CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

OF THE

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

----- X

Monday, December 16, 2024

Start: 10:13 a.m. Recess: 2:10 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

Jumaane Williams, Public Advocate

B E F O R E: Hon. Dr. Yusef Salaam, Chair

Deputy Speaker Diana I. Ayala

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Joann Ariola Diana I. Ayala Tiffany Cabán

Carmen N. De La Rosa Robert F. Holden Rita C. Joseph Christopher Marte

Chi A. Ossé Carlina Rivera Althea V. Stevens

Kalman Yeger

Other Council Members Attending: Avilés; Paladino

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

APPEARANCES

Samah Sisay, Attorney at Center for Constitutional Rights

Samy Feliz, Brother of Allan Feliz; Justice Committee Member

Babe Howell,

Professor at CUNY School of Law; Member of The Grassroots Advocates for Neighborhood Groups and Solutions - the GANGS Coalition

Kezilar Cornish,
Member of the Civil Rights Union of Voices of
Community Activists VOCAL-NY, Member
of Communities United for Police Reform (CPR)

Michael Gerber,
Deputy Commissioner of Legal Matters
New York City Police Department (NYPD)

Jeffrey Maddrey, Chief of Department New York City Police Department (NYPD)

Paul Gamble, Deputy Commissioner Department Advocate New York City Police Department (NYPD)

Julie Morrill,
Deputy Chief of Quality Assurance Section of the
Professional Standards Bureau of the New York
City Police Department (NYPD)

Josh Levin,
Director of the Legislative Affairs Unit of the
New York City Police Department (NYPD)

Rebecca Blumenkopf, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Executive Agency Counsel, New York City Police Department (NYPD)

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Germain Thompson,
The Community Liaison for the Office of the
Community Liaison

Tatiana Hill, Senior Organizer from Office of the Community Liaison

Mauricia Harry, Manhattan Community Organizer from Office of the Community Liaison

Michael Sisitzky,
Assistant Policy Director with the New York Civil
Liberties Union; Steering Committee Member of
Communities United for Police Reform

Brittany McCoy, Managing Director of Policy at Bronx Defenders; Member of the Communities for United for Police Reform

Alan Abraham, Communities United for Police Reform

Andrew Case, Supervising Attorney at LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Member of Communities United for Police Reform

Kimberly Saltz, Legal Fellow, Justice in Public Safety Project NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

Karina Tefft, Staff Attorney, Cop Accountability Project Criminal Law Reform Special Litigation Unit

Anya Weinstock, Legal Fellow, Surveillance Technology Oversight Project ("S.T.O.P.")

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Jacqueline Gosdigian, Senior Policy Counsel at Brooklyn Defender Services

Veronica Leventhal, Social Worker with the Adolescence Intervention Defense Project at Legal Aid Society

Mylana Gerard, Coordinator of Youth Initiatives at the Bronx Community Justice Center

Tanesha Grant,
Executive Director of Parents Supporting
Parents NY; Moms United for Black Lives NYC;
Member of the Davis Round table on NYCHA Policing

Sakeena Trice, Senior Staff Attorney of Disability Justice Program at New York Lawyers for the Public Interest

Dr. Tawanna Gilford, Licensed psychologist; Cofounder of the Stop False Police Reporting Initiative

Christopher Leon Johnson, Member of the Public

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

SERGEANT LUGO: Good morning, this is a microphone check for The Committee on Public Safety. Today's date is December 16, 2024, located in the Chambers, recording done by Pedro Lugo.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Quiet down, please, and take your seats, we will be starting soon.

(PAUSE)

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Good morning, and welcome to today's New York City Council hearing for the Committee on Public Safety. At this time, we ask you to silence all electronic devices, and at no time is anyone to approach the dais.

If you would like to sign up for in person testimony or have any questions throughout the hearing, we ask that you see one of the Sergeant at Arms, either in the back of the room, or on the sides of the room.

Chair, we are ready to begin.

(PAUSE)

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Good morning, I am Council Member Yusef Salaam, Chair of the Committee on Public Safety. I want to recognize the members of the Public Safety Committee who are here with us today: Council Member Marte, Deputy Speaker Ayala, Council Member

2 Holden, Council Member Cabán, and we are joined by 3 our public advocate, Jumaane Williams.

Today, the Committee will be conducting an Oversight - The NYPD's Use of Stop-and-Frisk and Other Investigative Encounters.

In doing so, we plan to examine relevant NYPD operations, including training protocols, patrol guide directives, superlative review... I'm sorry, supervisory review, and officer discipline as it relates to police civilian investigative encounters.

We will highlight the human impact certain police practices have on communities throughout the City, particularly communities of color that continue to bear the brunt of these interactions on a daily basis. The practice commonly known as stop-and-frisk is an investigative technique where police officers stop, question, and search an individual suspected of being involved in a crime in circumstances where the officer otherwise lacks evidence to establish probable cause needed for arrest.

For such stops to comply with constitutional standards of the 4th Amendment, an officer must have a reasonable suspicion the person has committed, is

2.2

2.3

2 committing, or is about to commit a felony or

3 misdemeanor offense.

2.2

2.3

The NYPD's use of stop-and-frisk has been the subject of significant controversy due to racial disparities amongst these... amongst those subject to NYPD's investigations, racial profiling, and unconstitutional policing.

This unfortunate history has marred the

Department and been a focus of legal challenges and
advocacy efforts aimed to reform NYPD practices for
more than 25 years.

In 1999, a New York state attorney general investigation found high rates of unconstitutional stops by NYPD officers. The attorney general concluded Blacks and Hispanics were significantly more likely than whites to be stopped even after controlling for race specific present crimes, crime rates, and present population composition by race. That same year, a class action lawsuit was filed against the City alleging racial profiling and unconstitutional stop-and-frisk by NYPD.

In 2003, a settlement was reached and the City agreed to adopt written policies prohibiting racial profiling and requiring audits of police officer

2.2

2.3

2 stop-and-frisk to determine whether stops were being
3 sufficiently documented and conducted in compliance

with the Constitution.

Despite this agreement, stop-and-frisk rose significantly during the Bloomberg Administration, increasing from 97,000 stops in 2002 to over 500,000 stops in 2006 and peaking at over 685,000 stops in 2011.

During this period, Black and Latino individuals were subject to being stopped by the NYPD at disproportionately high rates, as those populations consistently accounted for over 80% of all stops, and nearly 90% of individuals stopped by NYPD were found to have done nothing wrong.

In 2008, additional lawsuits were filed against the city and NYPD. Following a nine week trial, a federal court found the City liable due to NYPD's deliberate indifference to the constitutional violations arising from the Department's stop-and-frisk practices. This is this resulted in a remedial order, which sought to address the constitutional violations found in the NYPD's use of stop-and-frisk, including the appointment of a federal monitor tasked with developing reforms to department policies,

2 evaluating compliance with ordered reforms, and

3 publishing public reports on related NYPD compliance.

Through work with the federal monitor, in coordination with plaintiff representatives and the court, the NYPD has implemented many court ordered reforms. These reforms included adopting update policies related to racial profiling and street encounters, equipping officers with body worn cameras to document police civilian encounters, and adoption of new performance evaluation standards and auditing systems.

However, a decade later, the federal monitor has continued to find persistent issues with the NYPD's failure to document stops, deficits in officers obtaining required reasonable suspicion to legally justify stops, and lack of discipline when officers are found to have conducted unconstitutional stops.

Today, we seek to examine NYPD's efforts to change department practices as part of the federal monitorship and further reforms needed to ensure NYPD officers are conducting investigations and enforcement in an unbiased manner that meets constitutional standards.

2.2

2.3

Additionally, today, today's hearing will examine the Administration's implementation of how the How Many Stops Act, a Local Law enacted by Council earlier this year, which requires NYPD to report on all police civilian investigation encounters. The purpose of this legislation was to bring much needed transparency and accountability to those interactions and require the NYPD to document the reasons for encounters, their outcomes, and the demographics information of those stopped. We will question the NYPD about how they implemented the law, their established report reporting procedures, and any trends that the Department has identified from initial data reporting pursuant to the law.

We will also delve into whether the data reported pursuant to How Many Stops Act is sufficient to provide the public much needed transparency.

Our hope today is to promote dialogue to ensure that policing in New York City is fair, equitable, and effective. Through transparency and accountability, we hope to build public trust in the Department and confidence that the Department is taking necessary steps to ensure its use of stop-and-

2 frisk and other investigative encounters are not discriminatory.

2.2

2.3

I look forward to hearing from the NYPD, community advocates, and my fellow council members as we collectively work towards a safer and more just city for all New Yorkers.

Prior to inviting the NYPD to testify, the

Committee will hear from a brief panel of advocates,

legal practitioners, and directly impacted

individuals. Thank you.

And now we will hear from our public advocate, Jumaane Williams.

PUBLIC ADVOCATE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, everyone, as mentioned, my name is Jumaane Williams, Public Advocate for the City of New York. I'd like to thank Chair Salaam and the members of the Committee on Public Safety for holding this very important hearing.

As mentioned, in 2013 a federal judge ruled that NYPD stop and frisk policy was unconstitutional, violating the 4th and 14th amendment. This ruling was based on 1963 Supreme Court ruling, Terry v. Ohio, which found that an officer must have reasonable suspicion of criminality before the officer can

conduct that stop. Stops in which a civilian is not

2.2

2.3

3 free to leave is thus known as a Terry stop. The

4 judge in the 2013 ruling found that NYPD was stopping

5 people on the basis of race, not reasonable

6 suspicion, and this constitutes intention of

discrimination against Black and Latino New Yorkers.

I just want to make note that the tool of Stop,

Question, and Frisk is a tool that I understand is

necessary for officers to do their job. What's

commonly known as stop-and-frisk was really an abuse

of those tools, which is where most of us spent our

resources trying to pull back.

While the use of stop-and-frisk declined since the ruling, it began to rise under the Adams' Administration. In 2022, the number of stops rose from 9,000 to 15,000, and rose again the following year to nearly 17,000, and the percentage of those stops found to be unlawful rose as well. What's more, the number of underreported Terry stops increased with more than 30% undocumented in 2022. These stops are still disproportionately targeting people of more color in 2023, because 9% of those stopped were Black, though only 23% of New Yorkers are Black. We have often found that there is not a great

2 statistical one for one, the amount of stops in the 3 neighborhood versus how safe that neighborhood is and

4 the amount of shootings and weapons found.

2.2

2.3

The effects of stop-and-frisk were devastating to Black and brown communities. Those exposed to aggressive policing are more likely to drop out of school, to struggle with anxiety and depression, and to be distrustful of the police. I will say it also hurts officers' ability to solve cases, as sometimes the communities are less likely to provide information if the trust isn't there - It subjected people to inappropriate arrests, violence, and incarceration, and did not result in the type of, uh, addressing the violence and crime or recovery of weapons or the contraband that people would have liked to see.

In short, the only significant outcome of abuses that I've talked about, uh, were damage to communities of more color.

One year ago, this council passed and subsequently overruled a mayoral veto of the How Many Stops Act, now known as Local Law 43. As a bill I sponsored with Council Member Avilas, the NYPD is now required to report on the apparent race, age, and

O

2.2

gender of those stopped in level 1, 2, and 3 investigative encounters, which they are... were not previously required to do. The NYPD recently published the data from the first quarter, and it's apparent why they may have pushed back. We still see the type of stops that we were worried about.

I will say, uh, that unfortunately, there were months' long resources of Mayor Eric Adams and Administration lying about what that bill would do, and most folks who are hearing this now may not know that the report was even put out. It came out with no fanfare, the sky did not crack open, uh, police are still policing.

So all of the things - all of the things - all of the things - that they said during those times were about fearmongering had nothing to do with what we were trying to accomplish with the bill.

Despite the abundance of data that NYPD continues to use illegal Terry stops, there are few consequences for officers who do it. NYPD routinely tosses out cases of misconduct, including illegal stops, despite completed and substantiated CCRB (Civilian Complaint Review Board) investigations.

CCRB has the ability to recommend but not the power

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to impose discipline even when allegations are substantiated. Under formal commissioner of Caban, the NYPD ended without review more than 500 incidents, more than half the cases that CCRB referred to it.

A recent independent review of discipline found that NYPD fails to discipline officers who violate New Yorkers' 4th Amendment's rights from the precinct level to the top of the force. Often officers are assigned training instead of discipline; although, research has shown us that this type of training has very little impact on racial and ethnic disparities in policing outcomes.

In order to curtail violations of New Yorkers' rights to be free from unlawful stops and harassment, there must be some accountability for officers. The culture of looking the other way or undermining discipline needs to end. While reporting data illustrates the problem, it is meaningless if NYPD makes no real effort to address the clear disparities in who gets policed.

We should also empower CCRB, uh, to be able to impose discipline when allegation of misconduct are substantiated, to directly access evidence like body

1

3

4

5

6

/

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

camera footage to ensure that NYPD cannot purposely run out the statute of limitations, which we've seen happen more than once, and to end the practice of allowing commissioners to unilaterally intervene in substantiate the cases of misconduct.

I also want to say in the work I've been doing for 15 years, it's now clear to me that most of what we're doing, I'd like to call whack a mole. Whether it is abuses of Stop, Question, and Frisk, trying to address broken windows, trying to address the gang database, How Many Stop Acts, the real issue is how we police, when we police, who we police. And believe it or not, there is a lot of agreement on all sides that that has to change. And until we have a mayor that is willing to sit down with everyone and we figure out how we structure a public safety that is not reliant on police officers who don't have the tools to address many of the issues that we have -and when they use those tools, they rightfully so are admonished. I believe that is the question that I hope at some point we're really focused on, because I know there's agreement on all sides of that. And until we do that, we're going keep playing this dance back and forth, and it becomes unnecessarily tense,

1

3

4

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

(PAUSE)

2.2

2.3

24

25

uh, when we can all be having the conversation that I think most of us agree on. If we want to support our law enforcement, we should stop asking them to do all of the jobs that so many agencies should be doing and that communities are also doing.

It is a difficult conversation. It is a hard conversation, but we have to have it. Nobody wants to deal with the violence that's happening in those communities more than the people who live there, more than the people who are fighting for those resources, and for changing how we do policing, uh, than the people who live there and represent them, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. I would also like to acknowledge that we have been joined by Council Member Ossé.

And now I would like to call up our first panel of witnesses, Samah Sisay, Center for Constitutional Rights; Samy Feliz, Justice Committee; Kezilar Cornish, Vocal NY; and Babe Howell, GANGS Coalition.

MS. SAMAH SISAY: Good morning, good morning,

Chair Salaam, Public Advocate Williams, and members

of the City Council. My name is Samah Sisay, and I'm

an attorney at the Center for Constitutional Rights,

stops. The court's decision in Floyd, which

a member organization of Communities United For
Police Reform. Thank you for the opportunity today to
testify regarding the NYPD's use of Stop, Question,
and Frisk, and other investigative techniques.

As Chair Salaam alluded to, in February 1999, officers of the NYPD's now disbanded Street Crime
Unit killed Amadou Diallo during a stop and sparked outrage both within and beyond New York City.

Since Mr. Diallo's death, millions of New Yorkers have been subjected to humiliation, unlawful arrest, unlawful search, physical injury, and even death because of the Department's stop-and-frisk practices.

The Center For Constitutional Rights has served with co-counsel at the law firm of Beldock Levine & Hoffman for over a decade as lead plaintiff's counsel in Floyd v. City of New York. Before Floyd, we also filed the Daniel's litigation, which brought to light the level of stops that was happening within the city.

In August 2013, following a nine week trial, a

federal judge found the NYPD liable for a pattern and

practice of racial profiling and unconstitutional

predominantly dealt with street stops, along with resolution of two other federal lawsuits, Davis,

4 which challenged the NYPD's practice of racially

5 discriminatory stops and arrests around NYCHA

6 buildings, and Ligon, which challenged the NYPD's

practice of unlawful trespass stops in around private

8 apartment buildings, resulted in a federal court

9 monitorship requiring various changes to the NYPD's

10 practice of stopping civilians, changes which 11

11 | years later the Department has yet to fully

12 implement.

1

2

3

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

As ordered by the court, the NYPD has engaged in trainings, revised stop forms, started using body worn cameras, and stops have gone down from the height of stop-and-frisk. Yet the NYPD's continuing failure to ensure adequate supervision, adequate documentation for stops, and discipline for still prevalent racial profiling means they are not in compliance with the court order to engage in constitutional policing. In fact, we have seen an increase in unconstitutional stops by the NYPD over the past few years, and racial disparities have worsened, with Black and Latinx New Yorkers making up almost 90% of reported stops.

2.2

2.3

As Chair Salaam alluded to, we also saw an increase of stops recently. In 2013... or in 2023, we saw the highest number of reported stops since 2015, up to almost 17,000. Yet we know that even this data cannot be trusted, because the Federal Monitor has consistently found in public reports that the NYPD is not properly documenting and reporting on all stops that take place, with almost 30% of stops not being properly documented for.

There are also circumstances in which officers incorrectly label an encounter as low level, but upon review of body worn camera, it becomes evident that it was actually a stop that required reporting.

The level 1 and 2 encounter reporting requirements of the How Many Stops Act, which was originally a reform suggested by impacted New Yorkers during the Floyd joint remedial process, is one positive step towards taking... tracking these encounters, but incident level data is needed for further analysis.

According to the federal monitor, the NYPD's specialized units make a majority of unlawful stops. In 2022, only 77% of stops by the Housing Bureau officers at NYCHA properties were lawful. The highly

2.2

2.3

trained neighborhood safety teams, NSTs, Mayor Adams' revamped Street Crime Unit, are also engaged in a high number of unlawful stops. Even with officer underreporting, the data shows that over 24% of NST stops reviewed by the monitor are unlawful. Nearly (TIMER CHIMES) everyone stopped is Black and Latino - I'm going wrap up in a minute - and supervisors routinely approve bad stops by NST officers.

Lastly, officers are rarely disciplined for unconstitutional stop-and-frisk even when substantiated by the CCRB, as we Heard Public Advocate Williams speak to.

In September, the court published a comprehensive report that highlights these severe issues. For example, the current NYPD discipline metrics only recommends three day lost vacation time as a penalty for an illegal Stop, Frisk, or Search of a person, yet even this level of discipline is a rarity, as supervisors and police commissioners regularly excuse illegal stop, frisk, in searches of New Yorkers.

Unconstitutional Stop, Question, and Frisks are still a problem in New York City. The NYPD continues to stop thousands of New Yorkers, racial disparities have worsened, and much more must be done to ensure

police accountability and true community safety,
thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

2.2

2.3

MR. SAMY FELIZ: Good morning. My name is Samy Feliz, and I am the brother of Allan Feliz, who was unjustly stopped in his car and murdered by NYPD in 2019. I am also a member of Justice Committee, an organization that works with families whose loved ones were killed by police. I am also a New Yorker who was regularly stopped because of my appearance and the color of my skin.

I think that you guys know Allan's story. After Lieutenant Rivera climbed into Allan's car, beat, tased, threatened to kill, and shot Allan at close range, officer Barrett dragged Allan out of the car, exposing his genitals rather than covering him up; the NYPD let him to bleed out in the street, cuffed and exposed.

Lieutenant Rivera recently faced a discipline trial, and my family continues to fight to ensure that Commissioner Tisch fires him for murdering my brother.

Allan was killed during a car stop, which is not the focus of this hearing, but at the same disregard

for human life and dignity the NYPD showed for Allan is evident in their pedestrian stop practices.

2.2

2.3

When I testified at the first How Many Stops Act hearing, I shared that under Eric Adams, the NYPD's abusive stop practices were getting worse in my neighborhood of Washington Heights. Now, a year and a half later, things are even worse.

This past July, I was just walking out of my home carrying a satchel, which I usually have with me, officers suddenly jumped out of their car and demanded to know if I had any weapons on me. When officers jump like that and tell you that they think that you have weapons, what goes through your mind is that this could be the end of my life. They found a hairbrush inside of my bag, which they said it was a bulge that they thought it was a gun. I'm lucky that the incident ended there, but I no longer carry the hairbrush, and as you can see, I no longer carry that bag.

As someone who knows all my neighbors and works to make my community safer, I hear stories like mine all the time. Over the past several months, people have told me about being followed down the street by officers and who they see interacting with... just

2.2

2.3

to see who they interact with. When they shake hands with a friend or offer somebody a dollar just to lend some need, or to lend some help to somebody in need, officers roll up and start questioning them.

Others have shared about how they're just sitting out in front of their stoops of their building, maybe smoking a cigarette or joint, which is totally legal, but continue to get harassed by officers demanding IDs and explanations on why they're being... why they're there and why their presence is there.

Some of these encounters have escalated to unjust arrests and community members I know have filed complaints with the CCRB. Most of these incidents involve officers with khaki pants, the so called Community Response Cops, to me they're just community robocops. It's absurd to call them a community team when their actions only harm the community.

Thanks to the How Many Stops Act, we know now that in spite of Black and Latin New Yorkers making up about 73% of the population in Washington Heights, they made up to 85% of those target Level 1 stops and 97 of those target Level 2 stops last quarter.

The data shows that these kinds of racial disparities exist across the city, and we need the

_ .

NYPD to provide us the raw data so that we can further understand the rationale behind these stops and address these discriminatory impacts.

Some think that these so called low level stops are just minor inconveniences, but when it happens to you all the time, and you're consistently hearing about what hap what's happening to your neighbors, and when you know that the worst case scenario is that it can escalate to a loss of life, it causes constant fear and anxiety, and that's what my community feels.

So thank you, Chairman Salaam, and thank... and the whole Public Safety Committee for holding this hearing and paying attention to what is happening in our communities. This issue is deeply important to me and other families whose loved ones have been lost by the police, because we want to make sure that no other family joins this club that nobody wants to be in.

We appreciate your partnership on these issues so far, and we ask that you continue to partner with us in the new year, especially because the NYPD's abuse is only going increase under Trump and at least another year under Adams.

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 2.2

2.3

24

Lastly, my family would like to call on you to help us to ensure that Commissioner Tisch and Mayor Adams hold and fire Lieutenant Rivera for murdering my brother. The NYPD's violence and abuse must end, and it starts with meaningful accountability and systematic change. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MS. BABE HOWELL: Good morning, I'm Babe Howell, a member of the Grassroots Advocates for Neighborhood Groups and Solutions, the GANGS coalition.

Our coalition includes young people, their parents, those who represent young people, those who work with them through community based organizations, and organizations striving to protect their civil rights. We focus on the policing of our city's vulnerable children and young adults and the impact this has on their safety and the safety of their communities. Thank you, Chair Salaam and the Committee on Public Safety for holding this hearing on stop-and-frisk and other investigative encounters.

To begin with, how does gang policing relate to stop-and-frisk? Two ways - first, gang policing is, in New York, a cynical end run around the historic

a

ruling that the NYPD's misuse of stop-and-frisk violates both the 4th Amendment and equal protection.

The NYPD announced Operation Crewcut in response to the stop-and-frisk litigation at a time when crime was at historic lows in New York City, and gang crime accounted for a minuscule amount of the crime in New York. Operation Crew Cut gave a new name to policing based on appearance and location.

The second connection, critical for today's hearing, is that once labeled a gang member by the NYPD in their database, young people are targeted for and vulnerable in stop-and-frisk and investigative encounters.

A bit of background on the NYPD's gang policing before I go on to stop-and-frisk. NYPD's gang definition requires only three or more individuals. There are 500 gangs in the gang database, averaging about 30 members each. Gang policing in New York covers friendship groups and neighborhood groups. It is not limited to gangs. The database is populated entirely using noncriminal criteria. People are added to the gang database based on what they post on social media, what they wear, their friends and

2 relatives, and where they live - with no notice and

2.2

2.3

3 no ability to challenge their inclusion.

The NYPD's Office Of Inspector General's Report last year found that people could be added to the gang database for wishing a friend happy birthday or for using certain emojis. They found that gang locations included NYCHA properties, whole precincts, and people's home addresses. Children as young as 13 are added to the gang database, and they've added people down to age 11 in the past. And the NYPD also lacked documentation for many entries. They used illegally sealed arrests and denied a 100% of Freedom of Information Law (FOIL).

The resulting gang database is 99% Black and Latinx - 99%. The NYPD claimed this is about precision policing, but it is only precise in how it profiles and targets only Black and Latinx youth. There are no white supremacists, no mafia, no Russian or Armenian gangs, no Proud Boys, almost no white people in the gang database.

Back to the stop-and-frisk connection - The

Domain Awareness System means the gang designation is

available to every police officer and puts a target

on those that are labeled as gang members. Our youth

2.2

report being stopped as regularly (TIMER CHIMES) as they were at the height of Stop-and-Frisk, some monthly, some multiple times a week.

As the Federal Monitor reports, 11 years on, NYPD still has no plan for equal protection. Stops, frisk, and surges are all increasing. Moreover, the neighborhood safety teams, public safety teams, and housing are the officers most likely to conduct, self-initiated stops, unconstitutional stops, and searches.

The harms of this policing cannot be overstated Individuals are not safe online, they are not safe in
the streets, they are dragged unnecessarily into the
criminal system, often for minor offenses. They are
denied off ramps and second chances in criminal and
family courts. They are held at Rikers and subjected
to violence. They are punished for the crimes of
others. All this because of a label that is affixed
by the NYPD without criminal conduct and a label that
is reserved for Black and Latinx New Yorkers.

Of utmost concern, as we look to the future, gang labeled individuals are subjected to ICE (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement) sweeps,

Cornish, and I reside in Brooklyn. I'm a member of

the Civil Rights Union of Voices of Community

Activists Leaders (VOCAL-NY) and a member of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Communities United for Police Reform (CPR) We're trying to end mass incarceration and harmful policing.

2.2

2.3

I'm here to testify on police misconduct and corrupt police practices that I've endured personally. I want to express to the panel that for most of my life I felt powerless against the seemingly God-given authority that the New York Police Department has had over me and most of the people that I've known growing up our entire lives.

When we're in front of these, uh, police officers and, you know, other, representatives of law enforcement, we feel powerless. We feel as if they're given this godlike and God-given like authority, which should not be, since they're supposedly working for the citizenry, and we are citizens for sure.

Besides the powerlessness, you know, when, you know, the cops stop pedestrians, they feel like they have to put their hands up. You know? Why is the public trained to be fearful in that way? Right? It's because it's so ingrained within society that it's now become a normal thing, like, it's the norm; although, that's actually not policing, but that's just a culture that has developed over the years.

1

3

4

5

6

/

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

2223

24

25

So this reduces the citizens to being a suspect. The Police Department is deemed more important than the people that they're actually working for. When, you know, the reports are written and people are speaking about the interaction between the citizen and the police, normally, they're concerned about, if the police were safe as if they're not there for the safety of the citizenry. And that seems to be, you know, the reverse of what it should be, but that's not the case. And we all know that that the case is, uh, they're concerned about whether the officer, you know, was, safe or not. And, you know, that's viable as well, he should be safe, we don't condone the fact that, you know, police officers should be harmed or hurt in any way, shape, or form. But at the same time, we think that the overriding concern should be about the pedestrians that are walking the street going about their way.

I wanna share a personal experience. Many years ago, over 30 something years ago, I was on a train and a New York Police Department officer stopped the train and was patrolling the car. And we found that when the bulletin goes out for a particular suspect, what actually happens is that the New York Police

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Department begins to look for any Black man that's suitable. And so I became the Any Black man. So he searched the car and, uh, they were looking for, you know, someone, some description that we don't know of, but the people that were in the car with me, but this officer told me to step out of the car. Now I had an appointment, I was going to the studio. I could have possibly, uh, made some really big waves in the music industry, but that was derailed (TIMER CHIMES) because of this incident that completely changed my life and impacted me, my family, and so forth and so on. I ended up doing 30 years not for that crime, but because I was picked up for this crime that is now completely dismissed. And so because of this dismissed case, I ended up doing 30 years for unlawful conviction as well.

So these types of illegal stops are still far too common in the city of New York. The consequences of my wrongful conviction was a direct result of that illegal stop. I didn't do anything. And because of the fact that the case is dismissed, there's no way for me to receive any recompense. You know? There is no compensation when something is thrown out and there's no way to actually take that information from

very passionate for me.

,

I want start in terms of questions to Mr. Feliz, but I want to first, you know, express my condolences for the loss of Allan, your brother.

Mr. Feliz, what reforms can NYPD make today to ensure that more tragedies like the one that happened to you and your family don't happen again?

MR. SAMY FELIZ: Understanding that this council here is for something different from what my brother was stopped for. Like, we're talking here about regular traffic stops. My brother was stopped in the vehicle, we're talking about pedestrian stops here. I think it starts here at the pedestrian level, that it'll correlate and, at some point, translate to the police stops in the vehicles as well.

But I would say having - things that I would like to see is full blown camera footage. No 10 second runoff, so you can see what the reasoning is that the officers are coming up with before they make the stop - that's audio and video.

I would also like to see accountability. There aren't any reforms or trainings that will bring the level of, I guess, of understanding of the necessity for change without these officers being held accountable. At this moment, officers are not being

2 held accountable for any of the actions, whether it's 3 minor or it's for taking a life.

So accountability is the is the biggest thing.

And... and that's a start.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

You also mentioned the NYPD's Community Response Team, what is your experience with this unit in your neighborhood?

MR. SAMY FELIZ: It hasn't been a good one. It's been one of, I would say, constant harassment, constant abuse of authority, and a lot of unfair practices where we feel at threat.

And I would like to see things change, because it's just getting worse than what we were promised.

We were promised to have safer streets, and now we're at more fear to be outside and for those policing us. And these are happening in unmarked vehicles, so you don't know who's approaching you, who's coming out of these vehicles, so you don't know what's your first reaction until either it's a weapon in your face or them holding you down and telling you not to move, because they wanna see what's on your person. So it's just those practices of abuse that need to change.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: And a question for the entire

3 panel.

It's been over 10 years since the Floyd trial concluded, and the court ruled that NYPD had an unconstitutional pattern and practice of racial profiling in conducting unlawful stops. This case continues to this day with a federal monitor monitoring compliance with court ordered reforms.

In your opinion, if the NYPD wanted to end this case and get into constitutional compliance, what specific reform efforts would be most impactful to achieve this goal?

And that's to the entire panel.

MS. SAMAH SISAY: Thank you for the question, Chair Salaam, and I can start.

And I just wanted to quickly add to, uhm, about the CRT, just to note that the OIG recently released a report about the community response teams and the lack of transparency within the unit. So just to say that that report exists about needing more transparency about how they engage.

I think the question about how - and this monitorship is a big one, but I think maybe I can

2.3

answer more so, like, how the NYPD can actually work towards being in constitutional compliance.

I, you know, the monitor, like I said, released this report around discipline, and I think discipline is a huge... and accountability, like many people have said on this panel, is a huge step towards compliance. Right?

I think officers, supervisors, and police commissioners need to take this seriously in order to shift culture. Training is important. You know, having officers report on stops is important. But unless there's a real showing that there is consequence for not policing in a constitutional manner, uhm, for humiliating, harassing, racially profiling New Yorkers, we're not going to get anywhere. So I think that is a huge, huge step.

And within that report that was released by The Monitor, there's 55 recommendations about ways to change the, uhm, New York City discipline process, specifically related to stop-and-frisk, uh, for there to be more transparency and accountability.

So think that is a huge step, and we'll see what happens, what the court will do, because the hope is that there will be some recommendations ordered of

2.2

2.3

2 the NYPD, in regards to discipline relating to Stop,
3 Question, and Frisk.

I think another issue is, you know, I try to talk a lot about these specialized units, and we're seeing that these specialized units are the ones that are engaging, according to the monitor, the federal monitor, in a lot of these unconstitutional stops.

And they're supposed to be highly trained, highly supervised; however, when, you know, you look at the data, you're seeing that they're engaged in more

And so I think the use of these units, the revamping of these units, we have the Street Crime Unit, they were plain clothes, they were disband. We had another iteration, that was disband.

unconstitutional behavior than other officers. Right?

And now we have NST, CRT, PST. Right? And the entire purpose is for them to be doing precision investigative work, but what we're seeing is they're actually racially profiling folks.

And so I think really looking at these units and deciding, do we need them? How are they being trained? Are officers who are actually engaged in unconstitutional behavior being rewarded and put on these units in order to target New Yorkers?

2.2

2.3

I think those are questions that really need to be asked about how these units are being ran, uhm, and what behavior they're engaging in.

MR. KEZILAR CORNISH: I believe that it's a question of integrity, because many of these laws and the procedures that govern the police department, they speak about how to interact with the citizenry in such a way that it's a degree of respect that goes on, but that is not practiced. And because it's not practiced, we create a culture of acceptance.

And so beyond that, if these bad practices result in criminal acts and so forth, but they're not being recognized as criminals, then who's actually law enforcement and who are the criminals?

If law enforcement is allowed to commit crimes, because when you're going against the procedures and laws that are on the books, then you're committing a crime, but it seems as if somehow there's a gateway of acceptance and a blanket of protection that goes over them to, you know, as long as they have the color blue on.

And so, we're sending out the wrong signals to the population, because what you... what you're saying is that, uh, just become a police officer and

2 then you can do whatever you wanna do. And so, true

3 individuals who have crime in mind for real, they

4 say, oh, that's how we can do it and get away with

5 | it. And this is what it seems is going on.

2.2

2.3

And so there has to be, a degree of accountability. And the training, is not about the training because, you know, it depends on whatever news, uh, conference is being held that they'll say, "We have the best training," and then as soon as something happens, then they're like, "Well, we need more training."

But the reality is they are trained, and that means that they're making an informed decision as to whether or not they want to commit these foul practices, and that's something that has to be dealt with, integrity and principle amongst the law enforcement when it comes to interacting with the populace and to understand that you're working for the populace.

MS. BABE HOWELL: Reviewing the Monitor reports over the last 11 years, it seems quite clear that actually when the NYPD does the responsive investigation, uh, they are in 95, 96, 97 percent of compliance.

1

The patrol officers have high compliance. It...

3

predictive or precision, self-initiating stops that 4

are... it is the special units out there claiming

5

are not documenting their stops whatsoever,

6

misrepresenting them, uh, responsible for the vast

7

majority of unconstitutional stops, unconstitutional

As the Public Advocate pointed out, we cannot

8

frisk, and unconstitutional searches.

expect the police to do all the things. Their job is 10

solving crimes, responding to calls. If we remove

11 12

this part where they are somehow supposed to, uh,

13

quess who is committing crimes and find them by

14

stopping them, investigating them. Until we remove

15

that part, we will continue to see this abuse, uh,

16

and particularly the racial profiling that that

17

characterizes it.

18

19 investigative encounters; second, we do also need to

20

eliminate the gang database, because once we have a

So first, eliminate self-initiated stops and

21

label on someone that they are a "gang member" based

2.2

2.3

automatically going to elevate, uh, the police

24

interest in them, and they'll see reasonable

on things they post on social media, that is

25

suspicion where it might not otherwise exist.

3

1

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So we... in order to get rid of, uh, the equal protection violations, we must get rid of a database that is 99% Black and Latinx based on utterly lawful conduct.

And on that note, I think we also need to proactively limit social media reviews. We have whole teams scouring only, uh, people of colors' social media. That can be used as an investigative technique in a responsive sense, but should not be selfinitiated. We have to stop the mass surveillance of people of color. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

I would like to acknowledge that we have been joined also by Council Member De La Rosa and Council Member Avilas.

And I want to pass the questions to Council Member Cabán to start.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you. Good morning, and thank you to everyone for your advocacy, your testimony.

I want to ask a couple of questions about the gang database. So just to get in a little bit further detail, you talked about, obviously, the over representation particularly of Black and brown youth

MS. BABE HOWELL: a crazy world... (CROSS-TALK)

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: In your experience and research, is also true that, uh, even loose or tenuous associations can land you on the gang database list?

MS. BABE HOWELL: Absolutely. They'll say, "There you are in the background of somebody's music video or here you are in the same picture with so and so," that will land you on the gang database.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Great.

2.2

2.3

Now, I wanna give you, uhm, just like an example, a hypothetical, and then maybe you can just give me a reaction to, uhm, a reaction to it.

So I'm gonna use myself as an example. I grew up in South Richmond Hill. I went to public elementary school and middle school. Uhm, where I live, the school was predominantly, like, vast majority people of color and immigrants. And then (TIMER CHIMES) I went to... - may I continue, Chair? I'll wrap up quickly - Then I went to a Catholic high school in Northeast Queens, vast majority, white, higher socioeconomic status, and my experience was that the factors, uh, that influence social connection, they mirrored in each of those places. The same ways we were connected to people at my high school, kids in

the schools I went to when I was younger connected in that way, but... and they used social connections the same way. I would imagine today you can throw in - a little older so - throw in social media.

When you look at it now, I was a public defender for seven years, use social media very, very similarly, but for whatever reason, uhm, the kids that I grew up with and the neighborhood I grew up with were much, much more likely to be on a gang database, whereas I don't know anybody from my high school community that ended up the same. But the social connectives and behaviors kind of mirrored each other. Like, can... can you talk... like, what's your reaction to that?

mean, you can think about your child, your niece, your nephew, your cousin, think about the color of their skin and that's going to determine whether for the exact same social media post, my 6-year-old nephew, every single time I see a post, he's got his hands up with his three, four, five, friends, you know, that same conduct will land, a Black or Latinx New Yorker in the gang database. And I will say it's also 97% male. So you might not actually end up...

2.3

It's very, you know, just profiled. Uh, but the same conduct that will land, uh, Black and brown kids in the gang database will be ignored when white kids engage in it, even when there are more red flags.

I do wanna say all kids also make mistakes. You know, all kids dress alike and act silly and even do stupid things. Your parents cannot control what you do when you're 16, 17. You certainly can't control what your other friends do.

And finally, a lot of the social media back and forth, according to researchers who follow it like Desmond Upton Patton, and, Lane is his last name, skipping my mind, see that, you know, in the same way that rap battles and dance and breakdance battles, played out in the past to, like, as a diversion for violence, actually, the social media kind of conflicts and beefing is a way to keep, uh, violence off the street and kind of posture and enact things out online.

So, yeah, my reaction is a 100%. And it's not fair. All children deserve to be children, to actually to try on different personalities, to dress like their friends, and to get second chances, and, you know, thrive.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you...

MS. BABE HOWELL: They are our next... They're our future.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

MR. KEZILAR CORNISH: May I speak to that?

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Go for it.

MR. KEZILAR CORNISH: Okay.

So what we found in the community is that, uh, you can get in a gang database if you just have a tattoo. And we've also found that many of the people who are on the policing special units that are supposed to be gang specialists, they create a whole listing of things that are supposedly gang related that are not. And because there's no oversight, they get to say whatever they want to say.

And so they may have inside the listing, when you throw up a peace sign or a deuces sign, you're a gang member, even if they get a picture of you with that.

Now your mother may be 84 years old, and she's doing a peace sign with all of her grandchildren, and she will be labeled as a gang member in some way, shape, or form, because this is the culture and this is what's being done, but there is no oversight.

2.2

2.3

Now, we do also understand that there are gang members who have reformed themselves and changed their lives, and they're doing really good things in terms of education, producing jobs, and just being productive citizens. But they're not utilizing any of them so that they can actually, uh, verify and say whether or not this is what this is, and this is what this, you know, what is not, so that they can make a real determination as to whether or not these are gang members or these are gang signs or any of those sorts of things.

And many of them are just, uh, basic things that we do when we take pictures, you know, as the lady said. So, you know, I think a little bit of common sense and oversight from entities outside of the police department, there should be some citizenry involved in these special units that can say, "Come on, you're being ridiculous, that's a that's a peace sign, come on." You know?

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. I just want to acknowledge that we have been joined by Council Member Stevens and Council Member Joseph.

I am going to pass it to Council Member Ayala.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Thank you.

2.2

2.3

First and foremost, I wanted to direct comment at

Samy Feliz. I just wanna say that I'm happy to see

you to see you here today, and that I join you and

your family in calling for accountability from the

NYPD and firing Lieutenant Jonathan Rivera. It's been

a long time, and I think that the NYPD has an

opportunity here to do the right thing and to regain

the trust of the individuals that they serve every single day.

Miss Howell, could you tell us a little bit more about how an individual ends up, especially, I mean, you mentioned that there were young kids as young as 13 on the gang database. Is the only way to get on... what is the way to get on the gang database? I heard that you mentioned... you referenced, you know, pictures and some social media. Is DNA also a part of that factor?

MS. BABE HOWELL: DNA is not used to the best of my knowledge. There are three ways of ending up on the gang database: One is self-admission, but the NYPD will interpret a social media posting with an emoji, or "free so and so" or "rest in peace, so and so" as self-admission, uh, to admitting in... to being in a gang so they interpret social media posts.

2 That is one and probably the most common way to end 3 up on the gang database.

The NYPD has a smart unit social media analysis and research team or something that spends their time looking at young people and many people of color's social media.

A second way is through two independent sources; although, the independent sources are almost all NYPD, the precinct, intel, (TIMER CHIMES) the school safety officers. So, in the OIG's report says that of the... of the case of the people who are certified based on two sources, 27% actually did not have two sources listed, 9% had zero sources listed.

The most common way is two or more of the, uh, other criteria seen in a known gang location, which, as I said, could be your whole precinct, your NYCHA property, your home address, seen with known gang associates, if they've labeled your friends gang members, that could be one of the criteria.

As was mentioned, tattoos, clothing, color. So appearance, association, and expression, there's not a single criteria that involves being convicted of anything.

2.2

2.3

a

So many people end up on the gang databases based on social media, but others can be... It incentivizes to stop too. I see three kids hanging around, I've already identified one of them as gang member, I could put the other two in, they're in a known gang location, like the basketball court near their home, and they're with a known gang member - boom, boom - you can put a 13-year-old on the gang database.

There's no review. You know, this is the end run around the 4th Amendment and the Floyd and equal protection. They're collecting information without necessarily trying to put it in to court, but when they talk to a DA and say, this person is gang involved, that means the DA is looking to move them to adult court or deny youthful offender or wrap them up in a bigger case.

So you could get on without knowing it either.

You won't be notified.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: I just... One followup, do you know what the number is of individuals on the data base to date?

MS. BABE HOWELL: According to the OIG's report, which is the last number we had, I think it was 16,700, someplace between 16 and 17,000.

America is dangerous?

2 COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: I didn't ask... I didn't ask you, sir.

MR. SAMY FELIZ: Would you... Would you..

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: I didn't... My questions are directed...

(BACKGROUND NOISE)

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: If we're gonna allow this, uh... I mean, I asked the two attorneys.

MS. SAMAH SISAY: I just want to highlight that the point of this panel is to uplift the experience of people who've been directly impacted. So I'm happy to answer the question as an attorney. I think, you know, there are many instances where engaging in any type of interpersonal or one on one interaction can be dangerous.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Of course...

BABE HOWELL: And I, too, will say that especially engaging in proactive, self-initiated encounters, jumping out when you're not in uniform, those encounters are very dangerous. And reducing stop-and-frisk and investigative encounters and making them responsive would make police safer and make our community safer.

2.2

2.3

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: On March 25th, police officer Jonathan Diller approached a vehicle with, uhm, two individuals inside. He was shot and killed when he approached the vehicle. The one person, Guy Rivera, allegedly, uhm, shot him. Guy Rivera had 21 prior arrests. (TIMER CHIMES) His... the guy that was driving, Lindy Jones had 14 prior arrests and was out on bail for a weapons charge.

Now put yourself in those positions and just think of how dangerous this job is. When you leave for the day, leave your wife and child, young wife and young child, and you go out into the streets of New York and are dealing with the most dangerous people. It's not an exact science. Things can happen. Things can go very, very bad either way.

But I understand, because I've done three ride alongs, and I've seen officers who...

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Quiet, please.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: I've seen officers... you may not like what I'm saying, but this is the truth. This job is very, very dangerous. And at any time, you can get shot, just like the streets of New York. But you're dealing with the worst of society many times, especially the special units. So we hear one

```
1
                THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
                                                        57
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: to the dais... (CROSS-TALK)
 2
 3
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: well, yet, we sat here
     and we've listened to comments that I consider
 4
 5
     racist.
        UNKNOWN: (INAUDIBLE)
 6
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Don't... Don't... No.
 7
     This is two sides here.
 8
 9
        DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: (OFF MIC) (INAUDIBLE) It's
10
     inappropriate.
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: It's not... It... I
11
12
     didn't get to that, Diana.
        DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: (OFF MIC) No, we're not
13
14
     going there. (INAUDIBLE)
15
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Okay, wait, one
16
    moment...
17
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: (GAVEL)
18
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: We are doing it...
19
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I want to make sure... (CROSS-
20
     TALK)
21
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Oh, yes, we are, this is
     a hearing! This is a big hearing...
2.2
2.3
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I want to make sure
     that...(CROSS-TALK)
24
```

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Yes, we are!

```
1
                THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
                                                        58
 2
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Can I... Can I... (CROSS-
 3
     TALK)
 4
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: I'd like to recognize
 5
     people...
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Can we just level set for a
 6
 7
     second... (CROSS-TALK)
 8
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: on the panel!
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Can we level set for a
     second? I would like to make sure that we have a
10
11
     respectful dialogue, that's what... (CROSS-TALK)
12
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Absolutely...
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: this is about.
13
14
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: That's absolutely,
15
     correct...
16
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: So, I would like to... I
17
     would like to say this, because...
18
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: You...
19
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: The respect that has to be
20
     acknowledged on both sides, is to in fact -
21
     especially for this young man at the end who lost his
     family member - to ask this young man if he's racist,
2.2
2.3
     is very... (CROSS-TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: I was ask...
24
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: It is a very... (CROSS-TALK)
25
```

```
THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
 1
                                                        59
 2
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: it was a general...
 3
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: problematic thing... (CROSS-
 4
     TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: question. It was... I
     did not (INAUDIBLE)...
 6
 7
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I know it's a general
 8
     question, but we have to begin to start...
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Okay, can I... Let...
10
     Let me start over...
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: with (INAUDIBLE) in mind...
11
12
     (CROSS-TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: let me start over...
13
14
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: which is respect... (CROSS-
15
     TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Let me start over.
16
17
        We have four people sitting on this panel. One is
18
     the Center for Coalitional Rights, the other
19
     represents the Justice Committee, the other
20
     represents VOCAL-NY, and the other represents the
21
     GANG'S Coalition.
        Now I've sat here and I've listened to you speak,
2.2
2.3
    And I'm really up... I was going to get to you and
     your loss of your family member. And I wanted to
24
25
     start there, and I wanted to start the right way. And
```

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the right way was this - I'm sorry for your loss. I wanted to move on to the gentleman who represents VOCAL-NY, when you spoke about your... and what happened to you 30 some odd years ago, I want you to be aware, I was around 30 some odd years ago, and we were pulled out of cars, too, because they didn't like the way we wore our hair, or they didn't like the way we dressed or anything like this. We have made this situation here a Black and brown issue. This is not a Black and brown issue. And I sit here each and every time, and I listen to what is supposed to be the Safety Committee, and I listen to everybody turn this into Black and white or brown and white as if the people who are white-skinned don't matter at all. And this is absolutely pushed too far. Our police officers do their job. My colleague brought up the most recent murder of a police officer. We have a gang problem whether you like it or not. Trump is going to be our next president whether anybody likes it or not. And you know what? As far as a gang's database goes, soon enough we won't much have to worry, because a lot of our gang members are here illegally and they will be deported.

Now with that being said, that the ...

1	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 61
2	(BACKGROUND NOISE)
3	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Let's make sure we(CROSS-
4	TALK)
5	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: That doesn't sit real
6	well, does it? (TIMER CHIMES) Well, I'm here to tell
7	you, that our police do their very best. And there
8	are innocent cops gettin' killed each and every day.
9	And I'm really sorry
10	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you, thank you Council
11	Member Paladino.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Council Member
13	Paladino
14	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I'd like to pass it
15	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: I'm really sorry, that's
16	why my thoughts get (CROSS-TALK)
17	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I'd like to pass it(CROSS-
18	TALK)
19	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: jumbled up, because I
20	get interrupted every time
21	DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Next! Next!
22	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: (GAVEL)
23	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: I talk, because you
24	don't like what I have to say

1	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 62
2	DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Council Member, you're out
3	of order.
4	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Council Member, you're out of
5	order (CROSS-TALK)
6	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Okay, well, that's
7	enough.
8	(BACKGROUND NOISE)
9	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Council Member? Thank you,
10	Council Member Paladino.
11	I would like to pass
12	(BACKGROUND NOISE)
13	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you, Council Member
14	Paladino I would like to pass(CROSS-TALK)
15	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: You don't cut anybody
16	else off
17	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you
18	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: do you?
19	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you, Council Member
20	Paladino (CROSS-TALK)
21	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: You don't cut anybody
22	else off at these hearings, do you?
23	(BACKGROUND NOISE)
24	COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: But, Paladino gets cut
25	off!

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Do not speak to me,

because I am not speaking to you.

2.3

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2 COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: (OFF MIC) Well, then
3 point your face that way...

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Because I'm looking at you because you know what you said.

So let me just say that my condolences go out to this family who is seeking justice.

All of us leave our house in the morning trying to get back home at night. All of us deserve safety. But what I do know is that the men in my community in Washington Heights, Inwood, and Northern Manhattan have been on the crosshairs on the war of drugs my entire life. And I do not need to go on a ride along to know what happens on the streets of my neighborhood, because I walk the streets of my neighborhood every single day. And I've been stopped for standing in front of my building, I've been stopped. Therefore, I do not need... having a ride along does not make you an expert in how policing happens. And there are two very, very opposing tales to that story.

So I will put that there for the record.

And the other thing, too, is I'm an immigrant, and I'm a proud immigrant, and I'm the first

Dominican woman elected to this body from my

community. So do not question, okay, the

2.2

2.3

contributions of immigrants in this chamber.

With that being said, I want to say that one of the things that we are guided by in this conversation is data. Data that is publicly available and rare, because it is not always publicly available. But, what we do see in the data that is available, is a glimpse in a system that is not working and that has not been working. A system that treats my children differently than it treats children of people on this dais. Period. Black and brown New Yorkers being stopped, questioned and frisked unconstitutionally. And, those numbers are on the rise under this administration.

So, what I hope to get out of this hearing, since the circus has begun, is to make sure that we are able to ask the questions that pertain to why the system is working inequitably in communities like mine.

So, I have one question for this panel and my question is, in your experiences with the gang database, with what we're seeing with the new units that have been put out into the street, are you seeing that the data that is available after an

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

interaction is accurate and up to date and readily available in cases where accountability and discipline are needed for the NYPD?

That's my question.

2.2

2.3

MS. BABE HOWELL: The short answer is no. The database is secret. They do not tell people they're on the gang database. We, uh, the Legal Aid Society has started a "FOIL Yourself" campaign, and they normally have to, make the FOIL request, have it denied, and then sued to follow-up.

So that is a data piece that we would very much like. The Office of Inspector General of the LAPD has analyzed gang unit stops. They have specific units and found that they are longer and more likely to end up with searches and unconstitutional searches than other stops.

So that's data we're missing, and we really appreciate this city council's efforts with this, How Many Stops Act, and the Monitor Report, and the OIG's report in New York to fill some holes, but there are many more holes than certainties.

MS. SAMAH SISAY: I would just like to state for the record, I'm with the Center for Constitutional Rights. And so for the for the specialized units,

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.2

2.3

uhm, neighborhood safety team, the public safety teams, and the community response teams, which I think, are misnamed in the ways that they interact with communities.

But, the data is available with regards to Terry stops, so those are, Level 3 stops. And though that data is what the Federal Monitor uses for reports and to do analysis as to whether or not the NYPD is in compliance.

But like I said earlier, the issue with the data is that it's shown that a substantial amount of, uh, the data is actually not available, because 30% of stops - about 30% of stops - are not being reported on or properly documented.

And so part of that problem is that, you know, whether it's officers just not documenting, whether it's officers thinking it's like a Level 2 encounter, when actually it's a stop that needs to be documented on, you know, we're seeing that there's a huge chunk of the data missing.

And then there have been discussions, I don't think that's what this hearing is about around, like, CCRBs access to body worn camera and other, uhm, information when they are doing disciplinary hearings

and trying to get information in order to move discipline along. So I think that's another part of, you know, available data. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MR. KEZILAR CORNISH: In terms of data — and accurate data, since there's no oversight, any piece of data that we receive is data that is put out by the same people who are corrupt in terms of their police practicing. And if we were to go further, which we should, many... it's not just about racism. We find that most of the data crunching has to do with funding.

And so we have to look into the economics of this thing because they create what you call job security. That is a term in law enforcement. And so they target people and continue to keep people coming to the prison system so that they can ensure that their jobs will be there and available for them and their children as they go on 10, 20 years from now.

And so, uh, in terms of any data, there has to be some sort of outside agency or groups of people that are there to determine whether or not the data that's coming in is actually accurate.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. Moving along, I am going to pass it to Council Member Stevens.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: So, I'm just gonna start off by saying this - Everybody wants to be safe. And this idea that just because we are focusing on a group of people that have historically and disproportionately been affected by the brutality of NYPD - We are here trying to right the wrongs and set the balance straight. I want to be safe. I am not the enemy of NYPD. I'm not the enemy of Republicans. We are all here.

But let's be clear, if we want to talk about race, then why do we have a database that has 99% people of color on it and no one else?

So the question isn't to ask us if we're racist. The question to ask is are the practices the NYPD is putting into place racist? And that's where we need to start and that's where... that's why we are focusing on this.

So it is unacceptable for us to be in here and ask victims if they're racist. So I have to say that because it's unacceptable.

I worked with kids for 20 years who have been terrorized, and what I say to NYPD all the time, we

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

need to fix and to right... and fix the trauma that they've caused in our community before we can do anything else. They're not our enemies.

So a young person does not wanna play basketball with you if you have not addressed the traumas that, when they come out the community center, you're going to kick their ass. And it happens all the time in my community and I'm sick of it. And so we will not sit in these chambers today and victimize people who are consistently victimized.

So I'm gonna start there.

But I do have a question about the database, because again it's 99% Black and Latinos, which is a problem for me. Because it's to me baseline racist, we're done, let's move on. But we keep getting pushed back.

Babe, can you tell us how many young people - or if you know how many young people have been FOILed to find out if they were on the database? Do you have that information?

MS. BABE HOWELL: I don't. I'm pretty sure there's somebody from Legal Aid who could answer. I know it's more than 500.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: But do you know how a young person or a person who is on the database, do you know how they would get off the database?

MS. BABE HOWELL: There (TIMER CHIMES)... there is no way to get off the database. There's no way to appeal. They can be reviewed at age, uh, 23 and 28, they're supposed to be reviewed every three years.

Those reviews are happening late, and only one person is looking at them. There is no input from the individual to get themselves off the database. And by the way, they do enter people as young as 11 and 13, but up to age 70 as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: And just real quick, has there been other databases like this across the country? And if so, were they eliminated? Do you know the status of those? And then I'm done.

MS. BABE HOWELL: Yes. These types of gang databases are very common, and what they have in common is, A, they often rely on entirely noncriminal criteria as the New York City one does, and that they are typically, uh, wildly and disproportionately Black and Latinx or nonwhite people of color.

Portland and Chicago have eliminated their gang database. LDF just has a report out saying that that

2.2

2.3

had no effect on crime rates before and after, no

statistically significant effect. LA is also backing

off of their gang database, and we're hopeful that

those databases will be changed.

So London also had a gangs matrix, also included people based on no criminality. They reformed it somewhat, but this is a push that we should show leadership in. There is no reason for the NYPD, or any other police department, to keep data on people based on no criminal activity. There's no reason for that. So I'd like us to... we won't be number one, Portland wins, and then Chicago, but I... I think we'd be the biggest, shining example when we eliminate this database.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. I think part of that, uh, is... as the... As New York goes, so does the rest of the nation.

I would like to thank you all for your testimony.

And I would like to know introduce our panel of

administration witnesses and turn it over to the

Committee Counsel to swear them in.

So, we will be joined by Chief Jeffrey Maddrey;
Deputy Commissioner, Michael Gerber; Deputy
Commissioner Paul Gamble; Assistant Chief Julie

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Morill; Assistant Deputy Commissioner Rebecca

Blumenkopf; Director of Legal Affairs Unit, Josh
Levin.

(PAUSE)

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Okay, if everybody from the NYPD who plans to testify could raise their right hands?

Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, before this committee, and to respond honestly to council member questions?

PANEL AFFIRMS (OFF MIC)

Noting for the record that all witnesses answered affirmatively.

You may begin your testimony.

16 (PAUSE)

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Good morning, Chair Salaam, and members of the Council. My name is Michael Gerber, and I'm the Deputy Commissioner of Legal Matters for the New York City Police Department. I'm joined here today by Chief Of Department, Jeffrey Maddrey.

On behalf of police commissioner Jessica Tisch, we are here to testify regarding the Department's policies and practices in connection with

2 investigative encounters. These encounters, covering

3 a wide range of circumstances, are at the heart of

4 policing and public safety. As you know, the New York

5 courts recognize four different types of

6 investigative encounters:

2.2

2.3

A Level 1 encounter is a request for information; at Level 1, there must be an objective, credible reason to approach, but it does not require that the officer suspect the individual of criminality. Level 1 encounters include conversations with victims and witnesses, those who might be victims or witnesses, those who might be victims or witnesses, those who might have evidence regarding a crime, who might know where a missing child is located, and or who may, for whatever reason, be in need of police assistance.

A Level 2 encounter, based on the Common Law Right of Inquiry, requires an officer to have a founded suspicion of criminal activity. At Level 2, as at Level 1, the individual is free to leave.

At Level 3, by contrast, where an officer has reasonable suspicion that a person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime, the officer has the authority to temporarily detain that person in what is often referred to as a Terry stop.

3

4

5

6

7

8

_

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Finally, in a Level 4 encounter, there is probable cause that a person has committed an offense and is subject to arrest.

For years, the Department has reported to the city council on level 3 and level 4 encounters. Late last year, the City Council passed the How Many Stops Act, which requires the Department to provide quarterly data regarding Level 1 and Level 2 encounters. For months, we convened an executive level working group. We created new policies and procedures, new electronic forms, new systems to aggregate the data, and new training for our officers. In October, consistent with the How Many Stops Act, we reported the required data for the third quarter of 2024. This is a major change for the Department, and we continue to learn and improve. It is no secret that the Department was opposed to the Level 1 component of the How Many Stops Act. We are not here to rehash that debate. We are committed to complying with the law, and we have worked very hard, and in good faith, to meet our obligations under the law.

With regard to Level 3 encounters, the Department has been under a federal monitorship for a decade. I

2.2

2.3

wanna emphasize that I cannot speak for the monitor.

Only the monitor can do that, and she speaks through
her reports. That said, I want to offer a few

observations on behalf of the Department.

When it comes to the monitorship and the constitutionality of Level 3 encounters, the Department has made tremendous progress. We have rewritten our policies and revamped our training. Level 3 stops have fallen by over 90% since 2011. There has been a significant shift in the nature of policing in this city.

That said, there is still more work to be done.

The Department works closely with the monitor, and we learn from the monitor. There are times when we agree with the monitor's critiques. There are times when we disagree. But it is always a collaborative relationship in which we are fully engaged and responsive.

I want to close by emphasizing that we are discussing encounters that take place on the street in situations that can be fast moving, complicated, and potentially dangerous. Officers are asked to make split second decisions, sometimes with incomplete information, and often with concerns about public

2	safety and their own safety. This is challenging
3	work, and the challenge is compounded by the fact
4	that the law in this area is incredibly complex and
5	fact specific. Retired judge, Barry Kamins, who
6	literally wrote the book on the subject, has
7	explained how confusing the law in this area can be.
8	He writes: "Probably no area of search and seizure
9	law has caused more confusion and frustration than
10	that of street encounters with the police, where the
11	officer acts on less than probable cause. New York
12	appellate courts have acknowledged for some time that
13	the subject is riddled with problems. The First
14	Department has stated that one of the most vexing of
15	judicial issues is the delineation of permissible
16	police intrusion on the liberty of the private
17	citizen in a street encounter. The same court has
18	noted that seemingly similar fact patterns sometimes
19	result in different outcomes and lead to confusion."
20	He continues, "One of the primary reasons for the
21	state of confusion in this area is the diversity of
22	fact patterns involving street encounters and the
23	realization that the proper determination in cases of
24	this sort must necessarily turn on the facts in each
25	individual case. Two separate cases with almost

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

identical facts can produce different results because of a subtle difference in only one factor. If there is any conclusion one can draw from this, it is the realization that this is not a precise and exact body of law with equations that can readily produce easy solutions."

This is a lawyer and judge writing for other lawyers and judges who have the benefit of time to ponder the facts, review court decisions, debate abstract legal principles, and ultimately decide how to analyze and categorize a particular encounter.

We require our police officers, most of whom are not lawyers, to do this out on patrol in real time, sometimes in highly volatile situations. We must require this of our officers because it is the law. But I think it is important, as we discuss these issues, to acknowledge how much we demand of our police officers and how challenging their work can be.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify about these important issues. We look forward to answering any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

(PAUSE)

2.2

2.3

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for your testimony. Before we dive into the details of policing and procedures, I would like to start by asking a simple big picture question.

Do you believe that racial profiling or other forms of bias are reflected in how the Department and its officers engage with civilian and conduct investigative encounters?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So the CCRB, as you know, has responsibility for investigating, uh, racial profiling, bias based policing. They took that over, I guess it was end of last year, really beginning of this year. And that... that process they have a whole unit that looks at this, investigates cases, uhm, some matters have not been substantiated, some matters have. Those, you know, allegations and those cases then make their way through, our disciplinary system. We do have a number of such cases pending, and I think those cases need to play out through that disciplinary system. Obviously, these are incredibly sensitive cases, incredibly serious allegations. The presumptive penalty for bias based policing or racial profiling is termination, and rightfully so. But, of course, there's a need for due process and for these cases to play out. That...

that's what's actually happening, uhm, that's what's happening now, and that's what will be happening in the future.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: And I would just wanna push a little bit more on this, because the goal of today is to have an honest conversation and discuss potential reforms, and must agree on the underlying facts.

It remains a consistent and painful truth that despite over a decade of oversight from the federal monitor and ongoing efforts to reform Department practices, whether or not you are stopped by the NYPD still seems to be influenced by the color of your skin.

In 2013, when a federal judge found that the NYPD was liable for a pattern of practices of racial profiling in violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, approximately 82% of people stopped by the police were Black and Latino, even though these two groups made up only 52% of the city's population.

While the total number of stops has gone down over the years, the racial disparities and who gets stopped has gotten worse. Last year, 90% of the people stopped by the NYPD were people of color.

/

Is the NYPD comfortable continuing policing practices that have resulted in Black and brown New Yorkers being stopped at a rate nearly eight times greater than that of white people? Or would you agree that these stark racial disparities are an indication that there are Department practices that must change so that every community in New York City is policed the same way?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So I think in answering that question, I would start, uhm, with referring to the Monitor's Report on this issue earlier this year.

The monitor did a very comprehensive, detailed, very nuanced report about racial disparities. It came out, I'm not sure the exact one, but it was definitely earlier this year. Looking at racial disparities, 2013 to 2022, I believe, and that report, uhm, in some ways, uh, was... so I'd...that report describes very positive developments, but also pointed to some issues, like the ones you're talking about, that really do require very careful analysis.

So I do want to highlight that, in terms of the post-stop disparities, and that was a major issue in Floyd back in the day, you know, the sort of post-

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

stop racial disparities along variety of lines, arrest, summons, use of force, recovery of contraband. You know, the monitor found that those racial disparities, and there's are... the monitor used a sophisticated statistical model, which I could not describe to you. I'm not a statistician. But, the moderator found those disparities, in many cases, had had collapsed entirely, which is welcome news. And even with regard to frisks and searches post-stop, depending on which area you were looking at and depending on the race, again, you saw disparities that either had been, narrowed or collapsed entirely. So that is very positive. Now the report also pointed to the issue, Chair Salaam, that you just described, which is that the, racial breakdown in terms of stops, even as the total number has fallen, the sort of racial breakdown has remained roughly the same over time.

One thing we are working on right now, uh, is a 14th Amendment compliance plan with the monitor. And that's something that's incredibly important. It's important for the monitorship. It's important to address the issues that you're... that you're talking about. I don't think I can say too much about the

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

substance, because it has not been approved by the

3 monitor yet, but we provide the monitor with a draft,

4 we got comments back, we're in we're in that process.

There will be input from plaintiff's counsel as well, 5

and any 4th Amendment compliance plan obviously has 6

to have the final approval of the monitor.

But I'll say, big picture, that the entire point of that compliance plan is to get at these issues, to look at these disparities, to do it in a quantitative way, in a rigorous way, and understand what is driving that.

So I just, I do want to say that that's something that we're actually very focused on. It's been a priority of ours in connection with the monitorship. And that's something... that's something we're hoping to implement.

Again, as we go back and forth with the monitor, we need to get to something that the monitor obviously approves. We also will need to get input from plaintiff's counsel, which is very important.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: So developing this plan has been a legal mandate for over 10 years. I have a very simple question: What's taking so long, and what are the details of that plan?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: When you say the plan, do you mean the Racial Disparity... the, uhm, 14th Amendment Compliance Plan or you mean, uh, monitorship compliance more generally?

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: The 14th Amendment. It's...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So I think... I think it's a fair question, and I think it's a fair critique.

You know, I think for the early years of the monitorship, I think there was a lot of focus on revising policies, revising training. There has been for a long time now I think a lot of focus on the 4th Amendment piece. I think it is totally fair to say that the monitor has been pushing the Department to have a... they do a (UNINTELLIGIBLE) development compliance plan for quite some time, and there certainly wasn't extended period of time when we had not done that. It's a fair criticism.

But, I mean, we really (UNINTELLIGIBLE) push on this year, this calendar year, is to is to is to fill that gap. So we're doing it now, working with the monitor on that, and it is a priority.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: In September, at the request of the Federal Monitor, a report was published that

2.2

included recommendations for how long the Department could curb misconduct by improving disciplinary procedures.

I want to ask about some of these recommendations, many of which directly relate to curbing unconstitutional investigative encounters.

The report explains that when the CCRB recommends penalties for misconduct, the police commissioner often decreases them when an officer asserts that their actions were in good faith or mistake.

Does the NYPD have a written policy regarding how officer discipline is impacted by claims that an officer acted in good faith or due to a mistake?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah. Sure.

So, the Patrol Guide 212-11, which sort of covers investigative encounters generally and it does speak to this issue. And I think it's important to emphasize that that 212-11, what I'm about to describe, is monitor approved, court approved. It's not just our acting unilaterally. Because, obviously, many Patrol Guide procedures, we do ourselves. That's not true for 212-11, because of the monitorship, uhm, that was the product of, you know, court oversight.

And frankly, if we make changes to that, uh, that

2 relate to the monitorship in any way, uh, we need to 3 get, approval from the monitor.

2.2

2.3

So 212-11 says that to the extent you have one time, inadvertent, good faith mistakes, it is, uh, instructions and training are appropriate, and it's not presumptively disciplined. And that point, I think, actually makes very good sense in light of what I said a moment ago about the complexity of the law in this area. It is an incredibly complex area of law. There are many situations in which multiple lawyers are looking at body worn camera video, and we're debating, is it Level 2? Is it Level 3? And, you know, it's one thing for lawyers to debate that, and ultimately, of course, we have to categorize it. We have to make a decision.

The monitor and her team and her work have to make that decision. That's necessary and understandable. But, of course, the police officer in the moment who gets that wrong, you know, that one time mistake, that good faith mistake, you know, our policy says training and instruction is appropriate, and I think... I think that's right.

Now, to the extent that someone has gotten training and instruction over and over and over

again, and continues to do the same thing, then there is a need for discipline. That is a 100% true. And to the extent we've gotten away from that, to the extent we've gotten, uh, in a situation where someone is repeatedly receiving instructions and training over and over, you know, at some point, that's no good. And there needs to be discipline. And I can say also, this is an issue. We have a new police commissioner, as you know, she is aware of this issue, she's been briefed on this issue. I think you're gonna see her very much addressing this issue. Commissioner Tisch is very much a problem solver. This is a problem. It is going to get solved.

(PAUSE)

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: The report also notes that a stop, a failure to file a report, a frisk, or a search are all separate and distinct acts, and that penalties for each type of misconduct should be addressed... or sorry, should be assessed consecutively and not concurrently.

In other words, if an officer conducts an illegal stop, goes on to conduct an illegal search, and then fails to file... to fill out the required report right now, they will and are often penalized as if

they are engaging in one act of misconduct and not three.

So my question is why does the NYPD allow an officer disciplinary penalties for distinct acts to be served concurrently? And in what circumstances does the Department impose disciplinary penalties that require it to be served consecutively?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So I'm gonna answer your question in one moment.

I just wanna say two things first: One, I do wanna say, you know, the report you're referring to, the Yates Report, you know, the court has set sort of a schedule for us to provide comments on that. And we're gonna do that consistent with, you know, the court's direction.

I am gonna answer your question, I just do wanna be clear, you know, there is, like, a separate sort of sort of judicial process for us to do that. I certainly don't wanna... I don't want to be any suggestion that this is sort of usurping that or a substitute for that.

I also do wanna say that, again, when it comes to discipline, you have a new police commissioner and

2.2

2.3

she's looking at these issues, and I certainly would not want to get ahead of her.

That said, when it comes to concurrent versus consecutive penalties, two things: One, the matrix actually does speak to this. There's an entire section in the matrix about concerning... concurrent and consecutive penalties. We actually worked on this language with the monitor's team. And, we made certain revisions, uh, to that language that were approved by the monitor. That's one thing.

The second thing is, in the scenario you described, it depends. It depends on the particular circumstances. And the question is, are we talking about one problem or multiple problems?

So imagine a police officer who believes, for example, that they've received consent. They think they have consent for whatever reason, uh, and they're wrong about that. Right? Maybe if... and so they think it's Level 2. They think they have consent, uh, consistent with the consent they believe they have, there's a frisk, there's a search, they don't do a Level 3 report, because they think they're a Level 2.

Now that's a mistake. That's a mistake. And

2.2

2.3

consistent with our disciplinary system, consistent with our matrix, consistent with many things, there may well be a need for discipline. But if it is really one mistake, I'm not sure they should be penalized multiple times for that. Right?

Now to the extent you have an officer who is, you know, deliberately saying, okay, I, you know, I know there's a Level 3 encounter, but I'm gonna... I'm gonna fly right by that, I'm, you know, I'm gonna... I'm gonna, I'm not gonna do a report; I'm separately gonna do unconstitutional frisk. Again, if they are independent acts and independent decisions, I hear exactly what you're saying in terms of the need for a disciplinary system to account for that.

There's also a matter of fairness. If someone's making one mistake that plays out in multiple ways, I think that the system should account for that as well.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you, I am going to pass it to Council Member Cabán.

And, also, I want to just note that we have been joined by Council Member Ariola on Zoom.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: And, then, what are...

Like, what are the examples of the behaviors or

2.3

what's going on. They see people who might be

witnesses, who might have information about that

24

is almost never (UNINTELLIGIBLE) or really every

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay.

```
1
                THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
                                                        96
 2
        DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: 311, those are, as
 3
     you know...
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay...
 4
 5
        DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: often violations...
     (CROSS-TALK)
 6
 7
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: So, as...
 8
        DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: occasionally...
 9
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you...
10
        DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: misdemeanors.
11
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you, noted.
12
        So as of course, you know, the NYPD has been
13
     asserting this whole time that Level 1 encounters
14
     don't involve suspicion of criminal activity and
15
     therefore don't need to be reported. So there's some
16
     inconsistencies here, but certainly interested in
17
     seeing the connection between these Level 1
18
     encounters and broken windows policing.
19
        Okay, I am going to move on. I have a few
20
     questions regarding NYCHA housing: Are community
     members living in NYCHA housing especially dangerous?
21
        DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Excuse me?
2.2
2.3
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Are community members
     living in NYCHA housing especially dangerous?
24
25
        DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: No.
```

1	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 97
2	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay.
3	Does NYPD believe that by living in NYCHA
4	housing, people waive their constitutional protection
5	from unreasonable searches?
6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Absolutely not.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay. Does the NYPD believe
8	being Black in a low income neighborhood creates
9	grounds for a reasonable search?
10	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Absolutely not.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: And does being Black in any
12	neighborhood create reasonable grounds to be
13	searched?
14	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: The question is
15	offensive, and the answer is no.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay. So if the question is
17	offensive, why does your data consistently show that
18	regardless of neighborhood, Black people are subject
19	to stop-and-frisk tactics more than any other race?
20	If it's offensive, why does the data back up
21	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Because you are
22	you are
23	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: the justification for what
24	I'm asking?

suggesting that we are targeting people because of

their race. And we are not doing that...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: suggesting... You are

2

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Well, does the data say? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: We are not... COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Disproportionately, Black

and brown people are being searched, are being stopped and searched. Are...

CHIEF MADDREY: I took a look at the data... I took a look at the data, and of course I want to do a deeper dive. I was looking at the data in preparation of this. But, when I look at the neighborhoods that we're working in with where we are deploying, and I'm in charge of the deployment, along with my bureau chiefs...

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Mm-hmm

CHIEF MADDREY: When I look at neighborhoods like East New York, a neighborhood I'm very familiar with, who has 650 robberies versus Forest Hills, who has 79 robberies, of course we're going to be doing more (TIMER CHIMES) enforcement over there, we're going to be deploying more. There's gonna be more cops... (CROSS-TALK)

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: I wonder why that is?

1	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 99
2	CHIEF MADDREY: Alright? No, it's very much
3	organized. There's more cops over there, we're doing
4	more deployment there, we're addressing quality of
5	life conditions and crime conditions - 55 shootings,
6	11 murders versus zero in Forest Hills.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: So
8	CHIEF MADDREY: So, is that Is that (CROSS-
9	TALK)
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: So would you say then
L1	that
L2	CHIEF MADDREY: that that reason alone is
13	(INAUDIBLE) cause (CROSS-TALK)
L4	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Would say that that
15	neighborhoods that are majority Black are more crime
L6	prone or inherently dangerous? (CROSS-TALK)
L7	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: That is not what the
L8	chief said, no (CROSS-TALK)
L9	CHIEF MADDREY: (INAUDIBLE) There have But
20	there are more crime issues there. I'm not saying
21	it's more crime prone, but there are crimes that have
22	been committed there
23	COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Why are there more crime

issues there?

2.3

24

finish...

CHIEF MADDREY: So, uh...

```
1
                THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
                                                        101
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: this line questioning with
 2
 3
     a couple more questions?
        CHIEF MADDREY: (INAUDIBLE)...
 4
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Yes, just wanted to also...
 5
     (CROSS-TALK)
 6
        CHIEF MADDREY: So... (CROSS-TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you... (CROSS-TALK)
 8
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Just say that we have, uh...
10
     We're going to... (CROSS-TALK)
        CHIEF MADDREY: I... I have a (INAUDIBLE)...
11
12
     (CROSS-TALK)
        CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: have a second round...
13
14
     (CROSS-TALK)
15
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay, I just have two more,
16
     uh...
17
        CHIEF MADDREY: Now, wait, uh, let me answer the
18
     question. I have duty to protect people.
19
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Mm-hmm.
        CHIEF MADDREY: And when there's a high amount of
20
21
     shootings, a high amount of robberies, I have to send
     more cops over there. Alright? Listen, I wish I could
2.2
2.3
    bring the resources over there. I look to you to
    bring the resources over there. Alright? And I'm not
24
25
     saying that (INAUDIBLE) New York... (CROSS-TALK)
```

```
1
                THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
                                                        102
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Are you looking to the
 2
 3
     mayor to bring those resources? (CROSS-TALK)
 4
        CHIEF MADDREY: Looking to you to bring the
     resources (INAUDIBLE)... (CROSS-TALK)
 5
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Have you asked the mayor to
 6
 7
    bring those resources?
        CHIEF MADDREY: Alright? So, with that being said,
 8
     I have a duty... (CROSS-TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Have you asked the mayor...
10
11
     (CROSS-TALK)
12
        CHIEF MADDREY: I have a duty to... (CROSS-TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: to bring those resources?
13
14
        CHIEF MADDREY: bring police officers where crimes
15
     are being... (CROSS-TALK)
16
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay.
17
        CHIEF MADDREY: committed... (CROSS-TALK)
18
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: But have you asked the
19
     mayor for the resources for these communities...
20
        CHIEF MADDREY: I talk to the mayor all of the
     time about a lot of things... (CROSS-TALK)
21
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: It's a yes or no question.
2.2
2.3
        CHIEF MADDREY: (INAUDIBLE)... (CROSS-TALK)
        COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Have you asked the mayor
24
25
     for the resources?
```

specific population.

And so one of my questions was really on implicit

that the Department has... has implemented, uhm, as part of the revamping of stop-and-frisk?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So just, uhm, you

bias training and wondering whether that's something

wanna hear about training generally or about implicit bias in particular?

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Implicit bias in particular.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah, Yeah, so...so that's something that we have been doing and continue to do. So earlier this year, we did a 75 minute training for, really, the entire NYPD executive staff, uhm, risk factors for biased behavior, which gets at these types of issues. That was something that... that was... that was, I think, very productive and helpful.

And then more importantly, even more importantly, something were rolling out in January of this coming year, departmentwide fair and impartial policing training. That's for... that's for all employees. You know, we have a module we've done, a training module about racial profiling and bias based policing.

1 THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY We've had over... I think we had 24,000 officers 2 3 who have been trained on that. I'm not sure I've gotten it at all of the... all of the trainings... 4 DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: 24,000 officers to date have been trained on implicit bias? 6 7 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: On... I've done the... I've done the... It's a... I think it's a 8 video module, Racial Profiling and Biased Based Policing, yes. 10 11 DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: And how many officers are 12 on the force? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Uh, I think we have, 13 14 uhm, uniforms? We're around 30,000-ish. 15 CHIEF MADDREY: Yeah, total uniform about 33,000. 16 (CROSS-TALK) 17 DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Uh, I don't think your mic is on. 18 19 CHIEF MADDREY: Oh, sorry, uniform, 33,000. 20 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah, and I should 21 say, just to be clear, every... every... all of our recruits get training in the academy on this, right? 2.2 2.3 We do training on both policing legally, and we do

separate training on policing impartially. We do

training on policing in a multicultural society.

24

2.3

So, it's... there's... Everyone's getting this in the academy. And then on top of that, we're talking about essentially either ,you know, refresher courses or sort of where you're getting that kind of implicit bias issues and sophisticated training about that.

So, it's very much a work in progress. But it's something that we... we... we definitely do, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Okay. So the use of stop and frisk skyrocketed during the Bloomberg administration, and highlighting its central role in the NYPD's policing strategy during that era. Following the Floyd decision, the NYPD drastically reduced the number of stops, decreasing from, uh, conducting 685,724 stops in 2011 to 532,911 stops in 2012, to 191,851 stops in 2013 down to 46,787 stops in 2014, 22,000 stops in 2015, and now, and reaching a low of 8,947 stops in 2021.

In recent years, under the administration of,
Mayor Eric Adams, stop-and-frisk numbers have
consistently increased, reversing prior, trends.

Do you have an... how do you explain that? I mean, that's a significant increase. Right? We're recording, so in 2023, there were 17,000 stops; in

)

2.3

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: So... so there seems to be a disruption. Right? And whatever trend was... was occurring that was taking us on a downslide has now, you know, taken us back up.

CHIEF MADDREY: Yeah...

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: How do... How do we justify...

CHIEF MADDREY: Council Member, I mean if you look at the crime in 2016, 2017, 2018, it was a lot. It was significantly lower. Alright, we have been going up in crime, especially after COVID. So, I mean, our police officers are out there, they're engaging more, they're trying to reduce the crime, they're trying to bring down shootings. So, I think there is a correlation with there being more crime as compared to 2016, 2017, and 2018 versus 2021, 2022, and 2023.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Yeah, and I... I'll just,

I... Look, I do see that... And I recognize that

stop-and-frisk was a tool that was used, right, to

stop crime or prevent crime from occurring. I get

that. I think that it's the way that it's used, uhm,

has shown to be abusive. Right? There's been a lot of

abuse of power from NYPD officers as it relates to

stop-and-frisk. My son has been , you know, on the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

receiving end of that, coming out of his building, walking to the store - he stops to talk to his friends in front of his own building, gets stopped. Right? Uhm, he's walking ,you know, to work, helps a lady to carry her carriage into the building, he gets stopped because he looks like somebody. So, it's not... When it happens enough times, and it is not... it is no longer a coincidence, right? Then there is something obviously in the universe of policing that is skewed against people of a specific community, of specific identities. And that's the part I think that we're here to learn - is how , you know, have we applied those lessons learned, uh, the new, uh, policies around stop-and-frisk to reduce the numbers and to ensure that we're not stopping , you know, young men and women of color just because they live in a specific community. Right? And... And you can... You know, and I... And I can... If you tell me, well , you know, Council Member, the reason that , you know, in this specific precinct, it's because that's ,you know, you had a lot more crime there, then... And, I... It kind of makes sense, but it... I don't believe that crime is not happening in other precincts as well. So, the fact that the demographics

25

2 are primarily made up of Black and brown people,

3 doesn't look good. Right? So there has to be an

4 explanation for that that makes sense to us, right,

5 as legislators, so, that ,you know, we're better able

6 to work with the NYPD to ensure that , you know, this

7 | is not happening. Right? That we are not just

8 stopping people. So that's why I asked the question

9 about implicit bias, because I think that, because

10 policing is a difficult job, and ,you know, and I've

11 seen... I've... I've seen it. You know? I... I... I

12 work very closely with my officers. And I have no

13 problem holding the NYPD or anybody else to task when

14 I think something is wrong.

But, I do acknowledge that it is a very difficult job. But, I think in the course of that, right, you

17 have to make these decisions in rapid turnaround,

18 mistakes are often made. And the fact that they are

19 consistently made in communities like mine, is

20 problematic. So, I think that what I'd like to hear

21 | from these, uh ,you know, interactions is

22 | recognition. Like, look ,you know, it isn't... It

23 | isn't a perfect system. Right? We're looking at the

24 | numbers, and we agree, right, that there is a

significantly higher census data for Black and brown

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

people. This is why, alright? Or, we're trying to figure out the why and change that. Because implicit bias, I believe, does play a significant part of those stops.

I believe that , you know, our young kids are walking around , you know, with their pants down, they're walking around ,you know, as, uhm, Samy said with a bookbag that may have a brush in ,you know, in it. And somebody saw it and , you know, maybe assumed the wrong thing. But, these interactions are very traumatic. So, it's not ,you know, if the arrests are not significant enough, right, that lends to the argument that the stop-and-frisk is a valuable... such a valuable tool for the NYPD, then something is going to have to change in the culture of the NYPD in the way that you do this. Right? And I don't want to.. I think that it would be really nice to kind hear that from the NYPD, as opposed to having legislators force that upon you.

CHIEF MADDREY: Well, let me just address something... (CROSS-TALK)

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Do I make sense?

CHIEF MADDREY: No, no, I understand. So, let me address something, Council Member.

2

3

4

5

6

1

8

,

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

Now I've been in the Department a long time. Alright? And I was around for 2009, 10, and 11 when Stop, Question, Frisk was at its highest. Alright? It was something where, you know, we had to answer for. We had to answer for why? Why? Why? It wasn't properly used, and there was a lot of pressure with it. We don't do that anymore. We don't do that anymore. I'm the Chief of Department. I chair CompStat (Compare Stats). That is not a question that's asked. I don't want ever... any of my office... officers to ever think that they have to go out there and stop somebody because there's a certain pressure coming from the top. That is not the case. Alright? We ask our officers to go out there and use that intelligently. Alright? It's rooted in the

Do we see mistakes? Absolutely. Do we see things that we need to address? Absolutely. Alright?

intelligently, we want them to use it properly.

constitution, and we want them to use it

In preparing for this meeting, I've... I became aware of some things that I wanna go back and take a deeper dive on. But one thing I can assure you is that we do not pressure our officers to go out and do this. Alright? We put officers in places that need

help. Alright? Places that require help, places where

2.3

we see crime. That's where we put our officers. And
we want them to go out there and be visible and talk
to the communities and work with them.

And if there's a situation where they have to

conduct a stop, I want them to document it. Alright?

Be truthful about what happened out there. Explain what happened, and maybe we could teach you better.

Maybe we say, hey, you messed up, or maybe we say, you did a great job, you prevented something.

Alright?

So this is what we want, and this is what we expect. We'll keep looking at it and keep working on it, because I don't want people to feel that we're doing it just because - we're going into a community just because you're Black or you're brown. That's not what we're pushing out.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Yeah, but do you rec... Do you keep records of like, in a non-Black and brown community ,you know, what the... what the numbers of stop-and-frisk are and compare that?

CHIEF MADDREY: Absolutely...

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Okay...

CHIEF MADDREY: I have stop-and-frisk for every

3 precinct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Okay.

CHIEF MADDREY: And for every precinct, I can tell you the stop-and-frisk. I look at the precincts, I look at the crime, and like I said, the example I use, I looked at the 112, Forest Hills, an area I know, I looked at the 75, I mean, the crime numbers are completely different. They're completely different. We need more cops over there. We need cops to engage. People are being shot over there. People

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: No, I, listen, I get that, and I hear that in my precinct council meetings, right, I hear that a lot from my... especially, like, a lot of the senior citizens that are sitting in front of benches that are ,you know, sometimes having to ,you know, throw themselves on the floor, because there's gunshots happening. I get that. Like, I want to feel safe in my own community...

CHIEF MADDREY: Yes...

are being... (CROSS-TALK)

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: I want to... I want people to feel safe in their community. But I just don't want there to be any impression that because there

1 are people in my community that ,you know, may be 2 3 committing crimes, that we're all committing crimes. And how do we get to a place where we're not 4 5 necessarily stopping folks just because they have drooping pants or are wearing a bookbag that looks 6 7 like it, you know, it may have something in it when there's no other obvious reason for stopping that 8

CHIEF MADDREY: Right...

person. Right?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: There has to be that... And unless we meet there, we're con... gonna have this conversation every single year. We're never going to change, because we're doing the same thing and expecting a different outcome.

CHIEF MADDREY: Mm-hmm, and I agree with you. We don't want people stopped because of their pants are drooping or the kind of sneakers that they're wearing. But, as you just said, you go to the meetings and you hear this from the people...

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Mm-hmm.

CHIEF MADDREY: I've gone to numerous meetings throughout the community, throughout this whole city, a lot of times I go to these... go to these community meetings, and people are asking me, "Oh, we want the

고디다	COMMITTEE	\cap NI	PIIRLIC	CAEELA

officers to come to the building because of problems." "We want them to come to this corner because of the problems." "We want them to do this because of these problems." What do you think they're asking us? They're asking to come there to stop people, to challenge people, to move people along. This happens all the time. This... Even in your district...

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Mm-hmm

2.2

2.3

CHIEF MADDREY: I've been in some of the developments where they call and said, "There are people in here, we're not safe." And we have to go in there, and say, "Hey, do you live here? If you don't live here, you have to leave." This is exactly what our officers are doing. They're conducting a stop when they do that. And a lot of this is based on community complaints. I've been in community meetings all over this city, people ask us to go out there and do this.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: And...

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: People ask me all the time, too, but I know better than that. Right? So, when people ask me that, I also explain that while, yes, we're absolutely right to want to feel safe in our...

in our... in our buildings, uhm, in our place of

residence, in our streets, that there is also ,you know, a fine line when now we're ,you know, trampling

5 on people's basic rights. Right?

CHIEF MADDREY: And...

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: to... to walk the streets.

And these are young impressionable, often times,
impressionable young, you know, men of color. And
that has a long lasting impact on that individual for
many, many more years. I can tell you every
interaction that I've had with an NYPD officer. And I
haven't even done anything. Like ,you know, I have...
I've never been arrested. I have never committed a
crime. And yet, I... and the... and again, and that's
part of the implicit bias. Right? Like, their... It
goes both ways.

CHIEF MADDREY: Absolutely.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Whenever I see a police officer that's interacting in a specific ,you know, type of stop, like, I'm nervous. And I ,you know, I tell my husband all the time, do not make eye contact. Like, when we're driving, I tell him, do not make eye contact. Because I've made eye contact with an officer that looks like me, that has stopped me...

2 CHIEF MADDREY: Mm-hmm

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: because I looked at him.

CHIEF MADDREY: Right.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: And , you know, and, so, these things , you know, they continue to happen, and I just ,you know, I... And I don't think we're going to get to a resolution today, I think I would like , you know, I would love there to be some sort of initiated response from the NYPD that says, like, look, "We're looking at this data, and you're absolutely right." Especially because we have so many people of color at the top , you know, we expect a little bit more. Because these are our communities that we're talking about, and I'm not saying that everybody's a saint, and I'm not saying that crime is not being committed, those things are happening. But 95-97% of the people that live in my community are good, decent people that are going to work every day that are just trying to live , you know, a decent life. And ,you know, it...

CHIEF MADDREY: And I... And I agree with you,

Council Member. We could definitely take a better

look. And I don't want people to feel that way. We

will work on it. We will work on it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: I appreciate that, thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you, I would like to pass it to Council Member Joseph.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you, Chair.

Something I've always said ever since I was an educator, communities that have resources have less crime. And in your statement earlier, you stated that, and Council Member Cabán also highlighted the need for that. So that's... that's where that is.

So, we know as a mom of boys - and my boys get stopped all the time, and there's no excuse for it.

Right? Whether they're driving my car or not, getting pulled over, put in handcuffs, to say to them, "Well, you didn't match the description on the car, the driver is unacceptable for me." So that's the experience that many of the Black men who come here experience, and that's unfortunate.

So let's talk about accountability and responsibility. Does the public have access to the How Many Stop Acts data that you collect?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: It's posted online, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: It's what?

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: And what was the response?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

2.2

2.3

24

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: They have not taken me up on that yet.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: And can you figure out why?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: I hope they will meet with me about it. I'd like to talk...

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: There's a trust issue. Just like I don't trust, because of my boys, when they step outside, I'm worried about them. I'm sure, across the city, the parents, and as an educator, I felt the same way about the students that I taught. That coming to school is about the same experience. So, that perception has to change. That trust has to be gained. And over the summer, I had an incident with Chief Maddrey. He had to come to the district to apologize to my young people, because NYPD came in and trampled over my young people at a basketball game. And some of my colleagues will never understand that. You ask young people to work with you, we ask young people to trust them. But yet you come and violate that space. You have to do right. By imposing trauma on young people, we have to do... We have to right the wrong. Right? And we have to make it right.

Right? So maybe that's why they're not meeting with you. Because there's no trust. And I told Commissioner Stewart the same thing. He's, like, "Chair, I... I. I created all these great programs, no kids show up." They don't trust you. So, you have to build better messengers. And as you're doing this, you have to start talking to young people.

How does the NYPD address community concern about racial disparities highlighted in the How Many Stop

Act data? How do you how do you talk to community

members about that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So what I would say is, though, I... I think it's important, we have for the How Many Stops Act, we have one quarter of data.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Mhmm.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: I think it is way too soon to draw any conclusions about that data. I think we need a lot more of it before we draw any conclusions for good or ill. I, you know, that I don't say that in defense of the department or... or almost as an advocate. I just say it's like, with only one quarter of data, I don't think you can draw conclusions any which way. I think we're gonna get data over time, it will be quarters, it'll be years.

2 And then I think... I'm sure there will be, I'm sure

3 there will be analyses that are done, sophisticated

4 analyses of that data. I will say that on the Level 1

5 piece, you know, a Level 1 encounter, right, is

6 fundamentally different than, you know, a Level 3

7 Terry stop.

1

8

9

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: What are the differences? Please explain.

10 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Sure. I mean, a Level

11 | 1 encounter, I mean, it's like, a (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

12 | legal matter. Right? The person's free to leave. It's

13 not there's no, suspicion of criminality. I'm sure it

14 doesn't have to be. You see an objectable...

objective, credible reason to approach. And most of

16 those scenarios are about talking to victims, talking

17 | to witnesses.

I think about level... level ones... Level ones

19 as being about responding to the community,

20 responding to 911 calls, responding to community

21 concerns. Obviously, when you're talking about Level

22 3, you're talking about enforcement. You are. It's a

23 stop. The person is not free to leave.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: But how do you use that data that you've captured to also inform policies on how you're gonna do better? Because earlier you...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: talked about Patrol Guide, training, refreshers course, officers that do not put in their information. How does that happen?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Sure...

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: You call CCRB, there's no leader to lead the CCRB right now, so where's the accountability and responsibility?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So think there are a few different pieces of this.

So one, I... I do want to say, talk for a minute about compliance stat, which is something that we... we started earlier this year. It... it is a major innovation for the Department. I think it's gonna have a really significant effect on how we do things.

You know, there's a joke in the Department that if you, you know, if we're serious about something, we create a stat about it. And there is.. there's... there's truth to that in the sense that you're gathering data, you're getting executives involved, (TIMER CHIMES) you're... you're pushing

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

accountability. And compliance stat functions very 2 3 much like ComStat. Right? In the same sense that we 4 have a ComStat, we have COs at the podium being held 5 accountable with our crime problems and their respective commands. Here, it's about accountability 6 7 in terms of under reporting, body worn camera activation, the Level 2, Level 3 distinction. You 8 have you have you have COs standing there being grilled by some of the most senior executives, 10 11 uniforms in the department, uhm, on their on how they do compliance, how they do oversight. I think that's 12 incredibly important. 13

There's an entire team that's been created, in the in the CO's patrol's office, that what they're doing, you know, pretty much all day every day is they're... they're prepping for... for compliance stat, pulling videos, analyzing videos.

We put up a compliance stat, both good videos and bad videos. I think it's actually a really helpful thing.

We have all the COs who are borough command in the room, and we're walking through videos, and we're showing examples of really great policing. And, by the way, when I say great policing, it's not just

2.2

lawful policing, but also that they're talking to people the right way.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: And how does that trickle down to communities that are being impacted?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Right. So the... the idea, the idea is that COs are taking this back to their cops, are learning from this, learning from this because they're seeing what's appropriate and what's not. They're getting feedback from executives on what works and what's not. And that's... they're taking it back to their teams, and they... they wanna do this right. In the same way they wanna succeed in ComStat, they wanna succeed in compliance debt. I think it does have an effect.

And, frankly, it is... compliance stat is a great example of the monitor raising concerns, some of the same concerns that you're talking about right now, and the Department being proactive, being responsive.

I should say there are many things that we do because the monitor requires some of us, a 100%. Compliance, that was something that we came up with. We said, we wanna do this. We came to the monitor with it. We said, hey, we think this would be really important, really helpful. The monitor comes to every

_

_

2.3

meeting - or the monitor or a member of her team, she's come to some herself, sometimes it's members of her team. But they're... they're at every single one of these meetings. They are giving us feedback, and I think it's a very important step.

On the discipline piece, as I said earlier, we have a new police commissioner. She is looking at this issue, this issue. And I... and I don't wanna get ahead of her, but what you are gonna see under Commissioner Tisch is a disciplinary system that is fair and that is effective. And that is what you are going to see.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: And we will hold you to that. Chair, I will come on back in on the second round.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

I am going to pass it to Council Member Stevens.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Hello, good afternoon.

I just want to start off by saying, Deputy

Commissioner, I was texting with groups as we were

sitting here. I know you said you reached out to them

to meet with them on How Many Stops. Folks said... I

don't know who you reached out to, but I'll be happy

to help you connect because I am a problem solver.

2 And

2.2

2.3

And if that's an issue, let's make sure it happens because that's...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: That's great.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: That is important. We're bringing people in the room together to have real conversations, because it's the only way we're ever gonna solve anything. So I will be helping you set that up, so don't worry about it. Don't you worry your pretty little face.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: And, I just wanna also say, Chief Maddrey, you're not lying, people in my community are always asking for more cops. That is... when I'm at the precinct council meetings, that is what I hear often like, we need more cops, we need more cops, but you know, and I always reeducate them that we need more resources. Right?

Like even if we get more cops, it's gonna continue to happen, because what happens, poverty is going to drive the crime up, and so we have to make sure that we are infusing the same amount of resources that we are infusing cops.

And so I say it all the time, which is why my... well my inspectors love me, because I'm like, I'm

2.3

trying to get you to do your job and not everybody else's job. You are not a social worker, you are not a you are not... you are not gonna do all the things that it's a good... that needs to get done. You don't have to... you shouldn't be doing Homeless Services - You... none of the things. So my job is to help you guys get the resources so you don't have to be there. Right?

So you are correct, and you're not lying. And I do wanna make sure that that's being said, because I hear that all the time, we need more cops. And I'm like, is that what we need? Is that gonna solve the issue? No. We don't have any community centers. The kids have nowhere to go. "Oh, why they standing in front of the building?" Where they gonna go? Who's gonna let them come in their program?

So I think we have to work together to make sure that we are figuring out how we get more resources. Right? I think, you know, us together should be going to the mayor saying like, you see these areas? We need more resources. And I know they've tried to do different things with like Saturday Night Lights and all those things, but as we can see it's not working the way we want it to work. So then what we should do

2.3

is go back and say, let's reevaluate it to see what else we could do, and this is why I'm always saying - because I'm the chair of DYCD and ECS, and which is why I'm always saying, well how do we evaluate that?

How do we know it's working?

Cause if we don't have the data to back it up, then we can't say it's working. And today the data is showing that we are criminalizing certain people, and so that's why for me it's like how do we now figure out how to move forward and change this? So the next time we come, we're reporting on how we've changed it and what that really looks like. And so that's how I really wanna focus the conversation.

And so in the 4 6 precinct, there has been the... they've had a really bad record of escalating Level 1 encounters to more serious offenses. Uh, 18% of the Level 1 stops led to summonses, and 2.6% led to arrest, but 95% of all Level 1 stops of Black and brown and Latinos is a higher percentage of stops of 25%, uhm, self initiated.

And so we're seeing that this is trending up. Can you talk to me about what trainings officers and detectives are getting around conducting Level 1 encounters?

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So, officers don't really get... Well, we've gotten training about the How Many Stops Act. (UNINTELLIGIBLE) with How Many Stops Act.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Mm-hmm.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: When you talk about training... (CROSS-TALK)

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: But, what are some of those... What... Could you talk a little bit about those trainings, too?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Sure. Sure. Well, if
I may, just in terms of sort of how we rolled out the
How Many Stops Act and how we sort of...

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Mhmm.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah. So...

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: I don't have a lot of time, so succinct, don't be trying to eat up all my time. Because I see what you be doing...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: (LAUGHS) No, no, I'm... I want to answer your question.

In connection with the How Many Stops Act, before sort of July 1, and even after July 1, we did a lot of things. Right? We did an operations order; we did an administrative bulletin; we did a legal bulletin

2 about Level 2, uh, Level 2 interaction and consent; 3 we did a training video.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Alright, you're eating up my time...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: You do a training video? Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: We did a training video, uhm, and also we've had conversations at the executive level and with groups of COs about the importance of this.

In terms of the nature of the interaction itself though, I do wanna say, like, a Level 1 encounter, you're talking about a cop saying to someone, you know, did you see anything? Did you hear anything? Hey, we got a call about this. Do you know anything about that? Hey, we're looking for this kid. Hey, we got a report of gunshots, did you hear anything?

I mean, those are, like, your basic Level 1 encounters. So I mean... I mean, that's sort of... I mean, our cops (UNINTELLIGIBLE) know how to talk to people a 100%, but I'm but... I'm not... and that's incredibly important. But I'm not sure that it's

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

really about, like, a special training for how to do a Level 1 encounter, if that makes sense?

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Well, I might differ. So that's where we might differ. Because I think you do need a special training on how to, like, interact with people period. Right? Because even saying, like, "Did you see something?" and those things, sometimes people do need to have additional training or prompts or whatever they might need.

And because you ate up a lot of my time, I have another question really quickly. And this is pertaining to the gang database. Could you talk to me a little bit about, like, how the gang database has improved crime throughout the city? Like, how are those things correlating? Because for me, has it, like, changed dramatically? Does it, like, help with like, how is it improving, policing in in New York City?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Right. So the gang database is an intelligence tool, and I do wanna say, and I know you're watching the clock, but also there were things that were said before the gang database that are not true.

And I do wanna say that just for a second. Right?

1	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY 135
2	Criminal gang database (TIMER CHIMES), there was
3	a DOI report last year. We made major changes to the
4	database in light of that report. We took most of
5	DOI's recommendations, implemented most of those
6	recommendations. Some of it was being described
7	(CROSS-TALK)
8	COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Are you notifying people
9	that they're on the database?
LO	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: We do not notify
L1	people. We did say, though, as one of the things, is
L2	that if someone if someone does FOIL it, we will,
13	consistent with the FOIL Law, we'll honor that
L4	(CROSS-TALK)
15	COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Has anybody been removed
L6	off the database this last year?
L7	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: What was that?
18	COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Has anybody been removed
L9	off the database this last year?
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: We have an entire
21	process for reviewing this. Right?
22	COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: No, I'm asking you, how
23	many people have been removed from the database this

year? If you implemented all these....

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yes.

wrap it up here...

2.3

them...

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: But... They... It's self admission, and multiple, at least two separate witnesses - and do people sometimes, when they're being interviewed by law enforcement admit to gang membership? The answer to that is, yes, absolutely that happens.

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Okay. And they might have mentioned someone else being on there or something like that, got it. But, again, I think that if you... That hasn't really told me how that has helped improved crime...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So...

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: throughout the city. But, we can talk more about it, and I would love to hear more about the criteria that has been changed, and talk about it, uhm, because it's still very alarming to me. Right? Because the race disparities are, again, it's alarming. And Black and brown people are not the only ones in gangs. And that's a problem. And you cannot tell me by any means that it's helping anything, other than showing that you are terrorizing one group of people.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: I do want to say
though, to say that we are terrorizing people through

2.2

2.3

weren't.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Yeah, I'm terrorized by
6 it, because I could be on there. I can feel
7 terrorized by that.

the criminal group database, it...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Gangs and crews are real, and sometimes (INAUDIBLE)... (CROSS-TALK)

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: I didn't say that they

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: And sometimes they hurt people, people get hurt, sometimes people are shot or killed, and we have to have to a way of keeping track of who is in which gangs or crews... (CROSS-TALK)

COUNCIL MEMBER STEVENS: Deputy Commissioner, we are on the same page. I am not saying that we don't have gangs. I do... But, it's not illegal to be on a gang, that is not a criminal thing. If you done something, and you have done a crime, I am not saying that that is okay. But, if people have not committed a crime, they should not be being surveillanced. That's a problem for me. So, again, this to me is very point blank period. And I understand, like, oh,

this is a tool, but if the tool is not doing what we need, right? We just talked about data and having evaluations, but if it's not doing what we need it to

5 do, then why are we... why do we have it?

So, that's just my take. And we'll continue the conversation. And I am going to leave it there. And we are going to keep... And I'm going to connect you to the organizations, so you can talk about How Many Stops. And we are going to continue to have this conversation about the database, so set some time up with me.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. We are going to pass it to Council Member Holden.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for your testimony, Deputy Commissioner and Chief.

I just want to bring up, on How Many Stops, I know you don't have the data yet, but you do have the data on response times and critical response. Could you tell us since, uh, recently, since that law was enacted, are there is... there an increase in the response times?

2.2

2.3

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So the very short answer to that is, no.

Let me... let me give you a little bit more data about that, though. So I'll pull it up in a second. The response times in the third quarter of 2024 were down slightly. Obviously, there are a lot of factors that go into that. It's something that the Department has been very focused on, and Chief Maddrey can speak to that. But third quarter response times were down slightly. I think when it comes to How Many Stops, what we've done as part of our policy is we've given officers the choice, essentially. They can either... for the Level 1 form, they can fill it out essentially in real time. Right? You can sort of... as you have each Level 1 encounter, you can add to the form and essentially, like, save the form over the course of the day, if that makes sense. Or you can do it at the end of your tour, based on body worn camera, based on your activity log, based on your memory.

That flexibility we thought was important for a variety of reasons, in part because this is new and we just, uh, we're trying to figure out what works best. Part of it also is, obviously, depending on the

_

_

command, the tour, uh, it can vary very widely. And there are places where officers are running from one critical call to the next. We didn't want them to have to fill it out in real time. Obviously, if they if they have the time, then great. But if they don't have the time, they can do it at the end of tour.

I think we are seeing a lot of officers doing it at the end of tour, which would explain why you're not seeing an increase in response times. We do have an overtime code for How Many Stops. So the third quarter of 2024 is about 18,000 hours spent on the form by our police officers. That's about \$1.44 million in overtime. So I think you're not seeing it play out in response times. You're seeing it play out... (CROSS-TALK)

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: So, but you'll get criticized for that, because of, uh, overtime. So, it's a no win situation many times I've seen in policing.

But I just wanna, you know, I've been to almost 40 years now going to civic and precinct council meetings. I've never gone to one where they don't want cops - more cops. So I and I know, Chief, you

of recreation, both the school yards or inside. And

just walk. Right?

25

2.2

2.3

2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: So to call it a stop is actually incorrect. And you mentioned that. But resisting arrest, what percent of, like, the Level 3, let say you have reasonable suspicion that this person has done something, uhm, and they... And in a Level 3, how many go south because they resist at least that? They just want to walk away or they try to get away?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Well, I could say this, I don't have the data on resisting arrest. I can... I have... I do have some data here on use of force in connection with Level 3 encounters (TIMER CHIMES). It's actually, quite... quite low. Uhm, we can definitely provide you with that data, through.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: We will... We will provide that to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Alright, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you, I am going to pass it to Council Member Paladino.

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Thank you both for being here today. I wanna thank my colleague Althea Stevens

2 and my colleague Bob Holden. They brought up a lot of 3 the things that I have here on my paper.

I wanna know what percentage of the NYPD is non-white? Forty percent?

CHIEF MADDREY: Sixty percent.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Sixty percent? Yes.

So the implication here, made by many of my colleagues is that the police force that is... that's compromised of almost half non-white minorities, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and such, is somehow acting on racial hostility against their own communities.

How would you say these accusations by my city council members impact the morale of the NYPD?

CHIEF MADDREY: What I will say about that,

Council Member, is that you have a lot of men and

women in this department who put their lives on the

line. They're very selfless. They don't think about

their own lives, sometimes their own families, and I

think we, seen that as a Council Member Holden spoke

about officer Jonathan Diller, March 25th. Last week,

I was with the family of Pete Figoski, I was his

commanding officer, and he responded to basically a

drug rip and lost his life. And, 13 years ago, and

it's still to this day, I think about it every day.

_

They'll... the men and the women of this department are selfless. They're not perfect, but they're selfless. They go out there. They're trying their best, and we just need the support of the people of New York and especially the people of City Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: I agree with you a 100%. Because it seems that whenever we get together here for what's supposed to be a Safety Committee hearing, it always turns a little ugly. And there's no reason for that, because I think we're both... we're all here as human beings. And what we want here is the very best for our city and especially our young people.

When your officers patrol a neighborhood, uh,
Bob brought this up, would you believe that the
residents are generally very happy to see your
presence there?

CHIEF MADDREY: I would say the big portion of the neighborhood, the greater portion of the neighborhood is happy that the officers are there. From my experience going to community meetings all over the city, I've been in community meetings almost in every precinct in this city, and people say they wanna see

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

the police, they wanna work with the police, they
want their police to be respectful of them.

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: That's correct.

CHIEF MADDREY: We have to acknowledge that.

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: Mm-hmm

1

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHIEF MADDREY: But I demand that from our officers as well to be respectful of them, but they do wanna see the police.

COUNCIL MEMBER PALADINO: And, in in my experience as an older person and raising kids of my own and, uh, generational, uh, it's been my experience that what you teach at home you take outside with you. And one of the things I think that needs to be taught more often, both at home and in schools, is to respect the men and women who are brave enough to put on the uniform. And I think if they're taught at a very young age, three, five, seven, nine, I think as they grow older, they will respect you, and others like you who, like I say, are brave enough to do this. A relationship with our young people is a must, an absolute must. And, that's best lessons taught at home and in school. And when they hear this rhetoric that goes on here, both in chambers and outside of chambers, all it does is reinforce a negative towards

1

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

our police. And I think that really needs to stop. You don't need to come here and be, uh, questioned as if you are criminals yourselves. So I'm gonna leave it at that. Thank you very, very much, uh, for coming here and, putting up with what you, uh, put up with. I appreciate that, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. We are going to pass it to Council Member Carmen De La Rosa.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Thank you, Chief and, Commissioner for... Deputy Commissioner for being here.

I wanna bring us back to the data because; although, uhm, the inequities are clear, I think one of the things that is important to note is that if there is a racial bias in a policy, whether the person is racist or not, when they are asked to execute that policy by matter of their job, they're executing a policy that is inherently racist. Not necessarily their intention to be racist, but the policy that they're being asked to execute has racial implications, and we've seen that in the data.

So I have a question: In the information we've received, you know, Stop, Question, and Frisk kind of peaked in 2011, then we saw a historic low in 2021,

and now we are seeing an increase once again. What

3 accounts for the increase under the Mayor Adams

4 administration? And that increase from the data that

5 | I have in front of me is consistent with the racial

6 inequalities that existed previously. So what

7 accounts for that increase?

CHIEF MADDREY: I think, like I said earlier, in 2016, 17, 18, we've seen... we had less crime. So, of course, less crime, less arrest, less contact. We've seen less stops. We've seen 2019, 2020, 21 crime started to rise again. So officers will... we had to deploy them to address crime. So with that, of course, there's more contact, you know, more engagement. So doing it properly should be more stops. Documented stops - documented stops. That's important.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: That does cause a little bit of confusion to the general public, because the rhetoric that we continue to hear from our City leaders is that crime is down. And so when we say crime is down, but then to justify Stop Question, and Frisk, crime is up, that causes confusion in people. Can you elaborate on that?

2.2

2.3

2 CHIEF MADDRE
3 driving it down.

1

4

5

12

21

24

25

CHIEF MADDREY: Crime is down because we're

driving it down. We're out there doing police work.

Alright? Believe me, I'm not a... I don't want

numbers to go up. I don't want more arrests. I don't

6 want more stop-and-frisk. To me, that's a bad

7 indicator. It should be less. We want to work in our

8 communities and do less of that. That's not the

9 answer to it. But right now, we're out there. We're

10 deploying and we're engaging. We're engaged. We're

11 seeing more young people carrying guns. Gun arrests,

the last two years, record numbers, record numbers.

13 Something's wrong with that. More guns in our

14 community, something is wrong with that. Alright?

15 We've seen an increase in certain crimes. Alright? So

16 when you look at the big picture, crime is down

overall, but in certain communities, crime is...

18 we're still having challenges with the community

19 itself overall crime, maybe certain crimes. So we're

20 still out there addressing this stuff.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Okay.

22 CHIEF MADDREY: Right? We need the help. We need

23 the help.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Okay. Let me ask you a few questions regarding Level 1 stops: So, Local Law

2.2

2.3

43 is written and it states, the information shall be disaggregated by the precinct where such an encounter occurred and further disaggregated by the following: apparent race and ethnicity, gender and age, the mem... of the member of the public involved. These... the factors leading to the investigative encounter and whether a criminal or civil summons was issued in connection with the encounter, whether the use of force, uhm, of the incident is as identified in \$14-158, occurred in connection to the encounter - so use of force as well.

And the NYPD is presenting the data for each of those categories by precinct. However, we haven't seen the data presented in a way that allows for a detailed analysis of how many of these categories relate to one another. For example, we can't tell how many people of color were stopped at a Level 1 for quality of life issues, or how the use of force in these encounter varies based on race and other factors.

So that level of detail is important for us to understand what is occurring when we see the data that is presented to us. Will the NYPD commit to

encounters. I just have one kind of followup, Chair,

24

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

if I may. One followup, but it's also kind of like more of a statement.

You testified earlier, or we heard someone say earlier that in a Level 1 stop, you're able to walk away. And I wanna talk a little bit about that, because the reality of the matter is that in communities like mine, if you walk away, there is a consequence. Right? And the trust that should exist in communities that we've heard our colleagues talk about dictates that common sense for us as people of color in this city is not to walk away, because if we walk away, we risk our lives.

And I just want to know if there is an actual, like, acknowledgment of that when we talk about what a Level 1 stop means, because I could be stopped and asked a question about whatever, I can't necessarily just walk away. That, you know, the... I think that people in communities don't feel safe just simply walking away and evoking that right to walk away. And so we should have a conversation about what that looks like.

CHIEF MADDREY: I'm not here to challenge anyone's lived experiences. Alright? Everyone's gonna speak. I can speak about my experiences growing up, even now

2.2

2.3

experiences. I'm not here to challenge anybody's lived experiences. I'm here to learn from them and see how we can make things better. I'll gladly have that conversation. As you as we said, we have a new police commissioner here, I'm sure she wants to implement some changes to make sure all our communities are safer, and we'll work with that. We'll work to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: (OF MIC) (INAUDIBLE) Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: You're welcome.

I do wanna know, based on the question that was presented just now, what is the NYPD's practice when it... when an individual attempts to disengage an officer conducting a Level 1 stop and leave the scene?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: They're... they're free to leave. And just to be clear, if an officer approaches someone, at what should be a Level 1 encounter, let's say... let's say the person walks away and the officer prevents them from leaving.

That's a Level 3 encounter, period. Right?

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: As soon as the officer prevents them from leaving?

2.2

25 that. I

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah, if, uh, the question is right, when... for a Level 3 encounter, the question is does someone reasonably believe that they're free to leave? If they do not reasonably believe they're free to leave, we're talking about a Level 3 encounter.

So in a scenario in which someone... an officer walks up to someone, let's say a potential victim or witness, did you see anything, did you hear anything? Classic Level 1 encounter. If... if the person just turns and walks away, there are... they're... they have that legal right to turn and walk away. To the extent an officer were, for example, to prevent them from doing that, to... to grab them, to block them from leaving, without more, that's totally inappropriate. That... that is an improper Level 3 stop. That is... if they're preventing them from leaving, that is an improper Terry stop.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Are officers ever instructed to follow someone after a Level 1 stop?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Instructed to follow someone after a Level 1 encounter? I'm... I'm not... I'm not familiar with that. I'm not familiar with that. I... I...

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHIEF MADDREY: Each...

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: If I were... if I was... if I

was an officer and I saw something like that, I would

CHIEF MADDREY: You said are they instructed to follow someone after a Level 1 encounter? No, we don't instruct that.

Uh, Level 1 encounters could be innocuous. And I used an example as ,you know, the Level 1 encounters were being introduced. A simple example, I'm standing at the, uh, at the marathon, and I saw someone who finished the marathon, and he got woozy, and looked like he was about to faint. And I say, sir, are you okay? Technically, I just, uh, that... that was a Level 1 invest... Uh, Level 1 encounter. By me asking a question, are you okay? And I saw this man who looked like he... he just ran 26 miles, and he looked like he was getting ready to drop. Technically asking that question, yeah, I was supposed to do a report.

So sometimes these reports can be very, very innocuous. But, letter of the law, we should be filling out a piece of paper.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Is there an official, uhm, maybe the way I'm thinking about it, because I understand what you're saying in terms of that...

say that it's my duty to make sure that this person is okay. But what I'm wondering is, is there language that speaks to what a Level 1 is? Because I know you said it's...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah...

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: It's like unofficial, but what... is there like an official, "This is a Level 1, now we're required by law to document this."

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Yeah...

CHIEF MADDREY: Correct...

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Is there language that...

Because I think part of the issue that has been

brought up is, no one who has had the experience in

more impoverished communities has ever felt like, I

could just leave. I've been stopped. Many people saw

the stop that I was stopped and I was on the job. And

that was, I was actually stopped before then that was

even more egregious. I've never showed the video.

Maybe... probably would never show the video. Maybe

16 officers came out of four different cop cars and

stopped me. And I didn't feel like I had the - I

mean, it didn't become anything. You know, everybody

turned their body cameras on. But I didn't feel

personally like I said, like I'm like, "No, I'm

leaving," I was in my car, "I'm leaving. Excuse me,

1

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

reaving, I was in my car, I m reaving. Excuse me

3 move out the way." I've seen, I think, most of the

4 people probably have seen, social media examples

5 where the interaction, of course, is very negative

6 from the community. "Get out of my face", so forth

7 and so on. It almost like escalates, and so the

8 officer has to provide the level of training that

9 they were trained to, to make sure that they keep a

10 level head. And so, you know, part of it is...

CHIEF MADDREY: Right. I... I kinda think I understand what you're talking about. I mean, listen, we train our officers, we train our officers in deescalation. We talk to them about Level 1 encounters and stuff like this.

The conversation I had in the office about a week ago, we want to increase our training, more of our roll call training, the 10, 15 minutes our officers have to roll... have after roll call to address certain scenarios just like this.

Again, your lived experiences, you think... I can come up to you and ask you something very innocuous and you feel that you're not free to leave, and that's not the case by law. That's not the case by law. You can just say, "I don't wanna talk to you

Officer," and walk away. This is something that we
have to work on. I mean, it's the police department,
the communities, where people understand what it is.
So for officers approaching you and ask you an
innocuous question, you could talk, you you don't
have to talk. Alright? A lot of these innocuous
questions, people know that they have questions to
help. When the officer says, "Hey, did you you
just hear gunshots?" People know that the officer's
just looking for help. Whether they choose to answer
or not answer is, again, up to the individual, but
it's something that, you know, we're not gonna be
able to solve it here, Chair. It's something that we
really have to get the communities and work with.
CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I definitely understand that.
The named plaintiff in the landmark case Floyd
worms the gity of New York was a 20 year old Black

The named plaintiff in the landmark case Floyd versus the city of New York, was a 28 year old Black man named David Floyd. In 20... in 2007, Mr. Floyd was repeatedly stopped and frisked near his home in the Bronx. And at the time, the officer who put their hands on... into Mr. Floyd's pocket searched under his shirt. These officers were part of the Anti-Crime Unit. This unit had previously been abolished

2.2

2.3

3 litigation claiming unconstitutional policing.

However, in the Adams' Administration, they created new neighborhood Safety and Public Safety Teams that have faced criticism in that they appear to replicate many of the practices of the former Anti- Crime Unit that stopped mister Floyd.

So my question is, what types of operations did
the former Anti-Crime Unit conduct? How were they...
how were former Anti-Crime Units deployed? And to
what extent did these units utilize investigative
encounters or street stops while operating in
communities? And can the Department identify what
problem what was problematic about the former AntiCrime Unit? That was a lot, but...

CHIEF MADDREY: Yeah... So I think, one thing I wanna correct you on, the, uh, after the Floyd settlement, anti-crime was not abolished. That's not true. Commissioner Shea abolished the Anti-Crime Unit, I believe, in, uh, 2020 or 2019, somewhere in between there, I don't... I can't remember exact year. He abolished the Anti-Crime Unit at the time just based on, you know, just history and for whatever reasons he made that decision.

2 We've implemented certain proactive teams, 3 Neighborhood Safety Team, CRT, because, again, this 4 work is important. Alright? It's important. It's 5 about saving lives. We definitely revamped it. We put everybody in uniform so there's no confusion, when 6 7 officer gets out the car, the person sees the officer in uniform, their name is prominently displayed, 8 their shield number is prominently displayed. We need our officers to go out there and engage. We have 10 11 people out there carrying guns. We have young people 12 shooting each other. Alright? This is no secret, you watch the news. Alright? We have people being hurt 13 14 out there. We need officers that are gonna go out 15 there and be proactive, but be respectful. We don't 16 want them to go out there and use any, uh, illegal 17 tactics. We don't want them to go out there to harm 18 people. We want them to go out there to be smart, 19 alright, to be intelligent, be patient. A lot of 20 patience involved in police work. Alright? Be patient, understand what the crime conditions are, 21 2.2 understand what the needs of the community are. 2.3 Listen to the people in the community, because in my experience, the people in the community, they're 24

telling you what the problems are. They do. Alright?

CHIEF MADDREY: Mm-hmm.

This is why we create these enforcement units, very small units, they're not big units, they're small units. Alright? And we work with them, and we know they make mistakes, and we try to train them, and we try to make them better, but this is important. We have to be able to go out there and be proactive in enforcement.

And if we stop being proactive, I think the results are... show immediately and there won't be good results.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Definitely.

One of the... one of the things that I was thinking about in preparation for our hearing today was that... that very thing. You know, part of the issue, of course, in our communities, especially in the more impoverished communities as been stated, is the resources that are needed. The opportunities that, you know, even Council Member Holden had brought up about opening up the schools and going to the mayor to ask for those types of resources that are needed.

But I'm thinking about some of the, uhm, I guess, the trends that have been explained.

)

_ _

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I'm trying to understand the trends from the perspective of, are we talking about things that could be fixed if we fix poverty?

Like, I know, you know, Council Member Cabán, you know, you talked about the differences in the levels of what was happening in schools and the communities and things of that nature. And of course, in more impoverished communities, especially when we talk about what happened during COVID, people who are already in the margins of life now trying to figure out how can they feed their families and, of course, you know, unfortunately folks had the masks on as well, right? So it was a lot harder to identify folks.

I think part of the real push that we should be trying to figure out as a city is, how do we really increase the... it's not just the quality of life issues.

CHIEF MADDREY: Mm-hmm.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I think a lot of things can be fixed if we solve for poverty. Because then the folks in the community, because I've had the same experience in my community - People have said, we need officers to show up right next to grocery

J

stores, because folks were... their grandmothers were afraid to go to grocery stores. This is prior to me becoming a councilman. And when I left the meeting, I was shocked to see officers maybe every two blocks. And people were still saying, we're afraid to go to grocery stores and things of that nature.

But I do know a lot of it is related to poverty in the communities that we're in - The lack of resources, the opportunities, the things that folks find themselves doing trying to survive.

I think... and the reason why I'm bringing this up in terms of just, uhm, a start is, the level of sensitivity needed in those communities has to acknowledge the history that happens in those communities. Like what, what is this community? What, what are we going to?

You know, oftentimes, I don't want to think that I'm joining a police department, because I want to just make sure that I'm safe if I'm a Black person.

Right? Go along to get along or so, you know, those types of issues. I want to really be able to say that police officers are people who are there to protect and serve. These are guardians of society. And that guardianship is a guardianship that is not always

perceived in the best ways in more impoverished neighborhoods, even though we want officers to keep us safe. But that... that historical piece is there. Right?

I'm gonna pass it to, I know we have a second round coming, uh, I want pass it back to Council Member Cabán to... Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you.

So I just want to state for the record that,
before I ask my questions that during, Council Member
Stevens' questioning, y'all both nodded when she, uh,
was saying that poverty contributes to crime, and
also continued... nodded when she talked about, uhm,
the need for more resources in certain communities,
uhm, just because, you know, that can't be reflected
without... without stating it on the record, which
still rhetorically begs my question as to whether or
not you guys ask the mayor about these things.

But I wanted to shift over to asking about ICE.

If ICE calls up NYPD about a person that's currently or formally in their custody and they wanna know the... the person's last known address, is NYPD providing that info?

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay. Can you find out

24

2.2

2.3

if...

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: Uh, I think that's actually a question for ICE. I mean, in other words, you're asking what ICE's capabilities are...

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Okay, what... What info does NYPD share with ICE?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: No, so... So in connection with Civil Immigration Enforcement, we are not allowed to share anything with ICE, and we... and we don't. ICE has a criminal component within it, a criminal... HSI, Homeland Security Investigations, they do criminal cases.

And as you know, in connection with criminal cases, we are allowed to work with HSI. We do work with HSI on criminal investigations and city law provides for that.

But in connection with Civil Immigration

Enforcement, we're not allowed to give anything to

ICE, period.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: But if a person is con... is fingerprinted in connection with an arrest, right, those... those prints are shared with federal law enforcement, including ICE?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GERBER: So, again, you know, if you're asking sort of, what... we fingerprint

Commissioner Tisch.

J

The NYPD is cracking down on freedom of the press and reporters and that's even, uh, according to the New York Post, dangerous police crashes have skyrocketed, averaging more than one a day at this point, including a chase that killed a cyclist in my district.

And the data shows that Black and brown people are disproportionately stopped, regardless of precinct, and that still continues to be the case.

So I think that you're right, there has been a significant shift in the nature of policing in the city. Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: You're welcome, thank you.

I am going to pass it Council Member Joseph.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you, Chair.

Just a quick question, earlier when you talked about... you saw an uptick in crime among young people. Are you working in partnership with Project Pivot or any other cure violence group to make sure that you're addressing the needs of the young people? And where do you see the uptick, and what's being done to address it?

CHIEF MADDREY: Just overall, you see more shootings. You see more gun arrests, you see more

young people being the victims of shootings, and we're seeing this all over the city.

Do I work with the violence interrupters?

Absolutely. I've been working with the violence interrupters for years, years - 2011, 2010. I've been probably one of the first commanding officers to really work with them, still work with them. Just met with a couple of them recently asking to do a little bit more because we see what's going on with the violence.

The Department itself, what we do for youth, I mean, we have more programs than ever working with youth. We have two youth centers now, one in Brooklyn, one in the Bronx that are open that we bring young people to. And a lot of our precincts, and something we don't get credit for, a lot... in a lot of our precincts, young... they have officers who are doing things with young people.

One of your districts is a 67, and you remember what Officer Barry did over there with young people. I mean, she had one of the best programs in the city - Officer Duhaney out in Queens - I can name so many of them who are doing many programs working with young people. Alright?

But we need to do more, because we see young people being hurt at an alarming rate. We just have to get to them, and we need everybody's help to get them.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: What... about around

Project Pivot, how are you partnering up with them in

New York City Public Schools? There also it has to

be, uhm, interagency, it can't be siloed. It has to

be interagency and... because the work overlaps.

CHIEF MADDREY: Right. I... Assistant Commissioner
Of Youth, Alden Foster, he worked with a lot of the
different youth organizations, Project Pivot, DYCD.

Over the summer, we brought about a 1,000 young people into the police department to work, to learn about policing and then to get paid for it. He does a lot a lot with a lot of CBOs, with Project Pivot, with DYCD. Him, the Community Affairs Bureau, and a lot of our youth officers that do a lot of different programs.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: We'll... we'll talk

(UNINTELLIGIBLE) the line. I would love to see what

those programs look like, and where... I'm sure if I

were to talk to any violence interrupter group, I'm

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2 sure there's a lot of gaps that can be filled in,
3 uhm, when it comes around to young people.

2.2

2.3

And one of the things, uhm, we also see is how are you engaging young people? Because we always tend to say, oh, we're doing this for the young people, but we never engage them in conversation, and I'm big on making sure young people are at the table, because we always want to do things for them but not with them.

How are we engaging young people to make sure that their voices are heard? Because their needs, I can go and say, as the Education Chair, oh, this is what young people need, and turn around and they're like, nah, Chair, that's not what we need, this is what we need.

How are you engaging young people in this conversation?

CHIEF MADDREY: I mean, I would really have to drill down to the commanding officers and what they do in each precinct, because every precinct does something a little different.

One thing I stress to the commanders and to the cops is, there are a group of young people who you don't really need to talk to. They'll come to the

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

precincts. They'll come to the programs. They'll join

3 the Explorers. You know, it doesn't require a lot. We

4 really have to go to the corners and talk to the

5 young people who don't want to deal with us.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: The young people we haven't seen, the young people that have not attended school...

CHIEF MADDREY: Right...

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: when they should be in school, those are the young people we need to target. Those are the young people we also need to bring to the table to have conversations with as to what's happening. Is it is it employment? Is it housing security? What are you facing that needs you that drives you there?

Because when I visit my young people, unfortunately, my portfolio goes all the way into East River Academy, it's the no engagement, no... nothing happening in communities to keep them engaged.

CHIEF MADDREY: I agree, and we need to work together and work in our communities to do more of that. We need to keep the young people engaged. What we've been seeing in the last few years is not good,

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: This... This week?

25

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2 CHIEF MADDREY: (TIMER CHIMES) This school year.

2.2

2.3

But, we do have Safe Corridors. Every precinct is required to have a Safe Corridor for the young people - Transit, they're required to have Safe Corridors as well. That's part of our plan to work with young people. You know, but we're just seeing the uptick, so we need some more help.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: And how are we using restorative justice to also work with young people? Everything doesn't have to be punitive.

CHIEF MADDREY: Uh, I 100% agree. Again, we'd have to drill down to the, YCLs. We have to really talk to them, what they're doing in individual precincts.

What precincts have programs?

Back when I was in Brooklyn as a commander, we had a youth court right there in Brownsville that we were using with a judge and other community, uh, a community person. It was good. Unfortunately, we lost the court, but, again, it's something that we need to do. Alright?

So I'll talk to the... the precinct commanders will really have the answers in terms of what they are doing in their individual precincts and how they're working with young people.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Do the COs have a youth advisory group that they meet with young people to talk to?

CHIEF MADDREY: Yes, we do have youth councils, we have youth councils. We have our Explorers. We took a hit with COVID. We took a hit with COVID, we lost a lot of young people, something that I just spoke about recently at a meeting that we gotta get back out there to bring any young people back to the Explorer Program. But, all the precincts have youth councils.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you, Chair.

(PAUSE)

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I now open the hearing for public testimony.

I want to remind members of the public that this is a formal government proceeding and that decorum shall be observed at all times. As such, members of the public shall remain silent at all times.

The witness table is reserved for people who wish to testify. No video recording or photography is allowed from the witness table. Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony, but may submit transcripts of such

(LAUGHTER)

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2 MR. GERMAIN THOMPSON: Good morning - good afternoon.

My name is Germain Thompson, I'm here to speak about... speak about the critical role of the community liaison in a reform process related to New York City's Police Department Stop, Question, and Frisk practices and trespass enforcement.

On December 16, 2022, I was appointed by the honorable Alyssa... Analisa Torres by the Southern District to be the Community Liaison. This position is essential for ensuring that voices of those impacted by these practices are heard and integrated into the reform process.

The objective of the Community Liaison, also known as OCL, is to engage in community, particularly those who have been directly affected by the NYPD's practices, offering them more opportunities to provide input and share their experiences. By working with community organizations and stakeholders, OCL can develop greater opportunities for dialogue and feedback. This information is then shared with the Monitor to the Federal Monitor Team and the courts informing them the assessments of City compliance

2.2

2.3

3

1

2

and LeGon cases.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

Community input is vital, it ensures that the perspectives of the experiences of community members are considered in assessing the NYPD's practices. This includes addressing concerns around Stop, Question, and Frisk practices, trespass enforcement, and racial bias.

OCL's role is to seek, receive, and organize these concerns, making sure that they are communicated effectively to the monitor.

The independence of my role from the monitor and the other parties ensures unbiased communication. OCL is not an advocate for any party, but a conduit for the community voices, ensuring that the Monitor Team regularly hears from a diverse set of community voices. The diversity is crucial for understanding the full impact of NYPD's practices and determining compliance within the course orders.

OCL has been tasked to develop a community engagement plan, conduct surveys, (TIMER CHIMES) public forums, and meet in to gather feedback.

OCL is about building relationships with community organizations, tenant associations, faith

2.2

2.3

based institutions, youth organizations, and most importantly, those affected by Stop, Question and Frisk practices.

The input gathered will provide context for the monitor's assessment, helping to identify issues or pathways that need further examination.

Feel free to cut me off this. This is a lot...

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: The bell has rung (LAUGHS).

So if you could wrap it up...

MR. GERMAIN THOMPSON: (LAUGHS) Since the beginning since the beginning of 2024, we have connected and reached out to 238 organizations and 37 public officials.

With these connections at the end of third quarter of 2024, we have completed 262 info sessions citywide, which are workshops designed to inform people about the levels of encounters we've been hearing about all day today, and a host of outreach meetings.

We have been involved in tenant association, public forums, and various, conferences nationwide.

We also urge community members, via... we also engage with community members via social media and our websites, Office of The Community Liaison, across

the board, which also gives community members an anonymous platform to share information about their experiences.

Through our reporting to the Monitor Team in the courts...

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: If you could wrap up?

MR. GERMAIN THOMPSON: Yeah, I'll wrap it up right

now.

Through the... through our reporting from the Monitor Team and the courts, from the community shared with us, we have discussed a number of significant issues, one being issues around body worn cameras and the inconsistent activation by officers during community interactions. Community members have repeatedly expressed concerns about officers activating their body worn cameras unless prompted by the public. And I yield back from there.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MS. TATIANA HILL: Hi, good afternoon.

I'm Tatiana Hill, I'm the Senior Organizer, and primarily organize in Brooklyn, New York for our office. I'm gonna talk more about our public education where Germain left off.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

So the info sessions, we basically go to communities that are most impacted by NYPD stop-and-frisk based on the data on NYPD's website.

That data proves that many of these neighborhoods are policed at a higher rate than others, and; therefore, they are the ones we want to interact with to find their feedback on police interactions. Those may be encounters as well as stops, which was talked about earlier.

The public education is really necessary. We find that a lot of people in our communities don't know the laws, the policy, and procedure of NYPD. So they're not able to name if their rights are being violated during these stops, and, therefore; they're not able to give feedback to us or other agencies such as CCRB.

So when we do these info sessions, it changes the dynamic a lot in the neighborhoods and communities that we work with, because now people understand where their rights have been violated legally, not just in the sense of how they feel in that moment, but according to the law and the Constitution.

So once we educate these groups, we now are able to collect feedback, and that is the largest part of

2.2

our work. Our office reports directly to this the judge mentioned, Honorable Analisa Torres, and she is overseeing this whole lawsuit for stop-and-frisk. So she's able to implement changes currently as well as in the future in the larger process of reform.

So it's really important that people who are most impacted by policing are able to give their feedback on what they would like to see change in this policing system.

I primarily work in neighborhoods such as Bed-Stuy, Brownsville, Crown Heights, Flatbush, Canarsie, Bushwick, Fort Greene in East New York. We do know that these neighborhoods are more heavily policed than others because of the data NYPD provided.

We attend events that elected officials have as well as collaborate with them to educate their constituents. We want to do more of those with your staff as well and other city council members.

(TIMER CHIMES) We also have, uhm, attended NYPD events such as community council meetings. So we do hear both sides of the stories on how people see police and view them and what they would like to see change. Our feedback is collected from all neighborhoods, all people, and all views on policing.

2.3

But we do know that more neighborhoods are impacted more negatively than others, and we speak on that throughout our work in our reports.

I'll now pass it off to my colleague, Mauricia.

And I'll close and just say that we're also working on feedback sessions where people specifically can talk about their feedback - after we have done these info sessions for the last year and a half.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MS. MAURICIA HARRY: So, good afternoon, my name is Mauricia Harry, I am the Manhattan Community Organizer for OCL.

Today I wanted to just cover the feedback that

I've received from some of the areas of concern. And

most of community, throughout all five boroughs and

Manhattan is included, has expressed the decrease in

regular blue and white patrol stops and an increase

in specialized units.

These increases are taking place in NYCHA, schools, and also vehicle stops as it is heightened in lieu of street stops. The CRT team, we know that their role is to respond to quality of life issues; however, based on the feedback, these teams are more present and it has expanded throughout all boroughs

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

policing. The community... the community is afraid of

using enforcement tactics that result in negative

making it out alive from these unconstitutional stops and searches based on the way that the officers jump out of unmarked vehicles, their offensive language, and use of force. Our office continues to receive videos from the CRT team referring to them as the "Tan Khaki pants Crew". As per the OIG report released last month, there is a opportunity, uhm, and a gap in transparency around the formation, staffing, and structure of that unit as well as the NST response team. Our Monitors' Team, last month... last year had released a report stating that they were contributing to the biggest amount of disproportionate stops. And amongst these two units, we have collected feedback on the Right to Know Act as gaps with officers identifying themselves and body cam usage.

The community acts for consistency and equality when it comes to discipline and accountability related to Stop, Question, and Frisk, because of the threat these units place in the neighborhoods.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: So I have... I have a

MS. MAURICIA HARRY: Thank you.

question, uh, Germain, you mentioned body worn camera activation as a community concern. Can you say more about what OCL is hearing about body worn camera usage?

MR. GERMAIN THOMPSON: Sure, uhm, so we receive a lot of feedback, uhm, in general, but we're... around body worn cameras, we've seen videos of community members having to remind officers that their body worn cameras are not activated.

So, say for instance, I could... I could cite our last report that we put out. It was, a group of individuals in Brownsville in NYCHA housing, they were out at night hanging around, four NST officers approached them, and none of them had their body worn cameras on. Community members start yelling, "Why us, why y'all approaching us?" "Why y'all surrounding us?" "Please get your body worn cameras on."

So we see instances like that throughout the city, and that's why I chose to highlight that today because it's a concerning issue for community.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony, I appreciate it.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

recognizing this is just one quarter of data, uhm, without much to compare it to as a baseline.

But the data really showed that disparities do exist at all levels of police investigative encounters in New York City: 68% of Level Ones

Э

reported during that quarter, targeted Black and
Latinx New Yorkers, and 86% of Level Twos, involved,
people who were Black or Latinx, and those
disparities largely mirrored what we see in Level 3
stop-and-frisk data.

In the Level 1 category, notably the, second largest category of, uh, of justifications for L One's in that data set were just listed as "other". Given the sheer volume of of encounters that we're talking about, we're talking about nearly 79,000 interactions that aren't given a clear justification. It's a point for further oversight and investigation as to whether or not there are more clear lines that could be drawn there, more clear categories that could be made, because that's a lot of encounters to not have any justification listed for with just that broad other category.

There were a few kind of eye popping numbers that jumped out from our analysis, some of which, uh,

Council Member Stevens asked about earlier, including in the 46th Precinct in the Bronx where, more than

1,300 summonses were recorded as being issued in connection with Level 1 encounters, which was by far the largest in that data set and is, uh, something

that is really demanding of closer oversight and an explanation from the NYPD as to how that (TIMER CHIMES) precinct is driving so much enforcement from the lowest level of interactions.

I'll just quickly note some limitations and this was discussed as well.

We really need to have a clearer sense of incident level information, uh, on these Level 1 and Level 2 encounters, because that's what's really necessary to get at whether or not there are real trends or disparities and potential bias in how interactions are playing out.

We have data that's broken down that can tell us how many Black people were stopped in a given precinct, how many of those Level 1, uh, encounters were a radio run, how many were self initiated, uh, how many were for a quality of life issue?

But we can't link those things together. We can't say that there were this many Black people who were stopped in a precinct on an officer initiated encounter for a quality of life issue. And getting that level of detail is going to be what's really critical for identifying whether there's bias,

whether there are other, uh, trends that we should be paying more attention to.

So we would encourage the NYPD to upload that information into future reports or the City's open data portal. And if they're not collecting that data in a way that easily allows for that analysis, we should work to find ways to make sure that we are getting that level of detail going forward, because that is going to be what's really critical to countering, uh, and pushing back on any unlawful or unconstitutional policing that's happening at those levels. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MS. BRITTANY MCCOY: Good afternoon.

Good afternoon, Chairperson Salam. My name is
Brittany McCoy, and I am the Managing Director of
Policy at the Bronx Defenders. I'm also a member of
the Communities for United for Police Reform.

Twelve years ago in 2012, as a high school student in the Bronx, I wrote an essay about how stop-and-frisk violated our constitutional rights. It would take a few more years, along with lawsuits by the Bronx Defenders and others, for the courts to declare as such, but back then it was obvious.

_ _

I watched classmates, some as young as 14 years old, stopped and searched for doing nothing more than walking to the gym after school or to the corner store or to basketball games or simply just standing outside in our neighborhood. It was rarer to hear that a friend hadn't been stopped.

After watching this happen to my friends for months, I used the class speech assignment to channel my thoughts, writing, "Is it really worth the intrusiveness and embarrassment for New Yorkers to go through this every single day just for police officers to find something in less than 1% of cases?". This question unfortunately still stands.

That speech was the beginning of my career in advocacy, and now 12 years later, I sit before you as the Managing Director of Policy for the Bronx Defenders, yet I'm still fighting against these same practices.

Even though we know stop-and-frisk doesn't keep our communities safe, the NYPD continues to use these degrading and unconstitutional tactics every single day. And although I will never stop fighting for my community, I would love for the NYPD to just follow the law.

2.2

The How Many Stops Act promises transparency and accountability, and although the initial data we have indicates the NYPD is not complying with the law, it's still enough to confirm what our clients tell us - that stop-and-frisk continues.

At the Bronx Defenders, where we represent nearly 20,000 people every year, we see the ripple effects of these stops - A mother detained and missing work because of an unnecessary stop, a teenager's future derailed because a false arrest leads to suspension or expulsion.

The Council must hold the NYPD accountable, but this is also a moment to demand more, to reimagine public safety (TIMER CHIMES) as something built on trust, dignity, and opportunity, not surveillance, punishment, and fear.

We know what works - Investment in affordable housing, education, and mental health services, and youth programs create safety and stability. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MR. ALAN ABRAHAM: Thank you to Public Safety

Committee Chair Salaam and Council members who are

concerned about the NYPD's use of stop-and-frisk and other investigative encounters.

My name's Alan Abraham, and I'm speaking on behalf of Communities United for Police Reform. We're an unprecedented campaign to end discriminatory and abusive policing practices in New York that's been operating for over a decade. The partners in this campaign come from all five boroughs and from all walks of life and represent many of those unfairly targeted by the NYPD.

As judge Scheindlin noted in her August 2023 remedy opinion, "Nothing can replace the unique and vital expertise of directly impacted communities, and whether reforms are viewed as legitimate by our communities is of primary importance."

The How Many Stops Act is now the law of the land, and although it's one... and although it's only one quarter of data, we're already seeing the continued targeting of Black and brown communities in police civilian encounters. And there are clear racial disparities between which communities are subject to Level 1 and 2 encounters.

It's unacceptable that Black and Latin New
Yorkers make up 68% of Level 1 encounters across NYPD

1

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

precincts, even though they're only half of the city's population. This discrepancy is even more egregious when it comes to Level 2 encounters where Black and Latin New Yorkers make up 87% of the total encounters. This data shows exactly why HMSA was passed in the first place. Without full transparency, these racist policing practices would continue in the shadows.

Police transparency and accountability are more important now than ever given the current mayoral administration. Since taking office, Mayor Adams, a recently indicted former police officer, and NYPD have systematically worked to dismantle accountability and oversight. This ranges from his failed attempts to block HMSA, his funding cuts to CCRB, and his failure to address the fact that his former commissioner tossed out over 400 misconduct cases, including stop-and-frisk abuses without even looking at them, and proceeded to weaken the NYPD discipline matrix just days before submitting his resignation. It's a staggering cycle of corruption.

(TIMER CHIMES) It's clear that the NYPD and the mayor put the protection of the police ahead of the protection of everyday New Yorkers. Until the NYPD is

litigation with the federal monitor.

The federal court in the stop-and-frisk

litigation wants to hear from you and your

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

constituents about the Monitor's Discipline Report that was issued in September. That report is 503 pages long, but thankfully, the plaintiff's group have put together a five-page summary of its findings. I've distributed those. I've given Josh the, uh, link to that is on the LatinoJustice website and the website for every group that is involved in the monitorship.

In 2013, the court ordered the NYPD to improve discipline, and that order included the line that the changes quote, "Must include increased deference to credibility determinations by the CCRB."

The report shows that has not happened. For example, between them, PO Dervant Williams and PO Ahsan Zafar have been the subject of 23 CCRB investigations. The agency has substantiated 12 allegations against them. Their misconduct cost the City \$650,000, and when the CCRB, again, found they'd convicted a bad stop, a Deputy Commissioner for Trials lowered the discipline saying, quote, "Neither respondent has a disciplinary record."

The report details the career of a deputy inspector we have identified as William Taylor, who over the course of two years was the subject of 11

CCRB investigations and four lawsuits, who kept getting promoted, was never punished, and retired without receiving any discipline.

The discipline report is full of this. Officers are fully excused for misconduct, and no officer has ever, according to the report, or rarely been disciplined for solely an illegal stop-and-frisk.

The report said that in response to that court's order from 2013, the NYPD (TIMER CHIMES) is in clear defiance of the opinion in Floyd.

The Court would like you and your constituents to respond to it about what to do about the NYPD's failure to discipline and its failure to abide by a decades old court order. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you

MS. KIMBERLY SALTZ: Hello. My name is Kimberly Saltz, I'm a law fellow at the Legal Defense Fund, which is also a member of Communities United For Police Reform. Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Today, we want to bring to the Council's attention that the same people targeted through the NYPD's unconstitutional stop-and-frisk practices are

2.2

2.3

also subjected to the NYPD's racially biased gang

policing practices.

2.2

2.3

∠4

The NYPD's criminal group database - or gang database - labels more than 16,000 city residents as

members of so called street gangs and youth crews.

Under the guise of what it calls precision policing, the NYPD has subjected the people in this database, primarily Black and Latino teenagers and young adults, to sustain surveillance and harassment.

The gang database has become a mechanism for continuing the unconstitutional stop-and-frisk practice of using race as a proxy for crime. Ninety-nine percent of people in the NYPD gang database are Black and or Latino, and less than 1% of people in the database are white.

Entry into the gang database is not tied to actual criminal activity. Instead, the NYPD uses broad, vague, and subjective criteria such as the colors a person wears or their use of undefined symbols on social media to label them as gang members.

Under these criteria, many New Yorkers who have never committed a crime could be designated as gang members.

In our written testimony, we provide research from our Thurgood Marshall Institute that shows that after Portland and Chicago eliminated their gang databases, there was no statistical increase in reported crime.

These findings suggest that gang databases do not reduce crime nor do they improve public safety. It underscores why New York City must eliminate its gang database.

To that end, we strongly urge City Council to abolish the gang database through taking up and passing Intro 798 to end the unjust surveillance of a select group of New Yorkers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

I would now like to call Karina Tefft, Anya Weinstock, and Jacqueline Gosdigian.

(PAUSE)

MS. KARINA TEFFT: Good afternoon, Chair Salam.

My name is Karina Tefft, and I'm an attorney at the Legal Aid Society's Cop Accountability Project.

At the Legal Aid Society, we see the profound harms of NYPD's persistent racist tactics, including the gang database and unlawful stops and frisks.

2.2

2.3

2.2

I'm one of the many lawyers involved in the Floyd, Davis, and Ligon lawsuits in which a federal court found that NYPD's use of stop-and-frisk and racial profiling is unconstitutional and placed NYPD under a federal court monitorship.

Over a decade has passed since that finding, and still the NYPD is not and has never been in compliance with the constitution.

Both unlawful stops and the sheer volume of stops have been trending up since 2021. In the first half of 2023, over 30% of documented frisks and searches were unconstitutional. And bad as they are, these numbers don't account for the significant number of stops that NYPD never reports.

The monitor's audits of officer body worn camera footage showed that in 2023, only 59% of stops requiring stop reports were documented.

Black and brown New Yorkers bear the brunt of these unconstitutional stops. And while the number of stops have declined between 2013 and 2022, racial disparities remain the same.

Over 80% of people stopped each year were Black and Hispanic, and today that rate is even higher, as you have pointed out, Chair Salaam.

2.2

2.3

Central to these persistent constitutional violations is NYPD's failure to discipline officers for engaging in unlawful stops, frisks, and racial profiling. These issues were examined in detail in a recently published court ordered report on the NYPD's disciplinary system.

The report found that officers rarely, if ever, receive any discipline for stop-and-frisk related misconduct, even when the Civilian Complaint Review Board finds that the officer committed the misconduct.

The report attributes this disturbing lack of accountability to many factors. But in our view, the primary barrier to accountability is the police commissioner's final authority over discipline, which often means that officers get no discipline at all.

You may know the quote, "Culture eats strategy for breakfast". In this case, culture eats policy for breakfast.

(TIMER CHIMES) The law is rendered meaningless as long as the police commissioner continues to facilitate NYPD's culture of impunity by refusing to discipline officers, even when confronted with clear evidence of misconduct. Without fundamental

2 structural changes to NYPD's discipline system, that

3 | culture simply will not change.

2.2

2.3

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I'll direct you to Legal Aid's forthcoming written testimony that expounds on these issues in greater detail.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MS. ANYA WEINSTOCK: Good afternoon, Chair Salaam.

My name is Anya Weinstock, thank you for organizing
this important hearing. I'm an attorney with the

Surveillance Technology Oversight Project. We're a

New York based nonprofit that advocates and litigates
against discriminatory surveillance.

We heard extensively today about how stop-andfrisk continues to harm New Yorkers. I'm here to testify about how every day a growing number of NYPD technologies are replicating the exact same injustices in a digital form of stop-and-frisk.

The NYPD's vast surveillance network includes sprawling databases, nearly a 100,000 cameras, social media monitoring software, predictive policing analytics, historic NYPD crime data, and countless other monitoring tools including the gangs database.

2.2

Even worse, this data is then pushed out to every officer's phone giving tens of thousands of officers the power to access this data and giving officers the pretext for to unconstitutionally stop someone. These systems are riddled with error and racial bias replicating the violence of stop-and-frisk.

One such technology is ShotSpotter which is a dangerous driver of discriminatory stops.

ShotSpotter is a notoriously error prone tool that claims to detect gunshots, but it's actually incorrect 90% of the time. And, when alerts go off, when ShotSpotter alerts go off, this gives a pretext for NYPD officers to enter a neighborhood to try to find the shot and to... this leads to discriminatory stops.

So, in the worst case scenarios, a ShotSpotter alert can even lead to lethal force being used, and in Chicago there was a 13-year-old, Adam Toledo, who was killed by police because of a false ShotSpotter alert.

In New York City, ShotSpotter has led to police stops (TIMER CHIMES) and harassing, uhm, individuals who are legally, uh, legally on the street and not doing anything wrong.

ShotSpotter is just one example of the countless flawed technologies, including automated license plate readers, including the gangs database, which we heard about that are error prone, racially biased, and concentrated in communities of color that lead to discriminatory stops.

In our written testimony, we highlight some of the, uh, bills that you can... that we urge you to support to mitigate the abuses of these technologies.

And so we are calling to abolish the gangs database, to abolish the use of ShotSpotter, to grow... to for New York City to join the growing number of cities that has canceled contracts with ShotSpotter, and to pass resolutions against technologies that lead to discriminatory and ineffective and harmful stops. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

MS. JACQUELINE GOSDIGIAN: My name is Jackie
Gosdigian, I'm Supervising Policy Counsel at Brooklyn
Defender Services.

I've been a public defender for 15 years, and I wanna thank the Committee, public the Public Safety Committee and Chair Salaam for the opportunity to address the Council about New York City Police

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Department's use of stop-and-frisk and other investigative encounters.

Public transparency is an essential measure for holding the NYPD accountable for the discriminatory and abusive policing practices they employ.

These practices criminalize and harm New Yorkers, disproportionately Black and Latin New Yorkers, LGBTQIA+ New Yorkers, and New Yorkers experiencing housing insecurity.

Discriminatory and abusive policing practices make all New Yorkers less safe. And in order to make our city safer for all our community members, the city council must take action now to ensure greater transparency and accountability.

The Federal Monitor Report, which we've already talked a lot about today, indicates the NYPD is moving in the wrong direction, conducting more unlawful stops, more unlawful frisks, and more unlawful searches.

The gang narrative is used to justify even more aggressive stops, summonses, arrests, and surveillance than before stop-and-frisk was declared unconstitutional.

_ _

In the last several years, thousands of New Yorkers have been swept up in so called gang raids or takedowns, nearly all of them Black or Latine.

The city council must move to eliminate the gang database and pass Intro 798, which would abolish the NYPD gang database altogether.

Public defenders usually become aware of police misconduct in connection with an encounter that results in arrest. It's only after an arrest that someone is brought to court and speaks with their attorney about what happened to them.

The vast majority of police citizen encounters that do not result in arrest go unreported or overlooked. That is why data from the How Many Stops Act is critical.

Our hope is that this data will assist the City and the public in monitoring and regulating the actions of the NYPD.

The ever increasing budget of NYPD is also a concern. (TIMER CHIMES) You already heard my colleague talk about ShotSpotter Technology. That technology has a \$54 million price tag and absolutely does not work. It also provides technical justification for disproportionate deployment to

Black and Latino neighborhoods to stop, frisk, and
harass New Yorkers when that technical alert is
neither accurate nor valid.

As defenders, we see how Black and Latino New Yorkers are disproportionately targeted for stops and arrests and how individual officers who engage in racist, bias, or hateful behavior remain on the job.

We cannot allow these biases to continue to entangle New Yorkers in the criminal legal system. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you. If anyone here wishes to testify but has not had their name called yet, please go to the back of the room to fill out a witness slip. After this panel, we will be moving to testimony on Zoom.

So, next, I would like to call Veronica Leventhal, Mylana Gerard, and Marquis Jenkins.

(PAUSE)

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: You may begin.

MS. VERONICA LEVENTHAL: Good afternoon, my name is Veronica Leventhal, and I am a social worker with the Legal Aid Society's Adolescence Intervention

Defense Project. We help young people navigate their felony cases in the youth part of Supreme Court.

My clients are all teenagers. Most of them live in the same neighborhoods in Brooklyn, and none of them are white.

I'm here today to speak out against NYPD's use of stop-and-frisk, and the gangs database, both of which actually contribute to increased criminality.

By utilizing these drag nets, the NYPD criminalizes people, including children, based on where they live, how they look, and the color of their skin without any consideration of whether they in fact committed a crime. Kids as young as 12 are targeted, harassed, and searched based entirely on their external appearance.

The impact this can have on a child's sense of self is profound. If an adult is telling you every single day that you are a hazard to your community and continually, aggressively stopping and searching you, it can severely damage your psyche. And what's more, it permanently hinders your faith in the police to keep you safe, making you less likely to seek their assistance in crisis.

I personally have witnessed the 73rd Precinct repeatedly abuse their power to subjugate the children of Brownsville. Our children need guidance

2 and support, and instead, the 73rd illegally stops, 3 searches, and uses violence to arrest them.

I cannot count the number of times I've seen a child with cuts and bruises all over their bodies, thanks to those sworn to serve and protect us at the 73rd.

The murder of Jordan Neely drove me to testify here today. It haunts me, because I worry it has now defined who in this city constitutes a criminal, who is categorized as a threat to our safety, and who is not.

I know my clients. They are not just reflections of the worst day of their lives, and they do not deserve the dozens of illegal searches they endure at such young ages. I wonder if they would have even been arrested if they weren't in the racist gang database, if they weren't already targeted.

I'm asking this council to end this unchecked abuse of stop-and-frisk and the racist gang database by passing Intro 798. But I'm also asking you to simply talk to the kids in our communities, (TIMER CHIMES) to hear their experiences directly from them, and then to invest in their communities and resources

2.2

2.3

2 for our children rather than in police and jails.

3 Thank you.

2.2

2.3

MS. MYLANA GERARD: Good afternoon, Chair Salaam.

My name is Mylana Gerard, and I serve as the

Coordinator of Youth Initiatives at the Bronx

Community Justice Center, an initiative of the Center

For Justice Innovation. I am also here today

representing the Gangs Coalition. Thank you for the

opportunity to testify.

Ample research shows that the practice of stopand-frisk continues to harm vulnerable communities' relationships with the police.

A study of young people living in highly patrolled, high crime areas in New York City found that 88% of young people believed residents of their neighborhood did not trust the police.

The use of stop-and-frisk is deeply racialized and disproportionately impacts young people. Nine of the 10 precincts with the highest stop rates have been in predominantly Black and brown neighborhoods.

In the last two decades, 18 to 24 year olds were stopped at a rate of 2,070 for every 1,000 residents in the same age group.

New Yorkers between the ages of 15 and 17 were stopped at an even higher rate, 2,127 stops per 1,000 residents.

Stop-and-frisk is being used to populate the NYPD's gang database, creating another deeply racialized tool with 99% of people in the database being Black or Latino.

This hyper surveillance has resulted in children as young as 11 being added to the database, marking them for life as they cannot be removed once added.

No criminal conduct whatsoever is required to be identified as a gang member.

At the Bronx Community Justice Center, our SOS

Team, which works to disrupt incidents of violence

and provide positive youth mentorship may unknowingly

be on the gang database with no way of being removed.

Participants in our programming report that activities as simple as getting food at their neighborhood deli or greeting a childhood friend is enough to have them placed in the database.

Participants living in NYCHA say that they are regularly targeted for the database simply as a result of where they live.

2.2

2.3

Like the stop-and-frisk narrative, gang
affiliation is defined so broadly that NYPD can
capture any neighborhood (TIMER CHIMES) or individual
they deem suspicious.

Residents deserve to feel safe in the communities they reside in. Over policing and surveillance conducted through methods such as stop-and-frisk and the gang database fracture trust and disproportionately harm young people and people of color.

Community programs developed in partnership with residents empower young people, providing them with an abundance of tools and resources to flourish.

We urge the Council to leave broad strokes policing behind, relying instead on tailored programming that suits residents' needs. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you for your testimony.

We will now move to panelists on Zoom. Please wait for the Sergeant at Arms to announce that you may begin before delivering your testimony.

We will start with Tanesha Grant.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

2.3

2.2

2 MS. TANESHA GRANT: Thank you, good afternoon,
3 Chair Salaam, and Public Safety City Council
4 Committee members.

2.2

2.3

Thank you for this hearing. My name is Tanisha

Grant, and I am the Executive Director of Parents

Support and Parents New York and Moms United For

Black Lives New York City. I am also a member of the

Davis Roundtable on NYCHA Policing and have been for

more than two years. I was one of the people, Chair,

that helped, hire Germain Johnson, and he's doing...

uh, Germain and he's doing an amazing job.

I live and serve the community of Washington

Heights and Harlem. Our reality is that stop-and
frisk wears heavy on our community for generations.

This unlawful practice has been used continuously and continues to be used to unlawfully search and lock up our loved ones.

In recent years, the practice of stop-and-frisk has returned. We the people, fund the violent actions through our taxes. We know all... I'm sorry, I lost my place.

In recent years, the practice (UNINTELLIGIBLE) we know all the ways stop-and-frisk violates community members' lawful rights.

2.3

Our recommendations are as follows: Stop funding the police and give our communities the resources... the resources we need to thrive. Too much money is focused on criminalization of Black and brown communities. Instead of and... and instead of innovative and fully funded programs and opportunities, we, again and again, are attacked and told that our personal lived experience with police does not matter.

I myself have been unlawfully frisked in the street trying to visit a friend. She lived in a building the police deemed a drug spot. They pulled me out of my car, pulled out my bra, made me take my shoes off in the middle of the street - all because they were surveilling the building. When I protested and asked for their badge number, they took me to jail.

The gang database is a direct attack on our Black and brown sons and daughters. It must... (TIMER CHIMES)

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time is expired, thank you.

MS. TANESHA GRANT: it must be... Thanks, thank you. I put in my written testimony.

CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Next will be Sakeena Trice.

2.2

2.3

2 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

MS. SAKEENA TRICE: Good afternoon, My name is Sakina Trice, I'm a Senior Staff Attorney with the Disability Justice Program at the New York Lawyers for the Public Interest. Thank you for the opportunity to present my testimony today on The NYPD's Use of Stop-and-Frisk and Other Investigative Encounters.

Police officers routinely arrest, and involuntary transport to a hospital, individuals in New York City who are experiencing or perceived to be experiencing mental health emergencies, uh, pursuant to NYPD's unlawful involuntary removal policies and practices, specifically Patrol Guide 22-13. Uh, 22-13 on its face, and or as applied, expands the NYPD's authority to remove people with mental disabilities and involuntarily transport them to psychiatric evaluation even when probable cause for arrest is lacking.

The guide needlessly heightens the risk of harm to people experiencing a mental health crisis and results in unlawful detentions and transport.

The stated purpose of the Patrol Guide is to provide technical operations, but it does not

instruct police on how to respond to the health care needs of a person with mental health concerns who is the subject of a 911 call.

Unfortunately, the City's current attempt to offer a non-police program, the Behavioral Health Emergency Assistance Response Division Program, does not meet the goal of actually offering a non-police response.

So, for example, in Fiscal Year 2024, more than 70% of all mental health calls in the B-HEARD Pilot (The Behavioral Health Emergency Assistance Response Division) areas were still directed to the NYPD.

We are asking New York City to join other cities across the country to remove police entirely from the equation and ensure that health care workers respond to health care crisis.

The City must establish a system whereby individuals who experience a mental health crisis receive appropriate services, which will deescalate the crisis and which will ensure their well-being and the well-being of all other New Yorkers.

We are asking the City to invest in a true non-police response model. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Thank you.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- 3 | SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.
- 4 DR. TAWANNA GILFORD: Hello, good afternoon.
- 5 Everyone able to hear me? Hello?
- 6 CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: Yes, we can hear you.
- DR. TAWANNA GILFORD: Okay, Thank you.
 - Good afternoon, Chair Salaam, and to the City
 Council Public Safety Committee. I appreciate the
 time.
 - My name is Dr. Tawanna Gilford, and I'm a licensed psychologist in New York state. I'm also the, co-founder of the Universal Stop False Police Reporting Initiative.
 - And I'll start, uh, with a very provocative statement by saying the Special Narcotics

 Prosecutor's Office is the place where accountability and transparency around stop-and-frisk goes to die.
 - My reason for making such a bold assertion is based on my family experiences and the experiences of other individuals that have been convicted of a questionable stop-and-frisk that led to a drug conviction in a prosecutorial office.
 - My brother, he was convicted and sentenced to six and a half years for a drug crime that he had no

J

2.2

O 1

participation in, one that did not exist. But because NYCHA has been deemed a high crime area and because, the (UNINTELLIGIBLE) are working tandem with the Specialty Narcotics Prosecutor's Office, there is very little oversight about how those handoffs work, and that's, uh, those were issues that came up during today's testimony.

So we all know that the Special Narcotics

Prosecutor is appointed by all five borough-based

district attorneys. However, these attorneys have no

jurisdiction over the Special Narcotics Prosecutor's

Office and cannot reach in to take a second look at

these questionable stop-and-frisk convictions.

These convictions never receive the justice they deserve, because there's no objectivity in the review process, and this is what I mean when I say the SMP's office is where justice goes to die.

I'm speaking out in this manner in... out in this manner for my brother, Tariq (phonetic) Guilford, and for all of the other Tariq Guilfords in New York state.

My call to action is for the Commission to create a provision that would allow each borough-based

District Attorney's Conviction Review Unit to be

- granted the ability to pull cases for review when

 officer credibility has (TIMER CHIMES) been pulled

 into question.
- Us New Yorkers deserve... (CROSS-TALK)
- 6 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time is expired.
- 7 DR. TAWANNA GILFORD: every opportunity for 8 justice... (CROSS-TALK)
- 9 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you.
- 10 DR. TAWANNA GILFORD: in this legal system...
- 11 SERGEANT AT ARMS: I'd like to call Christopher
 12 Leon Johnson.
- 13 CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Alright. Hello? Can you 14 hear me? Can you hear me?
- 15 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yeah, we can.
- 16 CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Yeah, yeah, hello.
- My name is Christopher Leon Johnson, thank you,

 Chair Salaam, so much for holding this hearing on
- 19 this bad Monday.

1

- But I want to make this clear that we need to
- 21 bring back stop-and-frisk. I support stop-and-frisk,
- 22 | because I live in a high district... high crime
- 23 district, District 41, and it's a bad neighborhood. A
- 24 lot of (UNINTELLIGIBLE) that happen around here and
- 25 | with stop-and-frisk, if we could stop people from...

J

on the street, we could catch a lot of these guns and knives and maybe the crime will be mitigated like that. You ever know people are out to kill or maim somebody if they have a gun or the knife. Stop-and-frisk is needed because of that.

And another thing is, I know everybody want to eradicate the gang database, which was done by Reynoso. But the truth and... of the matter about the gang database is that we can't abolish it right now, because we have a criminal migrant, uhm, segment in this city that is doing a lot of damage to the city, and Donald Trump is coming back. I'm not here to for to push a candidate, but Donald Trump is coming back, and ICE needs to know who these guys and gals are. It's easier for the NYPD and the federal government agencies to know who these guys and gals are. It's easier for the NYPD and the federal government agencies to know who these guys and guys are.

So you cannot eradicate the gang... gang database. I understand that there's a lot of, uhm, disparity with the gang... gang database, but if this was about three years ago, before this crisis and the situation with the migrant crisis, I understand that the gang database would be... should have been

_	
2	abolished, but right now, you just can't do. It's
3	unrealistic. And back to stop-and-frisk, uhm, we need
4	it because crime is high in a lot of these districts,
5	especially in the hot like, my district, District
6	41, Meeley's district, uhm, district 55, 80-55,
7	Latrice Walker, we need it. I'm Black, and I'm saying
8	as a Black man that we need to bring it back. We need
9	to increase it more. Because with this, it can get a
10	lot of guns up the street. It can get a lot of these
11	knives off the street. It could save a lot of lives.
12	It can save a lot of (UNINTELLIGIBLE) who are getting
13	shot and killed by a stray bullet because
14	(UNINTELLIGIBLE) keep on beefing and stuff like that.
15	So I'm Black, uhm, I totally support stop-and-
16	frisk. I understand that these guys and gals are out
17	here today fighting against it. I understand their
18	pain, (TIMER CHIMES) but this is a new time right
19	now. This is 2024 (CROSS-TALK)
20	SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time is expired, thank you.
21	CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: 2025. So, thank you,
22	thank you so much. Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON SALAAM: I would like to thank
24	everybody for today's testimony. This hearing has

been concluded. (GAVEL SOUND) (GAVELING OUT)

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 January 12, 2025