1	COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE 1						
2							
3	CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YORK						
4	X						
5	TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES						
6	Of the						
7	COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE						
8	X						
9	December 11, 2020 Start: 10:46 a.m.						
10	Recess: 3:20 p.m.						
11	HELD AT: REMOTE HEARING (VIRTUAL ROOM 3)						
12	B E F O R E: Keith Powers,						
13	Chairperson						
14	Jumaane Williams, Public Advocate						
15	Tubile Advocate						
16	COUNCIL MEMBERS: Alicka Ampry-Samuel						
17	D. Diaz						
18	Robert F. Holden Carlina Rivera Daniel Dromm						
19	Jimmy Van Bramer Helen Rosenthal						
20	Stephen Levin						
21							
22							
23							
24							

1	COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE 2						
2	APPEARANCES						
3	Cynthia Brann						
4	Commissioner						
5	Hazel Jennings Chief of Department						
6	Heidi Grossman						
7	Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters						
8	Brenda Cooke						
9	Chief of Staff						
10	Margaret Egan						
11	Executive Director of the New York City Board of Correction						
12	Bobby Cohen						
13	Physician and a Council appointee to the New York						
14	City Board of Corrections						
15	Emily Turner Interim Deputy Executive Director of the Board						
16							
17	Benny Boscio President of the Correction Officers' Benevolent						
18	Association						
19	Correction Officer 1						
20	Four years as a Correction Officer						
21	Correction Officer 2 Three years as a Corrections Officer						
22	Gannatian Offi						
23	Correction Officer 3 Six years as a Corrections Officer						
24	Correction Officer 4						

5 years as a Corrections Officer

25

1	COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE 3						
2	APPEARANCES (CONT.)						
3	Correction Officer 5						
4	Three and a half years as a Corrections Officer						
5	Correction Officer 6 Five years as a Correction Officer						
6							
7	Kelsey De Avila Brooklyn Defender Services						
8	Julia Solomons						
9	Criminal Defense Social Worker with the Bronx						
10	Defenders						
11	Kayla Simpson Attorney at the Legal Aid Society's Prisoners'						
12	Rights Project						
13	Sergio De La Pava						
14	Legal Director of New York County Defender Services						
15	Mik Kinkead						
16	White transgender man and an Attorney in New York						
17	City						
18	Janos Marton						
19	Civil Rights Attorney running for Manhattan DA						
20	Jennifer Parish						
21	Darren Mack						
22	Zachary Katznelson						
23	Policy Director at the Lippman Commission						
24	Scott Paltrowitz						
25	Daniele Gerard						

Senior Staff Attorney at Children's Rights

Daniele Gerard

1	COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE 4						
2	APPEARANCES (CONT.)						
3	Anthony Dixon						
4	Director of Community Engagement at the Parole Preparation Project						
5							
6	Corey Brinson Policy Associate with the Legal Action Center						
7	Eliel Cruz						
8	Director of Communications at the New York City Anti-Violence Project						
9	inici vicione ilojece						
10	Mateo Guerrero TGNCIQ Lead Organizer at Make the Road						
11	Sammie Werkheiser						
12	Member of the Justice for Women Task Force						
13	Melania Brown						
14	Layleen Polanco's Sister						
15	Kelly Grace Price						
16	Natasha White						
17	Member of Freedom Agenda and a Former Leader in the Close Rikers Campaign						
18							
19	Victor Herrera Leader of Freedom Agenda Campaign						
20	Andrea Bowen						
21	Consultant for the Sex Workers Project at the						
22	Urban Justice Center						
23							

2	SERGEANT	CASTRO.	Me	are	1 i 170
_		C110 11(O •	V V C	$\alpha \perp c$	$\pm \pm \circ \bigcirc$

2.2

2.3

SERGEANT BRADLEY: Thank you. Sergeants, will you start your recordings.

SERGEANT MARTINEZ: PC recording is going.

SERGEANT LEONARDO: Cloud recording is going.

SERGEANT Perez: Back up is rolling.

SERGEANT BRADLEY: Thank you. Sergeant Martinez, you may begin.

SERGEANT MARTINEZ: Good morning and welcome to today's remote New York City Council Hearing of the Committee on Criminal Justice.

To minimize disruption, please silence your electronic devices. If you wish to submit testimony, you may do so via email at the following address testimony@council.nyc.gov. Once again, that's testimony@council.nyc.gov. Thank you for your cooperation. We are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Good morning. Thank you everybody for being here today. My name is City Council Member Keith Powers, I am the Chair of the Criminal Justice Committee here at the City Council and I am glad that everyone could join us remotely for today's hearing on Ending Solitary Confinement in New York City Jails.

housing.

I want to first hope and wish that everybody is safe and healthy in their families as well and happy holidays to everybody celebrating. We are here today to discuss the use of solitary confinement in City jails specifically the use of punitive segregation as we approach the Board of Corrections rule making on the topic. In October of last year, the Board of Correction proposed a set of comprehensive rules to reform restrictive housing in our city jails. These proposed rules came just four months after the death of Layleen Polanco, a transgender woman of color who lost her life after being placed in restrictive

In the wake of Layleen's death, many of my colleagues and I publicly called for action to change the practices inside of our City jails and we are joined by many people who we will hear from today as well and just as many people know, over the summer of this year Mayor de Blasio announced a formation of a working group that was tasked with creating a plan for ending punitive segregation which has been needing over the last few months. And the working groups recommendations will ultimately inform the Board of Corrections rule making.

We have been waiting the results of those efforts over the summer and today we are hoping to get an update on their work and we look forward to working groups findings being released and recognizing the urgency of the issue, we ask them to do that as soon as possible.

We also recognize the urgency of keeping people safe. We have multiple challenges that face our City jails at this present time, whether it is ensuring that we do rely on practices that could exasperate existing issues for an individual. To providing the safety and security of those who work inside of our jails. On both accounts, we have to ask large questions, here today and in the rule making of whether existing practices are serving those goals.

And today, we will be hearing legislation introduced by my colleague Council Member Danny Dromm, who I believe is joining us and will give a statement shortly on the topic of ending solitary confinement. His bill will end solitary confinement by mandating the individuals in restrictive housing at access to least 10 hours of out of cell time each day. All other individuals would be required to have access to at least 14 hours of cell time each day and

2.2

2.3

2 | the bill also allows for legal council over

3 disciplinary hearings regulates the use of restraints

4 and sets limits on the use of emergency lock ins and

5 I will give him an opportunity to speak about his

6 legislation here today.

I want to thank all of the Committee Staff. Oh,

I am sorry, I should say, we are going to look

forward to hearing testimony later from all

stakeholders regarding the bill that is before this

Committee and about the issue at large. I believe we will be hearing from Department of Corrections, Board of Corrections and many others.

I am going to thank all the Committee staff for helping to put together this hearing and I want to thank all the Council Members in attendance here. I am just going to shortly recognize those that I see here. That are here. I think Council Member Dromm is joining us. I am not sure if we have been joined by others yet, but I will give them — oh, okay, I see, sorry, I apologize. I see Council Member Ampry-Samuel, Council Member Darma Diaz as a new member of the Committee who just joined the Council, welcome. Council Member Danny Dromm, here to speak about his legislation. Council Member Bob Holden, Council

2.2

2.3

Member Carlina Rivera and Council Member Jimmy Van

Bramer who I believe is also just joining us on this

Committee. So, I welcome them all and thank you for

taking time with us today to speak about such an

important topic.

I am now going to turn it over to — oh and I believe we are also being joined by the Public Advocate Jumaane Williams who has with myself worked on this issue.

So, I want to now turn it over to our colleague and Finance Chair Council Member Danny Dromm by the introduction of his bill here today to make a statement and then we will hear from the Public Advocate Jumaane Williams. Thanks.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you very much Mr.

Chairman. We are here to tell the families of those who did not survive that your suffering was not in vain. We are here to tell the survivors that we have heard your anguish cries. We would not be here if it were not for you have endured the endurable, survive the unsurvivable and come out on the other side to tell us what should already be apparent. That solitary is torture and has no place in our City, no place in our state and no place in our country.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

point today.

History will not be kind to us if we turn back 2 3 now from the clarion call. Solitary confinement must 4 end now. I could go on extensively about how there is no evidence that solitary saves money, aids in rehabilitation or enhances the management of 6 7 facilities. I could list the way the evidence pointing in the opposite direction. I could recount 8 the horror stories I have heard throughout the long and a time lonely journey I have taken to reach this 10

Rather, I would like to direct my comments to the Corrections Officers who are also hurt by solitary confinement. Solitary confinement is not just a violation of basic human rights or the individual subjected to it. It is a horrific practice whose negative impact reverberates throughout our entire society.

Corrections officers and their supervisors are forced to dehumanize their charges as they desensitize themselves to facilitate their participation as frontline individuals, all the while making work conditions more dangerous. There surely are violent individuals held in our jails but is the solution driving them to the point of insanity and

2.

_ _

then releasing them to face Corrections Officers, other incarcerated individuals and eventually the rest of the world. This is just not good criminal justice policy period.

I challenge the leadership to quit advocating against your own membership and join the call of corrections officers current and former, criminal justice experts, civil rights pioneers, human rights advocates and elected officials. Let this be the moment we all unite to say enough is enough.

Let this be the beginning of the end of solitary confinement across the United States of America.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you Council Member

Dromm. We have also been joined by Public Advocate

Jumaane Williams. I am going to call to make a few

statements as well. I want to thank him for his

partnership with myself at looking at this issue and

talking about ways to reform it.

Public Advocate Jumaane Williams to make a statement as well.

PUBLIC ADVOCATE WILLIAMS: Thank you Chair Powers very much for your leadership on this. Thanks

Committee on Criminal Justice for holding this

2.2

2.3

important hearing on a timely hearing. I want to thank again you, the Speaker and of course Council Member Dromm for being so vocal and calling on the Board of Corrections to change its standards on punitive segregation and in solitary confinement. As mentioned, solitary confinement is torture, whether we call it restrictive housing, punitive segregation or separation status, at the end of the day it is a form of torture that causes trauma, long-term mental, physical and social harm.

Needless to say a ban on this harmful practice is long overdue. At the end of June, the Mayor called for an end to solitary confinement and promise to create a working group that will present a report on how to stop this process. A report that was supposed to be released this fall. He also expanded a list of pre-existing conditions that will prohibit MH from being placed in solitary confinement. So it now includes asthma, seizure, diabetes, heart disease, physical disabilities among several others.

While this was the right move for the City to make, it is coming very late in the game. Why did the Mayor not expand this list of exceptions years ago. If he had, members of our community like

2.2

2.3

2 Layleen Polanco, a transgender woman who died while

3 in solitary confinement at Rikers due to epileptic

4 seizure would still be alive today. I know her

5 sister Melania Brown is with us today and I thank her

6 for joining us yesterday in my office as well.

Second, the Administration needs to update us on the status of this working group that the Mayor planned to put together and when this report will be released. We need to know that findings and recommendations as to when and how this practice will finally end. Instead of waiting on the Mayor to take affinitive action in sitting in solitary confinement, I along with my colleagues in the City Council are confronting this task head on.

Intro. 2173 would ban the use of solitary confinement in City jails. As a co-prime sponsor of this bill, I applaud Council Member Danny Dromm for leading this effort.

I want to take some notice today to raise concerns that I and many criminal justice advocates have about the bill in hopes that we can continue to work collaboratively to get this done the right way. While the bill prohibits the use of solitary confinement, a state that the practice may be used to

2.

deescalate immediate conflict in a said situation, the individual cannot be placed in such confinement for longer than four hours.

I understand that escalatory incidents may arise with separation may be needed to mitigate the situation. At the same time, there is a difference between separation and isolation. To isolate an individual is to put them in an environment by themselves. This practice does not serve a purpose and has a severe negative effect on many people.

Advocates have also raised to my office at the definition of each term and the bill is either too vague or too specific. Such as the definition of restricted housing. As the bill allows DOC to define restrictive housing without stricter guidelines.

A person can remain in restrictive housing with a review every 15 days. This can basically mean solitary confinement just by a different name.

Another concern is a phrasing of emergency lock in. I am concerned that definition is not strict enough to ensure all other options have been considered and there is a periodic aridly review by the Chief of Department used.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I also share the concerns held by many advocates 2 3 who I know who will be testifying later today about the out of cell time policies established in the 4 The bill mandates that all incarcerated bill. individuals have access to at least 14 hours of time 6 7 outside of their cells every day. Except the individuals placed in this restrictive housing and 8 those placed in aforementioned for solitary confinement to deescalate immediate conflict. 10

Those individuals would have access to at least ten hours of time outside of their cells. Activists who have advocated to ban solitary confinement or calling for 14 hours out of cell date each across the board. But only allowing certain individuals to be out of cell for 10 hours. This provision leave 4 additional hours in which someone can be locked in the cell. Therefore, I tend to be in support of community advocates calls to change their provision in this bill to show all incarcerated individuals have 14 hours out of their cell every day.

I want to make clear that there are differences between what I mentioned, isolation and separation.

And also, be clear that we understand we have the need for consequences for poor behavior. One of

2.2

2.3

those consequences being separation. But isolation

is a consequence or a punishment that causes

significant harmful physical and psychological impact

on many incarcerated individuals.

One example of nonharmful complicates is the Clinical Alternative to Punitive Segregation unit, also known as CAPS. This program started in 2013 as a new treatment unit developed by the New York City jail system, individuals with serious mental illness. But I believe this can be expanded to include people with less serious mental illness or no mental illness at all. CAPS were designed to offer full range of therapy to activities and interventions for participants such as individual and group therapy, art therapy, counseling and community meetings.

In fact, this program proved to be more effective in reducing self-harm and injury than restrictive housing. CAPS is just one of many examples and programs we need to consider as a consequence for bad behavior rather than resorting to things like solitary confinement.

The time for New York City to end solitary

confinement is now. If the tragic deaths of Layleen

Polanco and Kalief Browder tell us anything it is

2.3

that the unsafe disciplinary practice is not the answer.

This method of punishment does more harm than good and does not address the underlying causes of problematic behavior. I do want to just mention as my colleague Council Member Dromm did, that this is not only for the people who housed and incarcerated. It is also for the people who work there, including the men and women of the corrections unit.

By the way, this is the only law enforcement unit that is treated in the way that they are and I believe it is because they are Black and Brown. At the beginning of this pandemic, they were forced to work without PPE's, social distancing and I believe if they were not Black and Brown primarily women, they wouldn't be put in these situations.

The fact of the matter is, Rikers and many jails across the country and nation are set up to continue circles of violence. We want everyone to be safe, including the men and women who go to work and whose family want them to come home the same way they went to work.

So, we ask them to join us in a conversation where we understand that there has to be separation

in time and there has to be consequences for behavior but not isolation and torture and that we work together to put in systems that actually change behavior to the type of constructive behavior we want

2.2

2.3

to see.

So, I thank the Committee on Criminal Justice for giving me this opportunity to speak today and I look forward to this hearing. Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you and thank you for 11 those powerful comments and your work on this issues

12 | in your office as well.

I am now going — I acknowledge our colleagues. I don't think we have been joined by any more. So, I am now going to turn it over to our Committee Counsel to go over some procedure items before we start testimony. Thanks so much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I am Agatha
Mayropoulos, Counsel to the City Council's Committee
on Criminal Justice. Before we begin, I want to
remind everyone that you will be mute until you are
called on to testify. When it is your turn to
testify, you will receive a prompt to unmute. Please
listen for your name to be called as I will
periodically announce who the next panelist will be.

2.3

We will first hear testimony from the Department of Correction and the Board of Correction followed by a period of question and answer from the committee members to the Administration. We will then hear testimony from members of the public. During the hearing, if Council Members would like to ask a question, please use the Zoom raise hand function and I will call on you in order.

Chair's will have 10 minutes each and committee members will be limited to 5 minutes including responses.

I will now administer the oath to all members of the Administration. After I say the oath, please wait for me to call your name and respond one by one. Please raise your right hand.

Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth before these committee's and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Hazel Jennings?

22 HAZEL JENNINGS: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Brenda Cooke?

24 BRENDA COOKE: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Heidi Grossman?

2.2

2.3

2 HEIDI GROSSMAN: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Meg Egan?

MEG EGAN: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Emily Turner?

EMILY TURNER: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Bobby Cohen?

BOBBY COHEN: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We will now proceed with testimony from Commissioner Cynthia

Brann from the Department of Correction followed by Executive Director Meg Egan and Board member Bobby Cohen from the Board of Correction. Commissioner Brann, you may begin when ready.

CYNTHIA BRANN: Thank you. Good Morning, Chair

Powers and members of the Committee on Criminal

Justice. I am Commissioner Cynthia Brann and I am

joined by my colleagues Chief of Department, Hazel

Jennings, Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters,

Heidi Grossman and Chief of Staff Brenda Cooke.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify about the

Department's role in eliminating punitive segregation

for all individuals within New York City correctional

facilities.

Over the past six years, the Department has been a national trailblazer in its pursuit and implementation of profound changes in the management of individuals in our custody that balance the need for safety and security in an environment that fosters engagement rather than isolation.

We remain committed to continually assessing our practices and instituting further changes in the promotion of safety, engagement and rehabilitation for those in our custody. Rooted in understanding that age and health are important considerations in the disciplinary housing placement process, the Department developed housing strategies that provided meaningful disciplinary consequences for young adults and people with serious mental illness who have infracted without placement in punitive segregation.

Our commitment to reforming this disciplinary practice resulted in unprecedented changes to punitive segregation in both the application and duration of sentences imposed, including the development of a tiered system of infractions and reducing the maximum length of punitive segregation to 30 days for nearly all infractions.

In evaluating further changes to the Department's disciplinary housing system, we cannot forget how far this agency has come. Just six years ago, punitive segregation was essentially the Department's primary response to infractions, with 90-day sentences often imposed for these infractions.

Today, punitive segregation sentences are focused mostly on violent offenses, with penalties that directly proportional to the offense committed. The transformation to punitive segregation alternatives was not made overnight but was the result of several years of careful planning both internally and through conversations with Board of Corrections, Correctional Health Services and the State Commission on Correction. And in recognition of the crucial need to gain the trust and acceptance from Department staff who worked on the front line to keep everyone who works and lives in our facilities safe.

Instead of relying upon punitive segregation, the Department thoughtfully addressed the needs of this population and created several different alternative approaches. This includes establishing the Secure Unit and the Enhanced Supervision Housing ESH, which are designed to focus on rehabilitating individual's

2.2

violent behavior, addressing root causes of violence, and minimizing idleness.

Similarly, the Department created the

Transitional Restorative Unit or TRU aimed at

managing adolescents and young adults involved in

violent acts. TRU provides close supervision with

individualized support plans, treatment and

incentives to encourage positive behavior.

In addition, the Department established the
Clinical Alternatives to Punitive Segregation or CAPS
to foster collaboration between clinical and
correctional staff in treating the needs of those
with a serious mental illness who engage in violent
behavior. The Program to Accelerate Clinical
Effectiveness or PACE was also established to support
the needs of those with serious mental illness who
have not engaged in violent behavior but who can
benefit from a more therapeutic mental health
setting.

Our commitment to reform has continued in recent years. In June 2019, the Department increased out of cell time in punitive segregation from 1 hour to 4 hours, affording individuals in this setting

2.

instituting a congregate television hour.

In August of this year, the Department partnered

additional opportunities for recreation and

with Correctional Health Services to ensure that individuals with certain health conditions are no longer placed in highly restrictive settings. As a result of these reforms, there has been a dramatic reduction in the use of punitive segregation. The creation of alternative and supportive housing units has enabled the Department to successfully divert hundreds of individuals from punitive segregation placement.

As of December 2nd, there were just 72 individuals serving sentences in punitive segregation and 22 individuals placed in the Restrictive Housing Unit, also known as RHU. These numbers stand in stark contrast to the average range of between 500 and 600 people per day in punitive segregation at the time we began instituting reforms in 2014. This reduction of over 80 percent in disciplinary housing placements is a clear indication of this Department's commitment to reform and our dedication to the reduction of punitive segregation wherever possible.

J

2.3

∩ E

In furtherance of this commitment, since June of this year, the Department has worked hand in hand with other members of the Mayor's working group to develop a proposal on how we can safely end punitive segregation in New York City's jails. After months of thoughtful consideration, the working group is in the final process of finalizing our recommendations, which will carefully balance the creation of a more humane system with the very real need to keep everyone, including our staff, safe from harm while in our facilities.

While I do not have specific details to share at this time, I look forward to sharing more information with you on these recommendations soon. With regards to the preconsidered legislation attached to today's hearing, we share the Council's goals to using the least restrictive means when applying disciplinary action toward violent offenders in custody.

However, the reduction and elimination of punitive segregation requires careful and considerate balancing to ensure the safety of staff and people in custody. Any policy changes to this practice must be informed by correctional experts in order to ensure any decisions made do not result in dangerous and

2.2

2.3

unintended consequences. We believe the best results will come from allowing the working group, which includes critical representation from our partners at the Board, the formerly incarcerated community and the labor and advocacy realm, to finalize its recommendations and for those to be reflected in forthcoming Board rules.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you this morning. My colleagues and I are happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. I think we are going to actually do questions for the Department of Corrections, if I am correct and then head over to the Board. Just checking with Committee Counsel if that is correct. I think so. Okay, I am going to go ahead.

Thank you for the testimony and thank you for giving us a bit of an update. Just a few sort of housekeeping things here and then I want to ask some larger questions on landscape and things like that but just I know you are not here today to deliver actual updates on the task force, so we do hope we get those soon and the Board and we will ask the Board this but do you have a sense of timing here?

2.2

2.3

Lots of urgency to this issue but also, we are going to hear from lots of folks here today. I think we have been waiting since, I believe it was June when the Mayor announced this to see the findings of those, that working group and then to see the role making. Can you give us any sense of what the timing is on that?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So what I can tell you because I don't have a specific date. The Board of Corrections and City Hall received those recommendations and they are at work incorporating those recommendations into a draft rule and so, I don't have a final date. They are working diligently. We all understand the urgency behind this and the critical need to make reforms. So, I can't give you a date certain.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: We will ask the Board but thank you. Okay, so just on the leg-beyond the legislation, I want to talk about the legislation again because you just mentioned at the end of your testimony on the feeling that perhaps it should get four level which is what I heard but on the top- on some of the topics on the topic, let's just say Legal Council for individuals going through disciplinary hearings, user restraint desks, restricting lock ins.

2.

2.3

_ -

I am just remember the pieces, the other pieces here of Council Member Dromm's bill. Do you have opinions on those and does the Department have opinions on those issues.

So, if you just want to take those one at a time. Disciplinary hearings, having legal counsel for those. Further restrictions on lock ins and user restraint desks and Council Member Dromm will ask some questions as well if I missed anything.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, we share the Council's goals of using the least restrictive measures to manage dangerous and violent behaviors and I believe that the recommendations of the working group, which incorporates a balanced approach to the management of violent or dangerous behavior, takes into account the operational experience of folks in corrections and all of our interested justice stakeholders and for the specifics regarding let's say, let's talk about the access to legal. I have asked that our Legal Counsel, Deputy Commissioner Grossman address that specifically.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Sure.

HEIDI GROSSMAN: Good morning. The department has concerns regarding this provision that we are

working through but I do want to talk a little bit about the process. We do hearings about rule violations, not about — it is not a criminal proceeding. These are hearings for rule violations of the department. They are informal administrative hearings.

So, from a procedural justice standpoint, we believe that our process is transparent and fair. The matter is investigated by an uninvolved member of the department. A simple camera coverage as you know a lot is known about many of the incidents that occur. The incarcerated person is given notice of charges at least 24 hours before a hearing is scheduled and that gives that person a chance to prepare for a hearing and in then the incarcerated person also has an opportunity to talk with his own or her own counsel. All calls are free.

So, the individual has a chance to be heard and to explain what happened from his or her perspective. The incarcerated person also has a chance to ask for a hearing facilitator. A hearing facilitator is not a lawyer but that individual can also explain the process if someone doesn't understand or has questions. An individual also has the ability to ask

2.2

2.3

for an interpreter. If someone who is appearing for a hearing wants the hearing officer to speak with other witnesses, that's also something that can be requested and the hearing officer will go and speak

with another individual and interview those people.

Basically, the Department of Corrections

Adjudication Captain is serving as a fact finder in this process. They are in a separate unit and a separate organizational structure from the facility where an incident occurred and they are in a different chain of command from who is investigating and who is involved in the incidents.

So, Department of Correction, when they make decisions, they serve. The Adjudication Captains arrange to have the decision served on the individual and that's where an individual will be able to learn about the reason behind a decision. All hearings are recorded and every individual has a right to appeal and to challenge the decision in court before a neutral judge. And at that time, an individual can also have legal representation which is often the case. So, this is an uncomplicated process that we believe works.

J

2.2

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Could I just — but your first sentence was, we have concerns. So, can you just tell me what those concerns are?

HEIDI GROSSMAN: These are concerns that we believe this is an uncomplicated process that would be rendered more complicated by this proposal but we have concerns that we think warrant further discussion with the Council.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Can you elaborate? We are the Council, so can you just elaborate on some of what those might be? I just, I want to hear them in case Council Member Dromm or others who are here can address any of those with their questions.

HEIDI GROSSMAN: Well, I think the explanation of the entire process that I just provided, I think when you propose language in the bill, doesn't take into account all that is working in our process.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay.

HEIDI GROSSMAN: I think that this would over complicate what is a very simple process right now.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And how do you address the obvious, what I think would be the obvious rebuttal to this which is, somebody who is going through a process at a disciplinary hearing that will

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 potentially put them into a form of isolated housing.

3 Has counsel helping them and wants access to that

4 individual to be able to provide a rebuttal to the

5 allegations of the offense before they go into

6 punitive segregation. Want the right and want to be

7 afforded the ability to have somebody represent them

8 or at least you know guide them through that process.

9 Why should that not be allowed?

PEIDI GROSSMAN: This process is an informal process. This is not a criminal trial where you have these very strict rules of evidence. These are — this is all about an individual being able to tell their story to the hearing officer and it is at that moment that the hearing officer. Like I said, we have full camera coverage and if you — and much of the information is known and it is giving people an opportunity to be heard. It is a fact finding determination where we don't have these rules of evidence where you need to sort of [INAUDIBLE 32:14] etc. It is a simple process where people are really getting to the facts of the case.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. I am going to move on, I mean I do think we would like to hear more elaborate concerns here because this has been an

2.2

2.3

issue that's been raised in the past and you know,

obviously part of legislation. I want to go back to

Commissioner just on the general topic. Does the

department agree with the Mayor's assessment to end

6 punitive segregation?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, yes, we agreed that we could find a safe alternative to ending punitive segregation and we worked very hard on that both in internal meetings, separate from the working group but also me as a participate of the working group and we believe that we have come up with a very balanced and safe approach.

CHAIRPERSON POWER: Got it and you are going to give us details I guess sometimes soon in the near future but can you share with us what you think a safe alternative looks like, personally in your sort of expertise here as a professional?

CYNTHIA BRANN: Sure and just so you know personally as the Commissioner and professionally as a Corrections expert with over 30 years' experience, I would never sign onto a policy, a practice or a program that would put staff or people in custody at greater risk and so, that's what I went into the discussions with.

2.

So, an alternative system that balances risk management in the facilities but also ensure personal accountability for behavior is a fundamental piece of eliminating isolation. And so, we have a system right now in the enhanced supervision housing that does just that. You move through levels. There is programming that is based on an individual's criminogenic risk and their needs and it's based on what they need to get to the thinking behind the behavior that they engaged in.

And so, as they progress through those levels and they behave more appropriately with regard to rules and regulations and prosocial behavior, they move through those levels and back out to general population.

So, it's a combination of stopping the behavior, getting a risk assessment, understanding what those needs are and mitigating those risks by putting in programs that help that individual change the thinking behind violence and engaging in that type of behavior.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And what is the response from the Department and the Task Force, the concerns that this is going to lead to $a-you\ know$, you are

2.2

2.3

removing, you know, a disincentive or consequence and it will lead to increased and further violence. And I guess a second part of that question is, what do you feel the Department needs in terms of make something like that successful?

I would not sign on to anything that creates a greater danger for my staff or anybody in custody. So, the foundation of the recommendations firmly keeps that in place and what the department needs is the trust in staff and those in our custody and the trust of the Council and the Board and all of our justice stakeholders that the combined thoughtfulness of all different areas of the criminal justice world with advocates and formerly incarcerated and correctional experts and labor, all came together with the right solution.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Got it and we are mostly talking about punitive segregation but obviously there are other forms here of restricted housing and isolation and housing that you know, has limitations in terms of freedom of movement, time out of cell, so forth. Is the rule making that you are talking about aimed at punitive segregation or are we talking about

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

other forms of housing that would limit your time out 2 3 of cell and would - I mean, are you guys focusing on 4 punitive segregation as the focus here? Or are we 5 talking about other forms of housing that you know, there are other forms of restricted housing and there 6 7 are other forms of you know isolation. And I think 8 the concern that many folks have is that we, any of us, might only focus on punitive segregation versus focusing on other forms of restricted housing or 10 11 practices that will isolate individuals.

Can you speak to what your focus is and you know some of the isolation housing practices outside of punitive segregation?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, what I can tell you is that the plan focuses on removing isolation. People being isolating and that is the critical and most concerning area of punitive segregation as to what being behind a solid door for extended periods of time does to the human psyche. And so, the working group focused on changing that isolation.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, so the answer is yes to the working group is looking at isolation beyond punitive segregation.

24

CYNTHIA BRANN: Your question was a bit confusing.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Sorry, you know, I think one of the concerns is that you know beyond punitive segregation there are practices in housing units that are being used to isolate individuals that would not be you know deemed punitive segregation and whether the Board and the working group are ending that entirely. Versus just focusing on punitive segregation.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, I don't believe any of our other alternatives actually focus on isolation at all. In fact, in enhanced housing, in true and secure people congregate together. They may be in smaller day rooms. They may be lesser time out of cell than general population but they are not isolated from each other.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: What are you as a professional feel like is the appropriate amount of out of cell time for an individual?

CYNTHIA BRANN: Well, we have 14 hours out of cell time for general population for all of those folks who follow the rules in engaging prosocial behavior. I believe the system that we have set up

_

2.2

2.3

now in our enhanced supervision housing in true and secure are appropriate hours out of cell time.

It is all based on individual needs, the offence that was committed, the ability of the person to engage appropriately with others. And so, there is not one set answer for anyway to deal with people who are engaged in violent behavior. I can't give you one number.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Well, I guess, I mean like, you know, I think you and I would agree that one hour out of cell time is inhumane and it is both not allowed anymore but also we feel — is there a minimum hour that you feel like is a minimum standard that should be inside of our city jails in terms of out of cell time?

CYNTHIA BRANN: Well, I think I just spoke to the 14 hours out of cell time for everyone in general population. It reduces down if you are in alternatives to punitive segregation but there is still a lot of time out of cell and yes, I agree that the one hour out of cell was not enough and we were able to successfully transition from one hour to four hours without much problem because we had already had the practice of allowing more than one hour out of

- 2 cell time for those who were in punitive segregation.
- 3 Because they got minimum services. They got
- 4 visitation, they went to clinic, they had law
- 5 library, they had showers, they had access to phone.
- 6 So, those in punitive segregation for the longest
- 7 | time have already had more than one hour out of cell.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Yeah and what is the minimum
- 9 right now?
- 10 CYNTHIA BRANN: Four hours.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Four hours. So, there are
- 12 | individuals right now who are earned four hours. Is
- 13 | that fair to say?
- 14 CYNTHIA BRANN: Minimum of four hours, yes.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Oh sorry, I guess my
- 16 | question is really, what is the most hours out of
- 17 | cell in the individual who is held in our city jails
- 18 | is receiving today?
- 19 CYNTHIA BRANN: 14 hours.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I am sorry. There are
- 21 | individuals who are getting 4 hours out of maximum
- 22 | today, is that fair to say?
- 23 CYNTHIA BRANN: Yes.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON POWERS: In our city jails, okay. Do
- 25 you have an opinion about the 15 day placement

2.

2.2

review? Do you feel like that's a reasonable standard? It should be more? It should be less?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, it depends on where the person is in the system. I think the research tells that in order to change a behavior, it takes 28 days of practice. We have based some of our initial reviews in a lower level alternative housing to 30 days and then we decreased the time between reviews.

And so, depending upon where you are in the system and what the charge is against you for the infraction and what the behavior is and how you continue to behalf once you have been separated from general population, it determines I think what the review period should be.

We worked very closely with the Board of
Correction on shortening up the time between reviews
as we improved our enhanced supervision housing
program. And so, we have gone from 30 days to 15
days to 7 days, depending on where you are in the
system.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Got it and just in terms of tools of reducing violence. This is going to be a concern we are going to hear about during this hearing. I think at the Board of Corrections and in

3

4

J

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

2122

2.3

24

25

public discourse here which is, the impact on punitive segregation and housing and confinement related to strategies to reduce violence within the jails and I am just going to state what I have heard is the concern is that the sort of — we have head hearings on this but steady increase of violence inside of our city jails.

You know, inadequacy unable to manage that and the tools for how to manage that and you know, we have seen year after year that number can continue to go and sort of categories going the wrong direction and so, we have had I think at least two hearings as I have been the Chair on that topic and conversations about it throughout. What are the tools that you feel like are missing right now in terms of being able to address fines and also, what is your - I understand that you wouldn't sign your name on to something that would lead to violence. But there is a state concern here that will lead to increase in violence and I would be curious to hear what you feel or anybody in the department feels like are the tools that are needed. The tools that are being underutilized or other strategies here that we can take to address those concerns or frankly, if you

don't agree with them, what your opinion is on those stated concerns.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, one has to understand that while our population has decreased, the folks who are in our custody are the most violent and are more prone to engage in violent acts.

And so, yes, there has been an increase in violent acts but I think it stands to reason given the population that we are now charged with.

With regard to tools, one of the tools that's necessary for an operations to work effectively is flexibility to change practice when we see that something is not working. Or to enhance practices when we see that it is working very well.

so, having the ability to be flexible is critical as we further reform punitive segregation. We saw that when we eliminated the need for punitive segregation for young adults and we gave up something but then had to create something at the same time. We have had the experience of doing that and so, we have learned from that. We have taken the lessons learned and now we will be able to incorporate those lessons into eliminating punitive segregation all together in the city jails.

2.2

I would just reiterate again and as you said, I would not sign on to something that would bring more danger to our staff or those in custody. And so, when you talk about tools, it is not necessarily things that you have. It is the way you work with people.

So, its incentivizing good behavior and those incentives have to meaningful to the people that you want to take advantage of them. That combined with the appropriate programs and treatment that an individual needs to change their thinking and it's the thinking that you have to get to that changes the behavior. Punitive segregation stops the behavior temporarily but we have not been very effective at working with those in punitive segregation and giving them the programs necessary.

We believe that this change in punitive segregation reform will get all of those things.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: What programs or services are available to somebody who is in punitive segregation right now?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, right now, we are not delivering many programs at all to people who are in punitive segregation.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Got it and a program across the board. We have had this debate or discussion or dialogue about the need to increase it. What is the amount of programming we can provide average to an individual inside of our city jails towards hours per day?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, right now because of COVID, that has been severely restricted and most programs developed and delivered on paper. We had just started bringing our counselors back when we started to see an increase COVID cases. And so, we have slowed that down a bit.

So, it has been difficult over the past 9 months to be able to deliver that in the way that we want to and that we are expected to. The requirement is for five hours of programming and we are doing our best to do that in a modified delivery service.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, I want to just give —
I want to not take so much time up but I will come
back. I am going to hand it over to colleagues to be
able to have an opportunity to ask questions. I
think we are going to start with Council Member
Dromm, who has introduced the bill here today and
then to Council Member Holden in addition to others.

So, I will come back afterwards but we will give them an opportunity to ask questions as well. So, if you guys can please unmute Council Member Dromm.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you very much Chair Powers. I really appreciate your line of questioning. Good morning Commissioner, good to see you. I have to say I am very surprised and maybe more shocked at some of your testimony and your defense of current practices within the Department of Correction.

Actually, much of what the change is — many of the changes that you talk about occurred not because of no willingness or the departments willingness. It was because of legislation that I passed and the work that the Council has done and the advocates who have been very vocal about solitary confinement. Without that, I don't know.

I mean, I remember the day when time owed was still a practice within the department and that was changed at our urging. You know, I remember a time when speaking at the Board of Correction wasn't even allowed. The public couldn't speak and nor could even Council Members address the Board of Correction.

J

2.3

So, you know, I have been around a long time.

This has been an issue for me for 11 years. So, this is not being rushed through in any way shape or form.

I am surprised also about your testimony on punitive segregation. You are constantly asking for variances on punitive segregation and that's happening all the time.

The issue of 4 hours out of punitive segregation, I just want to ask theoretically, have you ever tried to sit in your bathroom for 20 hours and not leave? You know, that would be — you know, that alone and then you got to get out at some point. But the folks that are in punitive segregation don't even know if they are going to get out and a bathroom may even be larger than the cell that I have seen. Or even in restrictive housing, where they are there for 7 hours.

I mean, I was glad to hear your support of programming. I think programming is the key here.

My legislation addresses that and I think we are going to address that further because we do need more and its really unfortunate that because of COVID, there is no programming right now for folks.

2.2

So, those folks that are in punitive segregation could be released at any time and they have had no programming or no help to get them together before they have to go out into the street. I think that's really key here also. The majority of these folks have not been convicted of a crime. And you are talking about putting people in solitary confinement who have not been convicted of a crime.

I mean, it gets to the point of being bazaar when your legal representation says that you know, it's only a hearing. That's a statement. Only a fool represents himself. So, I mean, the question that begs to be answered and I don't expect an answer right now because I have other questions, is how many of those decisions when they have the hearing are overturned? I bet you that almost none of them are overturned.

Anyway, I want to go onto some questions that I have and there are so many questions but I only have 5 minutes. So, my questions are really about the cost. How much does it cost the City to place someone in punitive segregation and please describe the personnel services and OTPS services costs.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, thank you. Before I let

Chief of Staff Cooke respond to that and I do want

her to talk about those cases that have been

overturned. I want to remind you that no, they have

not been convicted of a crime. That they are charged

with for getting into our custody. Not all of them.

Some people who have been sentenced go to punitive

segregation as well and they are not being charged

with a crime before they go to punitive segregation.

They are being charged with a violation of rule, an infraction. And so, their hearing is about a violation -

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Commissioner, they had not been convicted of a crime outside of the jail. How do you justify taking people who are unconvicted, who are detainees. Okay, just detainees and putting them into solitary confinement, which is torture? Do you agree that solitary confinement is torture?

CYNTHIA BRANN: Well, let me answer your questions sir. So, it is a judge, a court of law who determines who comes into our custody. We don't have that choice. They may not be convicted of a crime but we have to have rules in place to keep everybody safe. And so, when you violate those rules —

CYNTHIA BRANN: I would not use the word torture

to define punitive segregation.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Commissioner, when you put people into solitary confinement, punitive segregation, you are not keeping them safe, you are harming them. Do you understand that?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So sir, if -

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Psychologically there is not a doctor or a psychiatrist in the world who will not tell you that punitive segregation is harmful to individuals.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: There is not a psychiatrist in the world, do you think that solitary confinement is torture?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I am going to defer to Chief of Staff Cooke to answer the question.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Could you answer that question for me please first? Do you believe that solitary confinement is torture?

CYNTHIA BRANN: We don't use solitary confinement sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Punitive segregation, same view.

_

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Wow, wow. So, you agree with all the medical experts and all the psychiatrists and all the social workers that it is not torture? Can you hear me?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I can hear you. I answered your question sir. I would not use torture to define punitive segregation.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And you still haven't answered my question about the cost. Let's go to the cost.

CYNTHIA BRANN: Chief of Staff Cooke will answer that question for you.

BRENDA COOKE: So, with respect to the cost, I don't have a specific number to provide you. I can tell you and Chief Jennings can provide additional detail. We have two punitive segregation housing units in the department. Those housing units operate at a staffing level that is not unfamiliar with other GP or other special housing units in our department. There is several staff assigned to that housing unit across tours and I can't calculate for you right now the cost of those staff members as you reflected and requested from an OT maps perspective. But we do have a staffing level that's appropriate for the

2.2

number of persons to live in that unit and the type of services that those folks receive, whether or not it be Recreation Officers, Clinic Officers who escort folks to and from appointments, visits, etc.

And so, it's — I wouldn't have an ability to answer a dollar figure for you today but it is not a staffing level that is unique just because it's punitive segregation. We have many housing units that have a pretty high dedicated staff to the population that they serve.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: What is the staffing model for a punitive segregation unit or restrictive housing?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, good morning, I am Chief
Hazel Jennings. So, with the punitive segregation
model, there is a dedicated captain to the housing
areas at a minimum of 2 floor officers with 2
additional escort officers and there is also a
recreation staff of a captain and approximately 6
officers that are assigned to do recreation and then
you have — they have their own mini-clinic and you
have staff assigned to that clinic to be there when
people are taken to be seen by a doctor.

2.

J

facilities.

But what I will say is that out of all of our housing areas, there are only two punitive segregation housing areas and we have many more housing areas in the department. And so, I would feel that just by staffing levels and the number of housing areas that we have for general population and ESH and the plethora of other housing areas that we have, the cost would be less than running everything else.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Is there overtime costs involved in these restricted housing units or in punitive segregation?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, there is overtime costs in every housing area that we have sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And what are those?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, it really depends on the day. You know, right now, this year has been very hard with COVID and so, we have had a lot of staff members who have called in sick and who weren't feeling well that had the ability to call in sick and so, overtime has been an issue. Although we have or

we are trending down on reducing our footprint in

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Just to go back to the question that you were addressing about staff. Are there dedicated staff and supervisors to the particular unit that they are responding to? Are they there the same daily folks always there?

HAZEL JENNINGS: Most of our staff are steadily assigned sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Okay and have you ever analyzed any potential savings from ending punitive segregation and restrictive housing units?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, I have not but again, what I will say is that there are only two of those housing areas compared to the amount of housing areas that we have in the department and we have other housing areas that have more staffing assigned than punitive segregation.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Does the department have a plan for reallocating resources from punitive segregation to other programs or punitive segregation alternatives?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, when we open up any housing area, one of the things that we do do with our department of finance here at the agency is to work with our partners and CHS, depending on what type of

housing area it is and then we come up with what we think is an appropriate staffing level.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Okay, so I am going to follow up on those questions and I am going to ask the Chair in his response to you to answer some of those more specifically, so we can get some idea for the cost. But Mr. Chair, I know you have been generous with your time.

I just have a couple of follow ups here.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: [INAUDIBLE 59:35].

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you. According to the Annual Claims Report for Fiscal '19 issued by the Comptroller, the total amount of settlements paid by the Department of Correction between Fiscal 2010 and Fiscal 2019 was approximately \$266 million. The Annual Claims Report also states that in Fiscal 2019, there were 3,750 claims filed regarding correctional facilities. How much of these settlements went to cases involving solitary confinement, punitive segregation or any form of restrictive housing?

HEIDI GROSSMAN: We would have to get back to you Council Member Dromm. We would have to get back to you. I know most of the cases are not — most of the cases that I am aware of on an anecdotal level, are

2.

not related to claims brought by people who have served time in punitive segregation. But we would have to get back to you on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Well, what happened to

Layleen Polanco is unforgiveable. So, I mean,

Chairman let me stop here. Maybe if we get a second round I will have follow up questions and certainly, there is a lot of questions about who goes into solitary, who goes into restrictive housing based on race, sex, gender identity, LGBT status as well and hopefully we can get to some of that. If in fact you even collect that data.

I know it wasn't included in my reporting bills but I am thinking about amending that as well, so we can get a better feel for what is actually happening on the Island. Thank you very much Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you Council Member

Dromm and we are going to move on. I will let the

Committee Counsel call on members. We are going to

give I think 3 minutes for each but I wanted to give

Council Member Dromm an opportunity based on his

legislation to ask some further questions.

So, we will move on and Agatha, you can call the next one please.

2.

Ŭ

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Next, we will hear from Council Member Holden followed by Council Member Rosenthal.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Yes, thanks Commissioner.

I get 3 minutes Chair. Is that the rule? Do we have a second round?

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: We may.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: I was anticipating 5 minutes, that's the regular on Committee's but — CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, we will give you 5

minutes. Go ahead Council Member Holden.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright. Commissioner, nice to see you again.

CYNTHIA BRANN: You to.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Even though we are on Zoom. We are almost like we are all kind of in punitive segregation aren't we during the pandemic but I just want to you know, question some of the things that were said.

You know, according to the Mayor's Management
Report, there was a near 50 percent increase in
violence in the jails from 2014 when Mayor de Blasio
took office to 2017, which was the last recorded year

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of the MMR. Even though there was an appropriate

decrease or approximate decrease of 18 percent in the

inmate count, like you mentioned before. And in

December 2014, Mayor de Blasio prohibited punitive

6 segregation for 16 to 17-year-olds. And then in

7 November of 2015, the Mayor announced the new use of

8 force restrictions for Correction Officers.

Then in June and October of 2016, the Mayor brought in the prohibition of punitive segregation for inmates 18 to 21. Is there any consideration here? Do you attribute this increase of violence because you said they were a more violent population and we have to figure why that is but could it be that the increase in violence was due to maybe the use of force restrictions or a ban on punitive segregation. Is that possible?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, I think there is a lot of different components to this atrium I am about to give you. First of all, in 2014, we didn't have the tracking systems for data that we have now. We also did not have full camera coverage in our facilities. We have 14,000 cameras now.

There is absolutely nothing that is not captured on video and so, we have a much clearer understanding

2.

J

2.3

of what goes on in our jails every single day. We have a different population over time. Yes, it has decreased but through efforts of the Police

Department and only arresting those who most violent go before the court and the court with bail reform has rightly made the determination that the most violent people should be taken out of the community.

I think all of that plays into it. With regard to the ability to use force. We have not been restricted in the ability to use force. Our force policy says we have the right to use force when it is necessary and reasonable. And so, we don't have the right to use unnecessary force, we never have.

So what the Nunez Consent Degree did was to clarify our use of force policies, so that staff had a better understanding of when they could and when they could not use force.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright but — we do — let's just go back to the dangerous population, the more dangerous population. What age group is the most dangerous in the jails today?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I believe our young adults. The most impulsive and the most act to engage in violence.

_

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: And we removed the punitive seg from that population, right?

CYNTHIA BRANN: Correct.

are seeing the population that obviously they are younger, you know, younger people tend to do sometimes you know, they don't think. Obviously, you are young, you may just act out with some violence in a way that is spur of the moment and yet we remove some of the consequences to their actions. And hopefully we can educate them in counseling which is what I had proposed and I do have a bill that's proposing, rather than use punitive seg or at least the length of time, is give the detainee an option for counseling.

That means if you agree to a certain amount of hours of counseling, that you will then not go into punitive seg for as long or at least into punitive segregation housing, which I think to what I saw at Rikers, the punitive and I don't know if it is called punitive segregation but it was housing. It is restricted housing, I think you called it which is, it has 3 levels. I thought that worked and you know,

2.2

2.3

2 if you couple that with counseling, I think that's an alternative.

So, we hear people say that they are calling it solitary confinement. I agree, we don't have solitary confinement anymore in New York City jails, do we?

CYNTHIA BRANN: No, we do not.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Yeah, but that's what I think people have been referring to that today.

Because I didn't see that.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

redefine what people are calling this in the bill, calling it solitary confinement because it is not.

You are not put in a hole for an extended period of time. You are in a housing unit and there has got to be consequences Commissioner to actions. If you attack another detainee, if you attack a correction officer, there has to be consequences. There has to be some punishment and I agree but where I think we could do better possibly is if they want to get out of any kind of segregated housing unit from the population, general population, then they should

agree to a certain amount of counseling and there has got to be some tradeoffs.

I don't know if maybe Bobby Cohen might want to weigh in because we did talk about this a few years ago but I think we need to redefine what punitive segregation is and the steps that we need to take.

And just talking about, I would rather wait until we hear from the Board of Correction before introducing bills that you know, I would want to hear from the experts. Thank you Commissioner. Thank you Chair.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Next, we will hear from Council Member Rosenthal followed by Council Member Rivera.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Great, thank you so much. Great to see you Commissioner. I appreciate your time and your work.

I would like to follow up on some of Council

Member Dromm's questions in terms of reporting

requirements and Grace Price actually sent some

information out this morning. So, Grace if I get

this wrong I apologize. I am trying to nail your

question because I think it is such a good one and it

has to do with the reporting categories and the

2.3

notice that you have a big other category that includes Latinx people. Can you separate those people out? Or Danny, can you require in your — I don't know who I am asking but the recommendation is that Latinx people be separated out.

And similarly, that transwomen in particular be separated out as well because reporting does not do that. Am I correct about that Commissioner?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I am not exactly sure which report you are referencing.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: The ones that have to do with how many and how much time people are in solitary or solitary like confinement.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, we do our best to report accurately if we are not capturing that data and are able to, then we would be happy to add that. We have to remember that people also self-identify. And so, we just capture the information that people provide to us.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Sure but right now you have Asian, Black, other and unknown. I mean, just for example in this particular or let me go to the one about women, which is the area that I pay attention to most.

2.3

Women, girls in the wing, I think this is 2018.

Asian 9, Black 370, other 153, unknown White, unknown 1 and White 83. Surely the other category can be — you could call out. I would ask, would it be possible for you to try harder to even have a Latinx category. That doesn't exist, so we don't even know.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, I would defer to my Deputy

Commissioner of IT and she I not with us today but I

will send her that question and get back to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you and then only because shortness of time, also, it looks like the data gets messaged by going from one year to the next and this is 2018 data versus 2019. In '18 your have broad data, 2019 you have sort of a line graph and the line graph numbers do not match, for 2018 don't match with the raw numbers in 2018.

So, this reporting is just so important.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: So is there, if you could get back to the Committee about why numbers change over time. In this particular situation it was reporting about young adults and went from a total of let's see if I have it. It was for young adults reporting, it changed from shoot. I am not

seeing it exactly but the difference, the delta it was like 70 people and it basically made you know, a change of 70 people reflects on how the department is doing or what the department is doing and it is a pretty big delta between the 2018 reported data, raw data and the 2019 graph.

What would make such a big change of 70 people like that? Like upon reflection it wasn't 300, it was 270. Like, what could happen to make those totals change that much, swing that much?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I am not sure. I don't know exactly what you are looking at, so I will check and I will get back to you. And so, I don't want to guess at an answer for you. I want to be specific and correct. So, we will have IT look into that and get back to you as soon as possible.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: You know, the concern is that were these people actually placed in adult, not youth solitary. That's the concern.

CYNTHIA BRANN: And it may just be data entry error that was corrected but I don't want to guess at the answer for you. I want to make sure I have the correct information.

BOC

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yeah, here it is.

Board of Corrections October 2018, Young Adults

4 Monthly Housing Report says there were 299 young

5 adults ages 16 to 21 in the youth only housing. But

6 the July 2019 BOC graphic in the new data report

shows only around 210 youth in the youth only housing

8 for October 2018. That's a big shift.

CYNTHIA BRANN: It is. It may account for the Raise the Age legislation as well. It's when we got adolescents off the island, so that could be.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: That was a monthly report, so numbers can't change. I mean, if there is point and time where Raise the Age went into effect, that wouldn't change the data of how many people are in the youth adult, in the young adult space, right. It's a one point and time.

CYNTHIA BRANN: But if you moved those adolescents off the island in that particular month, yes, it would change. So, because I can't see what you are looking at, I would rather have you send us that data you are looking at and we will get you the answer.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yeah, happy to do so.

Thank you. Thank you for the extended time Chair.

2.2

2.3

just want to align myself with Council Member Dromm's questions and concerns and I support what he is

trying to get at here. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Great, thank you Council Member Rosenthal.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Next, we will hear from Council Member Rivera.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Thank you so much Mr.

Chair. I just want to thank Council Member Dromm.

You are probably the first legislature today I have heard to make the call to end this — to end solitary confinement. So, I want to thank you for your leadership.

I just want to quick clarify and question. I understand there are technical terms and certain labels for housing. Are you — and I want to thank you for your testimony and for being here. Are you just, are you denying that solitary confinement exists at Rikers Island? And I also just want to ask, your position is that solitary confinement where it does exit is not torture contrary to all of the research papers and the things that I have read, is that the position that you are taking?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, there is two questions there.

We do not have solitary confinement. Under the

definition of solitary confinement, one is confined

alone in a cell for 24 hours a day with potentially 1

hour out of cell for recreation.

And there agencies in this country who do utilize solitary confinement. We have a housing unit that is deemed punitive segregation and folks who have committed very violent acts are taken out of general population and after a due process hearing, have been determined to have committed a serious infraction.

And they are placed in a cell, yes by themselves, without access to others for extended periods of time because of their violent behavior.

But they are allowed a minimum of 4 hours out of cell to engage in activities that you would get in general population.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: I understand, I just, I don't have a lot of time. So, I just want that clarifying question. From what I understand being kept inside by yourself solitarily for 20 hours and then you are out for maybe medical or for the cafeteria.

2.

Anyway, I just want to get to my next question.

I am the Chair of the Committee on Hospitals. I just want to know how many people in punitive and again, I think we are going to respectfully disagree on the solitary confinement issue. I want to know how many people in punitive segregation had medical visits missed or a specialist appointment missed or rescheduled and did they attend the rescheduled appointment?

CYNTHIA BRANN: That would be a question for CHS. They are not on this hearing today but I will pose that question to them and have them respond to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: I appreciate that. Thank you so much. How many people engaged — how many people in punitive segregation in 2020 engaged in acts of self-harm? What percentage of people who engaged in self-harm in the city jails did so in punitive segregation?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I will defer to my colleagues in the conference room if they have that answer.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

CYNTHIA BRANN: I don't have that answer with me at this point and time but if we don't have it, we can get back to you.

Ŭ

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Do you know what percentage of the total jail population are in punitive segregation today? Forgive me if you have mentioned that already.

CYNTHIA BRANN: There is 62 -

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, yes, hi -

CYNTHIA BRANN: Go ahead Chief.

HAZEL JENNINGS: Okay, I am sorry. Currently, we have 62 males in punitive segregation and no females.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Okay, how often do people who are in enhanced supervision housing and other restrictive housing units have restraints on when they are out of the cell?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, for our level 1 ESH housing, people have restraints on and programming desks and they are allowed time out of cell, 7 hours out with an additional 3 hours for the young adults who go to school.

And punitive segregation, anytime a person is moved from the cell to the shower, they are in handcuffs and once they are placed into the shower, the restraints are removed and when they go to recreation, they go out in restraints and once they get into the recreation area they are removed and

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

thank you for testifying.

when they come out for their time out of cell, their handcuffs are removed and they have leg irons on while in the congregate area with other persons.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: So, most of the time. Maybe not in the shower, maybe not in -

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, it's not - I wouldn't say most of the time. It's about going to and from the service.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Understood. Well, I will just say, I understand again about respectfully disagreeing. We are legislatures, I think we do have as much of a right to determine what constitutes solitary confinements since we do write the laws.

So, I just want to add that in. If you can get back to me on the some of the things that I asked that you were unable to answer about the missed medical visits and also, I did ask about self-harm while in punitive segregation. I know you gave me somewhat of an answer. I am out of time and the Chair has been gracious enough to allow me to ask these additional questions.

So, I do look forward to those answers and I

HAZEL JENNINGS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Next, we will hear from Council Member Levin.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you very much Chair and I apologize I don't have my video on. I am on dad duty here so, probably for the best.

So, I wanted to ask, what jurisdictions around the country have done away with punitive segregation in their systems, in their jail systems?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, to my knowledge sir, no jurisdiction has completely done away with punitive segregation in their systems. Some have modified it; some have called it different things but we would be the first.

So, when you guys went to Scandinavia last year, how were they addressing issues around, did they have punitive segregation there.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, I saw a unit in Norway, in one of their prisons. They didn't call it punitive segregation, they called it something else which I don't recall the name but people were kept in that housing for up to I believe 3 days without authority from a higher level. They had a bed on the floor, toilets were built into the floor. They were fed

25 4,827.

through a food slot on the floor and officers checked on them routinely from a window above their cell.

And so, I was taken back by that kind of unit in a system that professes to be the most humane in the world.

Now, in the general population yes. They have made significant changes and we have taken some of those changes and are incorporating it into our system and using those chances to design the new borough based jails. But they do use punitive segregation in Norway.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, Commissioner what percentage of detainees in the system are in a restrictive housing unit?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I will defer to Chief Jennings on that statistic if she has that.

HAZEL JENNINGS: Yes, so good morning. So, today, our census is 4,827. We currently have I would say 400- no, let me see. We have 62 people in punitive seg, we have 3 people in punitive seg light. RHU we have 25. Two females out of the 25, so there is about and I can break it down but there is only about 231 people in restrictive housing out of the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2.2

23

24

25

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I am sorry Chair, last question. So, last year I went to Rosie's with you all and we went to a restrictive housing unit. believe it was the same unit that Layleen Polanco died. I was taking it back to see that the women that were there and there were maybe two or trans They were actually handcuffed I believe to a women. So, they were out of their cells but they table. were handcuffed to the tables, they were given coloring books to color and they didn't have, so this was their time out of their cell. They were you know, talking, you know but not given any meaningful activity to do. Nothing of any kind of mental stimulation and had to you know, had to be for reasons unknown, handcuffed to a table.

They were you know; they had maybe gotten into a verbal altercation with another detainee. I don't think either of these women that I was talking to had any type of violent altercation and I think you all know who I am talking about because we talked about it afterwards.

So, breakdown that situation for me. Why would somebody be handcuffed to a table for the 4 hours out

2.3

of the 24 hour day that they are allowed out of their cell for getting into a verbal altercation.

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, sir, this is Chief Jennings again. I was not with you on that tour, so I am not quite sure as to whom you are talking about. But the one thing that I do want to state is that we do not put anyone in punitive segregation.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: This is restrictive housing. I don't think it was punitive segregation, I think it was restrictive housing.

HAZEL JENNINGS: Right, I don't know which
restrictive housing you went to and -

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: The one, it was the one that Layleen Polanco died. I know that because they talked about it.

HAZEL JENNINGS: Okay and I want to explain that people only go to punitive segregation or RHU for grade 1 offenses. So, a grade 1 offense does not — the criteria for a grade 1 offense is not an argument. We don't put people in punitive seg or punitive seg light which is a grade 2 offense. None of those persons for a simple argument are placed in punitive segregation or in any restrictive housing whatsoever.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I don't think either of 2 3 these women got into the type of altercation that's 4 been referenced here which is a serious physical altercation. I mean and I mean it was - I think that that was kind of acknowledged in my conversations 6 7 afterwards. I am dubious that it is not used. 8 concern is that restrictive housing is used as a tool to keep people you know compliant to the wills of DOC outside of any violent behavior but just if they are 10 11 difficult. If they don't follow instructions. If 12 they talk about, if they curse. If they don't you 13 know, are not doing exactly what is expected of them 14 or what is told of them to do. Then it could be used 15 as a tool of retribution or you know, a tool to try 16 to get them to be more compliant with directions and 17 you know, again the two of them that I spoke to were 18 not getting into heavy altercations with people. 19 That was not - I mean, you know, I spent an hour with 20 them and its nonsense.

And so, that's my concern, that's my concern here. So, I will leave you with that. Obviously I mean, you are saying, I guess my last question would be are you saying that there is never an instance

21

2.2

2.3

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.3

2.2

24

Polanco because that's where I was?

where somebody is put into restrictive housing without some kind of serious physical altercation.

HAZEL JENNINGS: That's what I am saying. saying that we have people who if they break rules, they can be written up for an infraction. infraction is heard by a hearings officer. However, we have a criteria as to who could be placed in punitive segregation and it is only for grade 1 -

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I am sorry. I am talking about restrictive housing. You are talking about punitive segregation, are those interchangeable?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, if you could clarify because when we talked about restrictive housing, we have punitive segregation. We have P. seg light, we have ESH, our women do not go to enhanced supervision housing. They do not go to secure. The only time that they can go for grade 1 a fraction is to punitive segregation or RHU. We do have CAPS and we have PACE for women.

They do not go in any other sort of restrictive housing area.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Well, where was Layleen

25

J

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Just in the interest of time, Council Member Levin, I just need you to you know -

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Yeah but my point in all of this is that there were grown women chained to tables on their time out of their cell with coloring books and that's what was given to them, coloring books and they were there for long periods of time. I think you know, so this is the reality of what we are seeing and they are not there for serious physical altercation.

So, I will leave it with that but I saw with my own two eyes, so.

BRENDA COOKE: So, I will just, this is Chief of Staff. I will round off the discussion with the following information. I believe the coloring books that you continue to refer to, I believe that was an art therapy program and that there was a counselor present with the women on the unit when you visited and that was part of an art therapy program, using the closing books. And the second thing is that all of the placements in punitive segregation with respect to the Departments decision making and the underlying paperwork as well as the paperwork related

2.2

2.3

to RHU or enhanced supervision housing or a secure unit that all of that information at the department reports, has significant reporting obligations to the Board of Correction as frequently as a monthly basis. There are quarterly reports, there are Council reports and so, certainly the transparency of who is being adjudicated and on the basis of criteria, qualifying criteria being placed in any of the housing units is widely available at a minimum to the Board of Correction. And widely reported by the department and required reporting to the public, including the Board of Correction.

And so, I just, the transparency over an oversight over the department and our use of these variety of housing tools is — there is significant transparency and I just wanted to add that.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay thank you. I have some follow up questions. I just wanted to state, you know, I am trying to ask questions to help you know, sort of talk about the plan ahead but you know, I don't want us to debate semantics here but I do sort of recognize that I think for lots of folks here, whether we want to call it solitary confinement or whether we want to compare it to other jurisdictions

2.2

2.3

that the 4 hours out of cell while being isolated, being solitary and being confined for that amount of time would define, would count as a definition for solitary confinement. It may not reflect what the other practices are or our former practices but I think it feels very much like solitary confinement particularly when some of those hours are just to go take a shower or something as basic as that.

But moving on from that debate there, can you just tell us and maybe in calendar year 2019 and certainly calendar year 2020, what was the longest amount of time that — what was the longest amount of time to hold somebody in a restricted house setting and which setting was that?

BRENDA COOKE: So, the time periods — this is

Chief of Staff Brenda, the time periods of sentences

for a period of segregation are capped at 30 days

consecutive, 60 days in a 6 month period and punitive

segregation.

So, it could be no more than that. The 60 days and 6 months. With respect to the other housing units and the Commissioner spoke at length earlier with you about the time period of review and the criteria of progression and then if there is you

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 know, violent act in the enhanced supervision housing 3 in level 2 for example, then you may regress to level

4 1. And so, those time periods of placement in an

5 enhanced supervision housing program vary. I do know

6 that we do regular reporting again to the Board of

7 | Correction and the Board of Correction does regular

8 reporting analysis as well and I know that we

9 certainly have information on the average length of

10 stay in those various levels and the times of the

11 media and the overall lengths of periods.

Off the top of my head, I can't give you the specifics but I do know that we, and the Board of Correction has reported as well in their reports that the fidelity of that program has improved significantly over the years we have been operating it and in fact, the speed of progression of folks through those units has increased and their overall length of stay and any of the levels of EHS housing has overall decreased. We are getting people through that program. They are holding themselves accountable for behavior and engaging in behavior that warrants their return to general population.

So, that information is reported, I just don't have specifics today.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, I guess my question,

I just want to rephrase my question and then we can
answer it to the best of our abilities here. 2020
and 2019, the last two years and previous fiscal
year, what is the longest amount of time that any
individual was held in restricted. And not just
punitive segregation but any restricted housing? And
then can you tell us what setting that was. The
maximum amount of days, maybe whether through a
waiver or through some other form of housing and what
was the setting?

BRENDA COOKE: Well, I don't, again, I don't have — it would not be punitive segregation because of the sentence limits and the caps that we talk about and the Chief can give you some specifics about the nature of an override that would even permit someone to spend those 60 days in a 6 month period as a consecutive stay as opposed to, we have a 7 day out in between the two 30 day periods.

And so, it is not punitive segregation is the answer to your question. It would likely be someone in our enhanced supervision housing unit. I don't have the specific person with the specific date that but in a calendar year —

)

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Nobody needs a name, right. Nobody needs to know $-\$

BRENDA COOKE: No, but I mean but I don't even have, I don't even have the -

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: It's a basic question right.

We are at a hearing on punitive segregation and restricted housing and the question, we are talking about the amount of time out of cell. The amount of time in and —

BRENDA COOKE: I can tell you that from my understanding and my recollection based on all of the reports that I read, although I don't have them before me, that the enhanced supervision housing units that the average length of stay for the folks in those units is about I believe 80 days in total.

And so, that's yeah, so that could be someone who moved through three levels and so, that's 80 days across three levels.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I am sorry, that's the average stay or that's the total?

BRENDA COOKE: The total. The average length of stay for any time in any level, the total time they spent in enhanced supervision housing is about 80 days on average.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And that is by rule or that is by practice?

BRENDA COOKE: No, that's by how they conducted themselves in the performance during the reviews that warranted the progression through that unit.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: So, I just want to refine everything. Does anybody at ESH spend more than 80 days in there?

BRENDA COOKE: Yes, yes, because that's an average and so.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: That's an average, okay. What's the max? What's the maximum amount?

BRENDA COOKE: I don't have the specifics but it is not — I have an understanding based on my awareness of the departments operations and again, reading earlier reports etc., that it would not be unusual that someone may have spent you know, six months in enhanced supervision housing through a variety of means because like I said, we have violent events. We have stabbings and slashings and a series of assaults causing injury to staff and people in custody that occur in that enhanced supervision housing unit, in those levels.

And so, if a violent event occurred and someone had moved through to level 2, they would be eligible for a return to a level 1 placement and then you know, start the movement through levels all over again.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And have you in the last, I am using two years. But in the last two years asked for an override beyond what is currently allowed at the Board for the Board rules for punitive segregation.

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, this is Chief Jennings. So, yes, so what happens is, is that I am the only one who could override. And so, if we want to just go from 12-9 of 2019 to 12-9 of 2020, we have had 17, 60 day overrides request. Out of the 17, from that time period, I have only approved five and I have denied 11. Seven day waivers, meaning that people will stay in without having a 7 day break coming out. I have had zero requests and I have approved zero.

Our 60 day sentence request for assaults on staff, we have had 12 and I have approved 12. So, I am looking at every piece of evidence. I am looking at the most restrictive way to handle a person. We are also engaging this person and for my young adults

2.3

predominantly, we have even done interventions with their parents to see if we can get family members to help persuade their behavior.

So, this has been used in the least most restrictive manner to get people out and to return them back into general population.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And for the 5 that you did grant an override on and thank you for giving us those numbers for the last calendar year, what was the longest stay or maybe it is ongoing but was the longest stay beyond what is allowed by the Board rules?

HAZEL JENNINGS: Well, 60 days is what it is. CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Oh.

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, there is 30 and there is 60 days and if I give an override for the 5, they can only do up to 60 days predominantly.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Gotcha, okay, okay. And the question has been raised here whether showers or access to services like the library service should be part of that allotment of time when it comes to time out of cell. Does the Board or does the Department believe that we should change that? I mean if feels a bit unfair to count a shower against somebodies out

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

of time cell. I mean that's sort of a basic. 2 You 3 are not getting programming around that time. You are not getting services during that time. That is 4 sort of a basic need of a human being and offering that as your - you know as a big part of your time 6 7 out of cell feels like - you know an advocation of duty to an individual which is to provide them with 8 out of cell time that's meaningful beyond basic services or just perhaps using that time. 10

Is there any discussion or plan about out of cell time particular relative for things like library service and showers?

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, I just want to say that the 4 hours is the minimum amount of time out of cell, it is not the maximum. So, perhaps you know, if you get two hours of recreation, an hour of TV time. You get to shower; you could go to the visits. You could go to law library, you could go to the clinic, you could go to court.

A person could hypothetically be out of there cell mostly all day if that occurred on any one day.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: How often does that occur on any one day?

24

2.2

HAZEL JENNINGS: Well, right now because of COVID, we don't have court proceedings but the person will get -

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: But I guess, I mean like court proceedings are not — I mean, like, I guess what we are trying to say court proceeding are counted out of cell time either.

MAZEL JENNINGS: Well, a person could get a minimum of 4 hours out. That's a minimum. That's not a maximum. So, if a person went to law library, if they got to 2 hours of recreation, 1 hour out of time for television plus to shower or excluding, if you want to exclude the shower, they could still be out for more than 4 hours in any given day. And because now of this year with COVID, it has slowed down some of the movement that has taken place because of the co-mingling and bringing people in and to stop the spread and then visits.

So, we still have people going out to video visitation even now because that's something that we implemented during COVID, so that we know that it's important for people to be able to be with their family members and have some contact. So, we did implement video visitation. So, they are coming out

q

lockdown?

for video visitation and the person could register and as long as there are available slots, they could register a person every day that a person may have visits for.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, we are going to ask for some data on a lot of stuff to follow up but I want to — just out of respect as follow up questions but in respect of time because we have so many folks here testifying Board of Corrections, I just want to go through a few more questions.

Just about lockdowns, just because this topic has come up. Can you tell us how many facility-wide lockdowns happened in 2020?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I am not sure Council Member Powers that we have that with us today but we can certainly get that quickly to you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay and then what access do people have to I think Council Member may have touched upon this but access do people have to health services during a lockdown? If I have to go to CHS am I missing an appointment? I mean I think the answer is yes but what access do I have if I need medical care or I need to go to CHS during a

2.3

HAZEL JENNINGS: So, during the lockdown, if a person has to attend any medical service rather, it's a mental health appointment or a dentist appointment or a specialty clinic, they are still allowed to go during the lockdown.

One important thing that I want to notice that we changed our lockdown policy and so, we have where during the first hour of the lockdown, we added in a certain step so that this way we could have the Chief notify and contact the facility to talk about the lockdown. What was the lockdown, to try to get the house locked out as quickly as possible. So lockdowns have been used very different than what they were previously.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay and just going through a couple more questions here. Oh, on terms of disciplinary hearings and this is part of the bill that Council Member Dromm has introduced. Do you have — can you tell us the percentage of people that refuse the right to attend their disciplinary hearing and if that's documented or how that's documented?

HEIDI GROSSMAN: We would need to get back to you on that. I am not sure how, if we track that. We would have to get back to you on that.

 move on.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay and I am going to stop
my questions there. I am going to let Council Member
Holden ask you know, one or two more questions but I
think in respect of time here, I do want to, Council
Member I am going to give you an opportunity but I do
want to make sure we get to the Board and then to
other folks here as well. I will let you ask one or
two more questions to DOC and then I think we should

So, thank you for your testimony. We have lots of more questions and I see Council Member has one more to but we will give you one more round but I want us to be able to move on quickly. Thank you to the Department. I just — you know, I want to close this section to say we are going to have a lot more follow up questions, I think a lot more dialogue in particular as it goes to the Board. Dialogue about what I think is you know, some support here at the Council for doing things a little bit differently than I think the Board may proposed but to have that dialogue but you know, I think it is really, really important that we have access to some of the information including longest time held, lockdowns and things like that because we are, you know, we are

2.3

engaging in what I think is a very serious conversation here about. A very serious practice inside our city jails. I think very important we have a wholesale picture of what is happening inside the City jails. Particularly for members of Council who are sort of beginning to engage on this topic.

But I thank you guys for being here and your participation of the task force. I will hand it over to quickly, very quickly to Council Member Holden and Council Member Rivera.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you Chair. Thank you for the second round. Commissioner, if Intro. 2173 were to pass, how would your department deal with violence in the jails?

CYNTHIA BRANN: We would continue to manage violence in the best way possible. It would take very creative thinking on how to house people safely.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Right, right and you said that we have the most violent, we have a concentration of the most violent people probably in New York City currently in our jails because fewer detainees but many of them are violent. And you just can't just look the other way because Correction

Officers are getting attacked right. Staff and certainly other detainees are getting attacked.

So, you have to deal with that and not to offer another alternative. Yeah, counseling is fine but you have to separate with people that are causing the problems right?

CYNTHIA BRANN: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: And so, it is simple and I just don't know, you know, we're not hearing about the victims of this violence so much today. Which I would really like to hear more of and all of the people and all types of injuries they had.

So, I mean, I fear that a blanket ban on a punitive segregation could involve in violent inmates and lead to further increased jail violence and I think that's commonsense. Just a question about, Commissioner, how often does your department meet with the correction officers union to discuss issues related to their work like this?

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, there are monthly labor
management meetings held across the agency in
different divisions. I have an open relationship
with the president of COBA and he frequently contacts
me to discuss issues. And each member of the

2.2

executive board is assigned a member of my executive team to discuss issues at a lower level. And so, I believe we have a very open dialogue and the ability to discuss issues whenever they arise.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Are they, you know, like let's say like a legislation like this is being introduced and you know it is coming. Do you call the correction officers in, the union to talk about this?

CYNTHIA BRANN: I have spoken, I have spoken personally with the president of COBA to talk about upcoming legislation particularly, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright that's good.

Just one other question, quick one. We house like in Rikers right, we house the same gang members in the same unit. Has there been some discussion on changing that because I could see how gang members of the same gang would protect let's say, they could gang up on a Correction Officer.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: If something came up. Do you ever think about not doing that about separating them? I mean we have plenty of space at Rikers now.

CYNTHIA BRANN: So, as a matter of practice, we do not intentionally house same members of the same gang or set together. It's not as simple as just saying, let's spread them all out. There are overarching gangs that are umbrella names so to speak and so, let's use the Bloods for example. There is many sets underneath the Bloods.

So, you could have 10 different members of the Bloods but 10 different members of 10 different sets. And because of different classification levels, different risk levels, keep separate orders from the court and incidents that might happen and moves that are made within the facility, sometimes we have an uneven number of affiliated gang members in a house. But we are working to change that and we know that that can be dangerous.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: So, it's complicated.

Thank you, thank you Commissioner. Thank you Chair.

BRENDA COOKE: Chair Powers, it's Brenda Cooke the Chief of Staff, I just wanted to answer your lockdown question if you would indulge me.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Yes, please.

BRENDA COOKE: So, we have the reports are located on our Department website that we are

C

obligated to report out in. So, on your question about department-wide lockdowns. There have been none. I just checked the last 5 reports, so that's all of Fiscal '20 and the first quarter of Fiscal '21. There are no department with lockdowns.

And in that same 5 quarters, so that's 1 year and 3 months. We have facility-wide lockdowns each quarter, 2 in each of 4 of the quarters and 3 in the $5^{\rm th}$ quarter.

So, we have very few department, well no department-wide lockdowns and very, very few facility, entire facility lockdowns as the Chief mentioned, we several years ago refined our lockdown data tracking process and the process and operations at the facility and we endeavor to utilize the most discreet scope of the lockdown necessary and in response to the incident that warrants it and I think annual reporting on our lockdown by the Board of Correction that's probably on their website, has noted the departments improved of these more narrow lockdowns and fewer interruptions in services over the years as well.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, well we may have some follow up questions just on that after the hearing

2.2

2.3

but thank you for getting back to us on that and we
will go to Council Member Rivera.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Thank you Chair Powers.

Do you think the hearing process for placement in punitive segregation or restrictive housing is truly fair to incarcerated individuals?

Do you think that incarcerated individuals deserve legal representation at every disciplinary hearing?

have outlined earlier in the testimony is a process that's fair. It is consistent with processes like this throughout the country. Where administrative hearings are held in prisons and jails where individuals don't have legal representation at these proceedings. So, we do feel that given all the transparency that we have fair process.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Well, I think in all of our legal proceeding spaces. The people most likely do not have representation are the same people who are incarcerated. And I think that's an intersectional problem that's rooted in racism and classism but I am going to move onto how many

incarcerated individuals overturn the decisions that are made in those hearings.

HEIDI GROSSMAN: I would say that infractions, I understand that the determinations that are made with respect to a determination after a hearing, where individuals have been found not to have followed the rules. In addition to dismissals before anyone even gets to a hearing for reasons like due process violations, overarching [INAUDIBLE 1:56:35] I would have to get back to you with more specific information but it could be up to 20 percent of the total number of infractions that don't end in a finding that someone should be placed in punitive segregation.

So, it's not like there is this rubber stamp process. That's what I think we can — we would have to follow up with the specifics on that but that's anecdotally what I understand.

CHAIRPERSON RIVERA: I would appreciate a follow up on the specifics and I will add that the question that I asked about medical visits that Chair Powers asked again, we don't have CHS here and we received a couple comments from you all that you will get back to us. I do feel like there is a little bit of a - I

am underwhelmed by the preparation I feel that was

taken by the Administration in anticipation of this

hearing.

I will just add that you know, there are new

charges that some of these incarcerated individuals receive while in custody and we want them to have a fair disciplinary process. I think you know the access to grievance forms and just overall the grievance process.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

1:57:47] that we can't quite know for sure because there is no data or we are going to get the specifics you know later in time is troubling. But regardless I just want to I guess thank you for being here. I am looking forward to the follow up on some of these answers and I want to thank Council Member Dromm for his leadership and Chair Powers, thank you for allowing me to ask further questions.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you and I just want to note and I just want this to educate where we are going. Thank you Council Member Rivera and your Christmas tree looks fantastic.

I just want to add you know, just to remind us all that in the Mayor's announcement on this and in punitive segregation, you did use the word specifically solitary confinement as a way to define it and I just want to remind us that because I think as we, we have debated a little bit the terminology. I know that that's not the terminology used in the department. That is the terminology used for the Mayor in his announcement for this.

So, I just want to offer that clarity to all of us. I am going to leave it there and I think we are now going to call on the Board of Corrections. Thank you to the Department of Corrections and the Commissioner for being here and we will certainly, if we have follow up questions, we will send them along.

BRENDA COOKE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We will now hear from the Board of Corrections. Executive Director Egan, you may begin when you are ready.

MARGARET EGAN: Thank you. Good morning Chair

Powers and members of the Criminal Justice Committee.

I hope that you and your families are safe and

healthy. Thank you for holding this important hearing today.

My name is Margaret Egan and I am the Executive

Director of the New York City Board of Correction. I

am joined today by Board Member Dr. Robert Cohen and

my colleague Emily Turner, Interim Deputy Executive

Director of the Board.

We are here today to talk about the ending of solitary confinement in the New York City Jail System. The Board of Correction has been developing rules on restrictive housing broadly and solitary confinement specifically for the better part of the last four years. In that time, the Board consulted with experts, advocates and city officials to understand the leading research and practice and ultimately developed a proposed rule that governed all forms of restrictive housing in the jail system.

Last fall, the Board approved preliminary rules.

Through the winter, the Board received public comment on the proposed rule. That public comment from many stakeholders, especially the testimony from people with lived experience was moving and transformative.

As a result, our Board Chair, Jennifer Jones Austin shortly after becoming Board Chair in March of this

year, joined with Mayor Bill DeBlasio in June to call for an end to punitive segregation or solitary confinement. Punitive segregation has been proven over and over to be an inhumane practice resulting in debilitating trauma that endures, often for the remainder of a person's lifetime. It has also been shown to not be an effective tool for reducing violence in correctional facilities.

The Board believes this practice must end. We believe it should be replaced with an alternative means of accountability with a focus on safety for both staff and detained persons, mental health, effective and robust programming and education, and investment in training and the well-being of employees.

Ending punitive segregation represents a significant change that requires careful consideration to ensure a system of accountability that is fair and safe for all. The Mayor and Chair Jones Austin convened a working group to develop a system of accountability that thoroughly considers and addresses the critical operational issues attendant to dismantling punitive segregation and the

2.2

implementation of a more effective and humane
accountability system.

The working group has been led by our Vice Chair Stanley Richards and included Commissioner Brann and Just Leadership USA President and CEO DeAnna Hoskins. COBA President Boscio was also included and has been participating in working group discussions. The group was charged with developing recommendations for a system that replaces solitary confinement with a system that prioritizes safety, accountability, transparency, and support for all, staff and people in custody. It was critical to receive input from all perspectives. The Department leadership and officers, as well as persons with lived experience to ensure that the model would be progressive and practical.

The group worked diligently through the summer and early fall developing a broad model for ending solitary confinement. The Board's rulemaking committee has taken those recommendations and begun redrafting a rule that will govern restrictive housing in the jail system. The committee has nearly completed its work and we believe will propose its rule in the coming days, initiating the CAPA process

2.2

for a final vote to occur in early 2021. This work has taken longer than we all desired but the Board takes seriously the complicated issues that arise in making these reforms.

Ultimately the rule that the Board proposes will seek to prioritize safety, accountability, transparency and support. These are the key principles informing and driving our work and discussions with respect to the system that will replace punitive segregation. Paramount in our planning is safety. Safety for all. People in custody and staff.

First, we believe that separating someone after a violent incident is critical. It is critical for the victim, the person who committed the violent incident and for the staff. However, this separation should not be indefinite. The best research tells us that a short period of separation, along with an individualized assessment of the core drivers of the behavior and an attendant care plan to are essential to changing behavior.

Accountability. The jail system must be able to hold people accountable for serious incidents. We believe that providing accountability is a critical

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

tool for staff and people in custody to increase and improve safety in the jails. A new system of

4 accountability must be based on swift, certain and

5 | fair principles. People should be provided with due

6 process before being placed in any system of

7 accountability. Their punishment, including the

8 amount of time, should be defined and expectations

9 should be clear and achievable.

Support. Any model that replaces punitive segregation must be centered on support for the individual. All who enter a new system should be immediately provided with an individualized support plan based on a validated assessment to identify the appropriate programming and therapeutic supports for that individual. This plan should be centered on addressing the root cause of violence and behavior and all the requisite services should be provided so that person can be successful in their care plan.

Transparency. For any system to be successful, all must understand and buy into the core principles of that system. It will be important that management clearly articulates, trains and manages both uniform and non-uniform staff, to the model's goals and principles. It will also be critical for the goals,

2.2

principles and expectations to be clearly communicated to people in custody, both before and after any incident. In order for people to be successful in the model, they will have to understand the expectations and have an opportunity to meet them. And when they do, they must be rewarded accordingly.

Finally, the Board's oversight responsibility is also essential to transparency. Requiring the Department and Correctional Health Services to track and report information necessary to monitor compliance with the rules will promote transparency and compliance. Our ability to independently assess and publicly report on the Department's fidelity to the rule will be essential to providing transparency for all of the people in the model, both people in custody and staff.

We also believe the City should conduct an external evaluation to ascertain the impact of the model on individual behavior and health as well as the systemic impact on infractions and violence.

Such an evaluation can provide the City with valuable information on the impact of this new model and other jurisdictions with critical information on a new,

innovative, humane approach to safety and accountability.

The Board would agree that this process has taken significantly longer than desired. Having heard from the public last winter, it was clear that the proposed rule required that more be done to end punitive segregation. The Board's rule making committee has been working diligently, meeting regularly to address the complicated issues that have arisen as we have develop this new model. We have been working closely with City leaders and continued to seek advice and counsel from experts, including people with lived experience and correctional management and oversight expertise from across the country.

We believe that the Board's final rule will evidence a shared desire to reform punitive segregation in a way that achieves our goals of more humane treatment, accountability and safety for all.

Thank you and we are happy to take your questions.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. Thanks for the testimony. I have a number of questions. First, as you just mentioned that you are, I think you believed

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON POWERS:

MARGARET EGAN:

To take a vote.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And you had started this, I

To take a vote.

mean I testified and we had engaged in a dialogue

you are going to start the rule making process in a matter of a few days.

So, can you just give us an update on timing of your rule making and then timing overall and process so and so for, so at this hearing I understand what the next process is on the Board regulations on this?

MARGARET EGAN: Sure, so we are finalizing our internal board discussions and then we will send our proposed rule to the Law Department and the City and that rule, that proposed rule will then be certified and the Board will vote on the proposed rule. should back up and say this is essential restarting the CAPA process.

So, the Board will vote on the proposed rule, we will open public comment. So, we will have 30 days for public comment. We will hold public hearings to hear comment on this rule and then move to finalize which requires going back to the Law Department to finalize the final rule and a vote by the board. so, we are hoping for early 2021 to -

about this last year with the Speaker. What is different between now and last year in terms of rule making around this and it seemed like the Board stalled some point here in terms of doing their rule making process and the Mayor then made an announcement and now you are back. So, what has changed in terms of either, well, I would say two things. One is the thinking around it and also in terms of procedural differences between doing it now versus having done it a year ago.

MARGARET EGAN: Yeah, so the big change is that the rule that we would propose would end punitive segregation. The proposed rule that was proposed in October of 2019 did not end punitive segregation.

And so, that is the major change and as I said, that came from the incredibly moving and transformative testimony that the board heard in public hearings and in written public comment through last winter and our new, relatively new Board Chair Jennifer Jones Austin took that very seriously and you know, we have engaged in this process of figuring out how to end punitive segregation and it was, I should say it was also important to us to take into account the

operational issues that arise in developing a new system and so we wanted to work through those.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Can you talk, what are the operational issues that come up when you talk about it. I assume you are talking about agency related implementation but what are those challenges?

MARGARET EGAN: I mean, I think it's physical location. It's ensuring that the Department is prepared to provide the programming that we are talking about. You know, we are talking about the importance of doing an individualized assessment at the beginning of this process and providing the services and care that people need to be successful in their care plan.

And so, I think there are a number of issues, of operational issues that arise in making sure that the Department is ready and able to implement this new system, so that it is effective.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: So, do you think that if, after you pass a rule making, the agency still needs time in order to be able to change operations in order to implement it or what is your feeling of the level of readiness to be able to make a change?

MARGARET EGAN: I think they probably will need some time but it can't be an amount of years certainly. I think that the Department is preparing and should be prepared to implement this new system within months.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Do you believe that current practices can't amount to solitary confinement?

MARGARET EGAN: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And did you have comments on the proposed legislation here today that Danny Dromm, Council Member Dromm has introduced? Yeah, you didn't comment on the bill.

MARGARET EGAN: We certainly share the goals of the bill and absolutely appreciate Council Member Dromm's leadership on this issue. You know, as I said, we are working through the specifics of a new system of accountability in our rule and continue to — and are looking forward to continuing to work with the Council and of course the Administration on moving this forward.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Are there any concerns you have with the legislation?

MARGARET EGAN: You know, I think that we are working through any number of issues through the

2.2

course of rule but I think we are generally aligned on the bill and the rule.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And the concerns that we have heard and we discussed earlier and I think we will discuss later is, you know, impact, you know, cultural shift including you know, leveling up services or programming or you know, maybe even changing strategies around housing to be able to address any sort of increases in violence that have happened.

The Commissioner testified I think three or four times that you know, she feels confident or we are in a process that would lead to changes and any sort of violence or risk factor to folks who are working inside the jails and I think that's a big topic. Do you have concerns around that? What do you think you know, besides what you have discussed are steps that the agency needs to take?

Also, you know, with borough based jails, are opportunities in those to be able to address any of those issues?

MARGARET EGAN: Yeah, I mean I think safety, as I said, safety in the jail system is our paramount concern and that concern of course extends to people

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

in custody and staff, everyone who is in the jails. 2

3 I think reducing violence is not just an issue of

punitive segregation or solitary confinement. I

5 think reducing violence is a departmentwide city,

sorry, systemwide issue and takes a management 6

7 approach from the Department to address. And so, I

8 think there are cultural change opportunities within

the Department and it takes a comprehensive approach.

You know discipline and accountability is one piece 10

11 of that but it is one piece of that.

> And in terms of the borough based jails, I think there is an incredible opportunity with the new facilities and thinking about the philosophy behind those new facilities to be more centered on programming services and therapeutic care for people who are coming through the system at large but also in a restrictive housing setting.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Does the Board have thoughts and I know we are going to hear from a Board Member Bobby Cohen as well but do we - and so maybe I will just save some for him as well but does the Board have an opinion on the disciplinary hearings and the right for some legal council to be part of that process?

J

MARGARET EGAN: Yeah, I mean, we as I said due process is a key component of this and we are continuing to work through the access to attorney issues. But I think broadly, due process is an essential pieces of this system.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, I am going to offer an opportunity for I think Bobby Cohen to maybe testify to. I have a few more questions but I think they would be, like we could have an opportunity then if members have questions to, we will ask both of them. So, if we can call on Bobby Cohen who is just saw on my screen.

BOBBY COHEN: Thank you very much Chairman

Powers, Council Members Ampry-Samuel, Diaz, Holden,

Rivera, Danny Dromm, you have been so critical for

this effort. Public Advocate Williams, Lander,

Reynoso and Rivera who sponsored this bill.

My name is Bobby Cohen, I am a physician. I have been a Council appointee to the New York City Board of Corrections since 2009. I hope you and your families and loved ones are well in this terrible moment.

More than six years ago, the Board of Correction ended solitary confinement for those between 16 and

2.2

2.3

21. Prior to that bill, close to 25 percent of young adults were kept in solitary confinement by the Department of Correction. We also ended the option of placing seriously mentally ill person and those with serious medical conditions in solitary. But

solitary confinement exists today on Rikers Island.

I had hoped that the Board of Correction would have passed its restrictive housing rule by now. Since we have not passed our rule though, we are very hopeful and that will [INAUDIBLE 2:17:26] away.

We will cover very similar ground to the Council bill. I appreciate the Council's commitment and continued leadership to ending solitary and I support this bill.

This action by New York City is long overdue.

The Board of Correction resumed rule making last winter because of the Council and community concern that our initial rule did not end solitary. This limited to 15 days. We resumed rule making to end solitary with the support of the Mayor this year but our timetable kept getting pushed back. We have not yet published our rule, although I am confident that we will and we will provide the support asked for in

the Council's legislation. We must end solitary confinement as soon as possible.

During the years of the Boards restrictive housing rule making, thousands have suffered in solitary and were humiliated and punished by being shackled in chains. These practices continue today. They must end.

Your bill will end these torturous practices.

The Boards Rule will also end solitary and routine punitive shackling. I know that there are many advocates here today who have comments and suggestions about the Council's bill and I look forward to hearing them.

We appreciate the working groups input but there work is done. The Restrictive Housing rule is a Board process now. We will shortly send our proposed rule to the Law Department for certification and we hope and urge that the Law Department will certify promptly.

I urge the Council and others to focus their efforts on getting the Board to submit its rule and for the Law Department to certify it quickly.

As the Council's Representative on the Board of Correction, one of the Council's Representatives and

2.3

as a New Yorkers, I am very proud to endorse your effort to end solitary. I honor you for your proposal.

Chair Powers, I know this is not on the agenda and there is so much to talk about but I would briefly like to just make some urgent comments regarding COVID-19 in the jails today.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Sure, go ahead.

BOBBY COHEN: So, I am very concerned that the Department continues to pursue policy in severe overcrowding. Over 35 open dormitory housing areas in 75 capacity this week. That increased from the week before. I toured VCBC last month and saw and was in dormitories filled in 98 percent capacity.

To date, the City has failed to take action to decrease the population and in fact, it grows daily because of actions by the Police Department, the States Judges, District Attorneys, the Parole Board and you know, I think the Mayor's program can do more. The population is 4,854, 20 percent greater than the 3,832 it was last April. It is time to take action on this.

Only if dormitories are under 50 percent can people have 6 feet of density and also, it is very

important that everybody who works and lives in the jails have access to COVID-19 vaccines when they are available. They already deserve because of the extreme risk they share. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you and thank you for that last section. Something we are concerned about and pass legislation to that degree, a bill I had to help with any COVID related releases earlier this year and also, I will call on the Mayor to actually point people to that.

And also, share their concerns and we have had a couple hearing but I think we are trying to keep a careful eye on it and I know others here as well.

But I want to just briefly on the topic at hand, do you see any conflicts between the work? This is for either one of you. Any conflicts between the work that the Board is doing right now and either the Council legislation or the Council effort?

BOBBY COHEN: I don't see any conflict. There are some differences in the number of errors. People are out of cell in the different periods. I think those can be worked out between the Council and we have asked the Board to take a major role in terms of creating the policies for implementing the program.

2.3

So, basically we are in the same line, limiting the amount of time that people are in restrictive housing. Making sure that there is due process, making sure that they get out.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Got it and do you believe, should there be a cap on numbers of days a person can spend in restrictive housing and so, what should that cap be? Should the Department be able to ask for a waiver from that? What circumstances you think would lead to a waiver?

BOBBY COHEN: The Board, I think has not yet come up but it will in the next few minutes, with its number on that although it probably would be something very close to what is in your bill. And I think when it comes to situations where that cannot be handled, within the restrictive housing process, the Department has other mechanisms. Not in terms of restrictive housing but in terms of appeal to the courts as it does already.

We should not design a system that replaces those very rare moments when the Department has to go outside of the Boards rule and we should always remember that's it is not the Departments responsibility to punish. It is just to provide

safety and security for the community and within the

institution.

Every person who is sent to punitive segregation

and to ESH1 is being charged with a serious crime.

Is being prosecuted by the Bronx District Attorney.

That is not our concern to develop a punishment

matrix. It is our concern to provide safety and

support and programming that can be helpful.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: And just a follow up to a question that I asked the Department earlier and maybe the Board can provide this information if you have it. My question was basically, what's the longest that they have held someone in restricted housing setting?

I asked for the last, this is going back to 2019, just as a limited time frame to use our recent timeframe to use and what setting was it? Do you have any information related to that question?

BOBBY COHEN: Someone — I am sorry Meg, you wanted to.

MARGARET EGAN: Oh, I was going to ask Emily to jump in here, the keeper of our data.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you.

EMILY TURNER: Yeah, so I think again, we keep coming back to restrictive housing and how we are defining it and including more than just punitive segregation which the Department pointed out. Our existing rules have limits to how long people can stay in P. seg. I think to answer your question, we need to think more broadly about the population that's been in P. seg, that's then moving into another restrictive setting or perhaps traveling back and forth between those settings.

So, in terms of the overrides, the 60-day period for P. seg specifically, the Chief mentioned that there have been five in 2020 and that's correct. So, only five people receiving an override to stay longer than those 60 days.

When we look at ESH, in the existing public reporting on this on length of stay has been limited to the Boards reports. That's something that our proposed rule would address, so that there is more transparency about exactly how long people are staying in ESH. And so overall, total length of stay but also you know, for people who are currently in but also people who have left, which looks different

because you can see that some people who are still there may have been extended amount of time.

So, our reporting conditions will address some of the transparency issues around this length of stay issue. When we first looked at this back in 2017 for adults, the average was 114 days for adults. When we first looked at this and the medium was 77 days with one person staying 636 days. Obviously, since that adult report came out, we then issued a report looking at the young adult population. We found that for young adults the sort of, for those when we were looking — when we did that report, we saw 180-40's for young adults and 192 for those who are still in and then lower lengths of stay of 74-40's and 50 days for those who had gotten out.

But since then, the Department and the Board have been working closely putting in guardrails to reduce that length of stay. So, since those public reports came out, we have seen at least for the young adult population, we have seen sort of medium time in ESH for young adults down to 85 days with many staying much shorter and we have seen them moving through the system. We have also seen, rather than people just leaving ESH and being discharged from custody, we

So, we have seen a lot of progress there with the

2

4

5

6

have been seeing people progress and move out of the

3

system.

Board and the Department working together on that issue but in terms of like regular tracking and

7 reporting on the adult population, that's something

8 that the proposed reporting conditions in the rule

9

that we are going to put forth would address, so we

have a clear understanding for all of these

1011

populations what we are talking about in terms of

But I did want to flag that there are other

12

length of stay.

segregation.

13

14 restrictive settings that wouldn't fall into P. seg

1 -

and ESH such as structurally restrictive housing

16

which the proposed rule would also address and we do

17

know that there are some people who will end up

18

spending very, very long periods of time in

1920

9 structurally restrictive housing, which the

21

Department does not consider - it doesn't consider

restrictive housing, it doesn't consider punitive

22

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Yeah, thank you. You just

24

think your rule making will address that?

25

BOBBY COHEN: Yes.

3

4

11

12

13

EMILY

EMILY TURNER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. Thank you. I am

going to keep questions limited. We do look forward

5 to continued dialogue with the Board in your upcoming

6 | rule making which sounds like its eminent and thank

7 you for your continued partnership on this issue. I

8 don't see any colleagues questions, so I think we

9 will move on to the next panel. But thank you and

10 happy holidays and please stay safe and healthy.

BOBBY COHEN: Thank you.

MARGARET EGAN: Thank you, same to you.

BOBBY COHEN: Thank you very much.

14 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We will now turn to testimony

15 from members of the public. Please listen for your

16 name, as I will be calling individuals one by one and

17 | we will also announce the person who is next. Once

18 | your name is called, please accept the prompt to

19 | unmute yourself and the Sergeant at Arms will set the

20 timer and announce that you may begin.

Our first panelist is Benny Boscio followed by

22 | Correction Officer 1 and then Correction Officer 2.

23 You may begin.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time -

24

21

BENNY BOSCIO: Good morning Chairman Powers and the distinguished members of your committee. My name is Benny Boscio and I am the President of the Correction Officers' Benevolent Association, the second-largest law enforcement union in the City of New York. Our members, as you know, provide care, custody and control of over 4,800 inmates daily in our city's jails.

Today's hearing focuses on a discussion of one of the most reckless and dangerous pieces of legislation to ever come before this committee, a proposed ban on punitive segregation. With the limited time I have, I want to set the record straight on the false narrative about what you and your colleagues refer to as solitary confinement and what Correction Officers and Correction professionals around the nation refer to as Punitive Segregation. Solitary confinement implies that inmates in our custody are kept in a window-less cell for 24 hours a day, are fed bread and water and are deprived of having access to the law library, medical clinic or recreation time.

Despite what the Legal Aid Society proclaims and despite what inmate advocacy groups tell you when you meet with them, we do not have solitary confinement

_

2.2

in our jails. We are a jail system not a prison system. The section in the Administrative Code in the City's Charter, which this bill is seeking to amend, doesn't even reference solitary confinement. It references punitive segregation. This bill would insert a false definition into law based solely on the narratives driven by inmate advocates and the Close Rikers movement.

So what exactly is punitive segregation?

Punitive segregation is simply a jail within a jail.

It enables Correction Officers to physically separate assaultive inmates from non-violent inmates. Inmates in punitive segregation are in fact housed in housing areas with windows, with access to the same food as everyone else, with access to the law library and recreation time and the medical clinic.

How do we know punitive segregation works?

Historically, when punitive segregation was employed for all assaultive inmates regardless of age, we were able to keep the violence low. In 2016, when Mayor de Blasio unilaterally ended punitive segregation for inmates 21 and under, we saw a major spike in violence. That violence continues today. I would hope that as members of the Committee on Criminal

2.2

2.3

Justice, each of you would take the time to review the jail violence indicators contained in the annual Mayor's Management Report. If you haven't, the report reveals a steady increase in jail violence year after year since 2014. In the most recent report alone, published in September of this year, stabbings and slashings are up 16 percent, assaults on Correction Officers are up 15 percent and inmate on inmate violence is up a staggering 284 percent.

Do these figures bother you? Do these figures perhaps illustrate the intensity of the violence my members face every day? Have any of you even taken the time to visit a punitive segregation unit?

Because before you vote on this sweeping legislation, you should do your homework. You should examine the impact this will have on the safety and security of our jails. It will have an enormous impact on the lives of many officers who live with their families in your council districts.

Some of you have not even taken the time to meet with us to seek our input on how this legislation would affect literally thousands of lives in our jails. Some of you will vote to pass this bill to satisfy the inmate advocacy groups, who come in and

•

)

out of your offices like a revolving door, while we can't even set foot in the door. We took an oath to serve and protect this city but who on the City Council is protecting us? I have asked to meet with Speaker Corey Johnson and he refuses to acknowledge my request. He is the second-most powerful official in the City of New York and yet he refuses to meet with the leader of New York City's second largest law enforcement union.

I can't help but think if I were a White union leader and if my members were mostly White instead of Black and Hispanic, that we would be at least afforded a single meeting. That we would at least be acknowledged as being one of the most important stakeholders in the City's criminal justice system. So on behalf of the Correction Officer who was slashed across his arm on Thanksgiving, on behalf of the female Correction Officer who was stabbed in the hand a month before that, on behalf of the Correction Officer who had his nose and eye socket broken before that and on behalf of the thousands of Correction Officers assaulted and splashed in the face by inmates with urine, feces and blood, I ask you and your colleagues in the Council, as well as the

Speaker, if you remove this tool to protect us and nonviolent inmates from violent offenders, what do you intend to replace it with?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

BENNY BOSCIO: What consequences should remain in place when officers and inmates are attacked with impunity. A time out? No Game Boy use for a few hours? 20 hours outside of their cells?

Our use of punitive segregation has been so diminished already, which is why you see such a steep rise in assaults on our members. To remove this completely will significantly increase the risks of someone getting killed at the hands of an inmate. Is that a risk you are willing to take? This bill is unacceptable to us, it should be unacceptable to every New Yorker who believes in protecting the victims of the predators we have in our jails.

Instead of rushing to pass this along to the full City Council, I ask you to meet with us. Take a tour with us. Speak to the Officers who have been victimized by assaultive inmates. Some of them are testifying today. Do your due diligence. The safety of your constituents, no matter which side of the bars they're on, should always come first.

With that said, I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would like to now welcome Correction Officer 1 to testify followed by Correction Officer 2, then Correction Officer 3.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CORRECTION OFFICER 1: Good afternoon Chairman

Powers and the members of your committee. I am a New

York City Correction Officer Number 1, with 4 years

on the job. I have never testified at a City Council

hearing but the issue at hand is far too important to

remain silent.

Several months ago, while working at a jail on Rikers Island, an inmate melee began to erupt in a housing area. Within a matter of seconds, I quickly intervened to break up the fight. I was surrounded by 15-20 inmates, all of whom were members of the same gang. I ended up getting stabbed in my left hand with a long, sharp weapon which had to be removed by doctors. I have not been back to work since this happened but I have been in and out of physical therapy and still can't fully use my hand.

I am also seeing a therapist to deal with the continued mental and emotional trauma this attack has

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 caused me. I am here today to ask each one of you,

3 as well as Council Speaker Corey Johnson and Council

4 Member Dromm and the other sponsors of this

5 legislation, what they plan to do with violent

6 | inmates like the one who stabbed me?

Do you and your colleagues believe it is humane to keep violent inmates in the same housing areas as non-violent inmates? How many Correction Officers did you speak with prior to this hearing? Before voting on this legislation, I ask you to consider my story and the stories of so many Correction Officers like me, who have endured vicious assaults by inmates, sometimes more than once. I'm asking you to oppose this ban on punitive segregation and to instead, support us and protect us if you expect us to be able to protect the inmates. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would now like to welcome Correction Officer 2 to testify followed by Correction Officer 3, then Correction Officer 4.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CORRECTION OFFICER 2: Good morning Chairman

Powers and the members of your committee. I am a New

York City Correction Officer with 3 years on the job.

2.2

Last May, while working at a jail on Rikers

Island, I was sexually assaulted by an inmate who was in jail on an attempted rape charge. I had simply instructed the inmate to report to the medical clinic to receive his medications. He refused. Instead, he told me "I'd rather stay here with you." Within minutes he grabbed me from behind, slammed me up against the wall using his body to pin me down while he aggressively grabbed my breasts and vagina.

To this day I remain traumatized from this incident. I am seeing a therapist to deal with the continued mental and emotional trauma this attack has caused me. I am here today to inform you that the inmate who assaulted me and every inmate who assaults my fellow officers belongs in punitive segregation.

Many of you think punitive segregation is some form of torture. It is not. It's a tool we use to separate violent predators from the rest of the population. You don't believe there should be any consequences for inmates who commit crimes behind bars.

You believe that officers who have been attacked and even inmates who have been attacked should continue to be exposed to their assailants. Isn't

2.2

2.3

that some form of torture? Before voting on this legislation, I ask you to consider my story and the stories of so many Correction Officers like me, who remain traumatized from these attacks and will wear the mental scars from these incidents for the rest of our lives. I'm asking you to oppose this ban on punitive segregation and to help us keep the city's jails safe for everyone. Thank you.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would like to now welcome Correction Officer 3 to testify followed by Correction Officer 4, then Correction Officer 5.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CORRECTIONS OFFICER 3: Good morning Chairman

Powers and the members of your committee. I am a New

York City Correction Officer Number 3, with 6 years

on the job.

In the last 17-months, I was assaulted twice by two different inmates. In 2019, an inmate strangled me and attempted to rape me as well. This year, an inmate punched me in the face. I am here today to inform you that the inmates who assaulted me belong in punitive segregation. This isn't about torture. This isn't about inhumane treatment to a group being

2.2

2.3

victimized. I'm the victim. My attackers should

face consequences for attacking me. If they

attempted to rape me or punch me on the street, every

one of you would agree they should be arrested

immediately. But when they commit the very same

crimes behind bars, you don't want them to face any

consequences. That's outrageous and they need to be

held accountable for their actions.

Before voting on this legislation, I ask you to consider my story. I ask you to seriously consider the consequences of your vote. Will you accept responsibility if I get assaulted a third time? Will Council Member Dromm accept responsibility? Will Speaker Johnson accept responsibility?

In closing, I'm asking you to oppose this ban on punitive segregation and to help us keep the city's jails safe for everyone. The lives of Correction Officers and those in our custody are at stake.

Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would like to now welcome Correction Officer 4 to testify followed by Correction Officer 5, then Correction Officer 6.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CORRECTION OFFICER 4: Good afternoon Chairman

Powers and the members of your committee. I am a

Correction Officer Number 4 with 5 years on the job.

A few years ago, a couple inmates refused my instructions to leave a housing area. A fight began, and I intervened to break up the fight and while this was happening, an inmate came from behind me and slashed me in my ear. I am here today to inform you that this inmate that assaulted me belong in punitive segregation.

What kind of message do you think it sends to these assaultive inmates when they learn punitive segregation is banned? When they learn that they will face virtually no consequences for their crimes. Do the rights of me or my fellow Correction Officer matter? Does our safety matter to you?

Before voting on this legislation, I ask you to consider my story. I ask you to consider seriously the consequences of your vote. Many of your colleagues here on the Council have never stepped one day in our jails, yet they will consider this vote based upon misguided information and very little facts.

In closing, I ask that you listen to the facts from us. Our lives matter. I'm asking you to oppose this bill and ban punitive segregation and help us keep the city's jails safe for everyone. The lives of the Officers and those who are in our custody. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would now like to now welcome Correction Officer 5 to testify followed by Correction Officer 6.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CORRRECTION OFFICER 5: Good morning Chairman

Powers and the members of your committee. I am a New

York City Correction Officer Number 5, with 3 1/2

years on the job. Last month, I was working a

housing area and I tried to bring an inmate up to the

dayroom in my jail.

As I opened the gate to allow the inmate to pass,
I was jumped from behind by another inmate who
suddenly smacked my head and face into the iron gate
twice and then started choking me. One of my eyes
was cut open and I sustained additional injuries to
my throat and neck and my knee. I am still have
difficulty swallowing and I walk with a limp.

2.2

I am here today to inform you that inmates like the one who assaulted me belong in punitive segregation. We must have the ability to physically separate violent inmates who commit these types of assault. I know you are hearing today from some of my fellow officers who have also been assaulted. But the reality is there are literally thousands of stories of Correction Officers who have been viciously assaulted. I have yet to see a piece of legislation from this Council that seeks to protect our safety.

Before voting on this legislation, I ask you to consider my story. I ask you to seriously consider the consequences of your vote. At the end of the day, when more officers get assaulted after the ban is in place, what will you do then? Are we just supposed to be the sacrificial lambs in this politically driven legislation? I would argue that every Council member who votes in favor of this bill should explain to us why the rush to pass this bill and why now?

In closing, I'm here to tell you that facts matter. Our lives matter. I am asking you to oppose this proposed ban on punitive segregation and help us keep the city's jails safe for everyone. The lives

Э

of me and my fellow Correction Officers and those in our custody are at stake. Thank you for your time. Have a good morning.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would now like to welcome Correction Officer 6 to testify.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CORRECTION OFFICER 6: Good morning Chairman

Powers and the members of your committee. I am a New

York City Correction Officer Number 6 with 5 years on
the job.

Last May, I was relieving another officer so he could have a meal. At one point an inmate requested that I remove the garbage from his cell. As soon as I complied with this request, three inmates rushed me and jumped me from behind and began hitting me. One of my teeth was knocked out and I sustained a laceration to my arm requiring five stiches. If not for another Correction Officer rushing to my aid, my injuries could have been far worse.

I am here today to inform you that inmates like the ones who assaulted me belong in punitive segregation. If you truly care about our safety and the safety of those in our custody, you will not support this proposed ban on punitive segregation.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

We must have the ability to physically separate 2 3 violent inmates who commit these types of assaults. 4 If we are unable to do so, how do you expect us to deal with inmates who prey on us and on the non-5 violent inmates? I didn't take this job to get rich 6 7 but I also didn't sign up to have my life threatened 8 on a daily basis. My safety should matter to you, but it seems you are only concerned with protecting those who commit violence against Correction Officers 10 11 and other inmates.

What will it take for you to start taking our lives seriously? Before voting on this legislation, I ask you to consider my story. I ask you to seriously consider the consequences of your vote. Thank you for your time.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I will now turn it over to questions from Chair Powers.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you and thank you everybody for testifying and sharing your stories and you know, I think its an obvious statement but I think I know for all of us, those stories are you know, not acceptable. It is not acceptable to go to your job and be hurt or assaulted or have any sort of actions like that taken.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I am going to ask a few questions. I see some hands up from colleagues, so I am going to let them have an opportunity to weigh in. This is just for just a couple questions here. Do you think the current system is working when it comes to reducing violence in the City jails? This is for the head COBA, sorry.

BENNY BOSCIO: No, no its not working.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay and why not?

BENNY BOSCIO: Well, for so many reasons. I mean the Department has decided to house inmates by gang affiliation and they have created army's in these housing areas and taken the power away from us to run the housing areas effectively.

You got 35 Bloods in a house that holds 40 inmates, 50 inmates, how can you effectively control the house. You know, when punitive segregation was banned in 2016 for the young adults, the violence has gone up systematically every year. Every year and the data doesn't support what it is that the Council is trying to do.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay and on the housing question, I think Council Member Holden asked this to the Commissioner earlier about housing based on

similar affiliation when it comes to gangs. The

Commissioner had said, I think, he tried to explain

that it was you know, more complicated because of

different affiliations within, being Blood or so

forth and that it was not their housing strategy.

Are you saying that's not your experience or that's

not the experience inside the jails?

BENNY BOSCIO: Absolutely not. They are housing by gang affiliation on purpose, because they thought that by putting the same gangs together they would reduce inmate on inmate violence and we see that that is not the case. We are put in an unfortunate circumstance. You know, they want us to be perfect in an unperfect environment and they have not allowed us to succeed. They put us in a disadvantage right out the gate.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, so — I am going to follow up on that in a second but do you have concerns, I mean, I think the stated concern here for repealing punitive segregation when they did it a few years ago, a continued concern that plenty of folks have is the effective isolation on any individual whether it is once you take them out of punitive segregation and their return back including your

_ ¬

members or when they return back to their communities have to deal with the impact or the effect of that.

Do you have concerns about, I am not even talking about the existing practice but just any housing practice when it comes to the long term impact on an individual? If you put an individual in long term isolation, whether that is 23 hours or 20 hours?

BENNY BOSCIO: Well, Chairman Powers, if an inmate cuts you across your face and give you 25 stitches, what should happen to that inmate? Because you guys want to do away with a practice that will not allow us to separate violent inmates from other inmates. Why don't I hear anybody advocating for the nonviolent inmates? For the people that are on the other end of that attack? It seems like we just want to do away with crime. I mean look, when a crime is committed in New York City, it should be treated no different than a crime committed behind the bars in jail.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, so but I guess I just, do you have a concern on the wellbeing of an individual if they are locked into a long term housing with no access to resources, programming and

done out of a long term and long term you know, with minimal hours out of cell?

BENNY BOSCIO: Chairman Powers, I have concerns for my members that have been assaulted with impunity by violent inmates. You know, I don't understand what's this rush to do away with something to try and be first in the country to do something that no none has done across the country. And you know the violence just continues to soar, so I ask you, what is the data that proves that you know, what you are doing is going to work? The violence has gone up since we have diminished punitive segregation as it is. It is watered down. There are no consequences for inmates that assault us with impunity.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: But I guess and with respect, I guess that's kind of the question I am asking, which is, I think at the same — I am hearing two things at the same time. One is you know, keep the system in place but also that the system doesn't work and I guess I am trying reconcile those two things. Because if you are feeling here as the violence has skyrocketed under the current system, why would we not seek to try — I understand your concern that taking something away here may further

2.3

exasperate that but you now, it feels like you know, in addition to that there should be other tools put in place here to help actually address the issue. I guess my question is, I think the feeling here is we should keep the status quo but I also hear the status quo doesn't work when it comes to reducing violence and I am trying to reconcile those two ideas.

BENNY BOSCIO: Well Chairman Powers, if you don't commit a crime in jail, you don't end up in punitive segregation. If you don't assault Correction

Officers or other inmates, you don't end up in punitive segregation. You come to do your time and you go home when your time is up.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Is there evidence that punitive segregation is a disincentive to committing violence?

BENNY BOSCIO: I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Is there evidence that the existence of punitive segregation or the existence of punitive segregation in some form you know, like in certain form is a disincentive to acts of violence?

BENNY BOSCIO: Well yes, if there is no consequences and like I said, the data doesn't support what you are trying to do. If you look at

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2016 when it was ended for young adults, the violence skyrocketed.

So, if inmates know that there are no consequences for their actions, guess what's going to continue to happen? They are going to continue to assault. They are going to continue to make crimes because there is no consequences happening. The rearrest process for inmates is a joke. Nothing is being done when inmates throw urine and feces and blood in your face. You know, this is what Correction Officers - this is the reality of what's happening in the jails. And I ask anyone of you, if someone did that to you in the streets of New York, what would happen to them? Should they be allowed to stay in New York City? Can somebody on the Council answer me that question?

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, this is -

BENNY BOSCIO: If someone cuts you in your face Chairman Powers, should they be allowed to walk the streets of New York freely? Because that's what it is that you guys want to do inside of our jails. There has to be consequences.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay, so I want to ask about disincentives towards violence. So, what

2.2

2.3

disincentives behavior that could be violent behavior and I am asking if there is evidence of that being a disincentive. I understand taking somebody away from housing you know, where many of your members are and putting them away somewhere might lead to the desired outcome here but there is a consequence to that. I mean, I think that's what we are debating here today is I am not at all trying to be disrespectful and any member here but I guess what we are talking about is we are talking about two things, disincentive and consequences on punitive segregation.

I think I believe and I think many believe and we could debate where those parameters lay but that some form of long term isolated housing is damaging to an individual and in this case, we are talking about folks that are going to return to our community or continue to live inside of your city jails or go somewhere else and I think what we are trying to do is desire for better outcomes.

Just to be fair, I mean you do and I have heard from prior to that they think the system doesn't work. I understand, I recognize that you know, maybe taking it away very quickly you know without doing anything else may not solve the problem around

a

violence but what I am asking, so let me ask you a different question. Besides the punitive segregation, what are other tools here that you think, the housing when you talked about the gang affiliation, what are other recommendations that you think are not in place right now that would help address issues around safety for people working inside the City jails today?

BENNY BOSCIO: Well, like I said Chairman Powers, we are all for jail reform. We have no issue but there is not a balance when it comes to jail reform because it is so lopsided and every one is arguing for the inmate population and no one is arguing besides the union and myself about the Correction Officer's wellbeing.

You know, inmates have game boys, tablets and a Correction Officer can't even get their own gas masks. And this is the lopsided way that the mentality of the Council, like, you know, these are people that are committing violent crimes inside.

Yeah, take away commissary. You know take away their ability to visit but then you guys don't want to do that because of all the minimum standards that you have.

_

Like I said, the consequences are watered down as they are and this is why we have a more embolden inmate and yes, based on bail reform, we have a more violent inmate that we are dealing with.

I mean, think about it, there is 4,800 inmates in our system now but the violence is skyrocketing because of some of it, I am sorry and no disrespect to the Department but some of it has to do with gross mismanagement of the agency. And we are pleading for your help because unfortunately you guys don't only represent inmates but you adhere to the Board of Corrections. You adhere the Council and it seems like the only people you want to represent here are inmates. What about us? Who is protecting us? We didn't take — you know, some people feel like it is our job, so we should be doused with urine and feces because we took this job. We should be assaulted with impunity because we decided to take this job.

No, we decided to protect and serve our City.

Alright but we are asking you guys for help because we need protections to. It can't be just about the wellbeing of inmates.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I understand that but I mean, first of all, no, it's not acceptable. I just

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

want to be very clear. I will say it if it needs to be said, it is not acceptable for your members to have any of that happen to them and we do need to repeat that. I quess, but I quess you are here. mean you are here at the City Council right now, right. If I am behind - if I am at Rikers Island right now, I can't testify before the City Council. That is why there are groups who are doing it for You are representing your members here. people. am asking you a question, what are other recommendations. You are going to go to the Board, you are at the Council. You have the Sponsor of the Bill here; you have the Chair. You know, I guess my question is, I believe that if you are going to make changes to restricted housing, punitive segregation, you also need to level up in other places as well. You need to change other practices at the Department. You have talked about mismanagement.

So, I am just asking because I think this is a public hearing for the opportunity to state this. If you feel like it's part of the dialogue that is necessary, what are the other tools that you think that the mismanagement that you think the Department needs or is undergoing that needs to be addressed?

2.2

2.3

BENNY BOSCIO: Break up the gang houses, lower the inmate to officer ratio. Right now it is 1 Officer per 50 inmates. Why? When we have 85, approximately 8,500 Officers and 4,800 inmates. You could lower the inmate population to have less inmates in each housing area. And like it was brought up here, the Department isn't even social distancing when it comes to COVID-19 and we fought and pleaded with the Department to put less inmates in a housing area to allow social distancing.

So, yeah, it has a lot to do with mismanagement but once again, if we can't have the ability to separate violent inmates, the violence is just going to continue to rise.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Okay. I am going to stop there. I am going to let members ask questions. I think we have a couple of members who have their hands up. Thanks.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, we will hear from Council Member Holden followed by Council Member Dromm.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you and thank you to all of the Correction Officers who testified today

2.2

2.3

because we have to hear your side and I am glad that

we finally did because I agree with certainly the

COBA President Boscio that your side is not

represented. And it's just like I don't think you

6 were consulted for this bill.

Commissioner Brann stated by the way, COBA

President Boscio, Commissioner Brann stated that if

Intro.'s 2173 were to pass, they would have to think

outside the box on how to punish violent inmates or

detainees. That's kind of a little scary isn't it on

your side? Because you are in with the most

dangerous individuals in the City of New York or

maybe even in the country.

Commissioner Brann said that we have a high concentration. She explained the violence saying that we have less detainees but they are more violent. I mean, I would like to know why that is. Why are they more violent?

BENNY BOSCIO: Well, I mean, they are more violent because they have been embolden by the way the Department has decided to house inmates. If you like I said, if you put 35 Bloods in the same house, if you put 35 Crips in the same house and the Officer that's working in that housing area needs assistance,

2.

2.2

2.3

when the prob team comes, that whole house is now ready to jump the prob team that's coming to assist that Officer. This is part of the disadvantage that the Department has put us in.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: But Commissioner Brann, really kind of, when I asked her that question, she said they are not housing the gangs in the same unit and you are saying something very different than I am hearing.

BENNY BOSCIO: That's absolutely false and you guys can see the data for yourself. Ask for the housing area reports, so you can see the SRG affiliations of how many security risk group members which is our terminology for gangs. How many of the same gangs in each housing area. Ask for the data. The data doesn't lie. When you can walk into a facility and the Correction Officers can tell you oh, yeah, that's a Blood house, that's a Crip house, that's because of what the Department has decided to do about housing based on the Nunez litigation, the Nunez Consent Degree. This is what we are dealing with because they want so desperately to try and lower the violence and they are trying to do it at all calls but it is not working.

S

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright, I have a bill, some Council Members are listening by the way to COBA and really feel for your plague because it is a — not only its more dangerous in the pandemic obviously in the jails but for everyone. But now the increased violence against Correction Officers and we heard from many of your officers how they have been attacked.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: And I have a bill, it's
Into. 1753 which would require that the Department of
Corrections separate gang members from the same
units. You think obviously, that would be a good
idea because we do have the space right?

BENNY BOSCIO: Absolutely and if you mix them up and put five for instance, of each different gang.

The focus will be on each other. It will be a little violent in the beginning but they will learn to live with one another like they did in the past.

You know, this was a reckless decision to decide to house inmates according to their gang affiliation. Yes, that would be a much needed bill Council Member Holden.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you so much. Thank 3 you Chair.

BENNY BOSCIO: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Next, we will turn to Council Member Dromm.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you very much and let me start off by saying how my heart goes out to those Corrections Officers who were attacked. Nobody, as the Chair has stated, wants to see that happen to people who are serving the City of New York. You know but my argument is that actually by you know, reducing the use or eliminating the use of punitive segregation, you are going to decrease those types of violence and certainly, the Commissioner pointed to the fact that with the lowering of punitive segregation, the numbers there and the increased use of programming, they have seen success. And I mentioned this to your former leader Norman Seabrook, way back in 2014 when we were touring Rikers Island and I have been there in Rikers Island at least six times in the time that I have been in the City Council.

2.3

_ 1

And even the facilities themselves, the facilities are in horrible, horrible shape and you know, I fought for better facilities just for the environment that you know, folks have to work in.

The physical environment that folks have to work in but I do take objection to a number of the statements that you made Mr. Boscio about not having any resources.

In one hand you are saying that you don't have any resources but on the other hand you are saying you want to keep punitive segregation. So, I don't understand that.

You are saying that you know, many of them are thrown into solitary for violent acts but I know for sure that on many occasions, folks are put into solitary for nonviolent acts and that has been a history of what's happened here. Look at what happened to Layleen Polanco. Why was Layleen Polanco put into solitary? Can you answer that?

BENNY BOSCIO: Council Member Dromm, again you keep using the terminology solitary and we do not have that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Yes, you do it's synonymous, it's synonymous.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Mr. Boscio, hold up

2 BENNY BOSCIO:

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

please.

BENNY BOSCIO: And when you ask, look -

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Mr. Boscio, I am a Council

Sir.

Member here to ask you questions.

BENNY BOSCIO: Right and I am telling you -

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: The words punitive

segregation and solitary are synonymous. When you put somebody inside a cell for 20 hours, that is

solitary confinement. It used to be 24 hours, so we

have pushed back on that in your union, under the

leadership of Norman Seabrook, who is on his way to

jail by the way, okay. I hope he doesn't have to go

into solitary, that's what I hope. God forbid he

goes into solitary, then we might see some change but

you know, it's the same thing.

20 hours, have you spent 20 hours in a bathroom?

BENNY BOSCIO: [INAUDIBLE 3:07:09].

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Mr. Boscio, have you spent

20 hours in a bathroom?

BENNY BOSCIO: No, I have not.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Well, try it, okay and see how you feel when you come out and see if it doesn't

2.2

2.3

have psychological effect on you. 20 hours in a cell alone locked up has tremendous negative effects on people.

You say that officers don't have gas masks, I know that's not true. I know that the gas masks we use in classrooms against kids who were chained to their desks, okay. It was the teachers who didn't have gas masks. That situation has now been turned around but it was not the Corrections Officers and they are the one's who fire the tear gas to begin with, okay.

So, if they don't want to get tear gassed, tell them not to fire tear gas at kids. Gassing kids is an abomination. You talk about bail reform without any evidence. What is your evidence about bail reform having anything to do with increased violence in Rikers Island? There is no evidence of that.

You know, look, I find it very hard to take COBA seriously because of it's long record of corruption and you know, it's just, I don't believe that using torture to cure violence is a way to end violence. It just doesn't happen that way.

So, you know, and then you are talking about you know, the way we house inmates. This hearing is not

2.2

2.3

about the way we house inmates. I feel bad, maybe

you are right about the gangs, I don't know. I don't

know enough about the gangs to be honest with you to

5 answer that.

BENNY BOSCIO: I was talking about what's going on in jail.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I know enough sir and I have oversight over your jails and I can go to your jails anytime without you following me around like your former leader did, okay.

BENNY BOSCIO: I invite you to tour any time you want Council Member Dromm.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Or your television ads or whatever you want to do.

BENNY BOSCIO: I invite you to tour with me anytime you like, unannounced of course.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I don't listen to thugs.

You can be as much of a thug as you want to be but

you don't bother me, okay. You don't bother me. I

am here to help people, unfortunately you don't see

the benefits of that and I wish that you did. If you

did, you would serve your members okay. But it is

time to change. Remember the people that have died

under your supervision sir and the people you have

harmed sir by your insistence on punitive segregation, which is actually solitary confinement, which is torture. Thank you very much.

BENNY BOSCIO: You and me can have a different opinion but like I said, slashings are up 16 percent. Assaults on Correction Officers are up 15 percent and inmate on inmate violence is up a staggering 284 percent and those numbers don't lie.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So, your officers are doing something wrong. That's got to be the reason.

BENNY BOSCIO: Oh, that's your ideology I guess.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Yeah, something is going wrong.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Alright, we are going to leave it at that. Thank you, thank you for the testimony and the questions. I am going to have the Committee Counsel — thank you for your testimony of your members as well. I am going to have Committee Counsel call to the next panel. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I would like to now welcome Kelsey De Avila to testify, followed by Julia Solomons then Kayla Simpson.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

_

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you, go ahead. Thank you for the wait.

KELSEY DE AVILA: Sorry, can you guys hear me?
CHAIRPERSON POWERS: We can hear you, yeah.

KELSEY DE AVILA: Hi, my name is Kelsey De Avila,
I am with Brooklyn Defender Services. Thank you
Chair Powers and a huge thank you to Council Member
Dromm for pushing back on the lies we heard today
from the Department.

Commissioner Brann couldn't say it but solitary confinement is torture and it does in fact exist in New York City jails. It just goes by another name. Punitive segregation, enhanced supervision housing and other classifications that don't have an official name at. People have been advocating not in an effort to end the term solitary but rather to end the inhumane practice and the lifetime of trauma solitary represents.

DOC is notorious for creating isolation units that have no directives or oversight. For example, people are routinely placed in what's termed deadlock. It is not a housing unit, it's not even used necessarily for disciplinary reasons, yet people are locked in their cells for 23, 24 hours a day.

2.

Not provided with any due process and completely denied all meaningful contact with others. Deadlock is a prime example why policies and reforms cannot target a specific term or housing unit.

DOC has and will continue to create nearly identical units using a different name. We must define solitary by the way people are treated and the restrictions they face. We must require that all people in DOC custody are treated with basic human dignity, starting with requiring all housing units or statuses to afford at minimum 14 hours out of cell with meaningful contact. It is the humane standard and anything less is restrictive and torturous.

This Committee and the Council have an opportunity to do something extraordinary by ending this horrific practice but despite the intent, unfortunately this bill as written does lack specificity and creates multiple loopholes, which based on experience we can expect the Department to use perpetuate harm against people in custody.

And just due to time, I direct you to my written testimony which is much more detailed with our concerns. And I will end with this, we absolutely can address safety without resorting to torture and

aiding in the trauma that is already present within the criminal legal system. We need not just the courage to say the words but the political will to ensure this torture ends.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

KELSEY DE AVILA: We urge you in the strongest possible terms to be leaders in ensuring an end to the torture in our City's jails. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Julia Solomons to testify followed by Kayla Simpson, then Sergio De La Pava.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

JULIA SOLOMONS: Thank you. Good morning Chair Powers and Committee Members. My name is Julia Solomons and I am a Criminal Defense Social Worker with the Bronx Defenders as well as a Member of the Jails Action Coalition.

While we are grateful to be speaking to you today, this hearing is one of many opportunities for public comment on the use of solitary confinement in recent years. Survivors of solitary have been reliving the trauma they have experienced for years now at public hearings as the Board of Correction deliberated about how to end this torturous practice.

J

2.3

It has taken the City too long to fix the broken disciplinary system in our jails. Lives have been lost because of that delay. We must ensure a true definitive end to solitary confinement immediately and for that reason, today we ask the City Council to adopt the amended version of Intro. 6908 submitted by the Jails Action Coalition and Solitary Campaign.

This would guarantee access to Council as a starting point for representation in disciplinary proceedings, require true out of cell time, making it impossible for the Department of Correction to create solitary confinement by another name and begin to shift the punitive mentality in jails that aims towards one of

We believe that the bill will not have its intended outcome as it is written currently. We strongly encourage the Council to amend the bill before passing it.

healing and rehabilitation.

DOC represented today that their disciplinary process is uncomplicated and working well and that's statement stands an unbelievably stark contract with our clients reports. People in custody currently have absolutely no true mechanism to meaningfully defend themselves before being placed in isolation.

2.2

2.3

We hear often that our clients spend days in punitive segregation without the opportunity to attend the hearing. In jurisdictions such as Washington DC and Massachusetts, access to Council in disciplinary hearings has been the standard practice for decades.

For those who have an attorney of record in an ongoing legal matter, that attorney must be notified 48 hours in advance of a hearing, so that they or a representative have a meaningful opportunity to attend the hearing. Before which the person cannot be placed in any form of restrictive housing. Our clients often report that they were never informed of their hearing in situations where DOC claimed that they refused the opportunity to attend and thus, any refusal must be video taped to ensure true access to due process.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

JULIA SOLOMONS: As others have shared, DOC repeatedly creates new housing units that are not labeled solitary but nonetheless continue to isolate and torture people.

As such, the bill must be specific in detailing the practices that are permitted when a person is

2.

/

convicted of an infraction. Offering people in custody critical support and engagement to address their mental and emotional needs is the only way we will actually rates of violence in our jails decrease and I would direct you to our written testimony as well for further comments. Thank you so much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would now like to welcome Kayla Simpson to testify followed by Sergio De La Pava then Mik Kinkead.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

KAYLA SIMPSON: Good afternoon. My name is Kayla Simpson, I am an Attorney at the Legal Aid Society's Prisoners' Rights Project. Thank you Chairman Powers, Public Advocate Williams, members and staff of the Committee for this opportunity to address human rights abuses in the City jails.

And we applaud Council Member Dromm's leadership, the Committee members, Public Advocate Williams for recognizing the enduring unnecessary harm that isolated confinement poses to the health and safety of New Yorkers in custody. But one of the things I think we have to take from the Correction Officers who testified today is that the Departments long standing fundamentally punitive attitude towards

_

people in custody does not work. It does not make anyone safe including them. Neither the Board of Corrections piecemeal rules about restrictive housing up to this point. There were years of reports from a federal Nunez monitor critiquing deep seated hostility the Department directs that the people incarcerates, nor the testimony of many survivors of solitary confinement have curved this reflexively punitive approach.

Instead, the Department has replaced the monolith of punitive segregation and solitary confinement with a plethora of alternative isolating measures imposed without the same due process, however imperfect is was for punitive segregation. And the names have changed, enhanced supervision housing, secure second chance solo, closed custody, MDC 9 South Separation Status, all of them are forms of isolation and deprivation with the potential for serious harm and there is no evidence that they actually address the issues of violence raised today.

And the Department will not solve this problem on its own, as is clear from their testimony today.

They don't believe they are even using solitary.

They are worried that due process protections will

_

result in complications to their ability to impose restrictions they want to impose. When they asked you for flexibility today, what they are asking for is discretion that history shows you they will use to default to isolation and deprivation.

That is the direction discretion goes in this

Department which is why clear standards in any bill

or regulation are essential.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

KAYLA SIMPSON: And we have given written testimony. I know my time is up. It is extensive there but I just want to reiterate the need for clarity in any bill that's passed to strengthen the goals that we know that this legislation intends. We look forward with you to working on that bill language. We appreciate you leadership which is what these times demand. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Sergio De La Pava to testify followed by Mik Kinkead.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

SERGIO DE LA PAVA: Thank you. Good afternoon, I am the Legal Director of New York County Defender Services and we thank you for the opportunity to be heard on such a critical issue.

I have testified here quite a few times on the various nuances and possible impacts of legislation being considered but never before has the proposed change carried such a clear ethical mandate. Our history is littered with discredited practices that we later look on with shame and wonder how a right thinking society could have encountered in such widespread harm to the powerless.

My 25 year career as a public defender has given me a close view of one such instance in mass incarceration. Today, we consider it a blay, a criminal justice world where Rikers averaged about 15,000 inmates to today's less than 5,000. What kind of social sickness had taken hold and powerfully victimized our most vulnerable citizens. We now feel shame about mass incarceration and are scrambling to rectify its severe injustices.

I predict that our current common place used of solitary confinement will likewise one day produce a similar phenomenon because we can use all the crafty euphemisms we like, administrative segregation, lockdown, punitive isolation, the hole, the ben. We cannot change the essence of what we are talking about today.

State sanctioned and state imposed psychological torture on individuals whose human rights have been stripped away by force. Our written testimony sets forth just some of the vast psychosocial and neuroscientific literature on the inherent cruelty of this illegitimate practice.

The studies confirm what we surely know intuitively. The intentional infliction of mental and psychological injuries like Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome, is deeply immoral. The only real solution is to immediately and entirely discontinue the practice.

Of course, I am moved by the account of officers who have been subjected to violence at penal institutions. It is always painful to contemplate human beings being intentionally harmful to each other and I understand the visceral desire for retribution but a society has to be more civilized in the worst acts of its citizens.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

SERGIO DE LA PAVA: Encountering physical with extreme and during psychological violence reduces the moral authority of our society. It is also ineffective.

We must ask ourselves what kind of individuals we want returning to our society for following incarceration. Do we want people who have been subject to psychological damage trying to reform their lives and contribute as members of society? I have spoken to many such people who decades later described battling disruptive symptoms stemming from even limited confinement.

So, any step in this bill is welcome but only a complete ban could match our moral imperative on this subject. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Mik Kinkead to testify.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

MIK KINKEAD: Thank you. My name is Mik Kinkead.

I use he, him pronouns. I am a White transgender man and an Attorney in New York City. Until the pandemic, I taught classes at RMSC twice a week rotating between the General Population Unit and the Special Consideration Unit, which is a unit at RMSC where transgender people are often housed. In particular transgender women.

This is the same place where Ms. Polanco was held. Where she was denied proper care. Where she

2.2

eventually died and then was laughed at by the Department of Corrections.

I am testifying today only in my individual capacity but I am an individual who both goes into the jails as a civilian and also could potentially one day be held in the City jails. And so, I am thinking about this from multiple different angles.

I fully support 217-32020 and the full ending of solitary confinement. It was promised by the Mayor in July. I had hearings where I testified last year before the Board of Corrections and I brought statements from at the time 6 incarcerated transgender women to talk about their experiences in any kind of restrictive housing.

So, we have mentioned the language game a few times but the issue of whether it is restrictive housing, protective custody which also is included here, solitary confinement or anything else that the Department chooses to call it. Any kind of separation, isolation and denial to access to meaningful services, is a form of torture.

I am really, I want to share what Council Member
Rivera said about the lack of preparation from the
Department of Corrections. The inability for them to

2.2

2.3

talk about the number of incidences of self-harm or suicide attempts was really unforgiveable knowing

4 that they had just recently had someone die on their

5 hands for who better work with medical could have

6 prevented such a death.

We also have heard from Council Member Holden that we haven't heard from the victims.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MIK KINKEAD: But you have heard from the victims because people who survive solitary confinement are victims. And those of us who then go onto work with folks who come home from solitary confinement in our neighborhoods, in our churches, wherever it is that we work with them, we also carry that secondary trauma that last for the rest of life. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I will now turn it over to questions from Chair Powers.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. A number of great testimonies, so I don't want to call anybody out by names to answer this question but you know, I think we heard a couple things just about legislation specifically and obviously the Board is considering this. They are going to be looking at these questions to around leaving definitions such that

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

practice and operations can undermine intention.

3 Does anyone want to speak a little bit more about

4 \parallel that, about that concern in terms of - I share, I

5 think we discussed earlier which is that we have

6 practices that are solitary confinement in name, I

7 mean maybe not in name but in practice. But I wanted

8 to just ask the question related to you know,

9 defining or writing, rulemaking or legislation such

10 that you leave gaps in the operations of the jails

11 | that would allow for continued practice that is

12 | contrary to the intention here.

I think some of the earlier folks who testified might be able to speak to that because I think they had raised it.

JULIA SIMPSON: I can speak to one example that I was going to include, which is just around out of cell time. So, we hear from clients frequently that officers will open the cells before dawn, sort of in the middle of the night to start out of cell time but without announcing themselves or waking up any of the incarcerated people and of course, they don't have alarm clocks or any mechanism to wake themselves up unless they are out of cell time is cut into significantly while they are still asleep.

2.

_

So, just when 4 hours is the stated rule, they may only actually get 1 hour or 2 hours. So, for that reason, we are pushing for 14 hours to guarantee that they actually get true out of cell time.

Wanted to add to that. I also would just ask on the disciplinary hearings for anybody that's worked in that area or has any sort of experience here, it feels like the process described is sort of fairly uncomplicated and somewhat self-explanatory to a person going through it. Does anybody have any experience related to that, that can share any feedback on those feelings that were shared by the Department of Corrections earlier?

KAYLA SIMPSON: Well, first I just wanted to address your first question also Council Member.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Sure, sure.

KAYLA SIMPSON: So, you know, one of the reasons that we have advocated for a definition, not just of punitive segregation or solitary but restrictive housing more broadly to be a functional one, not just what a unit is called or what the department says that the purpose is. Is because there are many, many units that don't even have names within the

/

department that are restrictive and are deprivations and I can give you one example of that. MDC9 South, I think I referenced it. It doesn't have a name like enhanced supervision housing. It is incredibly isolating. It is cell housing where the day room is just a bigger cage outside of each 2 cells.

So, you can't interact with anymore than one person, even in the time that you are locked out of your cell and what's really disturbing about that unit is that it houses primarily people who are excluded from punitive segregation because of evidence based reasons like mental health, because they have already been maxed out. The amount of time they could be in punitive segregation but the department views them as problematic, as a challenge and the way that they chose to address that challenge is to put them in that setting.

And there is no process to get in. There is no process to get out. People are just held there at infinite and we hear from them all the time and we also hear that there is a really heavy emergency services unit present there where they are subject to daily abuses. Like strip searches every time they even want to leave for a counsel visit.

_

So, it's really serious and when we advocate for a functional definition, that's why because we want to define restriction based on the experience of the person living there, not just what the department says that that unit is.

So I just wanted to -

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I think we agree with that which is visit practice not the name and I think even the debate over what we call stuff that we were having earlier, is sort of part of that debate. That you can call something anything you want but really what we care about is the standards and the practice of it.

Did anybody want to - did you want to add to the disciplinary part of that? I am sorry to interrupt you.

KAYLA SIMPSON: Oh, no, no, no, it's a welcome interruption. No, I think it's — the reason we are having a hard time answering this in some ways is because I do not thin it is uncomplicated. It might be uncomplicated for the entities seeking to impose restriction and I am sure that they would like to streamline that process and not present a lot of due process barriers that would pose difficulties and

3

4

5

6

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2 2.3

24

then being able to impose whatever restrictions they want to impose but I think it's complicated. people have a really hard time navigating it. directive is not easy to understand even for people who have law degrees and some of these units don't even have directives that govern any process.

And then the other thing I wanted to reference and make sure I hit on is, a lot of times we hear from people in custody that DOC staff are saying that they refused a hearing or they refused a medical visit or they refused a counsel visit when they weren't even offered those things. Or when they said, can you give me a minute and that was marked as a refusal. And so, that's one of the reasons in our written comments, we emphasize the importance of ensuring evidence of a meaningful refusal and that is not just that someone says they don't want to come but they have been instructed of the consequences if they don't come.

So, I think that's just one of many things that you know, and I don't think anyone should accept the role of a DOC hearing facilitator as the kind of advocate necessary to guide someone through this

complicated process. I don't think that those goals are aligned.

I don't know if anybody else wants to add.

SERGIO DE LA PAVA: I would just very briefly also like to add that you know, push back against this that some of the panelists need to create between the use of segregation and no consequences for criminal action behind bars. You know, the penal law is not suspended on Rikers Island. If an inmate commits a crime, they are charged with it and often charged with violent felonies and brought to court and face a lot more exposure to potential sentencing.

So, there is not this you know, kind of thought that you know, if you do away with these kind of practices, then suddenly there are no consequences for assaulting corrections officers, is plainly false.

KELSEY DE AVILA: Yeah and I would also like to add you know, I know the bill talks about having Counsel present or also expanding that to a legal advocate, a social worker or a paralegal. I know from BDS, we have experienced, it was mentioned that we had a young woman who she was told by a Correction Officer during a hearing, say, hey, look if you just

2.2

2.3

plead guilty, no big deal. You know, we won't give you red ID status but we will just give you a couple of days. We won't give you the full days of solitary. You know and she said okay and she plead guilty and DOC turned around and they filed charges against her and without an advocate, without someone there to be there with her, this may have had a different outcome. But also having an advocate council there, it also provides you know, some accountability on the Department to actually hold a hearing because like my colleague Kayla Simpson said, they are not happening.

I met with two people just this week via video who said they did not have a hearing and they have been in solitary for well over a week.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Got it, thank you. I am going to hand it over to Council Member Dromm who has his hand up and who has questions.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: There we go. Thank you very much. It's more of an observation. Thank you, you speak much more eloquently. These attorneys that have just spoken then I do. You know, I get emotional because I have had family members in

solitary and I know the negative consequences on people's lives and one of the last witnesses I believe spoke about protective custody as well. Can you explain for us why protective custody is solitary as well? Is our last witness, are you still with us?

I guess not, but anyway -

MIK KINKEAD: No, I am.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Oh okay, sorry.

MIK KINKEAD: Sorry, I wasn't able to unmute myself. Yeah, so the practice of protective custody where individuals are kept away from a general population and without the same level and intensity of access to programming and often having transferred jails. So, that means that they may have lost contact with whatever programming they were involved in has the same kinds of ongoing effects and has very little positive. I think one of the questions that was asked earlier, is there proof that solitary confinement helps to reduce acts of violence?

And I think likewise, we can ask the question of whether or not protective custody help to keep people safe. I worked with a young transgender woman who was immediately raped upon coming into protective custody. And so, no, it did not keep her safe and

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 the lack of actual having civilians in those areas.

3 The lack of having more ongoing access to outside

4 resources means that such as that can happen with

5 very little witnesses and very little consequences.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Great, I think that was it?

Okay, thank you Council Member. Thank you to all the folks here testifying and appreciate your comments and recommendations related to legislation. I know Council Member Dromm who has a bill appreciates those as well.

So, thank you and please continue to safe and healthy. We will call our next panel. Thanks.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Janos Marton to testify.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: I think we have to unmute Janos here. There he is.

JANOS MARTON: There we go. Thank you all so much. So, my name is Janos Marton and I am a Civil Rights Attorney running for Manhattan DA and I am really happy to be here for this important conversation. I thank all my colleagues who have testified and thank especially Chairman Powers for

2.2

2.3

putting this together and to Council Member Danny

Dromm who has been such an outspoken leader on

conditions on Rikers. Prior to my current run for

DA, I ran the Close Rikers Campaign 2016 and 2018 and

Council Member Dromm was the first Council Member to

publicly call for the closure of Rikers and has been

on this beat for a long time.

reformed instead of closed.

It was during that campaign that I was able to visit the units that we are talking about today and it was part of the Mayor's tour of Rikers, the advocates, suggesting that maybe Rikers could be

I have to say that that tour did more to assure me that we need to close Rikers and that in fact today's conversation has assured all of us, I would hope that we need to close Rikers faster not slower and it was seeing these units that definitely put me over the top. There is no way to do solitary in a humane way. These units were some of most dreadful places I have ever seen in my life. I would certainly not have the composure to last there more than a couple of days let alone weeks and what Council Member Levin alluded to earlier is absolutely correct. That even the common out of cell areas in

these units are equally bleak. They are tiny, cramped, winded, you know air and light and hardly better than the place where people are trapped for the most part.

So, I think it's important to remember when we get lost in these clinical conversation about number of hours and processes that when an ideas moral time has come, we just need to move forward with it as a City and then work on policies from there. I think we have long come to the conclusion as a City that solitary confinement is not in line with our values as New Yorkers and it is time to do something clean and simple, like pass Council Member Dromm's legislation.

I have also as DA that I will not prosecute anyone being tortured under solitary but I hope that my policies are rendered unnecessary because of the work of the City Council or the Board of Correction which ever does it work quickest. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. I appreciate your testimony. Thank you for waiting as well. I know this has been a long hearing and your work on the Close Rikers Campaign which was important and historical to organize around that. So, thank you

2.2

2.3

2 for being here and thank you for waiting through 3 this.

I am going to have the Committee Counsel call the next panel and just call a few names at a time, just so people have an opportunity to know when they are coming up.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Jennifer Parish to testify followed by Darren Mack then Zachary Katznelson.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

JENNIFER PARISH: Good afternoon. Thank you

Council Member Dromm for putting forth a plan for
ending solitary confinement. In the last five years
we have learned much about the challenges of bringing
about meaningful change to DOC practices. After the
Board of Correction adopted rules prohibiting the use
of solitary for 16 to 21 year old's. DOC developed
other forms of restrictive, degrading, dehumanizing
units. For example, they place young adults in a
restrictive unit where they are shackled and
restraint at desks for the 7 hours they are allowed
out of their cell.

Because of this and other efforts to circumvent meaningful change. The Council's legislation must

2.2

2.3

clearly define what is prohibited and what is required. For this bill to succeed, we need some essential revisions identified by the Solitary Campaign and the Jails Action Coalition. In particular, its essential that DOC not be allowed to restrict out of cell time in any units created to separate individuals. Limiting out of cell time creates a punitive environment and we know that punishment doesn't work. The Correction Officers union objects to ending solitary confinement because it is a tool they believe they need to ensure order in the facility and punish those who engage in violent conduct.

This objection is coming from a workforce and department that have perpetuated a culture of brutality within the jail for decades. Despite being under a court order to reduce excessive use of force brutality has only increased. The federal monitor attributes this hyper confrontational staff behaviors and overreliance on jail riot squads. Clearly the punitive approach is not working. In fact, Dr. James Gilligan who researches violence has written far from preventing violence punishment is the most powerful

2.2

2.3

stimulus to violent behavior that we have yet

3 discovered.

This Council's legislation must require a new approach in talking about the solitary reforms that Colorado has implemented, advocates with lived experience of solitary who have observed those units there and talked to incarcerated people —

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

JENNIFER PARISH: Comment on the way Correction staff interact with incarcerated people. The respect they showed people, not inmates, addressing them by name, recognizing their humanity. They have not only limited the use of solitary but transformed culture. That's what we need here. This bill can be the beginning of addressing the most egregious DOC practices and fully implementing it will require the Department to move away from the punishment paradigm and begin treating people in custody, even those who are engaging in problematic behavior with dignity and respect. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would now like to welcome

Darren Mack to testify followed by Zachary Katznelson
then Scott Paltrowitz.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

2.2

DARREN MACK: Thank you so much everyone. Thank
you so much City Council Members. City Council
Member Powers for putting together and Council Member
Dromm for your years of work on this issue.

My name is Darren Mack, I am a Co-Director of Freedom Agenda, which is a member led project dedicated to organizing people and communities impacted by incarceration to achieve decarceration and system transformation.

I am also a survivor of Rikers Island and solitary confinement. In the words of Nelsen Mandela, a nation should not be judged by how it treats its highest citizen but its lowest ones.

We are not here today because DOC or COBA brought this issue to the table. It was advocates, directly impacted people and their allies who raised the issue of solitary confinement and other issues to end the torture and brutality of this system which Bryan Stevenson brutally stated treat you better if you are rich and guilty than if you are poor and innocent.

There is one thing that COBA union president said himself that I agree with and that is DOC is a mess and COBA hired agents of this mess who has

2.

J

2.2

2.3

perpetuated this violence with its code of silence over the abuses of incarcerated people.

My experience in solitary confinement, walking into the unit, I observed one cell which was the only cell covered in plexiglass. The plexiglass was smeared with so much feces from the inside, you could barely see the person in the cell. Clearly there was a person experiencing serious mental health issues in that cell.

People with serious mental health issues in solitary confinement was a normal practice by DOC. A few months ago, I participated in advocating for the in the solitary confinement and I heard Kate Andirshel[SP?], Founder and Executive Director of GLITZ[SP?]. A transgender woman describe how transgender women are subjected to solitary confinement —

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

DARREN MACK: To effectively end solitary, there should be no carve outs. Every incarcerated person must have a minimum of 14 hours out of the cell in light of the current minimum standard of people in jail to generate.

J

Lastly, I encourage the City Council to support and pass legislation with the highest standards which is reflected in the blueprint but end this solitary confinement in New York City jails submitted by the New York City Jails Action Coalition and the HALT Solitary Campaign. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would now like to welcome Zachary Katznelson to testify followed by Scott Paltrowitz and then Minister Dr. Victoria Phillips.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ZACHARY KATZNELSON: Good afternoon. I am
Zachary Katznelson, Policy Director at the Lippman
Commission. Thanks for the chance to testify. We
are very appreciative that alongside the Board of
Corrections, City Council is tackling solitary.
Everyone's attention to this issue is critical. We
need consensus to ensure that whatever follows after
solitary is fully and faithfully implemented.

I have worked for 20 years in jails and prisons.

During that time, I met with hundreds and hundreds of people in solitary. I have seen the damage it inflicts. It breaks people and there are much better, smarter, more humane ways to hold people accountable and reduce violence.

2.

2.2

Solitary in all its forms with the answer to violence in our jails, it would remarkably safe places already. But of course unfortunately that's not the case at all. Please remember also that when the Nunez case started, almost a decade ago, 2011, the jails were already marked then by levels of violence so egregious that they violated the US Constitution.

So, violence has not been low at Rikers for a long, long time. Maybe not ever and if changes to solitary were to blame, recent changes in the last few years. If that were the problem then we would see similar spikes in violence, similar rise in violence in Chicago and Colorado and other places that have taken on these same type of reforms but there, the levels of violence have dropped significantly when solitary has been restricted.

Because it seems like the real problem here is how our jails, New York City jails, are operated and run, how they managed. And so, while we absolutely believe that solitary needs to be tackled, this is critical. This is one piece of the puzzle and that what we really need is for everybody to look at how the Department is run. Can we think of a way as

people said out of this mess because it is unacceptable that it continues, it can't wait for Rikers to be closed and as we all know, changing what's on paper will not actually change what happens on the ground. We have got to change mindset and with real accountability. Thank you so much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Scott Paltrowitz to testify followed by Minister Dr. Victoria Phillips then Daniele Gerard.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

SCOTT PALTROWITZ: Thank you for the opportunity to testify and thank you Council Member Dromm for being a longstanding champion for ending solitary confinement. Let us be clear, what we are talking about today is a systematic government program of torture that is predominantly inflicted on Black and Brown New Yorkers and too often transgender and gender nonconforming people.

And this system of torture has been going on for years and decades in full and plain view that we are all aware of. It is a system that has damaged and destroyed countless minds and bodies that has increased violence and harm in jails and in our

outside communities and has directly caused the deaths of far too many people.

Solitary causes people to engage in selfmutilation. It causes heart disease, it causes
anxiety, depression, psychosis. It leads people to
deteriorate mentally, physically, behaviorally. It
makes jails and outside communities less safe.
Solitary confinement should have ended so long ago.
It must end now and it must fully end.

Let us also be clear that when we are talking about people incarcerated in New York City jails, we are speaking about human beings. Again, mostly Black and Brown and poor people being forcibly removed from their families, their jobs, their neighborhoods, their communities, their loved ones. We are speaking about human beings even a part from solitary confinement being put in cages and boxes, subject to brutality and strip searches and a system that attempts to strip them of their agency and their humanity. Which is why it is so imperative that at the very least to effectively end solitary confinement, the basic minimum standards that already apply to people generally in the City jails must apply to everyone in the City jails.

2.

Those minimum standards that already exist, say that people should have access to at least 14 hours out of cell per day. And so, as long as people are held in New York City's jails, that standard must apply to all people in City jails. There must be no carve outs to this basic minimum standard.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

SCOTT PALTROWITZ: And there should be no loopholes that provide the opportunity to place people in what amounts to solitary by another name.

I know I am out of time but I just would say that the City Council has an historic opportunity. This is a moment where you as law makers have the opportunity to rise to the occasion, do what is right and finally and fully end this practice that has destroyed far too many minds and taken far too many lives. An opportunity like this may not come along for a long time, so I urge you, I appeal you to marshal your best selves and to do what is right. End solitary now and end it fully. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would now like to welcome
Minister Dr. Victoria Phillips to testify followed by
Daniele Gerard then Anthony Dixon.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

MINISTER DR. VICTORIA PHILLIPS: Peace and blessings everyone. I am Dr. Phillips; everyone knows me as Ms. V. and I have been a long standing member of the Jails Action Coalition because of what I directly witnessed while working behind the Correction walls. And I have been working behind the walls of Rikers and DOC facilities for at least the last decade in various different positions. My last time physically being on Rikers was in March doing monitoring for Brad H.

So, let me clear, having worked in nursing and mental health and criminal league system for over 20 years, in various different situations, I know how to address or respond to all populations in society without creating harm. And I just want to point out some things today.

Commissioner Brann said over 14,000 cameras are on the Island right now but no one asked her how many are working or how many cover all the blind spots.

Please find that data out.

She also mentioned 28 or 29 days to change a behavior. Yeah, it's been about five years of Nunez reports coming in and DOC has yet to change their

culture or their behavior. Please hold them accountable for that.

She also mentioned that one of the most dangerous populations is the young adults yet being on the advisory board for the Department of Corrections, adolescents and young adults and the adults for at least the past six and a half years, I know for a fact Commissioner Brann has never met with us. I have even asked DOC directly for her to attend the meetings and I know for a fact that DOC has never outreached any of us on that Board this entire year on pandemic.

So, hold her accountable because that's the most dangerous population. Why is she not reaching out to the Advisory Board to push things further and make things happen?

I also want to point out that Chief Jennings has also testified to BOC that 40 PPE masks are brought to each unit but many units have 48 to 49 people, so how is everyone being protected during this COVID pandemic? Make it make sense.

I also want to point out, last year 911 received over 200,000 calls concerning mental health crisis.

DOC has a population right now of over 50 percent of people in their custody who have had a mental -

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MINISTER DR. VICTORIA PHILLIPS: Contact with a mental health professional. Follow up on that because many of those people end up in solitary confinement because of the lack of training around DOC officers to understand when someone is decompensating or needing medical attention. There is so much more I can say. People are missing medications, missing their appointments. DOC, even the Board of Corrections is losing their funding and losing their staff to follow up with what DOC is doing. Make sure you pass a bill, pass a law, free of all loopholes that will hold them accountable.

Council Member Dromm, I have been riding with you since we released the youth for 16 to 21 year old's. Everyone is saying this is rushed, this is not rushed. I respect it. I thank you for bringing this bill. I thank you for holding DOC and COBA accountable and I am going to stand with you as long as your mission does not change and that you agree to end torture. You all stay blessed.

3

4

J

6

7

a

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Daniele Gerard to testified followed by Anthony Dixon, then Corey Brinson.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

DANIELE GERARD: Council Member Powers, committee members, I am Daniele Gerard, a Senior Staff Attorney at Children's Rights. Since 1995, Children's Rights has been a national advocate for youth and state systems. We remain deeply concerned with the current bills omission of safeguards for young adults. Solitary confinement is torture. It should be abolished outright, no matter the euphemism. As a member of the New York City Jails Action Coalition, Children's Rights supports the coalition and HALT Solitary campaigns blueprint to end this barbaric practice. We have several specific concerns with the bill first. No one incarcerated in New York City's jails should have less than 14 hours out of cell time per day. Young adults should never be placed in any form of restrictive housing, not enhanced supervision housing, not secure unit, not separation status housing.

Second, the bill allows incarcerated persons to remain in restrictive housing for 15 days at a time

2.2

and up to 4 months in a year. This does not abolish solitary confinement but codified it into law.

Third, for any separation from the general jail population, there must be narrowly defined criteria for what conduct can result in placement into isolation, restrictive housing and emergency lock in. There must be specific uniform due process and procedural safeguards including access to council. This is particularly true for the separation of young adults for de-escalation purposes.

Fourth, all Department of Correction personnel, not just staff in restrictive housing units should be trained in de-escalation techniques, conflict resolution, use of force and related topics to address the needs of all incarcerated persons, including young adults, especially given that more than half of incarcerated persons have symptoms of mental illness.

We urge the Committee to reinstate the 14 hours minimum out of cell time. Provide uniform and adequate due process provisions and narrowly define terms like emergency lock in to avoid their arbitrary use to perpetuate solitary confinement. People incarcerated in New York City jails —

2.2

2.3

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

DANIELE GERARD: And if I could just add one sentence, I think we all know the definition of insanity, continuing to do the same thing expecting a different outcome and unfortunately, this is what is going on on Rikers and in the City jails today.

Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would now like to welcome Anthony Dixon to testify followed by Corey Brinson, then Eliel Cruz.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ANTHONY DIXON: Honorable members of this

Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify
on the Civil Rights issue of our day. I am the

Director of Community Engagement at the Parole

Preparation Project. I am tasked with the

responsibility to interface with policy makers on

punitive incarceration bill, train attorney's to

prepare individuals for successful parole interviews

and help individuals released from incarceration make

a successful transition.

Without deconstructing the term punitive segregation, solitary confinement can be summarized as having three components. A racial component in

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

the era of Black Lives Matter, solitary confinement cannot be divorced from this discussion.

A recent investigation found that generally non-White incarcerated people are punished twice as often as Whites, placing solitary confinement twice as often and are held there for longer periods of time. And they are also subject to the use of brutal force by Correctional guards.

Analysts to the punitive paradigm in our legal system, there is a racial bias in the practice of solitary confinement when it comes to people of color in correctional settings. Consistent with that finding, it appears that when Black people commit violent acts, they are demonized as thugs, sociopaths and placed in isolated dog like cages and given drugs. When Whites commit violent acts, they are deemed sick and in need of therapy.

An economic component, it is common knowledge that traditionally solitary confinement environments are seen as economically viable. With the prospect of prison guards and prison unions, a lockdown environment —

8

16

17

14

15

18 19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

ANTHONY DIXON: Is a perfect cash flow for working labor. I would lastly say that mounting studies show that solitary confinement leaves people worse, more hostile than how they entered. I would ask that this Committee at this day and time, look at the evidence that solitary confinement has no proof to curve violence. No proof that it addresses the underlying issues and no proof that it can help someone become prosocial and that dogs are given more time out of their setting and treated better than human beings are treated inside our facilities. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Corey Brinson to testify followed by Eliel Cruz then Mateo Guerrero.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COREY BRINSON: Hello, my name is Corey Brinson. I am a Policy Associate with the Legal Action Center. The Legal Action Center uses legal and policy strategies to fight discrimination, build health equity and restore opportunity for people with arrests and conviction records, substance use disorders and HIV or AIDs.

I am testifying in favor of eliminating the practice of solitary confinement in New York City jails. I have endured difficult times in my lifetime. I have endured the high crime out of city neighborhood, was stationed in Saudi Arabia with the United States Airforce on September 11, 2001 and I reacted to the alarms indicating that we were at war.

But the most difficult experience I have ever endured is being held in solitary confinement for several days. That experience of living in a cell, which was a size of a large closet, with no clock, lights that went off at midnight, no privacy for sleeping, showering and being fed through a slot in my door, was psychological torture.

It would tell a lot about a country by how it treats the people incarcerated. Placing people in solitary confinement for any extended period of time, is immoral, unethical and should be unlawful. People need meaningful social interactions with other people to maintain their mental health. People in prison already isolated from society, isolated from the communities and their families and when they are placed in solitary confinement, they are essentially buried alive.

Placing people in that setting says more about us as a society, as lawmakers, as community then what it says about the people behind those walls. I acknowledge that we have made strides to reduce the number of people being subjected to this practice but one person in solitary confinement is one too many.

In this law, we treat animals better than people in prison. Under New York Law Section 356, a person who has impounded or confined an animal and refuses to provide that animal with a good supply of wholesome [LOST AUDIO 3:59:35] by prison.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COREY BRINSON: [LOST AUDIO 3:59:40- 3:59:49] a day. We cannot count this a law that treats people worse than they treat animals. Solitary confinement does just that for too many people.

There is an argument that this bill is moving too fast through the legislative process. For people who are cut off from any meaningful for other people, this bill is already too late. The Legal Action Center encourages you to immediately end solitary confinement in New York City jails.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Eliel Cruz to testify followed by Mateo Guerrero.

2.2

2.3

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ELIEL CRUZ: Good afternoon Chair Powers and the entire Committee on Criminal Justice. My name is Eliel Cruz, I am the Director of Communications at the New York City Anti-Violence Project. I am here to urge you all to end solitary confinement for all. Without any carve outs with a minimum of 14 hours outside of cell time.

I have some longer written testimony that I will submit but for today, I would like to get this across. Solitary confinement is torture. You will hear this repeated again and again because it causes human suffering, it causes devastating and irreparable mental, physical and emotional harm. And those facing the brunt of this violence are Black, Latinx, transgender and gender non-conforming people. These are the facts but today I really want to urge you to listen to the survivors in solitary confinement in the victims families. Really sit with the pain in their voices as you listen to their experiences.

For over the last year, I have worked in my professional capacity to support the family of Layleen Polanco and telling her story on the national

stage. I combed through every egregious detail of
her arrest, incarceration and death. I have watched
footage of Correctional Officers pass by the cell
without adequately checking for signs of life. And I
have pride over watching them open her cell doors and
hunch over in laughter just moments before she was
pronounced dead. No one deserves that. To be
isolated and ignored, that is not a humane treatment
of a fellow human being and jails routinely use
solitary confinement under the guys of protective
custody for trans people. But isolation is not
safety, it's violence. Even the transgender housing
unit which Layleen was in, separating survivors is
violent when community isn't safety outside of jails
and it is not safety inside of jail.

If it doesn't end now fully, I am certain we will all be back here in a few years, wishing we had acted sooner. The Council has the opportunity to make history today. It is time to end solitary confinement. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Mateo Guerrero to testify.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

2.

2.2

2.3

MATEO GUERRERO: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Mateo, the TGNCIQ Lead Organizer at Make the Road. I am a transgender man but today I am here to read the testimony from Norma Retto[SP?] who is one of our members.

So, she says, Good morning. Thanks to all the City Council Members for holding this hearing. My name is Norma Retto, I am a leader with the Trans

Immigrant Project at Make the Road New York. I am here to share my experience in the mistreatment that happened to me and to many of us as transgender communities when we are put in solitary confinement.

And on the importance of eliminating this practices of torture without any carve outs in our city.

In 2015, I was unjustly arrested and transferred to Rikers Island where I was put in the men's jail and later I was put in solitary confinement completely separated from the population. The excuse that they said to me is that in order to protect me they had to put me away from other people because I had breast and I had a feminine figure.

However, the reality that instead of protecting me, they traumatized me and this is a form of state

2.2

2.3

violence. They locked me out for all day and for
weeks on a schedule that was almost 24/7 in a very

small cell that looked like a hole.

The cell was very cold and it was a punishment cell. The treatment was completely inhumane. I told them that I didn't want to be there. I begged them to take me out of the cells but they never listen me. It was as if I didn't exist.

Even when I asked them for medical attention, they never listened to me. They never gave me my hormonal treatment or respected my gender identity. What the officers would do was make fun of me all day long. There also did not let me call my family members or the LGBTQ organization. This form of isolation was not only physical but it was also mental and emotional.

This mistreatment and form of violence has caused many consequences on my body and when I was picked up by ICE and transferred to a detention center, my health worsened and I ended up in the hospital with pneumonia.

My story is not the only one here. I made it out alive.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

2.2

2.3

MATEO GUERRERO: Layleen Polanco was a Latina transwoman who died in solitary confinement while being mocked by police officers. It is time for New York City to completely eliminate these practices of torture and solitary confinement without creating any exceptions or carve outs. And we need to make sure that stories like mine and Layleen's stories do not happen again. We need to protect trans and queer communities. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Sammie Werkheiser to testify followed by Kelly Grace Price then Natasha White.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

SAMMIE WERKHEISER: Layleen Polanco, Layleen
Polanco, Layleen Polanco, Layleen Polanco, that's
Melania's sister. Layleen Polanco. I apologize
Melania on behalf of all human beings who care that
those Correction Officers who laughed about your
sister. I apologize for them. I apologize for them
as a human being and I think you should have been the
first person to testify today.

Melania is here today. Since Commissioner does not consider solitary torture, please Ms.

Commissioner, I am asking for you to prove that

2.2

2.3

theory. I demand this year from December 23 to the 30th for you and your entire family to house in solitary or punitive segregation, the cute little politically correct name all of you seem to use to make it sound better.

Mid-week, I request a Zoom live for you to check in your family and see how they are doing, see what's up with their wellbeing. Ms. Commissioner, I just really look forward to this project.

For the Council, for anyone watching, if you see solitary confinement as a Black problem, look at me. It is a human problem. I am hoping that I look like your niece. I am hoping that you pay attention.

For the Corrections Officers who complain about getting hurt, my solution to that, don't be a Corrections Officer. Also, to this Council, stop referring to people as inmates. They are just as impacted or incarcerated men and women.

My name is Sammie Werkheiser, I am a member of the Justice for Women Task Force, a Speaker for New York Campaign for Alternative to Isolated Confinement and an advocate for citizen action of Southern Tier New York Chapter. A Member of the NAACP and a Member of the Human Rights Campaign.

I did a total of 54 months of incarceration.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

SAMMIE WERKHEISER: [LOST AUDIO 4:07:28] in my incarceration. Now, now, I will have you know there are lots of vacancies at my hotel tonight. I didn't get it. What hotel was this captain speaking of?

Then I got it, he was referring to the segregated housing unit. The acronym for SHU or S-H-U. If the extent of your knowledge of hard time is a few viewings of Shashank Redemption, then you may have thought it was spelled S-H-O-E but no, now you know.

Anyways, that captain was joking of course but what stuck with me more was his jovial lackadaisical attitude. And almost pleasure throwing another incarcerated woman into SHU. He was making jokes. Friends, I did a total of 8 months in solitary. I tell people, think of your worst enemy. In your mind, place them in a cell the size of VW Beetle.

Okay, now, after four days of knowing that your worst enemy is still in the cell, probably you might peek around the corner to check to make sure that that enemy is you know, kind of alive and what not.

Well, that little check in exists because you are not evil. Maybe you want your worst enemy to suffer

J

a little bit but I ask you, do you want that person to die? I feel like you don't. While in solitary, due to being placed in protective custody, I gave birth to my daughter at five months pregnant. Her twin brother survived but she lived only 22 minutes on my chest.

I am asking you not as a formerly incarcerated person but as a human being, please completely and totally eradicate solitary confinement. I survived solitary but these little footprints, my baby girl, Decenterain[SP?] did not.

Please put people in counseling. Let them heal.

Use open dorm settings for the naughty kids. Put my incarcerated brothers and sisters in group therapy, painting classes, let them listen to music while they are blowing bubbles and let the puppies behind bars visit them.

This will heal our people. They can become better, not just bitter. Now, New York is a leader, you have all the power. I am not on the New York City Council but you are. It is Christmas, you can give the gift of humanity by changing policy. Even the Corrections Officers are traumatized by this

practice. They have guilt. They are telling you this.

Stop solitary now and lastly, I want to give the Commissioner this crayon and this coloring sheet.

This concludes my testimony.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Per request of Chair Powers, we are actually going to ask Melania Brown to testify now if you are ready.

Want to, I agree and I apologize that if I know that Ms. Brown was here, I would have had her testify at the beginning of the hearing to talk about her sister Layleen Polanco, which is the large reason why we are here today and why myself and the speaker called for action last year at the Board because of what we saw as the continued harmful practices where you lose site of individuals when you don't have, when you put them into restricted housing and you lose very critical attention services and socialization.

So, I just want to apologize because that's an hour and we should have had Melania spoke at the beginning but I am glad she is here and I am glad to offer her — to get her the opportunity now.

So, with that we will offer an opportunity here to testify.

MELANIA BROWN: Thank you so much guys for having me. I truly appreciate the space. My name is Melania Brown, my sister Layleen Polanco, she passed away last year in solitary confinement while being held in Rikers Island.

I am putting this picture up, so you guys can really look at the pain that I am left with. I use to once hold my sister in my hands and now I carry around her ashes. I became so crazy with it that I carry her with me to every family function, even for Thanksgiving she came with me all the way to North Carolina.

I refuse to let my sister go and for Danny, I hope you are listening. You are making a scene like your Correctional Officers are victim, but have you ever heard that a riot is the language of the unheard? How long do you think you are going to continue; you guys are going to continue to hurt individuals? Correctional Officers are going to continue to get away with what they do and think that people are not going to react to it. Think that they are going to just lay there and continue to die, get

2.2

2.3

O 1

abused, get raped, get thrown in there simply for their gender identity.

My sister wasn't violent. I am going to go back,
I had a whole speech written down but after hearing a
lot of the people talk, saying that they only throw
people in there that are violent. My sister wasn't
violent. My sister was placed there simply for her
gender identity, that was it. It wasn't because she
was violent okay. So please rephrase that when you
do address the public, okay. You guys use solitary
confinement to your own advantage.

If someone is not listening to you, if someone doesn't go throw out the garbage on time, you throw them in solitary confinement. Solitary confinement is pure torture and it needs to end. Please, I really want to know, what do you guys think you get out of it? You throw humans in solitary confinement; they are alone all day and then you think you can le them out to society. Even to the own prison and think that they are going to be mentally okay?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MELANIA BROWN: To continue to carry on through the day. No, it does not work like that and no, my time is not up. I am going to continue to talk and I

2.2

2.3

2 want you guys to listen to me. My sister died.

3 Those Correctional Officers only got a vacation okay.

4 My sister is dead. I walk around with my sister

5 around and chained of ashes with her ashes in it. It

6 is not okay.

How many other people got to suffer? How many other people go to go through what they go through? How many other families got to face this painful life sentence that I am facing? These Correctional Officers, they come and testify today and they stand and they say what happened to them but can we hear what you did to them. Can we hear what you did to these individuals in prison? Come on, let's not play victim here. My sister was a victim. My sister wasn't violent. My sister was 5'2. She was not violent. We owe the world, the whole world seen how they opened that cell and laughed at her while she was dying.

That's inhumane, yet you sit here Danny and you tell me that your Correctional Officers are not wrong. You sit here and say that nobody is paying attention to them. What about my sister? What about all the other humans in the world that right now, they are losing a family member or a family member

)

passed? What about individuals right now banging their head on the wall because they can't get out of that box?

You can't even throw an animal in a box and expect that animal to come out and be okay. Oh, I learned my lesson. It does not work like that. That causes further mental issues. You guys need to get it together because as long as you guys don't see what you are doing and how you are hurting the world and hurting these individuals because you hurt in the world. When you treat people the way you treat them and throw them in solitary confinement and then release them to the world, the world gets hurt and then they are set up to end up right back into the money making system.

Because that's what it is. It is just a chain.

It's a chain. These are not, again, these are not chickens, these are not animals you guys to have in there. These are human beings. Place yourself, I want all of you right now that said, Danny, you number one. I want you to go home and go in your closet and please do me the favor of sitting there for 20 hours okay, alone. A matter of fact make it 23 alone, okay. Have your wife or your children

2.2

bring your food okay to your closet and give it to you like you are an animal and then walk away and lock you again for another 23 hours.

Now you tell me mentally how you are going to come out of that? Okay, my sister did not deserve this and I am going to continue to fight and I am going to continue to push forward and I am not going to give up. I am not and that was not a threat at all. It is a promise that I am going to stand grounded and I am going to make sure my sister gets the justice that she deserves. My sister is the prime example of the torture that goes on in solitary confinement. She won the highest lawsuit okay, in New York City which clearly, it states that you guys were wrong okay.

Enough is enough. Enough is enough. Enough is enough. You guys need to end this now. Please do not have another family member suffer the way I am suffering. I can't sleep, I see my sister in my dreams. I want to hold her; I can't catch her. It is not okay. You guys need to end this. How about if it was your family member? How about if you, that picture right there was your sibling you are holding in hands? Someone that you was born with. Someone

that you are used to talking to every day. Someone that you told your deepest secrets to and then you get a call that she was treated like an animal, less than an animal and guards watched her die.

You know how hard it was for me to watch that video of those guards laughing at my sister when they could have went in there and helped her. But you tell me that these Correctional Officers, they need to be protected. Protected, no, they need to be thrown in solitary confinement as well. They need to get locked up. They need to go to jail. These are real criminals okay. Real criminals are the ones that kick those that cannot defend themselves. They cannot defend — they are in there defensive. They cannot defend themselves. Those are real criminals.

You go in there, you know you got a little power, you walk around with a little stick and a little taser, whatever they give you and you think you are boss. You are walking through these cells hurting people. You are the real criminal. You deserve to be in jail. You deserve to be in solitary confinement, you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you and I just want to add, I can't even imagine what your family has been

2.2

2.3

going through but that's a reason we are here today and I think the Board should have taken this up last year when we had asked them to and we are acting here as a Council to be responsive to that and make sure there is no more loss of life. And I want to acknowledge, I mean, I know I think, some of the comments are aimed at Council Member Dromm but just for the correction here that he is the sponsor of the bill here and I know cares deeply about this issue as well and Council Member Dromm, I see your hand up. I don't know if you wanted to add in a comment or question as well.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I just think Melania meant somebody else not me. I am hoping because I am on the other side of the issue, I am with you. I am with you 100 percent and I have been fighting for Layleen for you know for a long period of time. So, I am hoping it was another Council Member.

MELANIA BROWN: I am sorry, I am not talking about you. Hold on, hold on, I am going to tell you exactly who I am talking about. I am sorry Danny, not you. I am talking about Benny, Benny Boscio.

2.2

2.3

Whatever his name is. That's who I am talking about,
I am sorry, not you.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. I think we all knew that Danny was not the intended person but we, and we appreciate his efforts here and thank you for your testimony and I apologize again. I wish we would have had you gone earlier because I know how important your story is and it is powerful and your testimonies are powerful. I apologize, we should have done that earlier but thank you.

We are going to I think call on the next person to testify as well, the next group.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes, I would like to now welcome Kelly Grace Price to testify followed by Natasha White then Victor Herrera.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

KELLY GRACE PRICE: Hi, my name is Kelly Grace

Price and I would like to thank you for Melania for

your testimony. I wish that I had an advocate like

you in my family that fought for me. I want to thank

you for your testimony. I am sorry, I don't usually

lose my composure.

I want to talk to you today about the reporting requirements in Intro. Number 2173. I have already

2.2

2.3

submitted my written testimony which is efficacious and includes my usual data analysis of current solitary and punitive conditions for women on Rosie's. I briefly go on to elucidate a second point where I discuss lessons learned from past DOC restrictive housing rulemaking and City Council legislative attempts at DOC oversight, rough Local Law 21. And then I also add some further suggested reporting requirements for Intro. Number 2173. I absolutely agree with Kelsey and with other advocates who have explained that the DOC will do absolutely everything to dodge reporting requirements and to fudge transparency.

The number one example that I discuss in my testimony Council Member Rosenthal brought up this morning and what she was referring to was a report that I produced to the Board of Correction in December of 29 and I refer to in my testimony that elucidates that the Department had been fudging comingling data for about four or five years.

They were only counting people in co-mingled units that were youth placed in adult units. They were not counting co-mingle units that were adults placed in youth units. And I brought this up in my

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

NATASHA WHITE: Good afternoon. My name is

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

Natasha White and a I am a member of Freedom Agenda

testimony and Councilwoman Rosenthal was right to bring it up because this is the kind of dog and pony show that we always are faced with when we get data.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

KELLY GRACE PRICE: I would like you to pay very careful attention to my testimony. I would also like, please be very careful when you are asking for the Department to report on 4 hours or more in solitary. You are going to get the Department putting people in solitary or solitary like conditions for 3 hours and 50 minutes, removing them for 5 minutes into the hallway and then replacing them again.

So, please be very careful about your reporting requirements and make them sufficiently broad so that there can be no funny business. Again, I have submitted my testimony already, my written testimony and I thank you for allowing me to testify.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Natasha White to testify followed by Victor Herrera then Andrea Bowen.

J

0.4

and a Former Leader in the Close Rikers Campaign. It would like to first thank Council Member Dromm,

Council Member Powers and the Sponsors of this bill for stepping in to make sure New York City actually ends solitary confinement, also known as segregated housing months after the Mayor's promise.

Since last week, winter and before, people have been joining Board of Corrections meetings to tell them about their experiences in solitary confinement. The Board said they are committed to ending solitary but New York City is still subjecting people to that torture. It s beyond time that this Board vote to end solitary confinement and implement the blueprint developed by the Jails Action Coalition and the CAIC.

Today, I want to remind you that solitary confinement is torture and has long term mental effects. I am not only a survivor of solitary but also a woman who had to deal with what solitary confinement can do to our loved ones.

Jails and prisons justify solitary confinement by saying it is supposed to teach you something. It is used as punishment for breaking the rules of prison or for getting on an officers bad side. However,

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

when a person goes into solitary, remember they are handcuffed and transported with nothing.

No books, paper, pen, or anything else for that They are likely in a cell with no windows, no sunlight. The door has no windows, so you cannot see anyone that is passing. No outside interactions, phone calls, basically you have put a person in a metal box.

Every hour and every day in that box, you hear the same sounds and smell the same smells. There is nothing corrective or rehabilitating about that kind of isolation.

The effects of solitary confinement also reach outside the prison walls. In December of 2018, my husband was released after serving a 20 year sentence. 12 years of which he served in solitary confinement. The only thing solitary taught my husband was how to live alone in isolation and it did long term damage. For a man who had read more than 2,000 books.

Time expired. SERGEANT AT ARMS:

NATASHA WHITE: Minor things as simple as a delayed train makes him furious. For the first year, I had no idea of the real effects it had on him but

2.

2.2

2.3

one day during an argument between us, he snapped breaking everything he got his hands on in our apartment including my heart.

Because of the severity of this incident, I relocated having to leave everything behind. A little over a year later, I am still putting the pieces together. My husband's time in solitary did nothing to rehabilitate him and actually made it harder for him to deal with other people.

Now is the time to fully end solitary confinement, not to cut it back and leave small traces or a few hours of it but to once and for all do away with the idea that isolating someone does anything to address the causes of their behavior. If the Department of Corrections doesn't know how to address the root causes of violent behavior, that means we need new people to manage the jails.

It doesn't mean we need to keep torturing people and thinking they will get better. If we want safer jails and safer communities, solitary cannot be a part of that.

I also want to say, the first problem with how Corrections deals with their job is that automatically a person stops being a person and

2.2

2.3

becomes an inmate when they enter a jail. These are people you are talking about. We are not inmate advocates. We are formerly incarcerated human beings that know first hand that the biggest gang is the Correction Officers. That know first hand that nobody slices an officer for no reason. Simple things as a lack of communication between an officer and a person incarcerated can turn into a bunch of officers beating on somebody.

I have witnessed first hand the type of crime

Corrections commits. So, stop it, stop it. Melania,

my condolences to you and your whole family. My

condolences to how people no longer care about human

beings. Who are you to judge? Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Victor Herrera to testify followed by Andrea Bowen.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

VICTOR HERRERA: Hi, my name is Victor Herrera, a Member, a Leader of Freedom Agenda Campaign and a directly impacted and formerly incarcerated individual who has had direct experience with solitary confinement on Rikers Island on numerous occasions and honestly, most of the periods of isolation were for concerns related to my internal

)

2.2

2.3

advocacy while detained and preparing for my own defense. The City of New York Department of Corrections has used against me at every turn or forced punitive isolation. The Mayor has promised to end solitary confinement. I am here to stand to hold them accountable to that promise in hopes that the Committee here today will follow with the proposals as set out by the Jails Action Coalition of October 2019.

I have had my share of experience in the 80's and the 90's. Was forced punitive solitary confinement solely for the purpose of personal animus against me on charges ranging from physically resisting staff to disobeying a direct order. All stemming from the Department of Corrections staff due to abuses and fragrant violations of their own rules or part of pattern and practice and demonstrating authority over the detained.

I can count the times I have spent in isolation and most unlawfully on account of verbal disputes that were a product of abuses occurring within the ranks that follow the Correction Officers.

Ending solitary and removing the discretion authority from Corrections to use punitive isolation

2.2

2.3

will promote the best approach to reducing violence and promote the safety necessary for all concerned. Staff and detainees alike. Removing exceptions that presently exist in the Board of Corrections minimum standards that permit corrections to enforce indiscriminately a policy that will severely impact the health of detainees is necessary. It is not a day that goes by that my own segregation during my pretrial detention in 4 harsh years of solitary confinement does not affect me today.

At times, even during lockdowns, Correction

Officers and personnel will extend the period of

lockdown just to the benefit of not having to deal

with the detained being out of their cells. This

clearly come from all occasions when the lockdown

could be cleared but extended solely for the

convenience, not taking into account the emotional

impact on those individuals, unnecessarily locked

into their cells. Out of site out of mind.

The Council for the Department of Corrections — SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

VICTOR HERRERA: Were disciplinary process exists is not true or supported by the facts. The disciplinary process better knows as the kangaroo

2.

J

court. Okay, where is the union boss now? He doesn't want to hear those who are impacted. Along with Melania's voice for her sister, we are the voice of Layleen Polanco and the many other individuals whose voice was silenced by the brutality. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I would like to now welcome Andrea Bowen to testify.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ANDREA BOWEN: Hello, my name is Andy Bowen, I am a Consultant for the Sex Workers Project at the Urban Justice Center, which provides client centered legal services to individuals who engage in sex work regardless of whether they do so by choice, circumstance or coercion.

Thank you Chair Powers, Council Members and staff supporting the Committee on Criminal Justice for this hearing and thank you to Council Member Dromm for introducing Intro. 2173 and for you and your colleagues in support of ending solitary confinement, as this is an urgent Human Rights issue.

We at the Sex Workers Project agree with you Council Member Dromm and our many allies today that solitary confinement is torture. Last week we

testified in support of Council's Resolution regarding the Walking While Trans Ban and Intro. 2173 is in that spirit. Making sure the city and state do all they can to save those victimized by the carceral system, which disproportionately includes Black and Latinx transgender sex workers.

With all respect to Council's good faith effort to stop solitary, Intro. 2173 must be strengthened to end solitary confinement in all forms. Quoting from our colleagues, the Solitary Campaign, Layleen Polanco was held in what was supposed to be an alternative to solitary and at the time she died, she had only been locked in her cell for 2 hours.

We fully support HALT Solitary's full outline of concerns about this legislation. It should also be noted that this conversation integrately includes the need to eliminate the NYPD Vice Squad. A greater than \$18 million drain on the city's budget and moral standing. A Vice arrest was a major event leading to Layleen Polanco's death.

As this weeks public Expose revealed, even members of Vice a need to defund it. Vice is a part of irredeemable system that deprives people of their

2.2

2.3

human rights to bodily autonomy, health and so much
more.

Thank you so much for your attention to these issues, holding these hearings and constantly being in conversation with marginalized communities to address long standing and ongoing injustice. Thanks so much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. This concludes the public testimony. If we had inadvertently forgotten to call on someone to testify, if that person could please raise their hand using the Zoom raise hand function, we will try to hear from you now.

Okay, seeing no hands, I will now turn it over to Chair Powers to close the hearing.

CHAIRPERSON POWERS: Thank you. I just want to say a very big thank you to everybody who spent a very long day with us but on an absolutely important and essential topic and we have a lot of work in front of us right now both at the City Council and in the City at the Board of Corrections Department of Correction to end these inhumane practices and replace it with a model that is much more humane but

2.3

also much more focused on actually addressing the issues that we have discussed here today.

I really want to thank Council Member Dromm for his efforts here and staying with us through this hearing and asking questions throughout. Thank you everybody who has come and shared a story or testified or been part of this hearing and I want to let you know this is not just about a hearing, this is about an effort and an effort to end practices that I think no longer has a place here in New York City. Now far out dated and don't provide the type of support I think we need in side of our City facilities for people that are there.

So, I want to thank everybody, all the members of the Committee and everybody who is here. And of course, I want to again, recognize Layleen Polanco, her family who are so powerful as part of this story that we are having here today. And so, I want to say thank you and I am sure that in the coming weeks we will be joining together again to talk at the Board of Corrections and other places and continue this dialogue here.

But I want to say that as we do that, we need to act with urgency to make that this doesn't happen

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

again. And so, with that, I want to thank everyone for their efforts, advocacy, testimony and we will all continue to work together on these issues. So, thank you. Thanks so much.

And that will conclude the hearing.

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



Date December 31, 2020_____