CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Jointly with the

COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

----- X

Thursday, January 30, 2024

Start: 10:12 a.m. Recess: 12:05 p.m.

HELD AT: COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

B E F O R E: Sandy Nurse, Chairperson

Julie Won, Chairperson

COUNCILMEMBERS:

Diana I. Ayala Erik D. Bottcher Tiffany L. Cabán Shahana K. Hanif Christopher Marte Mercedes Narcisse Lincoln Restler Althea V. Stevens Inna Vernikov

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

James Conroy General Counsel NYC Department of Corrections

Nell McCarty
Deputy Commissioner
Programs and Community Partnerships
NYC Department of Corrections

Althea Samuels
Assistant Commissioner
Contracts and Procurement
NYC Department of Corrections

Tanya Krupat Vice President of Policy and Advocacy Osborne Association

Jason Rodriguez
Policy Associate
Legal Action Center

Siobhan Hunziker Mitigation Specialist Osborne Association

Christopher Leon Johnson

Raul Rivera

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Good morning and welcome to today's New York City Council hearing from for the Criminal Justice joint with Contracts. Please silence all cell phone electronic devices. Please do not approach the dais. If you wish to testify you need to fill out an appearance card in the front of the room. If you wish to submit testimony via email, you can do so at Testimony@council.NYC.gov. Once again, do not approach the dais. Chair, we're ready

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Good morning. Thank you all for being here today. I'm councilmember Sandy nurse and I'm honored to convene this joint hearing with the Committee on Criminal Justice and the Chair of the Committee on Contracts councilmember Julie Won.

Today, we're here to examine the New York

Department of Corrections contracting of jail

services, with a focus on transparency,

accountability, and a fair treatment of people in

custody. We will also be discussing Introduction

number 825, legislation that seeks to ensure

detainees receive the remaining funds in their

commissary accounts upon release.

to begin.

The city's contracting process is meant to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently and equitably. However recent reports raised serious concerns about how DOC procures services for commissaries, phone systems, and tablets within our jail facilities. The reliance on emergency no-bid and negotiated contracts, often with limited oversight has Reportedly led to inflated costs, service disruptions, and a lack of accountability from vendors. For example, the Keefe group's commissary contract has been extended despite documented issues, included inflating prices, missing or expired goods, and a rise in grievances from people in custody.

Similarly DOC's phone contract with Securus
Technologies has faced scrutiny for privacy
violations and cost concerns.

Beyond these systemic procurement issues We must also address the millions and unclaimed commissary funds that remain in limbo funds that rightfully belong to individuals who have been held pretrial without a conviction or who have paid their debt to society. Introduction number 825 aims to correct this by ensuring that funds are returned in cash at the time of release, preventing unnecessary delays

2.2

2.3

and bureaucratic hurdles. We look forward to hearing
from you all and having a discussion. And now I will
turn it over to Chair Won to give her opening
remarks.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Thank you, Chair Nurse, for cochairing this hearing on essential services for people incarcerated in New York City's custody. My name is Julie Won, and I chair the Committee on Contracts.

Today, our committees examine contracts on vendors who provide inmates at jail cells with crucial links to the outside world and basic comforts. In particular, we want to take a look at the work done by Keefe Group, a national company that has provided commissary services at city jails since 2021, as well as Securus, which handles electronic communications and technology for inmates.

The Department of Corrections began working with these outside vendors with the worthy goals of modernizing city jails, reducing risk of contraband, and improving services for inmates and their loved ones. But reporting and local outlets have raised questions about whether the new systems implemented by Keefe and Securus are working as promised, with

2.2

2.3

2 serious consequences for inmates' comfort and civil
3 rights.

Possible shortfalls raise questions about whether these vendors are meeting their contract obligations or whether the Department of Corrections has been doing adequate oversight and accountability.

City watchdogs have long raised concerns about these Department of Correction contracts. The Keefe Group contract, in particular, has been subject to criticism from the Comptroller, who has refused to approve the contract before being overruled by the administration.

The city hired the Keefe Group during the early days of COVID-19 pandemic when city jails were racked by mass absenteeism, which created emergency staffing needs that had to be filled by outside vendors like Keefe. But as the crisis passed, the contract was renewed without a competitive bid. And in the years since, local media have reported that commissary systems run by Keefe sometimes fails to correctly deliver goods to inmates or provide adequate refunds for botched orders as well as price gouging.

We want to understand why the Department of Corrections settled on Keefe without a competitive

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

bid process, and what kind of oversight has been done to ensure that the city gets the service to which it is entitled.

Corrections officials testified earlier this year that the typical competitive bidding process wouldn't have been efficient in this case and could have disrupted commissary functions. But the system they have settled on is a subject of a record of volume of complaints. So, how did they decide to stick with Keefe?

Before we begin, I'd like to thank the committee staff, senior counsel, Chris Sartori, policy analyst Alex Yablon, and finance unit head Owen Kutowski and Jack Story for their hard work in putting today's hearing.

I'll turn it back over to Chair Nurse and the Committee Counsel to administer the oath.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Thank you, Chair Won. I also want to thank our committee staff, Natalie, here.

I want to acknowledge we've been joined by council members Bottcher, Marte, Narcisse, Ayala, and we have council member Cabán online.

Now I'll turn it over to... Okay, we will now call representatives of the administration to

testify. We'll be hearing testimony from the

Department of Correction, General Counsel James

Conroy, Deputy Commissioner Nell McCarty, and Althea

Samuels. Once you are settled, I will turn it over

to Committee Counsel to administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell the truth... Can you raise your right hands, please?

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: Yes.

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: You may begin.

MR. CONROY: Good morning, Chairs Nurse and Won, and members of the committees on criminal justice and contracts. My name is James Conroy, and I'm the Deputy Commissioner of Legal Matters and General Counsel for the New York City Department of Correction.

The department partners with a network of experienced and dedicated providers to deliver goods and services, programmatic support and skill building, and help in the transition back into the community for those in our care. Those vendors and the DOC staff who support them and enhance their

2.2

2.3

work-- support and enhance their work, are a critical part of maintaining a safe and humane jail system with modern practices and amenities. The department currently has over 100 registered contracts covering a vast range of needs and services.

Today, we would like to highlight three jailbased services in particular: telephone, tablet, and commissary services.

The department works in close collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Contract Services, MOCS, on all matters related to procurement. The department follows established citywide procurement protocols and utilizes the city's passport portal in the same matter as other city agencies.

Given the nature of our work and the vulnerable population we serve, we recognize the importance of transparency and accountability when selecting and partnering with vendors. Our goal is to ensure that the goods and services provided to those in our care are fair, valuable, and equitable. When selecting vendors that provide goods and services, the department carefully considers the associated costs.

Unlike many other jurisdictions, the Department of Correction does not engage in revenue sharing with

_

./

vendors, a common practice that can lead to predatory and exorbitant pricing. When selecting vendors and negotiating prices, the Department of Correction works to reduce or eliminate any type of fees where possible and to ensure that pricing is in line with fair market rates as they exist in the community.

Telephone services are provided at no cost to people in custody and to those that receive their calls.

Following the new admission process, each individual in our care is assigned a tablet at no cost, excuse me-- at no cost with telephone service capabilities as well as a wide range of free informational, educational, and entertainment media, including eBooks, religious and law library services, and a commissary ordering application. Individuals can order items through commissary such as food, makeup, and brand name hygiene items that are delivered directly to their assigned housing area. Items are priced at fair market rates based on comparisons with prices found in the community and with no associated fees.

Items that are not within market rates are not permitted on their menu. Item prices are set for the

in our care are met.

2.2

2.3

duration of the contract and can only be raised with
the express consent of the department. The
department's goal is to make sure that our
contracting process is thorough, fair, and consistent
with citywide policies while at the same time
ensuring that the needs of the agency and the people

The department has enhanced its contract review process to include a second level review of all contract submissions, which is conducted by the agency chief contracting officer and the senior deputy agency chief contracting officer.

Additionally, the Department of Correction is exploring establishing a contract compliance auditing process to reinforce our existing practices to ensure compliance. The department's procurement unit participates in training sessions and refresher courses on citywide procurement policies and procedures to ensure compliance with established citywide policies.

Of course, the department is aware that a limited number of vendors that operate in the jails have engaged in problematic practices in the past and has taken these into concern, excuse me-- these concerns

2.2

2.3

into account when drafting contracts with those vendors and designing policies related to their services.

In 2023, the Department of Investigation released a report related to the telephone services provider's unintentional recording of privileged phone calls, causing breaches of attorney-client privilege for some persons in custody. Well before the report was released, the Department of Correction had placed the provider on a closely monitored corrective action plan to address the unique issues that arose in this incident.

As noted in the report, the vendor worked quickly and transparently with the department to correct the issue and implemented safeguards to prevent future problems. Since the remedial measures were put into place, all privileged telephone communications have been handled legally and appropriately.

Additionally, we are aware of criticisms relating to the vendor providing commissary services in our facilities. However, the department receives very few complaints related to commissary services. Less than 1% of orders are associated with a grievance, and works with people in custody to quickly resolve

any issues that may arise. The vast majority of these complaints are related to delivery status or about accessing accounts to place an order. Very few, if any, grievances are related to product prices or quality.

Similarly, we have found that we receive very few complaints regarding tablet services relative to the scale of the operation. Complaints that are received are addressed quickly by dedicated members of our staff.

Contracting with a vendor to provide commissary services allows for the department to leverage the vendor's resources to minimize department staff directly involved in providing commissary to the population, allowing the Department of Correction personnel to remain dedicated to ensuring safety in the facilities. The individuals look forward to these orders each week and any disruption or stop in service would have adverse effects on those in our care as well as the staff who work in the jails. The vendor is able to provide a broader range of stock products than the department was able to offer when self-servicing the commissary orders. Consequently,

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

people in our care consistently receive the items that they want and order.

Turning to the legislation being heard today, Introduction 825, would require the department to return all unused commissary funds to individuals prior to them leaving custody. We share the council's goal of ensuring that individuals can access and claim their funds when leaving custody so that those funds are not abandoned.

However, the policies proposed through this legislation would not achieve that goal, and further would put people being discharged from custody as well as city employees at significant risk of harm. The department provides several avenues for individuals to collect their institutional funds prior to or during discharge. Individuals can collect up to \$200 in cash immediately upon discharge and can request a check for any remaining funds.

Individuals can also collect their funds in the same manner for up to 120 days following discharge at any of the department's cashier windows.

Additionally, individuals can arrange to have their institutional funds transferred to a loved one in the community at any point prior to discharge. This bill

)

2.2

proposes that individuals leaving custody, some of whom have several hundred or even thousands of dollars in their institutional account, be provided with those funds in full, in cash.

The resources needed to ensure that this amount of cash could be kept on site at each DOC cashier window 24 hours a day, seven days a week, would be insurmountable from an operational, infrastructure, and security perspective. The cashier windows may become targets for criminal acts, as would every individual being handed large sums of money in cash at these sites. Even if the department could reasonably and safely operationalize the bill as written, our data shows that the \$200 cash cap does not appear to be the barrier for the vast majority of individuals collecting their funds at discharge.

Nearly 70% of individuals who do not claim their funds when leaving custody have \$100 or less remaining in their accounts. We would like to work with the council on an alternate plan to resolve the longstanding issue of unclaimed commissary funds that addresses the root cause of the issue and does not present any of the safety concerns noted.

Overall, we believe that the telephone, tablet, and commissary services offered by these vendors are of immense value to the people in our care and to their loved ones in the community. Free and accessible phone calls mean that people can stay connected with their families and maintain the critical social networks that will support them in successfully reintegrating into their communities.

Since 2022, people in custody have had the ability to make free phone calls using their tablets, providing greater access to phone services and, in turn, more opportunities to stay connected. Tablets offer not only entertainment and reduce idleness, but also connect individuals to important services and educational resources without having to leave their housing areas or wait for a scheduled program.

These serve as critical tools to a holistic approach to violence reduction and behavior management, which supports safer, more humane jails. We share the council's goal of ensuring that these those in the department's care have access to high quality services that are delivered ethically and transparently, and that comply with all contractual legal and regulatory obligations. We believe our

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

vendors have been critical in supporting the department and moving towards a more modern and efficient operation, which not only benefits the people in custody and DOC staff, but the city as a whole.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today and we're happy to take your questions.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Thank you so much for your testimony. We're going to start our questions regarding the Keefe group commissary contracts.

How's the Keefe group selected for the emergency commissary contract in 2022 and why wasn't that selection through an ordinary process?

MR. CONROY: In 2022, we were coming out of the effects of the COVID pandemic. And as in 2021, a state of emergency was declared by Mayor de Blasio because of severe staffing crises.

In response to that, we had less people on site to supply commissary services and we recognized the need to do that quickly. And Keefe was an organization that was obviously throughout the country established in this area regarding commissary production. What the Keefe contract was able to give us was the ability to have a vendor that not only did

J

2.2

not have the supply chain issues that we were seeing at the time through our commissary ability to procure, but they also had the staffing needed to provide these services, package up the items appropriately and bring them to the housing areas rather than have DOC staff have to not only staff the, um, the inventory and compile all the commissary items together, but then also to bring the persons in custody to the areas where they have to pick up the, um, the purchases. And there was additional issues related to ordering and otherwise.

So, the department at the time recognized that an emergency contract would be appropriate to give these important commissary services without also having to move, excuse me, move persons in custody around to also limit the spread of the virus that occurred at the time.

CHAIRPERSON WON: What was the basis for determining Keefe's 2020 contract should be extended when it expired? And was there any RFP or other outreach done during the initial contract term to, or extension to determine additional providers who could do the same work?

MR. CONROY: At the time when we entered into the emergency contract with Keefe and quite candidly, the department was very pleased with the service they were getting, we were not recognizing the importance of that.

Um, the extension was negotiated with Keefe because, again, to continue those services. At the time, Keefe was actually working at risk during, for the period from when the first initial emergency contract ended to the time that the extension was granted. And we had to, uh-- that, that's the issue where we deemed the contract appropriate at the time. But when we had done a holistic review of all the pricing at the time, we did the initial emergency contract, that there were price comparisons per ounce made with, you know, local community pricing and based on that and the services that were provided and the continuing staffing crisis, a need was-- was identified to extend the contract.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So is your answer: No, you did not do any outreach, um, for the renewal of the contract term to additional providers to make sure that you're comparing services and pricing?

MR. CONROY: I'm not aware of outreach at the time. We got-- I could circle back with you on that to see if it was done, but it was extended based on the terms of the original contract.

CHAIRPERSON WON: There have been reports that

Keefe was charging people in custody for-- more for

items than specified in their contract. And for some

nearly a hundred percent higher than what is charged

in local stores, the benchmark established in your

contract.

Did you investigate these assertions? Were they substantiated? And how did DOC's contracting officers demonstrate the need for a negotiated acquisition in this case, as opposed to a competitive bidding process, particularly if the provider was overcharging?

MR. CONROY: We had done and had continued to do pricing comparisons. Um, there were members of the staff who were dedicated to this task. We did not see those levels of-- of price discrepancies, what you're describing a hundred percent more.

Uh, the, the comparisons were done in comparison to local, uh, competitive pricing based on a per ounce comparison.

In some circumstances, we could not do a direct apples-to-apples, um, comparison, because of the need for some of the items to be packaged in a secure manner for a jail system. That— That's an element that's not accounted for in some of the conversations that we've— we've had and have seen, is that there's a, you know, a need for clear packaging or other types of things.

For instance, we can't have cans of tuna because of the metal and, and the security risks that that presents. So, some of that is accounted for in the pricing, but nonetheless, we did not see the discrepancies that have been articulated.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Have you seen the articles where they do a side by side comparisons by the city?

MR. CONROY: We have seen those articles. And again, while I can't speak as to the, the processes of the reporter, um, we do know that again, we have a holistic and robust mechanism for people to check the prices. And in many circumstances, the prices are lower than what we see in the community. And then in some circumstances there, they can be. You know, the problem with what we see is it's not, it's not as convenient to like, what you could do now is just go

online and look at price comparison to what's on sale or otherwise.

This is something that where the vendor has to maintain things in stock consistently. You have the security mechanisms regarding the packaging and otherwise. So, where we can, we did these robust ounce comparisons per price and they were generally consistent with the prices that we see in the community. Again, some being slightly higher, some being slightly lower, but the prices that are in the contract are consistent and stable and are not subject to increase except by approval through the Department of Corrections.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Can you tell us about your process itself of how you're doing price comparisons? Are you using a software tool? Are you manually collecting pricing before you sign the contract? Can you tell us more about how you're doing that?

MR. CONROY: I don't engage in this myself, but the people that do, from what I understand is they actually go to the stores and look at the areas.

There's not a software that I'm familiar with, but I can follow back with you to see if we do have that.

But, um, I understand it's actually a physical

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

comparison to local stores and prices, some of which can be found online, but they do utilize again, local pricing.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay. So, you're manually going to a store and checking? Because that isn't a fair market comparison because for example, at the time that the -- that the article was written and the pricing that you have on your contract itself for female menstrual pads. Female menstrual pads are double the price of what it is at CVS. So, how would that work? Because each store may have a markdown at the week of -- that you're doing physical price checks.

MR. CONROY: Well, it's not a one time look in, This is an ongoing process. And we look at them on a rolling basis. The contract is for several year period. And again, we get --

CHAIRPERSON WON: But you had testified that item prices are set for the duration of the contract. if the contract is set for more than a year, how are you doing that on a rolling basis?

MR. CONROY: They're set at the initiation of the contract and they could only be increased. However, we have seen items that are decreased based on the

∠4

what's, what's on our menu is lower than some of the pricing obligations, but the increase in prices from the initial contract implementation, I think there've

computer consumer price index. So, we noticed now

only been three increases excluding stamps, which the

stamps only cost what they cost at the post office.

But excluding that, I think there's only been three

price increases. And one of them was actually due to

an error in the typing where we, uh-- it was for

sugar packets, which went from 11 cents to 30 cents,

but that was an error in the initial contract price.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay. So, you're saying that the pricing for the items set in the contract can be changed to decrease or increase with your approval throughout the contract?

MR. CONROY: The-- They are allowed pursuant to the contract. Only 20% of the items can be changed in a year, um, if at all, and they could only be raised by 5% of the contract price. And again, that's what the approval of the Department of Correction.

So, actually we had a request for an increase in price. I think in, um, in July of 2024, we actually

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

declined the, uh, one of the requests to increase the price and took the item off of our menu.

CHAIRPERSON WON: And what item was that?

MR. CONROY: I think it was pork jerky.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. And, um, I want to recognize council member Hanif who has joined us on zoom as well as I know council member Ina Vernikoff who has just joined us.

In relation to the contract, um, for Keefe, we saw that we had passed legislation requiring that women's hygiene products are available to inmates. But we saw that on your Keefe contract that there is a commissary charge for the menstrual products, almost double what it is in CVS. Can you tell us more about what's happening with menstrual products for women-- women, inmates?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Yes. Uh, my name is Nell McCarty. I'm the deputy commissioner for the division of programs and community partnerships. do just want to highlight that menstrual products are free, um, of charge for women, uh, who are in need of the menstrual products. And so any item, and actually generally the necessities that people need who are in our care are provided for free.

So, a woman does not need to, uh, purchase menstrual pads or any menstrual products through commissary. Uh, there are different brands. And so the brand that may be available on commissary may be different from what the brand is within the facility. And I cannot speak to that for certain at this exact moment, but I am aware that all menstrual products are free for women.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay. So, the pricing that is listed on the commissary contract for female menstrual products are there for sample or are they still being sold?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: They're available for purchase. Um, someone can purchase them. Uh, but as mentioned, it, it may be a different brand or a brand name that someone prefers, but there are free and available menstrual products for women within the facilities.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay. Thank you for that. How much did com--

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Because this was a conversation we had earlier just to clear, uh, just to have on the public record, what are the types of

2.2

2.3

2 menstrual products that are you're offering for free?
3 Cause there's a variety.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: I do not have a list of that with me right now. And I'm-- I'm just hesitant to give you like the exact, um, breakdown of every single product.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: It doesn't need to be a brand, but if, you know, if it's, yeah--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON WON: If you can-- you know, like tampons, pads, cups, like just to make sure we have for the public record, exactly what items like--

MR. CONROY: Yes, at least--

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: If it's only one type, that might be why people are purchasing. It's there are tampons and pads available. Um, beyond that, we can certainly follow up, but it can definitely, um, vary by types.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. That'll be great.

Cause when we-- my team had checked into the law, it said that we saw that for DOC only menstrual cups were available. And we thought maybe that is why they're purchasing. But if that is not true, that's great to hear.

2 MR. CONROY: It's definitely-- Yes. We 3 definitely have those other products that are

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay. Okay great.

MR. CONROY: Yes.

provided free of charge.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WON: And how much did commissary services cost the department of corrections before the 22-- 2022 emergency Keefe contract that outsourced the fulfillment of commissary orders? And what is the current annual cost of commissary services to the department?

Now we would like to see a comparison of internal in-house as well as external with a contractor.

MR. CONROY: I am not sure that the-- the actual-- we're able to make a comparison, right? Because what we did with the previous commissary, uh, system was that we-- we purchased items, right? We purchased products and then we had our own staff do the services.

What is now provided within the commissary contract is actually the services and the products.

So, the-- Um, Keefe does send commissary staff to the, um, facilities and they package the items. They sort the items, they process the orders, they bring

2.2

them to the housing areas. And then they, they also, um, check-- We have a system where the, the persons in custody could check their items in a clear bag, check off a receipt.

So, it's not really—— I'm not really able to do a cost comparison before the previous processes and what we've done under Keefe, because it's a complete modern modernization and revamp. For instance, even now they could order with the tablets, which we'll talk about, but we didn't have that before it was a whole different system that required transport of the persons in custody to, uh, you know, a commissary area. It's—— It's really not a comparison that we're able to do.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Got it. How, um, for DOC

Commissioner Maginley-Liddie testified before the

council in 2024, that DOC did an analysis of other

jail service providers. What did that process

entail? What other vendors did you examine when

documents were produced for this analysis? And on

what grounds did you conclude the existing contract

with Keefe provided better and more cost effective

services than other vendors?

MR. CONROY: Well, we looked at-- We regularly communicate with other jurisdictions. I think particularly in this case, one of them was Cook County. Um, Cook County, which we've communicated with because they've been under a monitorship and receivership as well. And they've used a different vendor. Their price-- The price comparison that we did at the time was substantially higher.

One of the important elements that I think should be pointed out. Um, other jurisdictions have a revenue sharing program wherein they— the jurisdiction or the correctional facility itself gets a portion of the revenue from the sales. We don't do that here for any of our commissary sales whatsoever. We do not revenue share.

So, that is designed, uh, purposefully to maintain the costs and keep them down. And also to not profiteer off the persons in custody. But Keefe does engage in, in, um, those types of contract arrangements with our other jurisdictions.

So, we did-- We looked at that. Also, some of these are available online. You know, that's another price comparison you could do, even through some of

2.2

2.3

2 the online reporting. But specifically we did a 3 price-by-price comparison with Cook County.

And actually, Cook County sought out a separate vendor from what they were using based on our comparison, because they recognized how much lower our prices were.

CHAIRPERSON WON: And who are the other vendors that you checked?

MR. CONROY: I don't know which one Cook County was using.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So- No, no. For our own comparisons. So, for our vendors that you were checking against Keefe to see if they're competitive, who were they?

MR. CONROY: I don't know that information. I can get that for you, though.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, thank you. I'm going to pass it over to Councilmember -- Chair Nurse, and then we'll come back to more Keefe questions later.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Would you be able to get that information while we're in this hearing, or see if we can text around?

MR. CONROY: Yeah, I think we the follow up. I'm not sure.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 1 2 CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, I just--3 MR. CONROY: Because I really don't-- I'm sorry, 4 Chair, I don't know it, so I have to find out where 5 we could get that. CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, I just wanted to follow 6 7 back up. I know that the tampons and pads are free. I think there was a period where you weren't 8 providing tampons because of security concern, so it's good to know that they're back. I think the 10 11 price gouging issue is important because it's my understanding that in order to get those menstrual 12 13 products, you have to ask from a CO, right? Or are 14 they just-- Tell me on the record how somebody would 15 ask or get those products. 16

MR. CONROY: We can find out, but they are regularly provided. It's not--

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: How are they provided?

MR. CONROY: It's provided in a manner similar to our other items like clothing and any hygiene products. We have to give soap, we have to give all those types of things.

So, anyone, I think, at the intake process that would request or express a need for that, it's part of the regular production. But again, we will

2.2

2.3

confirm the exact process. I don't think it's
anything that's outside the ordinary provision of
these types of items.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, yeah, my understanding is you have, or it's been told to us that you have to ask for these things. And so sometimes people, depending on the relationship with the CO on the floor or what's going on in the housing unit, might want to purchase instead of having to deal with that. And so that's why we want to make sure that those prices are what is comparable to the outside for the loved ones.

MR. CONROY: We understand that. I've not become familiar with any complaints of that nature, but certainly we'll find that out.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay.

MR. CONROY: And if you're aware of any situation where that's happening specifically, please let us know and we'll certainly address that.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, I have questions regarding Securus.

MR. CONROY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: I think the council's been quite concerned about Securus' recording and

2	retention of privileged attorney-client
3	communications for some time. I think there's been
1	back and forth about this, and there was reporting in

I think you were alluding to it in your testimony. We understand that some steps were taken to prevent further occurrences.

DOI also issued four recommendations to limit the risk that privileged communications will be recorded in the future. And I'd love to know the status of those. Have these been implemented?

MR. CONROY: I think with the exception of the actual policy changes, we have implemented steps to ensure that this problem does not happen again.

And as a matter of fact, we had had a quality assurance program in place, which Securus still does. And we have not been apprised of a situation like this since the initial complaints.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, so the recommendations were annual training for Securus users on identifying potentially privileged calls.

Is there annual training being conducted?

2.2

2.3

2020 and 2021.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS MR. CONROY: There's not annual training, but when we considered this, at least when we talked about it. I'm not really 100% what they mean by Securus In terms of department users, it's a very extremely limited universe of staff that have access to these calls. It has to be approved, essentially, by the commissioner or another high-ranking executive.

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

Those are ordinarily people who are trained in this manner. So, we don't have an ongoing training because of that, because it's not a broad universe. And I don't think the intention was to train the actual people who make phone calls on this process.

I understand what I think they're getting at, but it's not something that's...

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: So, no. Memorializing protocols to prevent the monitoring and recording of privileged calls in written departmental directives was another recommendation. Do we have that written? MR. CONROY: We had not changed our directives in response to this.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. And immediately notifying DOI upon discovering that a privileged call

2.2

2.3

2 has been improperly recorded. Is that a practice 3 that's been put into place?

MR. CONROY: 100% it is, yes. And we shared with them any of the auditing that was done prior to and post the DOI report and the discovery of the incident.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. So, the first recommendation, it's unclear what the DOI recommend—You are unclear about what they are intended, but you've said you are, from my understanding, from what you just said, the department, people within the department who are utilizing Securus, are doing an annual training?

MR. CONROY: I don't know about annual, but they certainly have been trained in investigative techniques, including the use of Securus and dissemination or identifying privileged calls.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. Okay.

Is there any intention to change departmental directives?

MR. CONROY: I don't know of any right now, but I could certainly find out, we could see. But again, the policies and procedures related to this, we have not seen problems of this nature again. So, it's not

something that we're opposed to, it's just whether or not the necessity exists for a specific directive related to this, but certainly something we could

5 explore.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. And in an instance where people whose conversations were unlawfully recorded and retained, were any of these people notified?

MR. CONROY: Everyone was notified, I think. So, it came-- As you're aware, it came to us through what ultimately was a discovery production to a defender's-- defense attorney.

In response to that and through the auditing process that we did in conjunction with Securus, all of the defender agencies were notified. Not only Bronx and Brooklyn defenders, which were involved initially, but all of the other defenders. It was a limited universe and it was just essentially human error that caused that, that has since been rectified. And we've, again, not seen it since. And it's not been brought to our attention that any of these types of phone calls have been part of criminal discovery or otherwise recorded when they were privileged.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. Just a few more questions on the recording. How-- What percentage of calls are automatically reviewed by a human? MR. CONROY: There's not necessarily an automatic We do have-- I don't want to get too deep review. into our intelligent investigative techniques, but based on certain things that happen, intelligence, confidential informants, something that happens. We have, our analysis shows that only 10 to 15% of all the calls are monitored at any time, and usually

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

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: And they're monitored by human beings versus, for example, AI. Are you all using AI?

MR. CONROY: We don't use AI in that.

those are not randomized, they're targeted.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: And what percentage of these recorded, reviewed calls are leading to the prevention of a security violation or a crime?

MR. CONROY: I don't have that breakdown. have to speak to our intelligence. There's varying things, right? So sometimes we just discover that somebody could be planning an act of violence within the jails. That then doesn't happen because we take measures to prevent it. Alternatively, it could be

Ŭ

2.2

done an open bid for Securus back in 2014 for the

district attorney's offices.

something criminal that we would share with the

But again, I don't have a breakdown of what percentage result in some type of method.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: In the follow up, we could have the breakdown of what percentage of these calls have led to a successful intervention, And what percentage of those have been turned over to the district attorney's office?

MR. CONROY: Well, the district attorney's office usually will return calls over in response to a subpoena. So, that's usually the sharing mechanism for that. Otherwise, it's not an ordinary just automatic handing over, unless there's specific criminal activity that's identified.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, can we talk about the procurement process that the department followed for contracting with Securus for tablets? Can you tell us a little bit about that? Were there multiple bids received? How much money is the tablet contract for? And what is the duration?

MR. CONROY: Sure, so the department had-- we had

3

1

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

phone services. So, we had Securus as a vendor at the time.

We were using a different vendor for tablet

services, and as it turns out, they really weren't up to our standards. It wasn't working. They were increasing the prices on us, so we recognized the need to go outside of that. We did some market research into other types of providers that had tablet services, what would be required, what would be the cost. And then Securus, when we initially procured the tablets, they had a tablet service, but it wasn't very good. We recognized that Securus was not up to our standards as to what we were looking for. During the time that we had Securus as a provider for the phone services, and when we recognized that the tablet service vendor that we had was not working for us at all, we were able to look at Securus' tablet provider and add an amendment to the contract that provided them to give us the tablets and to give this multitude of services that is currently on the tablets.

So, it was ultimately an amendment to the contract.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 1 CHAIRPERSON NURSE: And what's the value of that 2 3 contract, and how long is it for? 4 MR. CONROY: Yeah, you can say. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER SAMUELS: Sorry. 5 The value of the contract is \$5,395,600. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON WON: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear 8 that. I think because the microphone was a little bit far away.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER SAMUELS: Sorry about that.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Yeah, no worries.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER SAMUELS: The contract value is \$5,395,600.

15 CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay.

MR. CONROY: And that's for the year renewal.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Year renewal, right.

Okay, I have some more questions, but because we have a quorum, I want to offer-- Okay, sorry, we don't have a quorum. I was going to try to offer one of our colleagues who is online to ask questions.

I'm going to offer Council Member Narcisse a question.

24

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

_ 0

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: Good morning, and thank you, Chair. One of the things that I'm always talking about is about the appointment.

So, with the tablet, can they make appointment for, let's say, if they're not feeling good in the cell and they want to make an appointment, can they access the tablet to make an appointment, medical appointment?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: At this time, there isn't like an application where they could just open up an application and use that to make a medical appointment, but I do want to highlight that Correctional Health Services does have a direct hotline. And so, the fact that the tablet affords somebody the opportunity to make a phone call, if they are in their cell, they could make a phone call using that hotline to speak with Correctional Health Services.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: Thank you. I think to make it easier, since we've been having a lot of missing appointments, I think that's one of the things that people can feel like, I feel kind of I'm in charge of my health. And when they transition out, so I become part of their lives, knowing that I

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

have to take responsibility to go to the doctor and make an appointment when I don't feel good. That's kind of preventive care from here.

What is the current percentage of the people-don't know if they have access to that one -- the current percentage of the people in custody who has assigned a tablet?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Thank you for the question. So, as of January 22nd, 2025, which is when I got this report, 84% of eligible people in custody were assigned a tablet.

And when I say eliqible people in custody, we do not provide tablets to people within the first 30 days of their incarceration while they're during the new admission process.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: If a person is in custody has an issue with their assigned tablet, how is that addressed?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Thank you. There's actually multiple ways. So, there is a way for them to submit an inquiry through their tablet directly. But if the tablet issue that they're having is one that it's not operational, there are then, again,

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

further options. There are hotlines that they can

call for the division of programs.

We also do have social service staff and program counselors who visit housing areas at varying cadences weekly for sure, sometimes in most cases daily. And so they would have an opportunity to speak to that staff personnel, provide their complaint, and then that complaint would be provided directly to the tablet staff. They can also submit a formal grievance through the department's grievance process or through calling 311. So, that would be collected and gathered as well.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: Are tablets taking away as a punishment discipline? We have heard that tablets are taken as a punishment. If yes, are there rules and guidelines that you have in place or when it's appropriate to take, like if it's appropriate to take it away in a tablet due to behavior or concerns? What are the guidelines on when it is returned?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Thank you. tablets are not just removed to be removed from a person as a discipline practice at this time. do want to highlight that there are instances where a tablet is damaged or is destroyed, and then that

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

tablet would ultimately be returned back to the Division of Programs staff and the tablet operations team who would assess the situation on an individualized basis. And when I say assess the situation, there are obviously reports that come with a damaged and destroyed tablet.

Not all may be done at the damage of the person in custody. And so we do review that, which would then result in them potentially being reissued an additional tablet. But as like a blanket disciplinary process, that is not the practice with the tablets at this time.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: At this time.

Since the change in presidential administration, multiple city agencies have issued memos advising staff how to respond if non-local law enforcement agents show up in your facility, in the city's facilities. You want me to repeat it for you?

I didn't hear a question. MR. CONROY:

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: Since the change in presidential administration, multiple city agencies have issued memos advising staff how to respond if a non-local enforcement agent shows up at the city's facilities. Now, has DOC, yourself now, issued such 1 a memo to staff? Have there been any communications 2 3 with vendors and service providers regarding sharing identifying information of incarcerated individuals? 4 MR. CONROY: I'm not aware of a memo advising how 6 7 8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to handle people coming to our facilities. again, Rikers is a unique place, right? You can't just drive up to the front door. There's multiple points of entry that you have to go through. So, we don't have that type of interaction on an ordinary basis.

Nonetheless, to the second point, all of our contracts have provisions regarding privacy and the dissemination of information.

None of our vendors, to our knowledge, and if it's doing so, it's without authorization or it'd be a breach of contract, or sharing any personal identifying information about anyone in our custody with anyone, never mind other federal agencies or otherwise.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: And by any chance, if someone being discharged, would they-- how far, like you put them, do you guide them, give them some information, how to navigate, what they should do? Because I think, like, if somebody's being

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

discharged, not knowing all the in and out, what's going on here outside, I think it's our responsibility to give them some guidance.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Just as a highlight, I mean, for the City of New York, we obviously, our DOC staff are not communicating with entities like ICE.

But further, the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, MOCJ, they do have the Community Reentry Network, which does afford many contracted providers, that do help guide individuals post-release and upon their discharge from our custody. And those providers, I know, offer a wealth of services and availability to support somebody, even additional legal support as well, or guidance on how to get in touch with additional legal support. So, I do just want to highlight that during the discharge process, the providers through the Community Reentry Network, through MOCJ, are really the primary resource that help people the day of discharge and post-discharge as they navigate next steps.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: Thank you, because there's a lot of anxiety outside right now for a lot of folks. So, sometimes after discharge, people kind of lost.

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

They don't know. I know some agency give some nice services, but I think it's somehow making sure that people are okay as they're being discharged because we're in a challenging time. So, thank you for your time. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: I just wanted to follow up. You said you aren't aware of any quidance or memo or anything that comes. When we were here a week ago or two weeks ago, I forgot, we had a hearing with MOYA. They testified that they have sent quidance to all agencies and those heads of agencies, and they're expected to communicate down.

So, I just want to confirm if you have or have not. Has DOC received any guidance? And if there's a reason why it wouldn't, could you put that on the record, please?

MR. CONROY: Yeah, no, there's no reason why we In our agency, any of these communications wouldn't. with MOYA or otherwise and anything related to immigration services is vetted and works through the legal division, which I oversee, so that we have two attorneys dedicated to that, and then they communicate with our custody management discharge unit. So, there's very limited circumstances where

could certainly explore that.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.3

2.2

24

there would even be the chance of that interaction. But again, we don't have opposition to it, and we

CHAIRPERSON WON: Sorry, it's not a question of if you'd have opposition to it. It's a question of can you confirm that you received any updated quidance or new quidance since directives have been coming down from the federal government?

MR. CONROY: Oh, yes. No, no, I'm sorry. I misunderstood the question.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Yeah, no, I just, because you had said, like, you weren't aware of any memo that's come down, but they said they were sending memos, so I just wanted to confirm.

MR. CONROY: No, to clarify, Chair, I'm sorry. I was responding to the Councilmember's question that I was not aware if we had sent out a--

Okay, understood. CHAIRPERSON NURSE:

MR. CONROY: --that we had put out a memo internally. But yes, we have been in communication with MOYA regarding all of these issues, and we've communicated within our division and in custody management.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE 50 Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 1 The question is, what I said I would not be 2 opposed to, is a department-wide memo. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Got it. No, thank you. just wanted to make sure we were clear on that. 5 MR. CONROY: Understood. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Councilmember Ayala had some 8 questions. 9 Sorry, Deputy Speaker, don't want to get in trouble. 10 11 DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: It's okay. I have a lot 12 of names. 13 So, I just have some basic questions about the commissary. Do you know what the number of inmates, 14 15 I guess, you know, what does it average to that do 16 not claim their commissary prior to being released? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: We do report on the 17 number of individuals who don't claim their 18 19 commissary funds on an annual basis. So, we do know that-- and this is a stretch of time, that there are 20 21 about 100,719, I hope I said that right. But this is 2.2 from, like, I believe 2007 to present. Now, when

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Wait, \$100,000 or 100,000 people?

2.3

24

25

we're talking--

1 Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONT

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: No, no, accounts.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Accounts. Wow

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Accounts.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: From 2007?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: From 2007 to present. But then, just to let me confirm that I'm giving you the accurate breakdown, which it's not right there. But what I do know is that on an annual basis, it looks like about \$200,000 that are unclaimed funds for the individuals that have not picked up their funds. But I'm sorry. Give me one second to get you the exact number.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Yes.

MR. CONROY: So, we have-- So with respect to the specific accounts on what is the unclaimed funds, this we have up until August of 2024. But there are 137-- Again, this goes back to, as DC McCarty mentioned, 2007, 137,598 total accounts that have unclaimed funds. A vast, vast majority of those are-- So \$5 or less accounts for 30% of those. \$10 to \$30 accounts for 30%, and up to \$100 is like 25.

So, the amounts that exceed \$200 are very, very small. But that's the accumulative amount. And these funds are sitting there, right? We're not

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

using them. We want to work with the council to find a way to get rid of them. But they go back pretty far into the past, as far as what's abandoned.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: After the 120 days window, what happens with the funds?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: The funds stay in this account, and they can't be touched by the Department of Correction or anyone. But somebody is able to still actually claim those funds. So, let's say someone does have funds from beyond 120 days post-release. And we actually have this communication up on our website as well.

So, they can go through the website and submit a request for the funds. But the formal process post the 120 days is that they can be provided in a check So, the notion that we provide \$200 in cash format. after 120 days, all funds would go into a check format for the person.

And the department would need a notarized letter indicating the request for the unclaimed funds. again, that's only after the 120 days. Prior to the 120 days or during that initial post-release period for those three months or 120 days, they would be

2.2

2.3

able to receive the \$200 or less in cash. And then
the remainder of the funds in check format.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: And what prevents DOC from having those funds or that check or whatever format you wish to pay it out ready? We know when somebody's being discharged, right? We have a date.

I'm assuming there's a process, right?, for discharging. Why wouldn't that money be available at discharge? Why would I have to claim it?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: So, when someone is discharged, first, their discharge date isn't always known, especially for people who are detainees. And some people do leave directly from court.

But just to highlight, there are funds available. So, again, the \$200 in cash that someone can receive is available immediately upon release at the Rikers Island Central Cashier, which they walk through upon release. They can stop at the window, which is open 24-7. So, it is a 24-7 operation that they could receive their funds from a cashier at that window.

If they are released from the courts as well, there are bail windows available that they could pick up their unclaimed funds as well from their commissary.

MR. CONROY: And by the way, I'm sorry, just for clarity's sake, a person who's discharged can also at the time of discharge get a check for funds that exceed \$200. So, it's not like you're limited to \$200, then you have to claim it after. You can get that at the time. But only the cash is up to \$200.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Is there a reminder postrelease whenever possible to encourage folks to get their money?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Well, I'll answer your question this way: There are flyers throughout all of the facilities that do identify that someone can receive up to \$200 in cash up to 120 days postrelease. And within those flyers, they also indicate that they can come and pick up a check for remaining funds that are above the \$200. With that, we also put that flyer on the tablet.

We do have staff available throughout the facilities. So, we have-- I had mentioned the counselors that go and visit these areas that can help people, one, release funds prior to discharge. So, they can release funds to family and loved ones if that was an option throughout the entirety of

3 discharge.

2.2

2.3

But those counselors can also support them in identifying how much funds are actually in their commissary account. So, to give them a printout so that they're aware that they have funds in their commissary account and that it would also further tell them verbally about how they can go and receive their funds post-discharge. So, those counselors can give them kind of that human interaction or that human support.

their incarceration and prior to leading up to their

But once somebody is post-release, so once somebody is discharged and in the community, we have this information up on our website in detail.

There's actually an entire page dedicated to-- in the person in custody services of how they can claim their unclaimed commissary funds.

MR. CONROY: And additionally, on that same website, people can go on and check to see if they have and how much unclaimed funds that are there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Yeah, I mean, I just assume that if I have \$5 and I'm, you know, I've spent eight months, two years, whatever it is at Rikers, that I'm going to leave as fast as possible.

T might not think that \$5

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

I might not think that \$5 is enough to stop by the commissary, you know, window. So, you know, but it also doesn't benefit you to continue to accumulate,

5 you know, funds that are being held in perpetuity.

So, what is, you know, I'm trying to figure out what measures you've taken to try to remediate this, right? Maybe having that money available so that when we're giving, I'm assuming if I'm an inmate and I've never been in, you know, in Rikers, but so I'm going to play a little bit here. And imagine what it would look like. I'm, you know, now I'm leaving and I have to get my clothes that I came in with or whatever I'm going to wear. I'm going to grab my documents and the things that I, you know, my belongings that I wish to take with me. And then I have to pass a certain area. So, why wouldn't, I think it would make sense to have those funds readily available. "Here's your stuff, have a good day." don't, I wouldn't stop for \$5. But again, you know, it might not mean, it's not going to, this is not life-changing money. But the problem is that it continues to add up. And we have no way of communicating with folks. And I don't see anybody going on the website, quite frankly.

2.2

Unless I left a lot of money there, there's no reason why I'm going to go in there.

MR. CONROY: I mean, a couple of things to that.

One, we share the concern. I mean, we really do. We don't use this money. We don't want this money.

We're just concerned about, you know, the bill and the issues of having this cash on site. But that doesn't solve the issue you just raised, right? So even if we have all this money, which presents a danger to anyone, you know, again, if they do stop, and you hand them \$50,000, they have to have that in the account. That's a dangerous situation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Is there a limit on how much you can have in commissary?

MR. CONROY: No.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: No, there are individuals who do have thousands or tens of thousands of dollars in their account. It's limited.

MR. CONROY: It's not a huge percentage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: I'm assuming that's a very small percentage.

MR. CONROY: It's a small percentage. Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Okay.

2.3

MR. CONROY: But also, I mean, we hope this doesn't happen, but it's also notable that if somebody does come back into our custody for any reason, that money automatically goes back into their commissary account that they had before.

You know, obviously we don't want that to happen. We'd much prefer people don't come into our custody and come, you know, and take their funds. But that is another, you know, avenue. So, it's not exhausted necessarily. It can be exhausted later on.

But we do share those concerns. You know, the problem with some of the aspects of the bill, I think, and one of the things you mentioned is giving the money to them kind of during this process.

The problem is that cash is actually a contraband in our prison. So, we can't give it to them until we, in our jails, until we-- jails-- until we have them discharged. So, that's just one of the processes elements that we have to wait until they're out.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: But there are many ways to pay out, right? Electronically, via cards, via check. Have any of those options been exhausted?

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS MR. CONROY: But-- I'm sorry. We do these things. We do have this availability to do it. DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Upon request, though. MR. CONROY: But-- Right, but that's at this discharge time. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: And I mean, I do want to highlight again that when someone is a detainee being discharged and they're literally exiting Rikers to go to the bus that takes them off of Rikers Island, they pass the cashier window. So, it is available.

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

And at that passing of the cashier's window, and I understand the point that you just may not stop. But it is in the concept of like it's being handed or

available, it is right there and accessible.

But I do agree that, you know, we equally want to see people receive their funds. And I do think that this is for all of us to really think collectively.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: I just think that if the \$5 that I could care less about are becoming an inconvenience for you, that it will be for you to figure out how to get me to claim those \$5.

MR. CONROY: Honestly, I think this is a great conversation to have. We could share this offline

2.3

and work out something that we think is fruitful and would solve that problem. Again, this is not an issue for us. You know, we can't force someone to do it, but certainly we could explore every measure to try to get it so that we don't have these. Because again, they're not being used. They're just there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. CONROY: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: One of the things I want to add to that conversation is— just can you actually simplify the process? Because you don't want to hold the fund. Can you put a paper on top of it and then kind of like, this is the fund and this is the window, like direct the person? Because everybody just like, even a dollar you find on the floor, people will pick it up. So, if you have \$5, you have \$200, whatever it may be.

So, I think it should be, for me from listening,
I don't think that engagement is kind of fluid. Like
for the person to be like saying, "Okay, this is the
money that I have." And said, "Okay, on your way
out, this is a \$5 and circle the amount and you can
stop at the cash and pick up your money."

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY SPEAKER AYALA: Thank you.

So, we'll look into any suggestion.

want to go, like my colleague just said. Do you think that is something that you can do to simplify it, to make it a little more encouraging? Like you have that kind of money, you stop at the cashier? Can you do that?

So, because you're anxious, you just don't-- you

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: I definitely think that we can explore how we message to people what their remaining funds are leading up to their discharge.

I think the challenge that I mentioned is that for, let's say somebody who's city sentenced where we know their discharge date, or if somebody has a great sense of where their discharge may land in their process with the courts.

In that scenario, it may be easier. There are some scenarios that where people do post bail and they're very quickly removed from custody and that we may not be able to always instantly print it out. But again, I agree that there are definitely avenues that we could be communicating.

COUNCILMEMBER NARCISSE: All right, thank you.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Yeah. And it's good to know that you're open to that conversation and trying to, with Councilmember Hudson who couldn't be here to speak on her bill and actually solve the root cause of the problem, as you say, which is, you know, I think a big issue.

Okay, Council Member Won.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Thank you so much, Chair Nurse. On February 29th, 2024, the Comptroller of the City of New York denied the registration for the Keefe contract. And I wanted to understand -- Because it was denied on lack of compliance to multiple procedural rules. The first one was the subject contract action, which was submitted months after its contract start date, and it lacked appropriation of sufficient funds to support the entire year of the contract. Second was inconsistencies concerning the contract's potential displacement of city employees. Third was failure to comply with requirements concerning MWBE. Fourth was failure to resolve all adverse and negative vendor issues as required prior, by the PBB rules, prior to the vendor commencing work on July 1st. And failure, lastly, failure to provide

a timely, completed, doing business accountability form.

What I'm most interested in, because we heard you

2.2

2.3

testify especially about how there is basically,
there are no real negative vendor issues, but clearly
the Comptroller had evidence that there are adverse
and negative vendor issues that are required to be
resolved prior to commencing work. Can you expand on
pursuant to the PBB rules, "Agencies shall monitor
and vendor performance no less than once annually."
The Comptroller has noted that DOC is behind on
required vendor performance evaluations dating to
2021, and there are just one vendor performance

Can you refute the Comptroller's assertion or
explain why the agency is failing to meet its
performance evaluation requirements on what has been

19 done to remedy those issues that he has outlined?

evaluations for the Keefe group since 2022.

MR. CONROY: So, I think there's a bifurcated thing here, right? So, we had the Keefe contract initially and what was done with that. I mean, obviously at the time, Keefe was in place and operating in the system and operating at what we consider to be in a very effective and efficient

2.2

concerns.

level for us that again alleviated a lot of the

So, when that process was in place and I wasn't here at the time, but when we responded to the Comptroller's office was that even above and beyond the performance evaluation that the relationship and the look into and the awareness of other concerns that have been raised through news articles regarding Keefe were considered, and that even in the face of those, because of the services that they provided, they were still an adequate vendor for us.

Separate from that, the second part essentially of the question is that I'm into the agency about seven months and in the time since I got there, the Commissioner has— We've moved procurements from under our Deputy Commissioner of Management and Budget to the Legal Division, which is the structure of many of the agencies.

So, now the Procurements Division falls under ourselves. Our agency, our Chief Contracting Officer came from another city agency. Assistant

Commissioner Samuels is here for two months. We've both now sat down and looked at our processes and are

Z 1

shoring up everything regarding the evaluation process to ensure that passport is utilized.

We also had the fortunate circumstance of having someone from the Mayor's Office of Contracting

Services work with us, kind of embed with us on a part-time basis to give an assessment of our practices and procedures relating to that.

So, in all of those measures that we've taken in the months that I've been here, we intend and will continue to do this evaluation process. As I mentioned in the testimony, we're also looking into getting an auditing compliance, either team or person in to look holistically and work with our contract managers in each of the divisions to ensure all the vendor performance and the good work that they're doing in order to make an even more informed assessment as to continuing contract services with any vendor.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, do you have an estimate time of when that will be? Since the last time was 2022 and it's 2025?

MR. CONROY: When what will be, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON WON: For the evaluation and

performance and the audits that you're looking to do?

2.2

2.3

MR. CONROY: Assistant Commissioner Samuels is looking at all of our contracts currently and we're going to be implementing immediately the annual evaluations as required. It's something that's unequivocally necessary and we're going to be doing that.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, so we can expect it this year?

MR. CONROY: Yes, we intend on doing it. I can't guarantee every single one of them because again, the contracts are a rolling basis on some, but yes, we will not be in arrears nearly as much as current.

CHAIRPERSON WON: But could you make sure that the Keefe contract is done this year?

MR. CONROY: Yeah, absolutely, we are going to do that. And I would also note, by the way, that we are currently processing a Request For Proposal, an RFP for commissary services.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay.

MR. CONROY: So, we have an extension pending for this current calendar year. Keefe is expired at the end of 2025? No, 2026. At the end of 20--, June of 2026. And this RFP will be out at some point during this year for commissary services.

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, great. Good to know that you're returning to competitive bidding.

And for the outlined adverse and negative vendor issues for Keefe that the Comptroller was focused on, have those been remedied or resolved?

MR. CONROY: I think the answer is the same.

Again, we're talking about the performance that they were doing at the time and our look into what was happening, that it was determined that this was in fact a vendor that we would be pleased to continue working with for the extension. But we are looking for an RFP.

And I would just like to point out also, you're talking about the competitive bidding process. We have 104 active contracts right now. We have no emergency contracts in place. And only three of those are actually no bid. So, I don't want to leave here with the perception that this is a broad issue within the department. Three of all of our registered contracts, which is again 104 active right now I believe, are no bid.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay. It is our understanding that the initial emergency contract with Keefe had an annualized monthly cost of \$583,000. When Keefe was

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

granted a negotiated acquisition contract, the annualized monthly cost rose to \$2.25 million.

And with renewal, it has now risen to \$2.75 million. Can you help us account for the rising monthly costs?

MR. CONROY: I think-- I mean, a couple of things obviously, coming out of the COVID pandemic, different costs and issues rose. But also I think our initial look into this was when we entered into the emergency contract, there were projections that our population would decline. And that has not been the case. And in fact, we're higher now, our census, than we were pre-2020, pre-pandemic. So, I can't--

Again, I'll be more detailed. I'll look into that and get back to you on specifically what you're talking about. But I know some of the associated costs were exactly that reason. Because the staffing that they were required to provide the services had to increase because our population and the housing areas that were actually being utilized increased, contrary to initial projections of a decrease in population.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

it.

Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 1 2 CHAIRPERSON WON: So, you believe that your 3 population has increased by fourfold because it went from \$583,000 to \$2.75 million? 4 MR. CONROY: I don't know that those are necessarily commensurate. Like it's not dollar for 6 7 I mean, there's other things associated with

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, please make sure you give us the breakdown because it's a significant increase in costs.

The initial three-month emergency contract with Keefe Group provided itemized budget lines for staffing both on site and at warehouses, commissary products, IT warehouses, build-out, and freight. contract's subsequent renewals have not included itemized budget lines. Can you provide us with updated budget lines for the current contract?

MR. CONROY: Yeah, we'll follow up with that. don't have the budget lines with us, but that's certainly documentation we can provide to you.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, in April 2024, DOC indicated there had been a trend in expired items or just not having packages delivered. The department also reported that in spring 2024, leadership met

2.3

^ F

with individuals who managed the day-to-day commissary contract-- commissary operations to address the issues. What was causing the issues of expired and non-delivered items, and how did you resolve them?

MR. CONROY: I was not here at the time, so again, I will have to follow up. But what I've been informed is that it was just very simply supplier issues that they had gotten--

CHAIRPERSON WON: From Keefe?

MR. CONROY: From Keefe, and then we've taken those items off the menu. We found comparable items to put on at, again, the same price comparisons, so as not to-- which was really our main concern, to disrupt the customary commissary for the person in custody. Because it is something that they requested and appreciate.

CHAIRPERSON WON: It's extremely concerning that we went from a monthly cost of \$583,000 to now \$2.75 million, and we, even this past year in 2024, you chose to continue to do business with them even though they were selling expired items or just not delivering at all. So, what was the consequences of

them giving us expired items or not having packages delivered at all?

refunds, and just to highlight, of all of the commissary that was provided throughout, an example, in 2024, 56 items were refunded because they were expired. There are refunds that are provided to people when commissary items are out of stock. If something comes and it appears damaged, like the packaging, they also receive refunds. If somebody indicates that they feel, like, for example, the ounce or the amount that's in there, it's not what was requested, that could also be refunded as well, or if the order was wrong, that can be refunded.

CHAIRPERSON WON: How does the refund process work? Does the individual have to request a refund, or are you auto-refunding, noticing that the item was never delivered?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: There are a few ways. First, when a product is actually— When they receive their commissary, so when it actually is brought to them, they get a receipt of all the items, and they go through all of the items within, in the presence of the Keefe personnel, but also in the

presence of DOC personnel, where they can indicate if the item that they requested that's on a receipt is actually within the packaging that they received.

So, in order for them to accept the packaging, they actually need to sign the receipt, and during that process, if there is an indication, let's say something was supposed to be there and it's not, or if there was an indication that something was out of stock, it would be automatically pulled out of the receipt, so it shouldn't even be indicated on the receipt, or it should be indicated that it was refunded automatically.

But again, if somebody notices that, you know, they requested something and it doesn't look right, or that it was the wrong item, that then they can reference that when they sign the receipt to get a refund through that practice. Now let's say somebody says, okay, this looks like all of my items are present and available, I sign the receipt, I take my items, and then I look, and so in the cases of the 56 expired from calendar year 2024, that this item is expired. That is when we would go through the grievance process of them actually being able to grieve to receive the refund for the product.

CHAIRPERSON WON: What is this grievance process?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: That would be-
They could do it multiple ways. They can submit a

grievance within the facility, but they can also call

311. So, they would be able to--

CHAIRPERSON WON: So, now they have to do the work to get the money back that they were wrong because they were sent an expired item.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: It should be automatic that those expired items are not provided to them, but in the case that it is found there is an expired item, they do have an avenue to get a refund.

CHAIRPERSON WON: But now the onus is on them to go through a grievance process to call 311, or what is the other process?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: We have grievance within the facility, where they can submit a report.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So, they have to fill out a form. So, again, my question is, what are the consequences for Keefe for selling expired items, especially perishable food, where people can get very sick when consuming their expired products?

MR CONROY: I'd just point out, this is an extraordinarily low situation we have. You know, as

2.2

DC McCarty just mentioned, we had the refunds that were processed, and what we see were of the hundreds of thousands of orders, and items that are provided.

We've had 56 for total in 2024 for expired.

So, I mean, in a comparison, we're not talking about widespread issues related to expired items.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Do you think in the outside world, if I went to a supermarket, and out of the things I purchased, even if I had two things that were expired, do you think the consumers of the world would be upset?

MR. CONROY: Yeah, and we'd have to go back to the store to get a refund, which I've done in my life.

So, I mean, we're not saying the same thing here. We're talking about a very minor--

CHAIRPERSON WON: If you have consumer protections in New York City, you should have consumer protections as an inmate, and it shouldn't be on them to go through an onerous process to get the money back, and there should be consequences to Keefe for their 56 expired items. What were they?

MR. CONROY: I understand that's not-- I'm sorry.

I don't think that it needs to be any consequences

2.3

for a vendor that provides an immense service to the people on Rikers Island for what is really an extraordinarily small potential. I'm not mitigating it. We should not— That should not happen in any supermarket or anywhere in the world, but it does.

And in these circumstances, again, evidenced by the very low-- It's not-- First of all, it's also not an onerous process, I mean, to make a grievance.

I mean, it's literally a phone call or raising it up to someone in the facility, and then that gets transferred to Keefe, and then these refunds are made.

So, I challenge the notion that the grievance process is onerous, but secondary to that, it's also a very small percentage of items that we're talking about in the hundreds of thousands when we have complaints of anything related to commissary in less than 1% of all the delivered items.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, I just want to note for the record, we've had multiple conversations here publicly about how the grievance process is actually onerous on individuals, and most people don't even bother with it because they know how ineffective it has been.

I think you've been here at some of those conversations, if I recall correctly. I think the fact that a contract jumps so high, I mean, there should be a standard of excellence. There's just a question here of like, there's no consequence.

Your testimony is that there shouldn't be a consequence, I think is a pretty poor statement to make. But to say that the grievance process is functional when we've still been waiting to hear the updates of how it has been improved, if at all, is, I think, a poor statement about the situation.

CHAIRPERSON WON: It's also very concerning to me that there seems to be contradictory thoughts or opinions from DOC versus what the Comptroller has seen and what inmates are seeing.

Can you help me understand, what do you attribute to the consistently high number or share of grievances related to commissary since Keefe Group took over the operations and why there seems to be a different understanding of what you see as a very minute amount of grievances and what the Comptroller sees as a very significant amount of grievances that it even warrants him not allowing the contract to be registered in the first place?

MR. CONROY: I don't know what data the Comptroller is using regarding grievances or complaints regarding Keefe. I just know what our specific data shows and that I think it's 0.06% of all orders result in some type of grievance or complaint. To have just above a half a percentage.

So, I can't comment on what the Comptroller has seen, but this is what our on-site specific data that we look at shows.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Okay, I think even 56 expired items being sold is not okay because now you have lost the trust of your consumers where they will now have to check every single item that they purchased to make sure it's not expired.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, I'm going to go back to Securus. I just had one question I wanted to ask and then I have some questions from Council Member Cabán. who we weren't able to make quorum to get on. We had a question about the phone calls being used by the Securus tablets, the phone calls that go through those tablets. There was a question if there is a do not record option to ensure attorney-client communications are retained or is it just every single call is recorded?

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

MR. CONROY: There's multiple ways to get on the do not record list. Requests directly through the legal division or the department. There's a website where you could go on and speak to see whether or not your number is registered. There is -- When that is not the case, when there is a line that is going to be recorded, there's a dual level, what we call an admonishment, essentially informing the caller and the recipient that this call is being recorded.

If you believe that it should be privileged, then you should hang up and not utilize this line. And then there's actually information on our website is how to go on there and register that number. We do get these numbers in bulk, especially from defender agencies to input them, but there is both the ability to do it and then when it's not, especially now since 2021, when it is not on a privileged line, that you get this second two-tiered admonishment to make sure that people are aware that otherwise the phones are being recorded.

I'm sorry, I don't know if that answered your question, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: I think that does. And it's just more for getting it on the record.

2 MR. CONROY: Understood.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WON: And then for the same thing with text, they are able to send text out of the tablets?

MR. CONROY: No.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, I have some other questions.

So, this, I don't know if you'll specifically be able to answer this, but maybe others here. In FY24, there was \$17 million worth of contracts that were canceled. Then there were four RFPs that were reissued after there was recognition that actually we needed outside help to carry out these services for \$14 million.

And there was a question of why not the full \$17 million to be reissued and what is that \$3 million going towards?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: So, I can say we submitted multiple proposals for different types of programs and \$14 million of those proposals were picked up for us to be able to move forward with contracts. Now, the four that were selected are in areas that weren't necessarily through that \$17 million contract. So, I do want to indicate that

2.2

2.3

there are two-- the \$17 million that were lost, these are different scope and different areas that these new contracts are going through.

So, although maybe similar providers might be eligible to be submitting through this contracting process, they are covering different topic areas such as substance misuse programming, trauma-informed care, supplemental educational services, and then we have the reentry planning and transportation.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: And are the same number of people being served, I think it was, I have here 1,700 people were served per day under the former contracts, are the same number of people being served under the current contracts?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Do you mean like the upcoming contracts?

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Well, the ones that will be accounted for in the \$14 million. Will the \$14 million in contracts serve 1,700 people?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: I can't say for certain like the person-to-person comparison because the contract hasn't been implemented yet.

So, we're going to see the findings of how many people these contracts service, but the goal is

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 intended that these contracts cover every single 3 facility and that there is support provided to a 4 large network of individuals in custody, but it's 5 challenging for us to, I think, give like will they meet this 1,700? It's intended absolutely that they 6 7 would and actually beyond that scope, but I can't say that for certain right now because we don't have the 8 data because the contracts just were released on January 6th. 10

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Sorry, the contracts were just released or the RFP?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: The RFP, I'm sorry, yes.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Got it.

Okay. I have a question here about drug use and how drugs are getting into Rikers. The recently issued RFP for substance misuse treatment describes rampant substance misuse and the pervasive presence of drugs in the jails, which clearly makes everyone there less safe.

The previous commissioner claimed that fentanyl was flooding Rikers because it was coming through the mail. However, the DOI recently issued a report showing that these drug tests were flawed and

2.2

inaccurate in 85% of cases. DOI also issued a number of recommendations to prevent DOC staff from bringing in drugs.

Which of these recommendations have been implemented or not implemented and why?

MR. CONROY: So I don't, I mean, because we were focused on contracts, I don't have the DOI reports, but I just happen to know because I did work on some of them. I can't state specifically with the recommendations, but we have worked closely with DOI regarding implementation of some of those procedures. One of the things in particular that we saw with respect to the field test and the previous testimony from the commissioner was that we've since purchased more—— I don't know what you call them, I'm sorry, but narcotic scanning devices that are up to 90% accurate versus the field tests, which were relatively not as accurate.

So, in addition to that, that's located in the mail trailer to kind of identify these drugs that come in. So, we're using these more robustly and they have a more accurate testing measure. The issue of scanning and preventing the contraband from coming into jails is a consistent issue that are, we have a

measures and procedures consistently.

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

think we accepted many of the recommendations, or if we had not, with respect to the field test in

those DOI recommendations we've worked on, and I

relatively new security commissioner and a senior

So, it's a nonstop issue of having to best

address security in the jails. But again, on both of

deputy commissioner that are looking into these

new scanning devices in, I think, almost all of our

particular, it was because we had implemented these

facilities.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: And do you have any updated figures you could tell us about how these newer scanning technologies are, what are the findings that they're showing?

MR. CONROY: So we've used, not yet, because that was one of the things that we're going to work with DOI on, is actually doing a study to see the improved accuracy of the testing, because then that also requires a supplement, excuse me, a subsequent NYPD laboratory test.

And for a number of reasons, just because of the volume of things that they're dealing with and issues with staffing that they have, it's not something that

•

can be done pretty quickly, so we can't just send it to them and get it right back. It takes a period of time. Overall, we've based some of the more accuracy information on scientific studies that have been conducted around the country.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, so you're saying you are going to do some in-house study of these machines before actually using them?

MR. CONROY: No, no, they're being utilized now, but we are also, to supplement that and to ensure, I actually just had a conversation a couple weeks ago with DOI about doing a joint study to kind of look at these, what we're covering, what the testing shows, and then kind of gauge the accuracy of it. But I mean, it's industry-widely accepted. These are used by the Transportation Security Administration at airports, some of the types that we're using.

So, it's something that we have a higher level of confidence in, but we are going to continue to look into that.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay, we would love to get in the follow-up which of the recommendations you are implementing, which ones you aren't, and the rationale for why not.

MR. CONROY: Sure.

3

1

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: I think that was, oh, sorry,

4

I'll turn it back over to Councilmember Won.

5

are multiple clauses in the contract that talks about

CHAIRPERSON WON: For the Securus contract, there

6 7

confidentiality. The first, there are many, but

8

we're going to just list a few.

9

10 confidentiality of such reports, information, or data

The contractor agrees to maintain the

11

by using a reasonable degree of care and using at

12

least the same degree of care that the contractor $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

13

uses to preserve the confidentiality of its own

The contractor agrees that such reports

14

confidential information. The contractor agrees.

15

16 information data shall not be made available to any

17

person or entity without the prior written approval

18

of the department. The contractor shall restrict the

19

20

access of confidential information to persons who

_ .

have legitimate work-related purposes to access such

21

2.2

information. The contractor agrees that it will instruct its officers, employees, and agents to

2.3

maintain the confidentiality of all information

24

required to kept confidential by this agreement.

A breach of this section 5.08 shall constitute a material breach of this agreement for which the department may terminate this agreement pursuant to article 10. The department reserves any and all other rights to remedies in the event of an unauthorized disclosure.

Notwithstanding any agreement provision of this agreement, the contractor shall not be relieved of the liability of the city for damages sustained by the city by virtues of the contractors breach of the agreement for confidentiality and privacy and the city may withhold payments to the contractor for the purpose of set off the amount of damage due to the city from this contractor, Securus.

So, can you tell us what contract payments have been withheld and what actions have been done for the breach of contract for privacy for Securus?

MR. CONROY: Are you talking about the what breach of privacy are you referring to?

CHAIRPERSON WON: When we have reports of the conversations that were had especially with legal service providers that should not have been recorded or surveilled.

2.2

2.3

MR. CONROY: So, that's not a breach of the contract by Securus, right? So, what happened there was a human error as to establishing what phone calls should be recorded or not. In this circumstance the that human error that we talked about that the DOI spoke about and made recommendations on was based on just their ability to record it.

The actual phone calls were not provided by

Securus to the district attorneys. That was provided

by the Department of Correction to the district

attorneys upon request by subpoena.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So, you're saying that Securus has to record every single phone conversation?

MR. CONROY: That's what happens, yes.

CHAIRPERSON WON: And you're saying--

MR. CONROY: Except for those that are on the do not call lists, right.

CHAIRPERSON WON: And weren't they not supposed to record that conversation?

MR. CONROY: Right, but they didn't disclose the information. That's not a date that's not the same type of breach that you're speaking of.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So you're saying that--

3 d u u 5 k 6 d d 7 p

MR. CONROY: So, that was just a matter of what database was—And I should also point out that unrecorded, excuse me, recorded conversations are kept for a limited period of time. I think it's 120 days but I'm not certain. So, even when you know the privileged or unprivileged they're only kept for a certain amount of time and then when the Department of Correction turned that information over to the district attorney's office.

So, it was not a privacy or data breach-CHAIRPERSON WON: So, how could you say that that
was not supposed to be recorded if you actively
decided to turn that over to the district attorney's
office? That was an intentional decision then?

MR. CONROY: It was an intentional decision based on the fact that we were not aware at the time that it was a privileged phone call because of the initial human error that has been addressed that caused those phone conversations to be recorded.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So, for Securus, how do you expect them to know which ones that they can and cannot share to a third party?

MR. CONROY: But they don't share them to a third party.

/

Ŭ

CHAIRPERSON WON: So, you're saying that they share all of them to you, to the department?

MR. CONROY: We are the owner of all of the data.

CHAIRPERSON WON: And the department is the one that's sharing it out.

MR. CONROY: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON WON: Even though you're not supposed to have certain data. Because we could have an error.

MR. CONROY: Right, right. This is, I mean we're talking about two different things. There's there's data that's secured and they're not allowed to disseminate it.

We own and retain all of the data that is recorded in the Securus contract. What happens and the practical, and I don't have technical terms, but the practical aspect of what happens is we have a universe of phone calls that are privileged and not recorded. And then we have a universe of calls that are recorded.

In this instance, what happened in 2021 was that by-- again by human error, which has since been rectified, some phone calls, 200-something phone calls, were inadvertently recorded that should have

been privileged. Therefore, they then appeared accessible to our personnel, DOC personnel. And when

4 received a subpoena -- when we received a subpoena

from the district attorney's offices, they were

6 turned over as part of what is necessary discovery in

7 those cases.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

And then what happened from there is those recordings were turned over to the defense counsel who pointed out that said, "Hey, these were conversations that we were having with our clients. You're not supposed to do it." So, we're talking about not privacy breaches or otherwise.

This is different. Privacy breach in that context of a contract is different than attorney-client privilege, right?

So what we did is we took these inadvertently recorded attorney-client privilege calls, turned them over. That was not a breach on the part of Securus.

This was a human error as to what should be recorded, what should not be recorded, but they did not directly disclose information to the district.

CHAIRPERSON WON: So, what is required of Securus? Are they supposed to record all conversations or no?

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 1 2 MR. CONROY: Yes, excep--. I'm sorry. I think I 3 answered this already. I said yes, except for those 4 that are designated as privileged calls. 5 CHAIRPERSON WON: So, for 200-something conversations you're saying that they should not have 6 been recording it, but they did anyway? 7 8 MR. CONROY: That's right. 9 CHAIRPERSON WON: And you're saying that even though they shared those conversations that weren't 10 11 supposed to be recorded to you, that it still is not 12 a breach of privacy? 13

MR. CONROY: It is not, because we own the data pursuant to the contract. All of that data is ours. It is not Securus'.

So, I guess we need to have a CHAIRPERSON WON: bill to make sure that those conversations can't be recorded, that it should be illegal even for them to obtain it.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: I think it'd be helpful if you could describe on the record what the human error was.

2.3 MR. CONROY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: That might clear it up.

24

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.2

MR. CONROY: So, as DOI reported, what happened was the Securus company was given these numbers to put on a do-not-record list.

When they entered the numbers into the system, and this is my understanding of what happened is what's reported, they put the numbers in as, for some reasons, do-not-record, but it was site-specific, meaning if you were in a particular building within our facilities, those conversations were not to be recorded. What had happened then is some of the persons in our custody moved to a different building, and then for that reason, because of whatever this marker they put on it had, it became something that was now not privileged, meaning it was being recorded.

Theoretically, the admonishment was read.

What we discovered in the auditing system, what Securus did, and they took immediate ownership of this, was that there needed to be an all facilities marker or tag put into it. What has happened since is that now Securus has, again, a two-fold supervisory and review line.

So, the numbercomes in, the technician or personnel puts it into the system, it is reviewed by

2.2

a supervisor, and it's signed off by a supervisor, and then it goes in. But nonetheless, the tags now all read all facilities. So, no matter where anyone moves in our facilities, that do not record marker moves with that associated number.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Thank you for explaining that.

Okay, I have one final question, then we're done. But before I ask my question, I just want to make sure that we have down all the items that we are needing in the follow-up.

I believe there was some data on what supply, what items were taken off the menu from Keefe, and how often you're doing comparisons for outside pricing, like what is the actual process for initiating that, and how often does it happen.

We had some questions about the percentage of recorded calls that are turned over that actually lead to some kind of intervention or prevention of crime, and then what is handed over. No, sorry, just that part.

And then the recommendations from the DOI study related to substance use and the testing.

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS My final question is -- I know that the ICE office was closed in 2015 on the island. To your knowledge, have there been any conversations about reopening this office? MR. CONROY: We have not had any conversations about reopening the ICE office on Rikers Island. CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. I just wanted to get that on the record. Thank you so much for being here and answering questions. I appreciate it, and we'll follow up. I'm going to now dismiss the panel. Thank you.

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

I now open... Thank you. I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry.

Did you have a question? Oh, sorry. No, right. You are dismissed. I recognize Councilmember Stevens.

I'm going to now open the hearing for public testimony. I 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.

2.2

2.3

Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony but may submit transcripts of such recordings to the Sergeant-at-Arms for inclusion in the hearing record. If you wish to speak at today's hearing, please fill out an appearance card with the Sergeant-at-Arms in the back and wait to be recognized. When recognized, you will have two minutes to speak on today's hearing topics, contracted jail services and Introduction 835.

If you have a written statement or additional written testimony you wish to submit for the record, please provide a copy to that testimony to the Sergeant-at-Arms. You may also email written testimony to testimony@council.nyc.gov within 72 hours of this hearing. Audio and video recordings will not be accepted.

Our first panel is Melanie Dominguez, King

Downing and Tanya Krupat. You can begin when ready.

MS. KRUPAT: Thank you. Thank you Chair Nurse and members of the Criminal Justice Committee and Committee on Contracts for the opportunity to provide testimony today. My name is Tanya Krupat. I'm the Vice President of Policy and Advocacy at the Osborne Association. Osborne is one of the largest and

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

oldest criminal justice service organizations in the state and we provide services on Rikers Island. Thank you for focusing on contracted jail services.

Osborne was among the five providers who lost their contracts at the end of June 2023. elimination of the targeted approach jail-based services providers through which five community-based organizations serve thousands of people in Rikers each year and this has had a devastating impact for those inside. The target approach program provided core foundational services across the entire DOC system, all of Osborne's services inside DOC jails including visiting support services to people at Rose M. Singer Center and their children. We provided elder services and transitional planning and we continue to provide a very limited amount of services but even those are affected by the loss of these The services that were eliminated, we served others. 1,700 people in individual and group sessions offering more than 12,700 group sessions per year.

In the interest of time, the benefits of programming are enormous and have ripple effects that benefit officers, families and communities. While DOC currently has four RFPs out, these do not replace

the contracted services that were eliminated and there was no notification that these were finally issued 10 months after the funding was announced.

Providers are also partners to the department which can improve the well-being of everyone. We can work together to catch worrisome signs and address concerns. For example, our staff recently headed off an escalating situation with a gentleman at EMTC who had a previously unknown and serious food allergy and then was afraid to eat because of it. We were able to contact a program's captain and he was switched to a special diet.

We were only able to do this because of the relationships we built. Programs are extra eyes and ears to avoid dangerous situations and prevent emergencies and even death.

We thank you for your focus on this and improving the conditions on Rikers Island.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Thank you. Thank you so much. We really appreciate you coming and testifying.

I'm going to oscillate to Zoom.

Kelly Grace Price.

Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

MS. PRICE: Oh, hi. I think I'm just observing today as a reporter in my capacity. I'm not testifying.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Okay. Thank you. Siobhan Hunziker. Not here.

Jason Rodriguez?

2.2

2.3

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, thank you, Chair Nurse, Chair Won, members of the Criminal Justice and Contracts Committee for holding this important hearing.

My name is Jason Rodriguez. I am a Policy

Associate at the Legal Action Center and I am

formerly incarcerated. I spent 24 years incarcerated

at the age of 18.

In 2023, New York City Department of Corrections abruptly cut \$17 million from programs at Rikers, programs that provided essential support to detained individuals.

These weren't just any programs. They provided people with evidence-based care, including treatment for substance use disorder and trauma to protect their health and keep them alive. By cutting them, the administration not only disregarded the needs but actively put lives at risk.

2.2

Even with these facts, the administration claimed the Department of Corrections could provide the same services at a lower cost with correctional officers. That assumption was not just wrong, it was reckless and harmful. Replacing skilled service providers with security personnel has left people without access to meaningful programs, setting them up for abuse, neglect, or even death.

Within the first four months of these cuts, group-based programming at Rikers dropped by 29% and one-on-one support fell by over 30%. People were left without meaningful engagement, fueling tensions, despair, and instability, outcomes that are well documented. After nearly a year and half DOC is now requesting proposals to restore some of the programs that had been cut.

While this was a necessary step, it is still not enough. The full restoration of funding is critical to ensuring that the people receive support they need. These RFPs offer approximately \$3 million less than the full amount that was cut in 2023.

Furthermore, the fact that these services are only now being put back out for bid underscores a much deeper issue. DOC was never capable of

providing them on its own. The RFPs released by DOC make clear that when community-based providers were defunded, even the most basic care, substance misuse treatment, trauma-informed therapy, and transitional planning disappeared, leaving people without critical support.

This is not just about funding or contracts. The conditions described in these RFPs, instances of self-harm, lack of basic mental health...

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you, time's expired.

MR. RODRIGUES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Siobhan Hunziker, I think you're back on. You may begin.

MS. HUNZIKER: Good morning, thank you Chair

Nurse and members of the Criminal Justice Committee

and the Committee on Contracts for the opportunity to

provide testimony today.

My name is Siobhan Hunziker and I'm a Mitigation Specialist at the Osborne Association. Osborne is one of the largest and oldest criminal justice service organizations in the state. Our services reach over 14,000 individuals each year, assisting them and their families in navigating arrests,

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE
Jointly with the COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

2.2

2.3

courts, incarceration on Rikers, and state prisons
and re-entry.

We advocate for decarceration and expanding alternatives to detention and incarceration, and we support closing Rikers. We also advocate for improved conditions inside Rikers and for our clients.

Osborne's Court Advocacy Services is our longest-running program. It's staffed by social workers and mental health professionals whose purpose is to provide mitigating factors to defense attorneys whose clients would not otherwise benefit from the critical social work services in their criminal defense.

I work on our Second Look initiative, through which we provide mitigation services specifically to women and gender-expansive people detained on Rikers. Thank you for focusing today on contracted jail services.

This includes contracted mitigation specialists and those who work to help people leave Rikers as soon as possible, which serves the interest of public safety in many ways, both human and economic.

In 2024, Court Advocacy Services spared 324 clients from over 1,411 years of incarceration, a

_

_

Ŭ

cost savings of over \$162 million. While I urge you to expand funding for mitigation and ATI programs, I also want to share some pressing concerns regarding people whose health and mental health needs are not being met while in DOC custody.

Please consider the following. Rikers is New York City's largest provider of psychiatric care and one of the country's largest mental health providers. In 2023.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you. Time's expired.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Thank you.

We now have two in person, Raul Rivera and Christopher Leon Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. My name is
Christopher Leon Johnson. I'm speaking on support
Intro 825. I'll explain why I'm standing on Chair
Sandy opposed to do another but I saw the bill. But
I request that you as a chair talk to your committee
council to amend that bill to add credit cards and
debit cards that only could be used for purchases
only no ATM withdrawals. Not only you have to amend
the bill to lift the cap from \$200. You need to lift
the cap to lift it to the unlimited amount of money.
And you got to give them a certain amount of days to

2.

2.3

spend the money, after that it gets sent back to the DOC. Like let's say by 90 days to spend the money. These-- It should be with debit cards and credit cards instead of just checks because the problem with checks is that there's a lot of check for these days. There's a lot of people you don't know where for the postal service that steals checks.

They know that the former incarcerated—— And I know it's the new word these days because the city council is woke, I don't know what to say but formerly incarcerated individuals are so vulnerable to death identity death identity fraud because majority of time they don't they live in—— they're not—— they're homeless and stuff like that, and they have no legal—— their address might not be to address that's on file. They have a big vulnerability of getting their checks stolen.

So it shouldn't be issued by check unless it's a pickup at the location they was arrested at Rikers Island, or you send out a check-- I mean put it on a credit card like how when you turn guns to the DA's office you get like a bank card that can only be used inside-- only be used but purchases don't like buying food and stuff like that with the with the tracking--

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

with tracking so you know what they're buying we can use for data you use for data for later on down the run but this bill should be amended. I support it but you need to amend the bill for credit card debit cards and virtual cards instead of the straight checks because of identity theft. Thank you chair. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Thank you.

MR. RIVERA: Good afternoon my name is Raul Rivera. I'm a TLC driver a TLC driver advocate we have to get creative when it comes to videoing. It's all right. Intro 825 I believe it is we are against it. Hold on a second Intro yeah 825 I'm against it. If you do the crime do the time. Once you leave prison you should get a bus ticket home and start over again.

The fact that we call this committee criminal justice I think it's pretty comical. I don't know why it's this is defending the criminal. Is that what that means? It means defending the criminal. Criminal justice. The crimes that are happening here in New York are congestion pricing that's a crime. The city of yes is a crime. And the biggest criminal in this City Council is the Speaker who endorses this

stuff our council members do not speak for us. But 2 3 you do speak for the criminals. I don't even want to 4 be here I don't know why I'm here I'm just repulsed by you guys. The common sense-- What is it? 5 oppressive caucus. That's what you guys are you guys 6 7 are oppressive caucus. I know you think everything 8 is funny. But these testimonies are important because many people are afraid to speak up and we're not. So we let New Yorkers know and we let you know that this 10 11 committee is a kangaroo committee. It shouldn't even 12 exist.

CHAIRPERSON NURSE: Thank you if we have inadvertently missed anyone who has registered to testify today and has yet to be called please speak with a sergeant or if you are remote use the zoom hand function we will be called on you in the order that your hand has been raised.

Seeing no one we are going to close out this criminal justice committee and thank everybody for testifying thank you

[GAVEL]

2.3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1

24

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



Date February 9, 2025