interposing] No,

I'm asking if somebody's causing continued, six or

seven times, continued random attacks, disturbances,

what-- when do you invoke Kendra's Law?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Well, first of all, it's not within our power to just invoke Kendra's Law, but I don't--

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: [interposing] You can petition.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I don't have any instances where we have six or seven random attacks, right? I think what we see most often and as has been discussed many times, it does take many and sometimes dozens or hundreds of points of contacts

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

before somebody is ready to come inside, but that is- that's what's typical and not something where we're
talking about repeated instances of violence.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: We've had a lot of that in the subways where people are just falling through the cracks. Until something drastic happens, somebody gets killed, is when everybody takes notice. We need a red flag, and that's what I thought ThriveNYC would do is to red flag people with mental illness, serious mental illness whether they're in the subways or not, but that we put a-- you know, we give them the necessary help they need rather than out there continuing to do some random attacks that we've seen, but let me just go to BRC for a second. You're aware of the New York State Comptroller's Tom DiNapoli's report that he found that DHAS had done little oversight of its homeless outreach contract with BRC. In fact, the homeless outreach in the subway has been so shoddy that with so little oversight from DHS and MTA that it should be no surprise that the homeless population in the subways has grown. DHS, meanwhile, shadowed BRC staff on just six occasions in all of 2018 and could not provide investigators with 14 months of borough by

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

borough reports on the contractor's work. So, and they were— they didn't show up when they were supposed to. They were in the office. So, your reaction to the Comptroller's report should have been what? I mean, do you— are you shadowing them more in 2019?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: have a Corrective Action Plan that's been in place since August of 2019 that addresses both Bork's requirements and also changes DHS' oversight of BRC. I do, though, however, want to challenge, and this is included in our response to the audit, this metric of success that the Comptroller makes -- focuses on. number of people experiencing street homelessness is a function of a range of very macro-forces, right? The growing income inequality for across the country upstate, de-institutionalization, the loss of rent stabilized housing units in the City of New York, I could go on and on, but I think you get the idea. These are all forces that are much larger than any one nonprofit organization can realistically influence. So we have changed the contract and we are no longer using the size of the census on the street as a metric for judging BRC. We are looking--

2.2

2.3

or any of our other outreach providers for that matter. We are looking at the number of placements that they've made, how successful those placements are, and interim output measurements like frequency of engagement and size of the caseload, but not whether or not they can absolutely reduce the number of people experiencing street homelessness.

DHS is not providing the oversight in this contact and not really doing their job overseeing BRC, and not over-- and actually, many feel that they're not overseeing the conditions of the shelter, and we've seen-- we heard-- we had people sitting here who said the food was awful. They don't let people, the homeless, bring their food into the shelters.

There's a line to get something microwaved, a frozen dinner, everything that we've seen from DHS has, you know,-- of course you're saying everything's improving, here's our new program, here's another program that'll be better, and then each time we see things are not better.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I'd like to challenge some of what you just said there. I think, first of all, there is a significant security

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

presence at the shelters that is coordinated very closely with the NYPD that we have instituted Peace Officers. With respect to food, there was an incident around food. Yes, people are not allowed to bring food into single adult shelters because people are sharing spaces, and we need to make sure that spaces are clean and vermin free and that we aren't exposing people to allergens. So, there's a variety of things going on. I think the -- overall, we provide safe, secure, stable shelter for close to 60,000 people a night. We continue to -- always are striving to improve, but the conditions in the shelter for the vast majority of people, it's a system that provides a critical safety net, and honestly when I look at reporting around incidents, our shelter clients are as much likely to be victims of violence reflected towards them as essentially hate towards low-income people as they are to be victims within the system.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Again, we're at a situation where what you're saying doesn't really coincide with what we're hearing from panelists and advocates that go into the shelter, that's why we have so many people homeless in the subways who don't want to go into the shelters. So, you know, we can

disagree but when we hear from the advocates who are saying I've not had fresh food in an entire year because I just got home—— I got—— in a homeless shelter I just had a frozen dinner that I have to wait on line for a microwave. So we're hearing that, but you're saying that everything is great and these are safe shelters and wonderful shelters, but it's not quite that way, and somebody needs to look at the entire picture here, and BRC is just one example of the lack of oversight but we also see it in many other areas in DHS. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

Menchaca, Gjonaj, Treyger.

the Chairs and thank you for this panel for being here today. I want to start with the Chief, and earlier I heard you say something about the summons and I kind of want to just get a better sense of the summons work that's happening, and that I just want to clarify that you said that the goal here is to not have any summons in this program and working with the DAs to ensure that summons are removed. Is that—did I hear that correctly?

2.2

2.3

DAS, it's the expunging of the summons rests solely with the NYPD and BRC at this point. So, BRC removes the summons from the client and gives the client a letter letting them know that the summons no longer exists for them. It's no longer a burden to them, and that summons is then returned to the NYPD. We have an agreement with the Transit Adjudications Bureau. That's the court under the MTA that adjudicates the summonses, and we have an agreement with them that we will then expunge those summonses.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: So it's a two-step process, and this is a-- what kind of-- is it--what kind of summons is this? Is this a civil?

CHIEF DELATORRE: It's called a TAB.

It's from the Transit Adjudications Bureau. It's a civil summons.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: A civil summons. But BRC first then the NYPD.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Well, BRC has to establish the engagement and then it comes back to us, and then we can expunge it.

2.2

_	
2	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay, but back
3	to the goal. Then essentially you want I just want
4	to
5	CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] I want to
6	be able to expunge every single summons. That's our
7	goal.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay.
9	CHIEF DELATORRE: And find ways to get
10	there.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay. Okay.
12	So then my then my next question is, why issue them
13	in the first place?
14	CHIEF DELATORRE: Because the reason
15	they're issued is that there is a violation, and we
16	don't know whether a person has an address or no
17	address.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: What is that
19	violation?
20	CHIEF DELATORRE: What's that?
21	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: What is that
22	violation?
23	CHIEF DELATORRE: What do you mean
24	what?

2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: What is the

3 violation that you're issuing?

2.2

2.3

Transit rules and regs that would warrant a summons.

Now, in order to address this behavior, you know, we have to now speak to the person, establish that they have an address, then we can write a summons. Now, what happens with the average person that gets a summons, and we probably write 70 or 80,000 summonses a year in Transit.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: In this-- in Transit, okay.

CHIEF DELATORRE: what happens with the person who gets a summons, who normally get a summons who has an address is they get a summons. But here, what we do is we've created an off-ramp for somebody who does not have an address to actually have an opportunity to have that summons expunged.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: I just feel like that's a circular argument that I want to address in the next question to the Commissioner, and really, I'm thinking there's a-- there's a feeling that NYPD involved in this whole process in this whole initiative is actually a detriment to the whole

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

project, and I get the real sentiment from the work that you're doing at DHS and really trying to solve the issue and connect— and connecting people to services, but a person with a hammer is going to see everything as a nail, and what, Commissioner, is preventing the City, the Mayor, the Administration to remove NYPD from this program completely?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: diversion initiative is one piece of our overall outreach strategy, and I think it's really important to contextualize it that way, right? So we are at end-of-line stations. We are in rush hour stations. We are at stations that have been identified as having a particularly high concentration of people experiencing homelessness. There's certainly overlap between those three places, and we're also collaborating with the NYPD on diversion, and the thinking here, right, is really that as my colleagues have said, this is an off-ramp. Right? There is a moment that is going -- that has the potential to be a criminal justice inflection point. There is an offramp, and we want to be there at the end of that offram so to speak. It is -- it may be the right moment for some people. it's certainly not going to be the

2.2

2.3

right moment for everybody, and but I think because this is part of an overall continuum of services and spectrum of outreach that we can provide, it is appropriate that we are collaborating so that the--as the NYPD is enforcing the Transit rules, because enforcing the Transit rules is the job of the NYPD, that we can take advantage of this moment where people are given an alternative, and I think it's a very valuable inflection point.

think you're seeing the tension point here, that the unfortunate nature of involving NYPD in this diversion program and you being really at the end of this off-ramp and not at the beginning and really removing NYPD is causing the crimilaziation of people who we're all trying to help. And I get that there's a lot more work that needs to happen but I think there's a real opportunity here to remove an element here that is actually causing more harm to that continuum of service and may have actually prevented some this opportunity that you're seeking.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, there are three eligibility criteria, for lack of a better description, for the diversion program. The

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

first one is a violation of transit laws, right?

Second one is not having an address, and the third

one is not having warrants.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And all of 6 them have to be--

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It's an and.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: right? So, I think-- but I do want to come back to that first point. The universe is people who have violated a set of transit rules where there is an enforcement helmet there. If the only way that one could access services in the subway was starting with that violation of transit rules at an enforcement moment, I would think we would have a real problem. But that is not the case. Right? We have a broad spectrum of outreach opportunities. We are trying to connect with people separate and apart from anything related to enforcement as much as we probably can, and I think it's-- but when that enforcement moment is occurring because of a violation of rules, we want to be a part of that as well, so that we can hopefully connect people to services.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, and just if I might, it's our job. We have to enforce the rules and we have to seek out criminality of exists. is not what we're talking about here. This is just the opposite of what I just heard you say. We are not looking to criminalize anybody. We're looking to create an off-ramp for people how are getting caught up in police matters within the system, and I don't see the value in anybody at the end of the day, winding, getting caught up in the criminal justice system because they violated a rule. I do see value in giving them an opportunity and an introduction to services and resources. Now, those resources and services, I believe in getting better. Again, they're not under my jurisdiction, but from my end the best I can do for somebody who needs help is connect them with help, and that's exactly what we're trying to do here.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Yeah, again,
the-- I think there's some fundamental differences in
the approaches here and that NYPD is at all involved
in the continuum and the access of services is the
problem here. And I just-- I want to just offer an
opportunity to talk about how we exit ramp you all

2.2

2.3

from this process, and really create another way for New Yorker who are homeless, and there's a beautiful, I think, approach from the city right now to really include a connection to those New Yorkers, and I think that the third piece the immigrant community who are in real danger in connecting with NYPD which is ultimately my point here, is that there are some New Yorkers that are not going to welcome this kind of—and because of their status, this kind of interaction. And so have you all thought about that, in terms of immigrants who are going to be part of this summons process and potentially engaging in a situation where they're going to be more at risk?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: If I could just jump in and provide a little bit of context here before getting to the immigration question. We have about 150 contracted outreach workers across both the streets and the subway. The number of -- so that's-- it's not all BRC, just to be clear. That includes a number of other nonprofit organizations. The number of outreach workers who are tied to the diversion program, it's something like 40 or 50. I have to double-check the exact number, but it is a fairly small share of the overall

2.2

2.3

outreach initiative. So, it is— I think we agree that if the only pathway to connect to services was something that where NYPD was a gatekeeper, that there would be a real challenge, but I think what we are trying to do is offer a very broad array of services. A lot of moments when people can connect to whether it's shelter or other safe havens, other kinds of services, and in the moment where there is going to be an enforcement action happening, that that could be— there is an alternative pathway that can also be outreach—related. So, I do think it's critically important to acknowledge that this is a relatively small piece in a large spectrum of services.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: So, again, what prevents you from moving that, if it's a small piece, at all from the program?

I think the-- there is an enforcement moment that's happening, right? So, I think if you-- if you acknowledge that there needs to be some degree of enforcement of subway rules. And then there is a moment where that is happening, and I think helping people to connect to that services had some value.

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Very--

24

2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: and you 3 testified to the point that you're having difficulty removing those summons, and you're going to have to 4 do more work to remove those summons.it just -- I think there's a fundamental difference in how you're 6 7 shaping your work, and the humanity that you're 8 trying to express here is just failing to make me convinced that this is a good idea. And so we're going to have to keep working together to make this 10 11 work, and my idea, I'll own it, is to remove the NYPD from this somehow and figure out another way to 12 13 access-- for those New Yorkers to access the services. 14

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah.

[applause]

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you. I think we're done.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Before I call on

Council Member Gjonaj, I just have a couple of quick

questions here. What's the budget of this

initiative? Is there a clearly defined budget? I

realize that there's probably some crossover with

other programs, but--

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1 2 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: We're 3 still working with OMB to line up the exact numbers. 4 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, but it's an-- I 5 mean, it's up and running. It's an FY20 expenditure, so we should probably know, obviously now that we're 6 in the back half of FY20. 8 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: We're 9 working through the budget documents, and we will. CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, we should have 10 11 that obviously soon. 12 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Agreed. 13 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And then, do we have a comparison, a side-by-side comparison of the number 14 15 of people that received summonses that were-- that 16 did not have a fixed address for outstretch violation 17 in the months of September to November of 18, 2018, 18 in a side-by-side comparison to those months in 2019? 19 CHIEF DELATORRE: No, we do not. 20 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: can we get that? 21 CHIEF DELATORRE: WE can try. One of the problems is that now we're actually reaching out to 2.2

we found is we were able to confirm addresses for many people who may have even themselves thought un-

BRC on these engagements to confirm address, and what

2.3

24

2.2

2.3

domiciled but weren't-- because if they had stayed in a shelter during a certain period of time, they were then qualified, you know, to have an address and not qualified for the actual diversion. So we can try, but I can't say that--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] I--

CHIEF DELATORRE: the numbers are accurate because we weren't drilling down on this a year ago.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Or if we can get the numbers of individuals that got a violation for outstretch--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: in general in those months compared to those that had the violation written, because I just want to be clear that we have the 1,200 people that got the violation written, and 477 that then got that violation expunged.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Expunged, yes.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: But so the remain-so, it's the-- kind of the overall picture is the
number of summonses that were written, inclusive of
the ones that were already expunged. If we could get
that kind of in a side by side month comparison 2018
19, that'd be great. Council Member Gjonaj?

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON GJONAJ: Thank you, Chair.

3 It's evident we're dealing with some incredible
4 homeless numbers, mental health crisis numbers.
5 Commissioner, I just go back. I'm taken back by a
6 statement that you made that we should not be using
7 the metrics of the number of homeless people, but we
8 should focus on the number that we're actually

metric without looking at both sides of the equation.

finding shelter for. I don't know how we can have a

So yes, 2,400 people are placed in shelters, homeless people. Without looking at the actual number of remaining homeless people in the transit system above

ground, below ground, anywhere on the ground.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, if I could just clarify my statement for the record. So, first of all, 2,450 people placed from the streets into a combination of transitional and permanent housing, going back to the start of HomeStat. When I say it's not reasonable to hold BRC accountable for the size of the number, it doesn't mean we don't need to know the number. Actually, we-- next Monday night is the annual HOPE survey. We could still use some volunteers. We would love people to help us where we go out every year and we develop exactly that metric

2.2

2.3

for the number of people who are living unsheltered at any given time. So, it is incredibly important to know. But to expect that the acts of one nonprofit organization can counterbalance the macroeconomic forces that are driving that number. That's where we feel like it wasn't a reasonable metric.

back to that. If not BRC, then DHS, and if nor DHS, whomever, but someone should be held accountable.

We're throwing a ton of money at problem, and perhaps there's not a way to gauge the effect of what we're doing then, the percentage that is not being sought after begetting them of the streets. That's how we measure success, and if ever year, the percent is going down and more people are being placed into transit or temporary or permanent housing. That's how we can measure success, by no other standard.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

Absolutely agree that the number of people placed in permanent housing is the gold standard metric, and that's what we look a very carefully. I think we as a society absolutely need to be looking at the number of people who are on the street. My point was as we can't hold BRC individually accountable for that.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that. I think - you have to hold them accountable because that's the responsibility they've been tasked for, to get people-- to get homeless people out of the subways and into a shelter--

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: and we do hold them re--

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: [interposing] so, we're going to say we hold. We going to congratulate you and give you pint of vodka because you were able to get 2,450 homeless into shelters, but we're not going to look at the tens of thousands that are out there, I think is not reasonable. And I also, understanding what is happening here. I'm sure anyone listening to this hearing that hears anyone that's been homeless for 10 years and has fallen through the cracks time and time again and requires hundreds of points of contact, at what point do you say we have a real problem here? A person is on the streets for 10 years, a decade, that is known-- that is given a nickname like "Grandma" is a fundamental flaw that falls on who?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Well, I think the action, the Journey Home Action Plan to End

2.2

2.3

Long-term Street Homelessness is exactly that acknowledgement that we need more strategy than different strategies to address what is a really challenging problem. So, we are adding Safe Haven capacity. We are creating a brand new permanent housing model. We are adding medical services. We are adding outreach contacts. So, yes, this is a--

a person that's been approached for 10 years, time and time again, refusing services, to the point where we know that fundamentally— I mean, morally, we have an obligation here. That person may not know what's in their best interest and they're a detriment to their own health, being exposed to the elements, the cold, the heat, the rain, that is a person that's in danger. At what point do we say, you know what, we can no longer worry about that person's rights and make the argument that they're entitled to rights when we're entitled to make sure that that person is protected even from themselves?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, there is as component of the state mental health law that allows for us to require hospitalization when somebody is in immediate danger to themselves or

2.2

2.3

definition.

others. It is a very specific definition, and simply being street homeless doesn't satisfy that

5 COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: What is the name 6 of that law?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It's

Section 958 of the-- 9.58 of the State Mental Hygiene

Law, I believe. If I got that wrong, somebody will

get back to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: How many times was that law used in all of 2019?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I don't have that number right in front of me. It is something that we are collaborating closely with our healthcare colleagues to make sure that if somebody is a danger to themselves or others, that we are getting them hospitalization.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Could you take a stab at it? Because I'm going to guess under 10, maybe even zero.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: No, it was more than that. In calendar year 18, it was in the range of about 30 times. I think it is—that number is on the uptick, but I don't have it with me.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: So 30 times in a calendar year with the homeless population of 2018 was upward of 60,000 anyhow. That's a small fraction.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, just to clarify the record, the vast majority of those 60,000 individuals are sheltered. They are living in a DHS-financed facility for families. It generally looks more or less like an apartment. For adults, single adults it's generally dorm-style living. In that case, wow, it is certainly possible to be a danger to oneself or others while living in doors. Those are not people experiencing street homelessness. There are people experiencing street homelessness for whom-- who are a danger to themselves or others, but sim-- you know, I can assure you that simply opting to be on the street does not -- it does not qualify for that standard, and it is -- I hear where your concern is coming from, but we are very concerned about making sure that we are balancing people's civil liberties along with those health concerns. So, when it is warranted, we do invoke it.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Civil liberties, 2 great point. At what point do you-- and I'll share 3 4 an example with you. I had a homeless couple on 5 Pellum [sp?] Parkway for quite a period of time before I got involved, and they were sending 6 7 BronxWorks and everyone out there. DHS knew this 8 couple by name. And I would ask, how are you making an evaluation as to the medical needs of the individual, can you please explain it to me? 10 11 not a physician, but I could see clearly there is 12 health -- there's underlying health issues here. 13 Well, the response was we could visually evaluate 14 We can't ask them to stand, move, show, do 15 anything, but we have to make a visual assessment, 16 and based on that assessment we have to determine 17 whether or not there's healthcare needs. Well, let 18 me explain what happened with this couple. I 19 intervened, convinced them that I would keep them 20 together, told them I would drive them to the 21 hospital myself in my car, assured them that they 2.2 would never be split for him to agree. It took us 2.3 almost 15 minutes to get this man up off the floor. He was suffering from diabetes and a slew other 24 issues. He could not stand on his own.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

understand what would have happened if we would have prolonged the individual rights, the civil liberties?

We would have had a fatality on our hands, and it was— and this is according to the physician that examined them, they said, "I can't consider this anything more than life-saving what you've done."

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So,
Council Member, I'd be happy to follow up--

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: [interposing] It's not about follow-up. It's more. It's more than that. We cannot worry about civil rights when someone doesn't know they're a detriment to themselves, and we can't expect NYPD to turn a blind eye to crimes or rules that are being broken. And by whatever means we have to be cautious, and I'm not looking for arrests, and I'm not looking for summonses, but we have to be mindful that we're all responsible, and whatever it takes, whether it be using something as the coffee to engage with them and have them open up, or push them without worrying about civil liberties by asking someone to stand. I can't believe that for months no one asked the man to stand up so they can perform an evaluation. If they would have asked that simple task, it would have been determined that this

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

person is in jeopardy of losing his legs because of diabetes, and would have required immediate attention.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, one of the reasons that we are particularly excited about expanding the Safe Haven capacity that we have in the Action Plan is it will allow us to not only meet the needs of more people, but also meet the needs of people where they are and where they want to be. one of the reasons that we've heard that people are sometimes reluctant to accept the placements that we have to offer them, you know, including in Safe Havens, is that they aren't in the community where they are used to being. So, by being able to add capacity and put capacity in more neighborhoods, we think we'll be able to meet the needs of people. is not just what services we have to offer that have services line up with people's individual needs and by broadening the array and the variety that we have, we think we'll be able to do more of that.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: We've been at it for a long time. We've thrown a lot of money at it, and apparently it's not working, and yes, maybe occasionally we actually service and given someone to

2.2

2.3

take advantage of the programs by interacting. We caught them on one good day after hundreds of attempts. I think the writing is on the wall. At this point, we have to be more aggressive. And when I mean more aggressive that we jeopardize a person's civil rights, we have to be more aggressive that it's evident. A person living 10 years on the street, and Grandma's not the only example, because you can go to Pellum Base [sic] Station, you can go to any station, and you will find people there that are known to the community for years as being homeless, and not enough is being done.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: For 2,450 people, what we have done has worked. There is more to do. We are continuing to expand what we're doing. I'm really proud of the Action Plan commitment that we have to expand the services that we have.

This is absolutely an urgent problem, but I do think we are showing— we have shown the work that we can do can—

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: [interposing]

Commissioner, if you're looking to get a pat on the back because you took 2,400 people off the streets that were homeless and put in temporary housing,

you're not going to get one here, not when we got so many more thousands out there that are in desperate need.

[applause]

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Council Member Treyger.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Thank you. I've been listening very carefully and I am here today not just as a Council Member, but as a proud former public school teacher, and as the Chair of the Education Committee, where we have to confront the fact that over 100,000 of our kids are also homeless, it's a part of the numbers that we're talking about here today. I also heard a lot today about rules. have seen enough to determine that there has been unequal application of rules in our city and across our country. There have been government officials that lied under oath and signed false documents that they tested for lead in housing, and I don't recall one of them getting a summons or going to jail. I want to share with you that in the school system there are over 700 kids-- 700 schools, forgive me, that don't have access to a fulltime social worker, and there was a case where a school in my district, a

2.2

2.3

7-year-old child with an IEP was having a bad day, and because the school didn't have a fulltime social worker and counselor, they actually called PD to respond to the child. I said it at the Education hearing, I'll say it at this hearing, a 7-year-old child having a bad day at school was not an NYPD issue, and a person who is without a home is not an NYPD issue. I would like to know-- I know that we're spending quite a bit to try to manage poverty and manage homelessness. There's a difference between managing and solving it. How many licensed social workers on the DHS' payroll?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I'm going to have to get back to you, and what I would like to get back to you is the number of social workers across the system. The vast majority of our shelters are operated not by DHS staff, but by contracted not-for-profits. So, I do think the number of social workers on the DHS staff is going to be an under-representation of services offered.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: I would be curious to know how many licensed social workers work under the DHS payroll, and with regards to nonprofit organizations, I know them well enough to know that

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

sometimes their director might be a licensed social worker, but that person is not always on the field, because they don't have the funds and the resources to hire a lot of social workers to respond to the needs of people. I want to share with you to the Police Department that one of my good friends is a lieutenant in the Police Department, and I understand the gravity of your work, but respectfully, officers I speak with acknowledge that they are not licensed to respond to the type of crisis they're confronted with every day. I had to call out the fact that in the DOE they were spending millions of dollars on Thrive services that was heavily reliant on consultants. When a principle called asking for help and assistance for a child experiencing crisis, they were told, "No, we can't help you, but we can do a workshop for your staff three months from now." Why isn't a licensed social worker funded by the City of New York a part of the front-end outreach to reach people and to provide direct services. A cop cannot I don't-- I have much respect for city workers, but when I hear these titles, I don't know who's licensed to do any work. We need to know are they licensed to provide direct services.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So we'll say we have licensed social workers in all of our Families with Children shelters and many of the adult shelters as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: So, the reason why I'm going to take issue with this is because in the school system we keep hearing complaints that there's not enough. And the reason why I wanted to know the number of social workers is that I wanted to know the ratio, how many families, how people to social workers. In the school system it is an outrageous number. Many of which, again, one-tenth of our children are homeless, and we have to fight like hell every year to get more social workers in the school system. and the social workers we have in the school system, by the way, end up bring social workers for those families as well, because you take on one case, you take on a family case. And I hear from them, respectfully, and they say they can't handle this alone. So, I just say respectfully to the Police Department, we appreciate the gravity of your work, but I believe that you know in your hearts that this is not a police matter internally. And to our city officials, we're spending, I think, billions

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of dollars to tackle this issue. We need to solve this issue. I'm going to share with you that when I spoke to someone that was lying on the street across the street from Nathan's in Coney Island, and I offered help and assistance, the individual shared with me that she was almost stabbed at a shelter, and she said to me, "Councilman, I'd rather lay on the street than go back." That image and those words will never leave me. I wanted to help her. I called all 311, all the services to try to help her, she did not want to go back because she was afraid, and we have to understand that. And so we spend all this money on services, how are we ensuring that there's quality? How are we ensuring that folks are, in fact, safe and folks are, in fact, nourished? last thing I'll say, I turn back to the Chairs, is that I discovered through a PTA member in my district that one of our hotels was also housing homeless families. I didn't issue any press release. didn't do anything to hurt that because these are our families, these are our kids, but do you know what the PTA member complained about? That the child coming out of the hotel was coming to school hungry every day. So I paid a visit to the hotel, wanted to

see what kind of food they were giving. I saw little just tiny packages of juice, tiny packages of crackers. These are human beings. We're spending billions of dollars and they're getting small biscuits? So, I hear, I hear people, and we speak to people, and I want to solve this issue and not just manage this issue. And respectfully, to the Police Department, we appreciate you; this should not be your work. But we have to figure out a way to get people the help which they deserve through licensed personnel and the housing and dignity which they deserve, which is the long-term answer and solution—with supportive services. Thank you to the Chairs for their time.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Council

Member Treyger. Commissioner Park, I just want to

allow you to correct the record for a moment there.

When you said all family shelters— family with

children shelters have social workers, you're

referring just to Tier II shelters, correct?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Just to

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Not hotels?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Correct.

2.2

2.3

shelters.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Alright, and there's' hundreds of hotels in-- with families with children in the system. They don't have-- they don't have social workers because we tried to get it in last years' budget and we were told no.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: And as we have testified, we are down-sizing the hotel portfolio with a plan to be out of the hotels by 2023. It does take time. I think it goes back to my plea. There aren't many people left, but my plea for the collaboration on siting, and we have made very strong progress on the Turning the Tide. We have 30 open, 60 notified. We do still have a pathway still to go, and we really appreciate everybody's collaboration to open the strong, sustainable, high-quality shelters that we all want.

three years away. I think by the end of 2023, that's four years away. There are thousands of children that are in hotels today. There are many thousands that will be in hotels between now and the end of 2023. If there's no social workers there for them, they're the ones that are going to suffer. And then just to be clear, because I just want to-- you know,

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Why not all?

24

2 FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Right 3 now, we have the financial capacity to do some.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: That's a case-by-case basis, or? I mean, that's a--

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

[interposing] They're in the Thrive-funded shelters.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thrive-funded shelters. How many-- what percentage are Thrive-funded?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I need to get back to you on that one.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, so I'm going to just kind of run through some house-keeping questions here, and if we could do this as quick as possible, I know there's a panel or two-- two panels that would like to speak. How-- how many people-- can you provide a breakdown of through this program the number of people-- a breakdown by the type of violation, rule violation? The number of summonses that were written? And these aren't the ones that were-- this has to be inclusive of the ones that have been expunged. How many were written broken down by what type of violation we're talking about?

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 MICHAEL CLARKE: We'll get back to you on the breakdown of the summonses.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay. Let's see.

I'll wait for Chief to get back to ask NYPD

questions. I guess I could ask, prior to this

program what was the protocol for interaction between

outreach teams and people identified as being

homeless on the subway? BRC has had this contract for

a number of years. It's not as if there's-- it's not

as if we haven't made efforts to engage with people.

And then I have a follow-up to that question.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: Sure.

So, I break-- this is my own break-out as opposed to a formal contract division. But there's basically four pathways of subway engagement. There's the diversion initiative that we've been talking about. There's end-of-line work. There's rush-hour presence, and then there is just kind of standard practice, go where we are seeing people, have a presence across the City. Diversion is new. That is something that has come up since this past summer. Those other-- the other components of outreach have existed, you know, under different times, different pieces of it, are the priority, but all the other

2.2

2.3

streams of work in the-- with respect to subway

outreach have existed for some time and BRC has been

engaged in those for some time.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Let me ask, are there— are there individuals identified through the diversion program or through the joint crisis coordination center that were unknown to BRC?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: I mentioned earlier that our data systems haven't quite caught up with all of our initiatives. That's one of the questions that we can't answer at this time. I think--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] It'd be interesting to know how many were known or unknown, because those that I talk to-- I mean, I've been asking people about this. Most people have said, "Well, we know basically everybody that's sleeping on the subway." The outreach teams, BRC outreach teams. And if that's the case, you know, then we're not identifying anybody new. We're not really offering any new services other than the ones you mentioned, but with all due respect, they're not earth-shattering new initiatives, expansion of Safe Havens, healthcare stuff, but you know, we're not like-- you

2 know, we're not breaking through on that, really.

And so-- you know, you can see that there's-- here we are-- this is-- basically, this is a tactic that we

5 are now using to get people to engage with the

6 system.

2.2

2.3

think that the goal was necessarily ever to identify anybody new, although certainly we'd be happy to engage with somebody new if we-- if that happened occur. If the goal is take what would have been a purely enforcement interaction, right, and I will allow my colleagues to correct me if I get this wrong, but under-- before diversion existed, this was a moment that could have meant arrest, right? And turn it into a point where services can be offered.

asked Chief Delatorre about whether-- basically,
whether we're seeing increased interaction between
NYPD and the individuals who are sleeping on the
subway prior-- through this program compared to prior
to the roll out of this program. In other words,
were these instances where there was a police
interaction or was the-- or were the police kind of
not interacting with people. They saw somebody

2.2

2.3

outstretched, really wasn't their top priority to engage?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, I can't answer for every officer out there in that respect, but I would hope we've always been interacting. We do probably account for tens of thousands of contacts a year, so in different ways. Again, I can't answer for what every officer would do out there, but I would hope if they see something that they engage somehow, and that goes back to what I gave you out of my snapshot from the JCC. You know, over 1,100 jobs, 101 people sent to the hospital, 28 diversion. So, those jobs they responded to and had to engage somehow because they were sent there. So, there's different ways to handle every job.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And so when you were out I asked around the number of— the breakdown by type of violation or rule in the subway through the diversion program. In other words, the number of summonses broken down by type of summons.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, the majority is going to be outstretched.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So that's why we want to get those numbers compared to 2018. And we don't

State Police. I mean, your entire command is how

24

25

many officers?

arrest?

2.2

2.3

chief Delatorre: So, somebody is not given a summons and taken to a precinct. That's not the way we work. If you're give a summons, you're free to leave. So, somebody who comes to a police district is somebody who is taken into custody because they're not identifiable or they have a warrant. SO that's a different set of circumstances.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Not identifiable meaning what, that they don't have I.D.

CHIEF DELATORRE: We don't know who you are, and we can't figure out who you are unless we go back and do a further investigation.

an I.D. and you're outstretched and you're sleeping, and an officer says, you know, "What are you doing?" and, "We're going to write you a summons. But if you want to-- if you want to participate if you can, but here's the summons." And you don't have an identification, then are you-- are you an unknown--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Let me help you right here with this. The officer cannot write a summons to someone who they don't know who they are. So we have to be able to identify you to write a summons. Even if it was a traffic

2 infraction, we have to be able to identify you to write the summons.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: But a lot of people that are sleeping on the street or in the subway don't have an I.D., right?

CHIEF DELATORRE: That doesn't mean we can't identify the. I told you, what we built into this process is a phone call to BRC to say this person, "John Doe, says he's residing in a shelter, can you confirm that, or John Does has resided in the past, can you confirm that?" If they can confirm that, then we consider them identified at that point and they can certainly receive a summons and don't fall into the diversion category at all, or they may be warned as in many of these cases as well.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Well, why wouldn't fall into the diversion category if they receive a summons? The summons—

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Because a diversion— a diversion is for somebody who does not have an address, not someone who does. So, in other words, if you were outstretched on a train—

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Oh, I

25 see.

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 144 1 2 CHIEF DELATORRE: and you have an 3 address, you're going to get a summons, and that's the end of it. 4 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Right. CHIEF DELATORRE: The summons-- the 6 7 diversion is someone who doesn't have an address who can now be eligible for a summons and not get caught 8 up in any other process, be eligible for the summons, and then be offered the additional ability to have 10 that summons expunged. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Are people ever hand-13 cuffed? Have you -- how do you report use of hand-14 cuffs, is that--15 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] we don't. We don't report use of hand-cuffs, but somebody taken 16 17 into custody ordinarily may be cuffed, especially--18 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] People 19 are taken into custody--20 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] many of 21 these people--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] through 2.2

2.3 this initiative?

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 145 1 2 CHIEF DELATORRE: They may be. 3 Certainly, people with warrants are taken into 4 custody, yeah. CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Aside from warrants, are we seeing on the ground taken into the custody? 6 7 CHIEF DELATORRE: So, policy, anybody who's brought and taken into custody and brought into 8 the station house for any reason is likely to be cuffed. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Right. 12 CHIEF DELATORRE: Yes. 13 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, are we seeing -- I 14 mean, how many individuals have been taken in for 15 something other than warrants? 16 CHIEF DELATORRE: I don't have that. I 17 wouldn't have that. You know, people-- the ultimate 18 goal is if we bring somebody into custody, it's to 19 identify them and hopefully release them from the 20 station house with a summons if they're eligible. So 21 those are the circumstances that could overlap at different times. 2.2 2.3 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Does NYPD give summonses to people that are outstretched that they 24

don't deem to be homeless? 25

2 CHIEF DELATORRE: I'm sure we do.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay. That would probably— that would be something good to see as well. I mean, you could— someone that has a fixed address that is not BRC. If we could see those numbers as well. The number of arres— the number of— sorry, the number of violations issued for individuals for outstretch that have a permanent address that's not BRC.

CHIEF DELATORRE: So, the goal under normal circumstances, if you will--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Yeah.

The goal here is to provide assistance to people and give them an off-ramp from that corrective behavior, so-- from that correction action, so to speak, which is why we use a civil summons which is the lightest touch available to help people correct behavior and/or get engaged.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Now-- and I'm sorry.

The purpose of the command center is-- what's the purpose of the command center exactly?

2.2

2.3

1 CHIEF DELATORRE: The purpose, it's a DHS 2 3 command center I believe you're talking about on Beaver Street? 4 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: The joint -- the JCCC. FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It 6

brings--

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] That's not at NYPD, that's a DHS?

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, DHS is the lead agency on the Beaver Street station.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: It's a collaboration where we can bring the resources of various different systems together to address urgent So, we do work very closely with PD. also working very closely with the health agencies, both DOHMH and H&H. We are able to have a centralized team of DHS employees collaborating with the Homeless Outreach Unit, with the PD who can deploy outreach workers very quickly, respond to notifications about crisis situations. You know, we regularly get -- there is a -- we are concerned about a client at XYZ address, and we can send a team out from that. It is -- it's an enhancement and an expansion of the work that we've been doing to try

2.2

2.3

and bring more eyes, more transparency to that to make sure that we are bringing the resources of many different city agencies to bear on what ae some very complex problems.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, how do you measure success of that center?

the ultimate goal with for all of our street outreach remains the "come indoors, stay indoors" number, the 2450 that I have mentioned several times already.

We're actively looking at other ways that we can look at success. It is—this is a relatively new initiative, and it is something that we're evolving.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Chief, I just want to-- do you have any response to the letter that I read in the opening statement?

CHIEF DELATORRE: No, I just saw that letter today for the first time. A couple of months ago, I might have been able to move on it, the issues raised there a little quicker. I do know that there are thing said in there that are just simply false, and the rest of it I'm going to take a look at. We don't have quotas. That's not true. What are the other issues that I saw there? Anywhere there's

2 several things. BRC is not funded; that's not true.

3 BRC was funded to some degree to help with the

4 diversion. I think, also, I'd like to make clear here

5 that the subway diversion is one tiny piece of the

6 City's bigger plan here. So when we talk about whose

7 | idea or who's the lead here, it's not-- we're just--

8 we're part of a multiagency effort here to try to

9 help people out there.

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, well, I-- turn it over to my co-chair. Last word from me, I just want to-- you know, I under-- I think this is coming from, you know, a good place. I think that you all want to-- you know, I take you very much at your word that you want to have an impact on bringing people in who are sleeping on a train is not safe. However, people feel safer on the train than they do in shelter. That's a fact. And we know that. And so as long as we don't have the real resources that people need, whether that's social workers, low threshold shelter, safe shelter, moving away from a single point of intake at 30th Street which people hate-- it's demoralizing. Until we actually do all of those things on the back end, my fear is that we're just going to be kind of spinning our wheels because

we know the people, we know that we're not necessarily finding new people through this, and I could understand if we were having these law enforcement, NYPD, interactions anyway. I'm not totally sure that they were all happening prior to, but if we don't-- if we're not offering people the resources on the back end, I'm not sure how we can achieve success in what I think is everybody's goal, which is to provide permanent housing for as many people as possible. So, you know, I'll leave it at that, but I certainly -- I'm also concerned that we weren't involved in any discussion around this. As far as I know, none of providers or advocates or people that work with single adult homeless population every day, like we-- none of them were consulted about it. It does -- it does -- it causes to question, you know, why that is and you know, whether this is a policy that maybe the Administration wanted to keep from us or not seek our input, because obviously it didn't happen overnight. I'm assuming that this, the planning of this, went on probably back to Calendar Year 18, I'm assuming, and so you know, I didn't hear about it until Sept-- I think I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2.2

2.3

2 might have read about it in the press, or I might
3 have got a call from you guys on September something.

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK: So, we do collaborate with partners very, very closely. We meet regularly with both advocacy groups and providers. This has been--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] Nobody had heard about this.

discussion initially, and it's also something that, you know, it is not a set-in-stone program. I think the-- it's been alluded to before that we are evolving and continuing to evolve in response to feedback. Certainly welcome additional feedback. You know, I will respectfully disagree with the characterization of the resources in the Action Plan as insignificant. I think a thousand new Safe Haven beds and a thousand of brand new low-barrier permanent housing are incredibly exciting. I do think it's-- and I'm--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] I'm just stating they made--

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:
[interposing] very proud--

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

1213

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] We were probably going to announce-- those were going to be announced only in coordination with a diversion plan?

FIRST DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARK:

those were part of the Action Plan, but I think that is-- as we've talked about, the diversion is a piece of outreach, and it is important that we have resources, and I think we're making an incredible significant commitment of resources on that back end that you refer to. And with respect to 30th Street, you know, I think we are trying to balance the concerns of managing a very large system, and when we talk about making sure that people are safe, right, making sure that people are, to the extent that we possibly can, getting to the shelter that is the appropriate shelter for their needs, that we are-that we know who people are that they are get-- that they are connected with, the services that they should have or if there are other people in the system with whom it doesn't make sense for them to be with, that we're addressing that. We have to have some infrastructure around intake. I certainly understand that it is burdensome and that people don't like it, but I think, you know, managing that

2 infrastructure is an important part of running what
3 is a very large system.

UNIDENTIFIED: And one point to add to that. With the vacancy rate that we have across the system, that single point of entry is critical to us, and so opening those additional shelter beds is incredibly important.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Absolutely. I would just say one recommendation, get a focus group of like 10 to 15 people that are experiencing homelessness and ask them what is needed in the system, and do like a rigorous process around that, and ask them how they feel about the single point— I mean, it just—— I'm a little bit—— and I'm going to just—— I'll leave it. But I'm just a little bit annoyed that as—— I mean, I'm the Chair of the Committee. I didn't hear about this until it was like—— until it was literally expanded.

UNIDENTIFIED: Council Member, I have to disagree. You were included in the Mayoral press release in June along with a number of other elected officials.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: ON this program?

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 UNIDENTIFIED: On the diversion program,
3 yes.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I'll have to go look at that. I don't recall being— I recall getting a call in August or September because then I called Muzzy and asked him what's the deal with this. So, I'll have to go back and look at that, but the reality is— you know, I wasn't consulted about the construction of this plan, nobody else was. I'm not making it about me. Nobody else was consulted, and I asked all of them, Homeless Services United,

Coalition for the Homeless, none of them. Just there's more work to be done. I'll leave it at that. I'll turn back over to my Chair. Thank you all very much for your time. I realize this has been a very long hearing.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And let me just add, the Mayor's Office sends out press releases all the time, and I'm sure we get a thousand of those requests a day, but what I do want to add-- and I'll just back him up a little bit. A briefing for the Chair would be appropriate even if he decides to put something in a press release briefing is very helpful to Council Members. Let me also just in closing just

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ask you your opinion, Mr. Inspector, in a time when we're talking about building trust with people, do you see summonses being a good addition to building trust with individuals who are in the system. know, would this be considered counterproductive in lieu of where the Department is going, and I understand, I get the services part, and I commend the NYPD for taking these steps, although I do believe this should be out of the NYPD's court. I think you should certainly be a part of the conversation, but I don't think you should necessarily be leading the conversation around social services, and I think many of your Commissioners, just as Commissioner O'Neill in the past has said, you know, a lot of these issues landed on your lap that should really be being dealt by other agencies. So, the question I just wanted to get a clear answer from you, do you see giving summonses as being counterproductive, because it seems much more heavyhanded rather than providing the direct services or making sure there are local organization on the ground in the subway who you can assist perhaps on the ground? But I think this just comes across as we've seen in the past, very law enforcement-heavy,

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and even if that's not your intention, and I don't
think it is, it comes across very law enforcementheavy rather than social service building.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, I don't-- I see your point, but I think we live in a world of neighborhood policing where the uniform should not be impacting these relationships, and when we focus on helping somebody avoid the criminal justice system and be able to walk out with a very minor civil summons that can be expunded, you know, I think it's a very good way. When I had that fellow come back the following day and thank us for what we had engaged him in, and the fact that he's still in services come early January anyway-- I don't know where he is now, but you know, that tells me that that one person makes it worth something, and I'm sure there are many others out there that have gotten meaningful engagement that are maybe inches or yards or miles closer to where they need to be, I don't know, but I think the officers -- you know, I'll go back to the Narcan on Staten Island, the diversion initiative on Staten Island for people in the throes of drug abuse. You know, public health to some degree is our responsibility, and where we can help,

we should. And when we talk about arresting people, 2 3 we don't want to arrest our way out of anything. 4 Anywhere where I can take somebody out of an arrest process and divert them into social services or a 5 place where they can, you know, wind up with a more 6 meaningful outcome, I think it's our responsibility 7 8 to try and do it. And any ideas, I welcome the Council Members here to come down to my office and kick it around and have some coffee and we'll talk 10 about it, because any ideas you have, I'm all ears.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Wish you brought the coffee today. That's probably be a conflict of interest.

CHIEF DELATORRE: I used it up in the end room in the resource room.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Probably couldn't do that anyway. But I'll add this as well. You know, you don't find-- you don't think if you were homeless that you find this as an insult. You're giving somebody a civil summons who is homeless who perhaps may be unemployed. Would you not find that insulting, even though you're giving the option to clear the summons, but if they did not clear the

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 summons they would have to pay the summons perhaps if
3 they didn't--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] well, it depends on what you--

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] How much are the summons? Let me ask you that.

CHIEF DELATORRE: I'm not sure. I know they're--

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] Come on, somebody give me the summons--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] Probably about 50 dollars.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, alrighty.

CHIEF DELATORRE: But again, I'm not sure-

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] So hold on. So hold on. Alright, hold on. Hold on. Let's imagine the summons is 50 dollars and I'm homeless. I'm basically being coerced. Try not to use that terminology, but coerced into accepting a program that may or may not work. I'm just putting it out there. But I would-- I'm not homeless, and I find this actually to be an insult that you would give a homeless person a 50 dollar ticket that could

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE WITH COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
2	go to mail or to, you know, getting on the train so
3	that they don't have to fear beat [sic]. Just
4	putting it out there. And how many civil how many
5	summonses could you receive in a day or a week?
6	Could they so if they got one civil summons today,
7	and they decided not to go into your program, could
8	get they get another civil summons the next day and
9	the next day and the next day?
10	CHIEF DELATORRE: You could down the
11	road
12	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] Okay.
13	CHIEF DELATORRE: be offered diversion
14	again, if that's the question, yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right, but the
16	point is, though
17	CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] But 90
18	percent of the people that we've engaged
19	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing]
20	Right.
21	CHIEF DELATORRE: we've never seen again
22	in violation of a rule, over 90
23	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing]
24	Right, because they're going to get on a different
25	train.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 CHIEF DELATORRE: Remember, we're-- I got 3 you.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Like, man, I got hit on the J today, I'm going to the E. So, you know, I live in-- I try to, you know, put myself in people's shoes and sort of from a real world perspective, of course, you're not going to be on the same train. You're not going to see me tomorrow if I get a 50 dollar summons, right? So, I just wanted to put that out there, because I think the Department is moving, and I'll give credit, to try to correct a lot of those systematic issues that, you know, have occurred in the past, but I just see this as unfortunately-- and I understand the pressures on the Department, because obviously there are commuters who complain, right? You get on the train, people are, you know, stretched out on the seats, and so you're trying to balance the quality of life issues. just be clear, we could be real-- quality of life issue that people complain about as well, but I don't know if giving a civil summons to someone with mental health issues as I see on the train, you know, in some cases they may not even know what the paper says, based on some of the individuals that are on

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS:

Twenty.

24

25

1 CHIEF DELATORRE: So we're up to 12 now. 2 3 So we're going to have more teams going out. You 4 know, early on in the process we only had two at the time, but again this whole interagency approach has 5 opened up new doors like finding those nurses to work 6 7 those teams was a bit of a challenge for DHS, if I 8 might, but once we brought -- once we brought Health and Hospitals on bard and other city agencies, people were able to help us with some ideas on how to do 10 11 things like find more nurses. 12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] I 13 applaud you, but shouldn't be the NYPD's job. 14 should be DHS' shop or the Department of Health--15 CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] I don't mean me here. I don't-- yeah. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right, and I'm not 18 putting the onus on you. I'm not putting the onus on 19 you. 20 CHIEF DELATORRE: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. 21 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: But what I'm 2.2 saying is the Administration should take this out of 2.3 your ball court, and--

CHIEF DELATORRE: [interposing] It wasn't the Administration who brought everybody together.

24

25

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, got it, but

I'm saying I don't want you to lead it. So my

recommendation to the Administration would be to have

other professionals leading it and the NYPD

assisting. And I'll close with that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you my Co-Chair. Just a small rejoinder. I checked with my staff. we got a communication the night before the press release was to go out regarding the pilot program, and I'm just going to read the first paragraph of the press release so that -- for the record, so that we can see how well that corresponds with what we've been talking about for the last three hours. "The de Blasio Administration today announced a pilot initiative to support people experiencing unsheltered homelessness on the subway by offering alternative to pathways off the streets into transitional and permanent housing. The New York City Police Department in partnership with the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, Department Homeless Services, the Manhattan DA's, and New York City Transit will enhance our close coordination with HomeStat outreach teams by providing new options to individuals they encounter in the subway system,

2.2

2.3

diverting individuals from the Criminal justice

System for its outreach services and sportive

programs. Now, that's all technically true. The

question is where those people that would-- are the

people that you are diverting, would they have by

practice, have received that summons prior to this

program?

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And that's really the question.

CHIEF DELATORRE: Okay, I can't answer that question as to each individual case. Some of them may have actually been arrested. So the idea here is avoid the arrest, give them the lowest touch civil summons possible, and the opportunity to have it expunged. So,--

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing] And that part is good. That part is good. But the part where somebody gets a summons, the 800 people or so that got the summons and now have that summons. If they wouldn't have otherwise had any interaction whatsoever because the transit cop would have said, I'm not going to bother that person. They're sleeping on the subway. You know, then that's another question. But we can have—we continue to

have the conversation. Okay. Thanks so much. Thank you very much for your time. We'll take a three-minute break and call up the first panel. Catherine Trapani, Homeless Services United, Josh Dean, Human.Nyc, Kareem Walker [sp?], Giselle Routhier [sp?], and Josh Goldfein, Coalition and Legal Aid.

[break]

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty. We are waiting for Council Member Levin to come back. Thank you for your patience. You've been here, what is it? Three hours 32 minutes at the moment. So thank you for being troopers. And you may begin, and just, I'll ask everybody to just state their name for the record, and then you may begin.

 $\label{eq:Kareem Walker} \text{ My name is Kareem Walker,}$ and I am currently homeless.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And you could start your-- if you have a statement as well.

KAREEM WALKER: I do. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

KAREEM WALKER: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury and hon-- excuse me. Ladies and gentlemen of the Council and honored guests.

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: That's a first, by 3 the way. You made history today. Thank you.

KAREEM WALKER: First of all, thank you for your time. My name is Kareem Walker. As we all know, we are facing a homelessness issue in our-like no other, one that reflects what is going on nationwide, but the city's ill-considered and illconceived Subway Diversion program does nothing to address the root causes of homelessness, a lack of affordable housing and rapid gentrification. I say this from experience, because in August of 2019, New York police officers picked me up while I was sleeping on a Jamaica-bound E Train at Port Authority. They actually hand-cuffed me, drove me up to the Columbus Circle precinct, and while waiting for BRC outreach workers to collect me, actually went through my possessions despite my fervent protest not to do so. After about a -- they actually even put me in a holding cell for about an hour and a half. After BRC came and collected me, that's when they gave me a summons, which they said that was going to be removed When BRC arrived I was released from the anyway. holding cell, and with them they escorted me out of the precinct. Once we were out of the precinct,

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

however, they actually said that I was not legally obligated to accompany them back to 30th Street, at which point I declined their help, and we parted company there. This entire ordeal was pretty dehumanizing, demoralizing, and inhumane to say the least, and this is not how we're supposed to treat the most vulnerable and the most marginalized amongst us, nor is this a productive use of the taxpayer's money. While I can't speak for the thousands of street homeless in New York City, I do believe many of them would agree that this wrong-headed approach to so intractable a problem has the potential to more harm than good. Many of us on the streets have experienced the lack of safety and cleanliness that are rampant in many city-run shelters. I'm not on the streets because I'm ignorant of the shelters. Ιf anything, I'm all too familiar with the shelter system because I spent two years there. In 2019, I was again outstretched -- this time on a Queens-bound A train when police picked me up at Chamber Street. Still very wary of my last encounter, I declined help, declined -- and declined to give them my name. after about three minutes, decided to move on and kept-- but three weeks after that in December of 2019

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the police picked me up at the World Trade Center again, and this time, things got a little more interesting, because they were actually -- because when I once again refused to give my name or my I.D., and because of such they couldn't write me a summons. As I went to-- as I left and went to collect my gatherings, my possessions, excuse me, the-- one of the officers actually grabbed my left arm and held onto it for about five to seven seconds. partner who told him that he had to let me go, and this was all done in full view of an outreach worker. They also proceeded to walk me-- proceeded to follow me out of the-- through the turnstiles threatening me with criminal trespassing -- arrest for -- pardon me. Threatened me with arrest for criminal trespass if I did not leave. Last April, the United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in Martin vs. Boise that street homeless cannot be punished simply because they don't have-- simply punished for sleeping on public property if they have no other alternatives, adequate or otherwise. While we may not be in that court's jurisdiction, given the deplorable conditions in many citywide shelters, it's very understandable why many on the street don't view

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the shelters as a viable, adequate, alternative. We owe it to them and to the city as a whole to find a better safer way to help our unhoused neighbors.

5 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you so much. 6 Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you for your testimony. Thank you.

JOSH DEAN: Good afternoon, Council I'll be brief because I know it's been a Members. long day for everyone. I just want to comment on the questions that you all were doing a really great job of drilling down on, which is would people have been given a summons without the Subway Diversion program. I could speak from experience as I've spent much of time over the last two months on the subway platforms monitoring the policing and watching how the Subway Diversion played out. What I saw was officers spending hours upon hours at the specific stations standing on the platform waiting for trains to come through, and when the trains would come, they would stand there and look through the windows and scan looking specifically for people who were homeless and outstretched. Council Member Levin, you made the point that people are manspreading throughout the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

subway station. I can tell you that for the hours I spent there, I did not see a single person given a summons for being outstretched who did not appear to be homeless. What they did then, if they saw someone, or if they weren't finished scanning the train, they would tell the conductor to hold the They would spend-- I saw them spend two to three minutes looking through each of the cars until they determined that there was no one on the train, and in the case that they did see someone who appeared to be homeless, they would pull them off, sit them down on a bench, or if there wasn't a bench they would stand, and they would start to question them about their-- any I.D.s they have, any history they have in homeless services, any history they have in the criminal justice system, and really what they were trying to do was determine whether this person was eligible for the Subway Diversion program. you, they were asking quite personal questions out in the open such that I and others standing around could hear. Just yesterday I was with-- I saw them, you know, doing this again. They were scanning the trains and eventually they found someone and they brought an individual off the train.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

individuals was actually residing in a Safe Haven some of the nights. He happened to be outstretched on the train. So he was given a summons, his second summons of the day. He was given one earlier at Penn Station and then he was given a second one at Canal Street. He was ineligible for the Diversion Program. So there was no way for his summons to be vacated. So the -- they targeted him because he was homeless, but he didn't fit all three of those criteria, so he left with not one, but two summons from a single day. It's-- Karem put it better than me, but this is just outrageous, and the fact that this hearing even had to happen today in 2020 with a so-called progressive mayor is quite absurd. I'll leave it there. you.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

JOSH GOLDFEIN: I'm Josh Goldfein from
the Legal Aid Society. We will present testimony—
we presented written— joint written testimony with
Coalition for the Homeless. You'll hear from them
next. I just wanted to make a couple quick points
first. We heard again and again today that this idea
that summons are going to be given out anyway, and
therefore, the interaction with the client in that

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

situation is like an added bonus, but I've heard very good questioning from Council Members that highlighted that. There's not any reason why we need to assume that there's this baseline of summonses given out. As the point has been made again and again, the summonses are given out only to particular people, and the alleged infractions that the officers referred to are committed by everybody, and yet, only certain people are getting summonses. So I think it is-- one important takeaway from today, I think you established a very good record that there is a set of infractions that are being created solely from the purpose of targeting this population, and that we don't have to assume that there's this baseline of summonses that will be given out every day. particularly distressed by the response to Council Member Adams' questions about what happened to her constituent in the Jamaica station that essentially the individual who has been there for so long was arrested for her own health. I think that highlighted exactly what the problem is, that we're not coming to the people who -- it's coming to people on their own terms and asking what they need, but they're fitting this into their rubric of either

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

we're going to give you a summons because you're breaking a rule or because you are a danger to yourself, and those are the only two ways that -- the only two lenses they have to look at people. And finally, I just want to highlight this point that the-- if you have a shelter address, you're not eligible for this program at all, as Josh was just highlighting. The-- and we heard earlier, they're going to call BRC and determine are you assigned to a shelter. If you're assigned to a shelter, you have an address. You're still homeless. You're still on the subway. You still-- whatever need that the next person who was also asleep had to, but yet, you're not going to get any services from this program. Finally, -- I know I said finally, but I say finally twice. One of my colleagues appeared at the press conference that we had before here. She had to go back to arraignments, but I just want to read part of the statement that she made. This is from Jen Ben Wong [sp?] who is an attorney in our Criminal Defense Practice. She says that Friday night she represented a man who was brought into criminal court by officers with a swollen, bloody lip after an unnecessary police interaction that occurred in the subway.

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

"Transit officers woke my client up," she says, "shortly after midnight while he was sleeping on the train solely to issue him a ticket for having his feet up on the seats. That encounter escalated, and rather than just being issued the summons, he was detained. Twelve hours later he was in arraignments and was being charged with obstructing governmental administration and disorderly conduct." This is just one of many instances she says that she's seen where people ended up actually being brought into court for these interactions that wouldn't have happened if they weren't out looking for them. interactions, you know, this kind of aggressive tactics disproportionately affect the marginalized and vulnerable. It doesn't serve to help anyone at the intersection of homeless and mental health issues. It doesn't increase public safety. It creates new situations that are more harmful than helpful. The client ended up injured, spent hours in police custody, was charged criminally, and this is not the solution to the problem that we're facing right now. But more of these kinds of encounters will result in conjunction with this outreach, not just the rosy picture that we heard about getting

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

connected to services in a way that we understand that they want to happen. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Josh.

GISELLE ROUTHIER: My name is Giselle Routhier. I'm the Policy Director at the Coalition for the Homeless. We've submitted joint testimony with Legal Aid and I'll be reading from that today. I want to thank Chair Levin and Chair Richards for holding this hearing and asking such important questions. Mayor de Blasio's subway diversion program was launched in June 2019. It was framed as a way to offer services to homeless people in the transit system in lieu of contact with the criminal justice system. Unfortunately, this has not turned out to be the case. Based on the first-hand reports of homeless individuals, it appears that the program has served only to increase unwelcome contact with NYPD officers while adding a counterproductive element of coercion to outreach by using summonses to force those individuals to accept transport to a shelter, regardless of whether or not they intend to stay there. We have witnessed several examples of police explicitly targeting homeless individuals for infractions that are commonly made by riders who are

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

not homeless, including taking up more than one seat or placing their bags on an adjacent seat, removing those individuals from the subway, and in some cases handcuffing them, as Kareem spoke to earlier. is a direct violation of Local Law 71 of 2013, which prohibits bias-based profiling due to a person's housing status or other protected characteristics. The Coalition for the Homeless, The Legal Aid Society, and many other advocates have consistently raised concerns with the subway diversion program since it was first announced last summer. were confirmed on November 12th, 2019, when we received an email from an anonymous group of NYPD Transit Bureau officers who wanted to decry "the blatant discrimination against the homeless in the New York City subway" as a result of the program. In partnership with Human.nyc, we have created a website called diversioniscoercion.nyc to disseminate the NYPD officers' letter along with other documentation we have compiled of the subway diversion program in action. As our documentation shows and the NYPD whistleblowers wrote, "The Diversion Program that is being advertised by the Mayor as helping the homeless can be nothing further from the truth." Increased

2.2

2.3

policing is not the answer to homelessness. Deploying police officers in this manner only serves to increase the mistrust that trained outreach workers work so hard to overcome. And again, the program fails to offer what homeless individuals truly need to get off the streets, and that's permanent affordable housing, with services for those who need them. I want to thank the Council for the opportunity to testify, and we look forward to working with you in the future. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you.

CATHERINE TRAPANI: Thank you, Chair

Levin. My name is Catherine Trapani. I'm the

Executive Director of Homeless Services United. HSU
is a coalition of nonprofit, mission-driven homeless
services providers including those providers that are
tasked with conducting street outreach, and I'm here
to testify today because I cannot tell you how many
times I have been pulled aside at events and meetings
where everyone from frontline workers to the
executives of these organizations have whispered in
my ear and said, "Catherine, you have to do something
about this program. This is not the approach we
need." Client-centered practice, we need outreach

25

workers to lead the way. We know who are clients 2 are. We just need to be able to deploy resources to 3 4 help them. And these folks are not here to testify because they're afraid of alienating the 5 Administration. So, I'm just sort of here to tell 6 you what they've been telling me. We're grateful for 7 8 the promised investments in Safe Havens that Commissioner Park spoke about earlier today. agree that there have been substantial investments in 10 11 improving the shelter stock, but the truth is that 12 any person experiencing homelessness can tell you is 13 that those investments haven't yet taken hold. the approach then is to threaten a homeless person to 14 15 say, you know, here's a summons, or go to talk to 16 this outreach worker. All that serves to do is to 17 erode the trust that we're struggling mightily to 18 build. And so this program is really undermining our 19 efforts, and it's actually undermining the very 20 investments that this Administration put in place. 21 And so I just really want to call out that hypocrisy 2.2 and note that they're really hand-cuffing these 2.3 workers, these outreach workers and making it impossible for us to do our jobs. So I just wanted 24

to flag that and note that, that there's a lot of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

people up and down the line that are working on the front lines that really know what our clients need, and we look forward to being able to deliver those services, and you know, just total -- just to echo my colleagues, I really struggle to understand why there's this presumption that the NYPD needs to be involved in street outreach at all. As long as we have the resources, as long as we have access to meaningful, permanent, supportive housing, Safe Havens, rent subsidies that pay the rent, comprehensive medical care, not just street medicine, but integrated primary health and behavioral healthcare into our communities and our shelter programs, those are the things that our folks need. So, I just wanted to flag that and just say that we're all on the same page, and speak on behalf of my members. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you to this panel. Question for you all, was anyone consulted about the design of this program on this panel?

KAREEM WALKER: I certainly wasn't.

JOSH DEAN: I was not.

GISELLE ROUTHIER: I was not, and I remember getting the press release that day after it

2.2

2.3

came out and thinking I had to scroll really far down to see the details about what the summons that people would actually be given summonses and then they would have to get them cleared, and thinking that doesn't make sense. Why would you do that, right? And so it was like very confusing, but no we-- we were not consulted prior to the program, and raised many concerns since.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: It's like Amazon

letter 2.0 for me where I signed on to that Amazon

letter that one time. Big mistake. But this was-- I

did give a quote in June, but I did not realize that

this was what I was giving a quote to. Yeah.

GISELLE ROUTHIER: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Catherine?

CATHERINE TRAPANI: We're not consulted. We often get those late-night phone calls asking for quotes. So, yeah, no, I've been there. I wasn't on this press release, I checked.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Yeah, I mean,
obviously I appreciate you guys stepping up and doing
this and being out there and calling attention to it.
Kareem, thank you so much for your testimony. This
was-- it was very important to hear somebody's

2.2

2.3

personal experience with this program, and I very
much appreciate you taking the time to be here today,
and--

KAREEM WALKER: It was my pleasure.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And look forward to continue working with you. So, yeah, let's regroup in the coming days and talk about what came up in this hearing, and how to move forward.

CATHERINE TRAPANI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thanks. And last panel -- just for -- just for the record, is there any representatives from the Administration here in the room right now to listen to that panel? Nope. None Okay. Just wanted to make that clear. Next panel: Richard Hobbs [sp?], James Abro [sp?], Richard W. Flores [sp?], Wendy O'Shields, and Jonathan Sunshine [sp?]. If there was anybody that wanted to testify whose name was not called, please fill out a form with the Sergeant at Arms, and we'll make sure that you're here to testify.

WENDY O'SHIELDS: Chair Levin? May I start?

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Go ahead, Wendy, thank you.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

WENDY O'SHIELDS: I have a graphic and it's-- it says NYPD Subway Diversion Program, why not HUD Housing first or HUD rapid rehousing? And then I have hand-cuffs, hundred dollar bills versus housing. That's the real solution, housing. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you so much. Look for the red light.

JOHNATHAN SUNSHINE: Okay, my name is Jonathan Sunshine. I'm a consultant with the Urban Justice Center. Anyway, my thing is I wanted to say that, you know, -- I heard things about the housing the homeless and everything and the hotel-- I heard about the hotel. There-- you know, but I'm not saying that they have-- they should-- they should-- outreach teams should also look into the kind of hotels that they're-- you know, because they have like the Howard Johnsons and I know, Penn Stations and the other things, you know, like the Empire hotels and stuff like that. They can put some -- they can make a contract with some of them to house some of them in there and not worry about the beds and everything because the food and the, you know, quality of life is a lot better in those places, because you know,

2

Howard Johnsons-- I mean, Motel 6 says, "We'll leave 3 the light on for you." So, you know, let them leave 4 the light on for the people -- for many of the people who really need to have the light on, you know. 5 That's what I'm saying about that. And as far as the 6 7 rest of it, they-- you know, they -- people want to 8 be on-- they don't want to be on the streets and they don't want to be a lot of times in these shelters because they-- in the shelters it's almost worse than 10 11 being on the street. I'm telling you that because--12 and then the sub-- that's why they go to the subway. 13 That's why they go to the people in Port Authority and in Penn Station and stuff like that. That's why 14 15 they're stretched out there like that, because 16 they're over stressed and everything. They can't 17 find affordable housing. Get in touch with the 18 developers and everything and that's making these new 19 buildings and stuff like that. Put some of them--20 and put some of them in there, in the 80/20, the 21 20/20s and the 80/20 with the Elliot Spitzer thing. 2.2 I mean, you got to-- and cut down on the-- I hear a 2.3 lot of in a-- you know, I say inappropriate, but it's plain BS sometimes, I think, when they say they're 24 talking about all the improvements they're making and 25

2.2

2.3

they're not making them fast enough and they're not really helping the people that are really out there freezing their jollies off on the streets, and these so-called, you know, when you give them summonses and make them come in , that's almost like criminalizing them for things that they don't have any control over. So, that's what I had to say.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Sunshine. Whoever wants to go next.

JAMES ABRO: I'll go. I'm James Abro.

Okay, so I'll start with this. I'm living in a homeless shelter, but I am a human. Okay, there we go. I just say that I'm living in my homeless shelter, but I am a human, and we really need to start with that, because that's not how you-- I came into New York in November 2019 to meet with a publisher. I'm a professional writer, a published author. I needed a place to stay in order to work on a book proposal. So I stayed at Bellevue for three months to do the proposal. The proposal didn't work out with the publisher. I've been stuck in the shelter system since then. I spent six months in Bellevue, six months in two different places in the Bronx, and now I'm in a hotel in Brooklyn. So, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

think I'm a resident expert on the shelters. So, let me tell you, first of all, they don't need more security. Security is the problem. When you go into the 30th Street you are-- I was going to say assaulted. You're checked by people -- now, first of all they have them in pseudo police uniforms just like the regular police only they have Tasers but not guns. So, all of these guys are there, and you give somebody who doesn't have any power, and most of these are street dudes. You see them coming in the They're coming from the hood. They put on mornings. the street uniform. They got a little p9ower and you ain't got no power. That's just human nature. They're going to abuse you. So we don't need more security. We don't need more security guards. have a problem with anybody in a shelter while I am there, I take care of it myself, or I get the homies who have my back and I have their back. You don't call security. That's a big waste of time and money. Now I know that the budget of HDS, Homeless, whatever you call that, Homeless Services, its three billion dollars a year. Eighty-eight percent of that goes to the administrators. That's the clowns that are-they-- the place is completely dysfunctional. The

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

administration of it is completely dysfunctional. Social workers, that's a joke. And the food, I was the four or five different-- four or five different shelters. The food is different at each one. worse the shelter is, like you go to the Bronx, they sent me to a hell hole because I complain a lot and the food there was terrible. The place was terrible. There is no uniformed shelter system. Wherever you go you will end up there. Now, I'm-- now these are all vendors. Now they have -- they're not cooking on the premises. They're paying a vendor. You got to look into kickbacks here. There's got to be a kickback because this food is shit. I wouldn't give it to a teenager. Now, you go to any restaurant in New York City, and they're all bragging, Fret du Menge [sp?] or wherever, "We don't waste a single meal at night. We give it -- We make sure it goes to people who are" and they do. They send it out to the churches or they send it out to the food banks. doesn't somebody have them send it to the shelters? We're living in the place with the greatest restaurants in the world and we're eating like we're in the third world. The food at 30th Street is It comes in plastic and they reheat it in a

2

microwave. You don't reheat food in a plastic microwave. That's carcinogenic, right? Some people 3 4 they're doing it on purpose. That's their solution. Now the permanent housing, let's forget about that. 5 There is no permanent housing. There is no 6 7 affordable housing in New York. The rents are going up and nobody wants to sell. I've seen what-- when I 8 was in the Bronx they would take guys, they would give three of them -- they would go to a ghetto pimp, 10 11 three to a room. Three crazy people, put them in a 12 room. Of course they're going to go more crazy, and 13 they're supposed to-- he's getting three of the rents for this little place. I've been in the system a 14 15 year. I've seen one place in Harlem and it was 16 supervised housing for crazy people. What are you showing me here? Now, I-- my version of using the 17 18 shelters is give me a safe place to sleep and something decent to eat and let me go out here and 19 20 hustle, because writing is a hustle. I'll get myself 21 out of here, but just don't freaking bother me, you 2.2 I was in a place in Jerome Avenue in the Bronx 2.3 where they sent me-- they sent me to one place by mistake. You know, you can say they're messing with 24 you or they're just so incompetent that they do this 25

2.2

2.3

2 shit. Who knows? But that's what they do. And 3 well, that bing mean I'm over, right?

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Yeah, if you could conclude, that'd be great.

JAMES ABRO: What I want conclude? I don't even remember where I started. The shelter system sucks, period. It needs to be revamped, rehauled, done away with. You can't reform it. It's a monster. It grew into something it was never intended to be. Give me that three billion dollars and I'll do a lot more with it than this shelter system.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony. Thanks. Whoever is next? No, no. Whoever wants to go?

UNIDENTIFIED: Mrs. Routhier just left.

Ms. Routhier said in a recent interview that one of
the primary reasons for homeless amongst single males
for a rehabilitation facility, a prison, or a mental
hospital is because hospital workers or city case
workers don't discharge former hospitalized or
inmates without a safe discharge plan, and as a
result many people become homeless. I hope that
sounded clear. Well, that's what happened to me. I
was literally thrown into the street. I was evicted

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and thrown into the street with nowhere to go. went to the Coalition for the Homeless for help, and I was told, "We can't help you because you have an unemployment check and you get too much money from the state. We can't do anything for you." After that, I went to 30th Street. I was told, "You can't come here because you don't have a substance abuse problem, sir?" I said, no, I don't have a substance abuse problem. "We can't help you." Everywhere I went, every agency I've been to, no one helped me. I've made repeated calls to, what is it, DHS? that what's it's called. I got no help. literally said, "We can't help you, sir." I called the Legal Aid Society. They said, "We can't help you." So to make a long story short, I haven't gotten any help, and I've been homeless for four years and a month. As far as criminalization of the homeless is concerned, I hope I can say this on camera, but I think the NYPD are pathological liars, because I seen what they do. I've been a victim of what they do. I've seen the arbitrary behavior that they conduct themselves with, and they were sitting here with you, and you were questioning them, and they were giving you answers and saying this is what we've done, these

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

are the numbers, etcetera, but I've seen where they blatantly disrespect homeless people including myself. And then it becomes a contentious situation because if I say something or if I get upset, or if I feel like I'm not being treated lawfully, I can get arrested or something could happen to me. You know, they could say he's deranged, you know, he doesn't know what he's talking about. He's on the street, etcetera. So, it becomes a contentious situation, and then if you keep your mouth shut, then you won't get any help either. So, the point I'm making is that if this kind of divisiveness continues to go on, how can anyone expect anything to get any better? That's between the police, even what I listened here today, what I see on the street with civilians. This divisiveness that's going on. Unless the people want to actually really deal with that, which I know this is about, nothing is going to get any better. what's really alarming to me, you know. If that divisiveness doesn't come together, you know, it's only going to get worse, you know, the numbers are only going to continue to grow. There's young kids right now who, as you said, live in shelters, and what's going to happen to them when they get older?

2.2

2.3

You know, that next group of people who unfortunately going to find themselves in this kind of situation.

So, all I'd like to say is that to me there needs to be real communication, not a kind of semantical game of language, and I heard a lot of that go on here today, and I find that to be a little distressing amongst individuals who I consider to be very respectful and educated and that you want to do a good job, and everyone seems to want to have change, but if even in the language that they're using, you can hear this kind of divisiveness going on as a result of economic and social reasons, I guess. How do you expect for change to happen. That's just a question I'd like to leave you with.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I appreciate that.

Thank you. If you can make sure the red light is on.

RICHARD HOBBS: My name is Richard P.

Hobbs, and I want to say first that I really blessed today because one of the few times in my life I've seen people who are involved in the legislature's process who seem to have— who seem to be trying to bend the curve to social justice. I was blessed in my life. I was born in Rochelle [sp?]. I grew up. I'm

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

a member of the Riverside Church in the City of New York, and even though I didn't understand what was happening at the time, I got to sit in chu7rch with my mother and listen to a man speak. His name was Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, and he did mention through his lifetime about how a society can be rated by the way in which it treats the least amongst us. So, I'm 15 years old, I started working with homeless people when I was a boy scout and I've been doing it since. I'm a minister. When I work with the homeless I didn't take pay. I paid myself for doing the work, and I've always been poor. I was born poor. going to die poor, and some poor people are poor because they mismanage their monies. Others of us, including myself, are poor because we don't have any money, and we can learn to be very frugal with it, and I have been very effective at using small amounts of money to accomplish a lot, by putting effort into it, by volunteering, by helping. I've also-- I've helped many homeless persons in the last 50 years, individuals who I've helped by taking a personal concern for them and considering them -- Dr. King talked about the beloved community where I consider to be more important than myself, and that's a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

difficult thing for most humans to do. But when we do that, if we have eight people in a room and each one is concerned about the other seven succeeding, that's one scenario. What the scenario we usually use here is eight people in a room all concerned about themselves succeeding. Which would you rather be in? And I believe we're at the time in history where God or providence is calling us to reinvent ourselves, and I hope that this is a part of what you're doing. I became homeless in March 10th. I lived in Yonkers. I was in a Section 8 apartment for nine years. You paid a thousand dollars a month for my rent, but I couldn't get any heat in my apartment in my bedroom for nine years. And then six years after that I went in the hospital for having frozen almost through the winters not being able to bathe right. They wanted to cut my foot off, the doctors did, but I refused to let them do it, because I knew how to get it -- I knew things they didn't know, because I've been poor and I've had times when I had no doctors. I had to take care of myself. Now, I've fallen through all the cracks, and in the times I've been homeless people-- let me give you two short stories. One, a person become homeless and they have

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

things, and what do they do with their things? welfare system will say, "Well, we'll give you storage." And then you become a part of that system and they take over your finances. But what happens is, the mechanisms of the government are such that you never get the storage until all of your stuff-or you might get the stuff in storage, and by the time it gets paid, the stuff is gone because it's too I'm saying is the efforts we make to try to solve problems tend to cause problems unless we're directly interested in helping the person as an individual. And I've been at Penn Station. I'm not a-- I'm an intelligent person. In the seventh grade I went to college, and I know things, and I understand things, and I'm not better than anyone else, but I know that I'm a liar. Well, I do, and I admit it, so that's my take on life. I don't usually lie, but I am a liar, and I don't drink. I don't smoke. I don't use alcohol. I don't' use coffee, because I think it's a substance. I'm never-- I'm a virgin, although people accuse me otherwise, but it's not true. don't need anything from anybody else except the opportunity to do this thing that this country lets us do and that's to be self-- be able to control my

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

own life and do what I need to do for my psyche. in Penn Station I was mugged two days after Christmas at the ATM machine, and the guy mugged me, and the Amtrak police came by a little later. I was pulled-money was pulled out of my-- well, they didn't get it, but they pulled me off my chair onto the floor at the ATM machine Wells Fargo behind the Amtrak circle, and when the police came there, the Amtrak, I said to them, "Police, police." People helped me back in my wheel chair. I hurt my knees. I said, "I was just mugged." And he says, "I don't believe you." And then I asked him to make a report and he refused to make a report, and then a little while later-- and I'm sorry, unfortunately, in New York City it's against the law to sleep, and it's hard to have a place to go to the bathroom. I have to use a bathroom every hour and a half, and that's the-where is there a place in the middle of the night where you can use a bathroom? And I go to the Riverside Church and they have a shower project there, and they think they're doing a wonderful thing for God and the world, but then at 10 o'clock they throw all of the homeless people out of the church, and they pay a guard to sit there, and he can use the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

bathroom or she can use the bathroom, but nobody else can, and that's not social justice. You pay someone to keep-- so, now, what did I see in Penn Station? They say, you see something, say something. In order to deal with that Amtrak police, I had to call the FBI and report what happened, and I do that. And the Long Island Railroad, there's eight police officers there, and I saw someone peddling drugs to someone else, and I went over to the police officers and tried to tell them, and they shooed me away and all I'm sorry, my-- it's just-- I'm sorry. And I saw-- I'm seeing a lot of things going on here, that if you saw them, you would want to know about it. I was robbed. My phone was robbed from me in the Penn-- the most benign place I found where there's a bathroom at night that I can use seems to be the Staten Island side of the ferry, but they still-there may be 40 people sleeping on the floor at certain parts, and there's a whole process going on where they use the rules to oppress other people. You know, we had a rule that slavery was legal once, and we used it to oppress people, and the purpose of laws is not to oppress people. The purpose of this country is so people who want to do something that is

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

right have the freedom to do it, and unfortunately most of think that freedom is the right to do something we shouldn't be doing. Now, they robbed my phone, and I went over to the police, "He robbed my phone." They ignored me. They didn't say a thing or do a thing. They talk about cameras all over the place, and I had to call Internal Affairs Bureau. had to call the FBI. About a week later they started to investigate. Then the fellows name was Robert Gordon and he robbed my phone from me, and he robs phones all day long from people all over the place over there. All the other homeless know about it, but the people who travel through the terminal don't know that he's robbing their phones. And then I prosec -- I did the things necessary for them to have him go in front of a judge, but the judge just signed off and let him go. And since then, it's been about three days, four days, he's still stealing phones from people. So, I hope you get the gist of what I'm talking about. I volunteer my services to any of you to help you. I lobbied Congress for eight years. went to college in the 7th grade. I'm not stupid. I'm homeless in a wheelchair. I am homeless in a wheelchair in the greatest city in the world, and I

- belong to a church that has 100 million dollars in
 the bank, and they think it's good to give a shower,

 but then they throw people, even me a member, they

 put me out on the street so I have to poop in my

 pants, and then they wonder why people pee on the

 street. There's no bathroom. So, we really need to

 start reinventing ourselves, don't you think? And I

 think you're trying to do it.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I agree.
- 11 RICHARD HOBBS: And if you are, then God
 12 bless you.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you. Thank you.

 14 And I appreciate--
- 15 RICHARD HOBBS: [interposing] And I'll 16 help.
 - CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you. I appreciate that very much, and thank you to this entire panel, and I think that the takeaway from this panel is we need to not just reform this system by reinvent it.
- 22 RICHARD HOBBS: Reinvent it. And it has
 23 to be humane.
- CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: It has to be humane.

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

RICHARD HOBBS: If it's not humane, I mean, you wouldn't put your dog in the shelter I was They got-- I was in Westchester shelter. get \$4,185 a month for me to be there and they want to take my SSI away and give me 20 dollars a month, and then I have to-- and what happens in Westchester-- I don't know about here, but I do know that's the wealthiest county in the world, and they get from the Federal Government \$4,185 a month for each homeless person they have. How much does the city get? Maybe it's become a business, and maybe there's people who profit off of the homelessness, and maybe-- you know I'm told that a relative of the Governor is in charge of a whole agency. I know the BCR. I know Amish The BCR has become a business. It was taken over, and I know what went on politically in that organization. They took both of the shelters over. Milton Freedman told us about having a marketplace with a lot of people actively involved and he was pretty smart about that. Maybe we need to let these agencies compete with each other and let the best ones rise.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, again I want to thank all of you and appreciate you taking all the

2.2

2.3

time and staying here. This has been-- you know, it's been a four-hour hearing. So I appreciate you all staying to the end and giving your testimony on the record. This is on not only the written record, but it'll be-- the video is online and it's part of this-- the permanent record of this hearing. So, I want to thank you all very much and if there's anything we could do--

RICHARD HOBBS: Most of what happened to me I have documented on YouTube.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Yeah.

RICHARD HOBBS: Most of it.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And if there's any help that our offices can provide, we're more than happy to do that. Correct. That's Levine, close.

That's Mark Levine. I'm Steve Levin, but Mark Levine—

that's Mark Levine, similar last name. But I want to thank all of you very much for your time and appreciate your testimony. Thank you. And with that, at— I want to thank also our Sergeants at Arms and staff who helped put this hearing together: Daniel and Amenta and Natalie who I think still here. I want to thank all of you guys very much. And with that, this hearing is adjourned.

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 March 17, 2020