1	COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE	1
2	CITY COUNCIL	
3	CITY OF NEW YORK	
4	X	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES	
6	Of the	
7	COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE	
8	X	
9	February 28, 2018	
10	Start: 1:14 p.m. Recess: 3:51 p.m.	
11		
12	HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall	
13	B E F O R E: Andy King	
14	COUNCIL MEMBERS: Inez Barron	
15		
16		
17	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)	
18	Andy King,	
19	Juvenile Justice Committee New York City Council	
20	Felipe Franco, Commissioner	
21	Division of Youth and Family Justice, DYFJ	
22	John Dickson, Associate Commissioner	
23	Close to Home Luis Padilla, Youth Leader	
24	Youth Speakers Institute	
25	Beth Powers, Director of Youth Justice	

1	COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE	2
2	Children's Defense Fund New York	
4	Kate Rubin, Director of Policy at Youth Represented	
5 6 7	Anthony Wells, President of the Social Services Employees Union Local 371	
8	Giselle Castro, Executive Director of Exalt Youth	
LO L1	Lisa Freeman, Director of the Juvenile Rights Special Litigation Unit Legal Aide Society	
L2 L3	Julie Peterson, Senior Program Officer Pinkerton Foundation Co-chair New York Youth Justice Initiative	
L4 L5 L6	Karen Thor-Lesser, Prospect Hill Foundation New York	
L7 L8	Alissa Perone, Staff Attorney School Justice Project at Advocates for Children New York	of
L 9 2 0	Lizette Nayavez, Deputy Director of Programs Community Connections for Youth	
21	Gabrielle Prisco, Executive Director Lineage Project	
23	Janette Boganegra, Director of Family Engagement Community Connections for Youth	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON ANDY KING: Good evening everyone. Good afternoon. I'm New York City Council Member Andy King. I represent the 12th District. want to welcome everyone to the first Juvenile Justice Committee that I'm chairing. I'm honored and pleasured to have the opportunity to lead this sessions conversation when it comes to juvenile justice as a member and a Case Worker for the City of New York, ACS worker, I understand the challenges that families go through each and every day in maintaining their youth and the City has taken on the mantle of being partners with our families in the City of New York to provide safety, development, and as some have, rehabilitation to some of our young people who are in need of help. As I said, this committee is very responsible, very important and responsible in making sure that young people are involved and that the justices are treated in a manner that will give them the best opportunity to move forward in a positive path. This is our first meeting of the new legislative session and will be a general conversation about what the juvenile system is, what it's responsibility is, and just getting a

flavor of what we do and how we do and when we do and

when we do it right we applaud and when we do it
wrong, we figure out solutions to correct it. So I'm
looking forward to those conversations. We do
understand that there are a number of strengths and
weaknesses in the system and that's the conversation
we're looking forward to engage and encounter. I
believe that by the time a young person encounters
the justice system, they've already dealt with a host
of challenges in life and today I'm hoping to learn
more about the programs being offered and the efforts
that are being made to encourage positive development
amongst young people who come before you. Today's
conversation is especially important as we prepare
for the implementation of Raise the Age and as we
move forward in this new phase of juvenile justice
system, I'm looking forward to the opportunity that
we'll have to learn from the wisdom of past mistakes
but as this new population comes in from (inaudible)
age, I know it's going to bring a set of new
challenges for us all and I don't want us to rush
into anything that we cannot sustain because Albany
passed these rules down on us. I want us to make sure
that whatever we do in the City makes sense and is
stable to making sure that our young people will

enter into the system and at the end of the day when
they walk out of the system, they can be positive,
productive adults. So we have a lot to talk about
and I'm encouraged by all of us who are here today
and who are going to testify and drop their expertise
onto the record so we can figure out how we continue
to be partners, not just adversaries, but being
partners in developing a system that's designed to
provide quality service to our young people who are
in need. So, again I want to thank each and every
one of you who are here; administration as well as
the public and our union brothers and sisters who sit
before us and all the advocates. I want to say I'm
joined today by my colleague, and I want to thank
him, Counsel Member Mark Levine from Manhattan, for
joining me today as well as committee counsel Beth, I
want to say thank you for her and everyone I've met
in order to organize and prepare for today's
conversation and how we want to look at moving
forward throughout this whole session. So as I said
to Beth, and I want us to make sure that as we
continue to move forward today that we move from day
one to understanding the system and build a path of
where we want to see ourselves end up by the end of

2.2

the conversation. So again I want to thank each and every one of you here today and we're going to look forward to hearing from the administration right now. So, if Counsel may swear in.

COUNSEL MAYS: Please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony today and answer honestly to Counsel Member questions? You may begin.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Good afternoon

Chair King, Mr. Levine, and members of the Committee
of Juvenile Justice. I am Felipe Franco, Deputy

Commissioner of Division of Youth and Family Justice,

DYFJ, within the Administration for Children's

Services. With me today I have Sara Hemider(?),

Associate Commissioner for Community Based

Alternatives, Stephanie Prusack(?), Associate

Commissioner for Detention Services, and John

Dickson, Associate commissioner for Close to Home.

On behalf of David Hanson, I would like to thank

Chairman King for joining us on our visit to the

Close to Home (inaudible) in the Bronx area this

month. We look forward to hosting more visits for

you and the entire juvenile justice committee. Thank

you for the opportunity to testify today regarding
ACS continuing of juvenile justice services and
programming. The Division of Youth and Family
Justice oversees services of programs for youth at
every stage of the juvenile justice process and works
to promote public safety and improve the life of
young people, communities, and families by providing
treatment, safe and secure custodial care, responsive
healthcare, effective reentry services, and promoting
educational achievement. Our continuum includes
community based preventive services for youth who are
at risk of delinquency as well as their families. In
addition, we provide detention services to youth who
are arrested and waiting for court resolution. Since
2012 we cover the (inaudible) enactment of Close to
Home, we have been providing residential services for
all youth placed with New York City as adjudicated
juvenile delinquents. As well as after care services
upon return to their communities. First and
foremost, we aim to divert youth from the juvenile
justice system. As a city, it is imperative that we
all work to arm our youth with the tools and support
that they need to become successful adults. The
number of young people entering the juvenile justice

systems has continued to decline over the last
several years. In 2010, 5,084 young people were
admitted to detention for the current year.
Admissions to detention have decreased significantly
year after year; to just 1,979 total admissions in
the calendar year 2017. We think this is
attributable to smart policing, lower juvenile
arrests across the city, and intensive preventive
services that ACS and other partner agencies provide
to prevent young people from ever entering the system
in the first place. Community based alternatives, we
know that the best way to intervene in the lives of
young people is to treat the whole family. ACS
family assessment program is available to families
with youth up to age 18 and supports parents and
guardians who are struggling to address difficult
teenage behaviors. Fact, offers intensive in-home
therapeutic services that are designed to improve
family functioning and avoid delinquency. ACS also
runs the juvenile justice initiative, a partnership
with the Department of Probation, which is the
largest alternative placement program in the city.
JJI serves youth who have been adjudicated in family
court and provides intensive services to these youth

to keep them in their communities and with their
families. Both FACT and JJI help parents develop
skills to support their children and enforce limits
that steer them to positive activities. The vast
majority of young people in the juvenile justice
system, as high as 90%, regardless of gender, have
experienced some sort of trauma. We know that there
is a close correlation between child (inaudible) and
delinquency. So we have partnered with multiple
stakeholders to support children who have experienced
abuse and neglect. We (inaudible) to prevent entry
into the juvenile justice system. In addition to
expanding and strengthening programs to reduce the
number of young people entering the foster care and
juvenile justice systems, ACS is also committed to
investing in work that focuses specifically on dually
involved youth. The cross-over youth practice model
which was developed by the juvenile justice center
for reform at Georgetown University. The term cross-
over youth describes a young person who enters the
justice system while involved in the child welfare
system. These young people essentially cross over
from the child welfare system into the juvenile
justice system. ACS offers a broad range of services

to help prevent children with child welfare
involvement from entering the juvenile and criminal
justice system. The crossover youth practice model
CYPM is a multi-agency approach that seeks to improve
outcomes for young people who are involved in both
systems. ACS provides secure and non-secure
detention. Services for youth who have been arrested
and are awaiting judges to hear their case in court.
The Division of Youth and Family Justice currently
operates two secured detention facilities.
Crossroads in Brooklyn and Horizons in the Bronx and
over 68 non-profit provider agency operated non-
secure detention agency group homes across New York
City. Secure detention has the most restrictive
security features and is typically reserved for youth
who pose the highest risk or have been accused of
committing serious offenses. Young people have, in
our detention facilities, receive on site health,
mental health, dental services, recreational
activities, and case management. A location is
provided on site through the Department of Education,
District 79, Passages Academy. Youth in NSD receive
health, mental health, recreational and case
management services in a less restricted residential

setting than the secured detention sites. In non-
secured detention, those young people are able to
leave the residences on their street, staff
supervision to attend school, recreational
activities, and appointments. The Department of
Education provides instruction for all non-secure
detention youth at two Passages Academy sites;
Benmore in Brooklyn and Bronx Hope in the Bronx. We
also contract and partner with the New York City
Health and Hospitals Belleview Hospital to provide
psychiatric and psychological services to further
support the mental health needs of youth in
detention. Throughout this partnership, the Division
of Youth and Family Justice has implemented
(inaudible) family screening and care in our secure
detention facilities making us one of the first
secure detention systems in the country to implement
(inaudible) services. Belleview has trained all
secured staff in terms of trauma that impact youth in
our care which increases the staff's ability to
identify trauma exposure and work with traumatized
youth on secondary issues with staff. With ACS and
other home based communities before Close to Home,
New York City children were placed in large

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

institutions located upstate, hundreds of miles away from their families and home communities. distance to these facilities often hindered families from visiting and prevented meaningful family engagement. School credits earned while in placement at the upstate facilities were not transferred to the DOE school system so young people returned to their home schools significantly behind in credits, needed for academic advancement and created a disincentive for many youth to continue attending school after their release. Close to Home affords young people and their family's opportunities to participate in meaningful treatment together. Young people in Close to Home receive a location from the New York City Department of Education and continue to accrue credits for academic achievement while in placement. Since it's beginning in 2012, the administration operation of Close to Home has steadily improved and has positioned the city as a national model for juvenile justice reform. Close to Home has succeeded in improving outcomes for youth. Data in our recently issued Close to Home report for the fiscal year 2016-2017, which has been shared with you today, showed that young people are going to school,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

getting good grades, passing reading exams, in many cases more young people are engaged in school while in Close to Home than they were previously. In addition, they are receiving counseling and support services to help them manage underlying trauma and issues that contributed to their involvement in the juvenile justice system in the first place. A recent independent report on Close to Home release by the Center for Children (inaudible) policy, with support from the (inaudible) foundation, found similar improvement in sites Close to Home as a national reform model from which other jurisdictions across the country can learn. Involvement in Close to Home includes both state and residential placement and a term of supervised aftercare as youth transition from placement back into their home communities. ACS currently partners with seven not-for-profit agencies to deliver strong placement programs in 24 non-secure placement residents (NSP) located in or near New York City. All seven programs (inaudible) by serving the juvenile justice populations and this program offers structured residential care in a small supervised home-like environment. All non-secured programs require scales that are designed to ensure

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

participation in programs while preserving the safety and security of youth, the staff, and the surrounding community. In secured placement, there are three supervisors who are able to leave the residences to attend school or medical appointments and may earn the privilege to attend certain outside recreational activities. Limited secure placement which opened in the summer of 2015 currently has programs operating at four sites. One in the Bronx, two in Docks Farey, and one in Queens. Unlike NSP, all programming and services are provided to young people on site including medical, dental, psychiatric, and education. In the secure placement residences, also feature additional security features such as social perimeter fencing, closed security television monitoring and door locking mechanisms. Most of our young people return to their home communities on aftercare following the Close to Home residential placement. Families and youth receive intensive support and accountability from their assigned ACS worker and after care resources. Planning for reentry into the community begins while the youth is in residential treatment in order to put in place the supports necessary to meet the needs of youth and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

their families and reduce the risk of reoffending. (inaudible) opportunity to discuss ACS juvenile justice services and programming for youth in New York City. The Division of Youth and Family Justice provide age and developmentally appropriate services that are tailored to the youth's specific needs and risk as well as the support families need to assist in their children's needs and prevent further juvenile system involvement. The importance of this developmental approach is underscored as the city works to implement raise no age(?) and prepares to receive 16 and 17 year olds in the juvenile justice Given the remarkable success of Close to Home since the beginning in 2012, and the serge of young people who would need to be placed in Close to Home (inaudible) implemented. The state should expand its commitment to Close to Home this year. Instead, it is against this backdrop that Governor Acomo proposes to eliminate all state funding for Close to Home. I respectfully ask you and everyone in this room to join us in urging the state to properly fund Close to Home and not to abandon these life changing juvenile justice reform efforts. you are aware, extensive planning is on the way to

prepare for an implementation for the new
requirements by October 1, 2018. The citywide
steering committee chaired by the Mayor's office of
Criminal Justice and ACS and PD, the Department of
Education, Department of Corrections, the Law
Department and the State of (inaudible)
administration have been working to guide the overall
citywide planning effort. We have embraced the
opportunity to conceptualize alternatives to
detention and placement that are age appropriate and
gender responsive and that closes the current gap for
current youth with a permanency resource. We have
also been working closely with our partners in other
departments and locations to plan for enhanced caree:
and technical education programming for youth in
detention and Close to Home and in the community.
While all of these extensive plans are underway the
Division of Youth and Family Justice continues to
operate a safe and secure juvenile justice system for
New York City's youth. We view raise the age as a
way to strengthen the foundations of our existing
system and continue to improve our practice, support
our staff, and fortify safety across the entire
continuum. With Raise the Age we would need to

further adapt our services and our program within our
community, detention, and placement programs to meet
the needs of an older youth population. The city
projects the cost of Raise the Age to be
approximately \$200 million dollars, costs which the
governor's budget does not cover. As you might
imagine, this is a significant undertaking. The
Division of Youth and Family Justice had a long and
transparent relationship with the juvenile justice
community of the city council and we intend to
maintain that transparency throughout this planning
process as well as the phases of the Raise the Age
implementation. Given the very aggressive timeline
for implementation of this important legislation, we
need to be prepared for the individual challenges we
will encounter as we move forward to expand our
juvenile justice system to include these new youth.
We will continue to seek your guidance and support as
we move ahead. At this time, my colleagues and I are
happy to take your questions.

CHAIRMAN KING: Well, I want to thank you
Deputy Commissioner for your testimony today and
we've been joined by my colleague Council Member Mark
Gini(?) of Boogey Down Bronx and I thank you for, in

the last part of your testimony, in the past that the
system, ACS, the juvenile system has always had a
good relationship with the city council and we look
forward to continuing that and I say that with all
sincerity and I'm hoping that our conversations will
always be spirited. They will always be real and if
we can't get it right then we try to correct it to
get it right. One of the things I would like to add
and then I'll let my colleague share whatever he
wants to share and have a question, so is that while
your testimony gives us a breakdown and an outline of
the great things that the system is looking to do and
has done and wants to build on, sometimes we don't
get to the meat and potatoes of what are the
struggles and challenges that you're facing each and
every day and I think that that's what these hearings
are allowing us to open up and review so we can
figure out solutions to help you manage and deliver
for our children in New York. So that's going to be
pretty much my first question to kick off to you. Is
that right now with all the things that you've
accomplished, what are some of the greatest strengths
you think you have in your system right now and then

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

from there, what are some of the weaknesses that need to be improved on?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Thank you Chair. mean, as you heard before, we in New York City are lucky to have a continuum of service as it actually responds to the needs of our communities and the youth that we serve. We may take it for granted but that's not the case across the nation. Many, many, many other systems, and actually this system not that long ago, before 2012, was a disjointed system where the locality had really little say in the outcomes of young people from our neighborhoods and communities. Close to Home is one of the few efforts nationally that actually has a showcase that actually, localities, or cities, or counties can actually do juvenile justice system better. When it's actually in the hands of those who know the community and the youth best instead of being run by distance state run systems. And in that context, one of our biggest challenges is the realization that actually even though the state acknowledges that Close to Home is working although we know from the most recent report that I'm sharing with you guys from the (inaudible) foundation is the way that many of the jurisdictions

are trying to implement their juvenile justice system
continuum. It's a challenge that we are not getting
funded again. The fact that actually New York City
did what no other county did in New York State when
it was willing to step up and say that these are our
young people and we want to take care of them on our
own and we want to step up the resources of the
Department of Education, we want to step up the
resources of the Administration for Children's
Services, we want to step up the resources for the
Department of Probation, and we are all coming
together to take ownership of the young people in our
neighborhoods is incredible to actually believe that
now we are not having the funding to support such a
program. So that's actually one of our biggest
challenges right now. On top of that, we are
actually being mandated to enact the Raise the Age
Legislation which the city and many of you have
advocated for years and we are not given any support
to do that kind of work in New York City.

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay. I do want to get into both of those conversations when it comes to Close to Home and Raise the Age. I don't want to jump into it because that's going to be a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

conversation that's going to engulf the room more than 30 minutes of conversation than we have time for right now but I think we talked at one of our meetings specifically for that. Want to touch base on that but want to dedicate a hearing strictly on what that should look like and what it's going to I want to go back to some of the questions I tried to formulate before you got into the room. It's about, you have funding challenges with Close to Home and it's about making sure that we work with you and work with the Governor to advocate for getting that funding. Other than the Close to Home and trying to figure out the Close to Home, what are the other things that ACS is doing to set a positive stage for our young people as soon as they come into your doors or they come through the system?

we are very proud of and I alluded to it in the testimony is that actually our juvenile justice system is not premised on custody. As you heard before, a number of young people in detention continue to decrease and actually has continued to decrease significantly for the past ten years. The number of young people in placement continues to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

decrease. It wasn't that long ago when maybe, five or six years ago there were 1,000 young people or more from New York City in the custody of (inaudible) affairs. How many do we have in Close to Home today John?

John: 231.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We only have 231 of those young people. That's a testimony to the efforts of the Department of Probation, ACS, and others to support young people before they have to get into custody and one of the things that we're struggling with is the background that actually again, the state is imposing a cap and our ability to get reimbursement for preventive services. One of the things we do really, really well is the ability to allow a family, a parent, a teacher, a police officer to refer a young person to our family assessment program which actually is available through employee services before the young person has to enter the juvenile justice system. We serve almost 6,000 families a year and we believe that we should be expanding our services in that continuum so that young people don't even have to get into Close to Home or detention.

2.2

Chilinan Kind. Good. In June of
prevention is always better than a pound of cure and
I think that's the way we should always continue to
operate when it comes to helping our children out. I
want to jump into something regarding the condition,
the mental health conditions of some of our young
people who are in need of re-educating themselves so
they can be productive adults. So now how the
Department of Health connects with you all when they
come up for services. I know there are some doctor's
on site. Are there How do you deal with that
young person that comes in and has really strong
mental health issues?

actually has one of the best comprehensive mental health systems in the nation. We are lucky to have a very deep and productive policy with Belleview Hospital under the health and computer operations. Under Health and Hospital, Stephanie Bruhaw(?)can talk a little about the specifics in detention but the young person who comes through our door in detention gets screened and assessed for health and mental health needs and based on their needs we

2.2

continue to do deeper evaluations throughpsychological and psychiatric assessments.

STEPHANIE BRUHAW(?): We also have MSW level clinicians with a separate organization called Start who are available seven days a week. We also have at night, we have an on-call service. Our clinicians provide therapeutic services individually and they also conduct groups several times a week on our living areas and they also have their offices on our youth living areas in detention.

want to neglect is that I was hoping that we have learned in the work with Belleview and others which actually I think we're becoming an actual example for others, is that the first line of intervention for the young people that we work with are not just the clinicians, it's actually the frontline staff. So for the last five years, we have intentionally invested a significant amount of resources and training, particularly in detention, to help our juvenile counselors to acquire skills to actually run evidence based trauma formed groups but we have learned that many of the young people that we serve tend to gravitate to our juvenile counselors as the

2.2

first person, sometimes in their life that they can connect to and can learn to regulate their emotions and behaviors. We need clinicians to support them but I don't want to minimize the importance of caring adults in the lives of these kids 24/7.

With and when we speak with the kids and maybe struggling mentally, does the staff or how do they. .

Do they find themselves overwhelmed because if your ratio of adult staff to young people can be overwhelming, how do you manage that if you have an overwhelming population of people in one environment who are having mental issue challenges?

people that we serve, as I mentioned before, we have less young people in detention than ever before by design which is a good thing. The young people who come to us tend to be those who actually have the highest needs. You're right, they need more attention than ever before and it's one of those things that we are carefully looking at Raise the Age, one of the state mandates is to reduce our case loads. They are currently eight to one and they have to be reduced to at least six to one.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, so while you're
reducing case loads, and you said that the case
numbers have gone down, but do you find that it's
some form of resinovism(?) that might kick in with
these young people when they leave? Do you find in
your numbers that some of these same individuals with
mental health issues are returning back to you or
you've been able to put them on the right path that
they don't return back into the system?

of your question. I think one of them has to do with how well are we meeting the needs of young people when they are under our custody and I think additional staff and the support of the staff that we've been able to build recently with Belleview, I know it's actually paying off. It's allowing our front end staff, it's allowing the young people, it's allowing their families to learn new coping mechanisms to be able to regulate their emotions and behavior and that actually shows up in better behavior in the people we serve. How you said that we struggle continually to make sure when young people leave our fantastic care in detention and in

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Close to Home, that those resources are available in the community.

CHAIRMAN KING: I just want to put on the record we've been the colleague from the big island of Brooklyn, Council Member Inez Barron. So thank you being a strong advocate in higher education and since we've just mentioned education, I would like to talk a little bit about education right now. when young people come into the system, what plans do you have that are incorporated right now because I heard you mention in your testimony that when students were upstate that they were not getting credits when they came back downstate. First question is this, is that still happening because we still have young people who are not totally transitioned from upstate and what is the education plans that you have currently right now to ensure that children stay on track and then when they are released that they are able to move forward and follow paths of higher education?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: First no court adjudications are in upstate New York any more.

CHAIRMAN KING: Good to hear that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: All New York City kids will go through the family court or the State of New York City. In terms of how we manage their education transition throughout placement to aftercare, I think Jenn is the best person to talk about that.

Thank you. We have a really close partnership with the Department of Education. Department of Education and teachers are the folks who teach our kids but going all the way back when a kid is placed by the family court in Close to Home by the time that child leaves detention, more often than not we have all of their educational records at our disposal. I think that's one of the true benefits of Close to Home, the continuity that exists right at the time of intake and the Department of Education has education transition specialists who are embedded within schools in Close to Home and they're responsible for overseeing the plan for that child to return to the community so that every moment in the child's schooling while they're in Close to Home translates into when they leave. There is a lot of oversite on DOE's part. We have case managers who partner with DOE to ensure that the right school is

2.2

chosen for when kids do return home because some of our kids obviously need to go to either a different school or we really at least need to closely evaluate their home school to make sure that it provides them with the greatest opportunity for success and we've been very successful at doing that.

CHAIRMAN KING: How long before, and I call them students because even though they're in the system they're still learning and that's what it's doing in there is learning. So when they go into the system, when is the timeframe that they actually start that education piece of academics?

person is actually arrested in New York City and a juvenile delinquent is actually brought into the doors of our facility, Horizons, within two days at the most they are actually in a classroom.

(inaudible) Department of Education. That person, that student is actually immediately educated while they're waiting for their trial to be completed and if that young person as John mentioned before, is adjudicated we immediately start working with the Department of Education, exactly the same district that runs the school in detention runs the schools in

Close to Home. So we actually can have a meaningful
transition that involves the parents, the provider
agency, our ACS staff, our (inaudible) placement
specialists, an educational assistance advisement
counselor, a detention and someone from the receiving
school within district 79 and all of these folks
actually meet together for what we call a
transitional meeting where we talk about them moving
out of detention to the next phase in placement.
This happens immediately. There's no gap where kids
are not getting education. And that's a big change.
Not to age myself, but it wasn't that long ago when
you would talk to kids and they would say well I'm
coming back from (inaudible) facilities and ${\tt I'm}$
watching Ricky Lake for weeks before I get into the
right school.

CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah.

JOHN: If I could just add two pieces of data that I think support the good work that we are doing with the Department of Education. 93% of our middle students increase at least one grade level while they're in placement in Close to Home. So we're talking about roughly a seven month stay so that's a substantial and these are typically kids

2.2

that are substantially behind when they came into Close to Home so the fact that they're improving by at least a grade level is rather amazing. And the other piece to it is in the school year 2016 we increased the number of credits kids earned while in placement by 31%. While kids were in placement they were earning 9.3 credits.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you for that answer. Before I turn it over to my colleagues who may have a question or two, placement, when students are getting their education inside a facility or in a detention center and then they're transitioned out, how do you work with the DOE, and I'm talking about out of the system all together, how do you work with them and their families to remove the stigma that I've failed or something was wrong with me. I'm bad. I messed up. I'm a bad person because that's a part of self-esteem and how I get myself back together and help assimilate myself back into society. How do you work with these students and helping them on the right path?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I think you're talking about one of the biggest challenges in the juvenile justice system. If you were to look at the

2.2

data of the young people that we serve, you'd look at their attendance record before getting to the juvenile justice system and it's really, really low. It's kind of sad that they have to get to us to immediately get perfect attendance for a while and then our data shows that once there their attendance is actually better than it used to be. Having said that, we struggle consistently with how to get schools in the community to engage our young people and we can talk about the dynamics of how we do that through family conference and (inaudible).

JOHN: As Deputy Commissioner Franco was saying that certainly as you asked about challenges, continued good attendance in school is certainly a challenge. To address that we're working with DOE and their education transition specialists longer after kids leave placement but in addition to that, if we have kids coming out there attending school well but then their attendance declines we use a model called family team conferencing where we pull together everyone who's involved in that youths' life, including that youth, their caregiver, the educational staff, any provider staff who are involved, our staff, and we have a team conference

2.2

which then really looks at what's behind the story.
Why isn't this child attending school as frequently
as we would like to have them attend and then we take
what we consider the next best step in terms of
addressing that behavior. Sometimes it's a kid who's
afraid to go to school because they have
relationships with other peers there where they don't
feel safe. Other times there might be other draws
that might keep them from attending school. So we
want to understand what those are so then we can come
up with the right plan for the right kid.

answers. And you mentioned that we are going to probably have one of our hearings with the DOE and juvenile justice to make sure that we are in synch because I do understand that DOE has their own protocols and their own rules and while on paper we are committed when it's time to tell a human to implement some activity that's going to help a child some bureaucracy gets in the way or scheduling gets in the way or I'm just not feeling it today and at the end of the day our student's suffer from that.

So I want to make sure that everyone is committed to helping that young person live up to that commitment.

2.2

Before I turn it over to the council members, you	
mentioned something about reducing case loads. Wha	ιt
would you say is a reasonable case load that a	
staffor can manage?	

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: To clarify, I think
I used the wrong term when I mentioned case loads. I
was mentioning the youth to staff ration in detention
which is actually by regulation for security
detention is eight to one, with the new Raise the Age
regulation it's six to one, and that's actually what
we strive for every youth in every facility and I
think that would be the amount of young people that
we serve. As you mentioned so well before, we have
less kids but they have many, many, many more needs
and we have to be attentive to them.

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, thank you. I do not want to be the only voice in the room. That's why it's a committee, since Counsel Member Joe and I came in from. . . Counsel Member Barron who is a staunch advocate for education of our children, take it away.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you Mr.

Chair. Welcome, new committee for you and also to
the panel thank you for coming. We've had some

2.2

interaction before because I've been on this
committee. So in the family assessment program, so
you have this chart which talks about structure, you
have community, you have detention, and you have
placement. In the family assessment program which is
listed in the community part where children are not
held and they're not in detention, who are the
personnel that are involved in the administering of
that program? Who are the people going to the home?
What do they do? What are their titles? What are
their positions? What are their responsibilities?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Since I'm the

Commissioner I can answer these better. I think it's important for us to represent that it's one of our best preventive programs and has a long history of being effective at reducing the number of youth that come to the juvenile justice system. On the front end, it's definitely our staff. We have a significant amount of staff and we think that (inaudible) officers that are actually the gatekeepers and engage with the families when they come through the front door.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Right, so as Deputy

Commissioner Franco mentioned, the FAP staff or ACS

staff, the families walk through our front door
either they hear about it and they walk in or they're
referred by the schools or the NYPD and so that's the
bulk of our referrals are from the NYPD and the
schools, that's how the families hear about the
family assessment program. The FAP staff are the
first people who see the youth and the parents and
they are MSW's, licensed MSW's and they conduct an
assessment of the youth and the family and they
determine what level of service along with the youth
and family that would serve the needs of that family
And then they're referred out to sometimes our
contracted providers or to a community based
provider. The contracted services that we have are
mostly evidence based practices, they're therapeutic
in nature where the therapist from the agency is
going out to the home, working with the family and
the youth in the community and trying to resolve
whatever the issues are that are presented.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And do you have any data as to the number of children who are in foster care who are participants in any of the levels of your programs? Not just with that but all three levels.

2.2

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, are you talking
about the cross-over youth? The young people who are
involved in foster care and cross-over to the
juvenile justice system?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Well, that as well as children who remain in foster care but have some contact with your system.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right, so we have a unit in the community based alternative division that is called the confirmed unit that tracks or identifies the young people that are crossing over from child welfare to juvenile justice and we do have some data on the number of youth who've been identified either in foster care or another child welfare preventive or some other child welfare involvement who have gotten arrested which I can share with you if that's what you're asking for.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Well, in part. So what is a child who is cross-over child?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: A young person who is involved either in our foster care system receiving preventive services or under the supervision of our division of child protection and get arrested.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, and does that child have the opportunity to go back to the foster home or not?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Because when you said crossover I thought it meant okay that's it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, and actually that's one of the things with the work that we're doing with crossover youth is trying to get the two systems to talk to each other because before we started this work the systems were very siloed and didn't know what the other was doing with the child. So what the crossover youth model that we've implemented with many stakeholders across the city is to get the child welfare side and the juvenile justice side to come together to create a plan so that they do not further enter the juvenile justice system.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So how do you measure the success of your community program? How do you measure the success that you achieve? What are your benchmarks? What are your indicators that you can point to? I imagine it's kind of difficult

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 to say but what are your benchmarks or indicators of 3 success?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: (inaudible) it's just that we have less kids in the system than ever before and the reality is that for those kids that have actually been arrested that actually are in the process of being adjudicated, not that long ago, most of the kids were placed in a bed, they actually were removed from their homes and they would be sent away to a facility like OCFS. The fact that the city, the Department of Probation, and others began what we call an (inaudible) placement program. JJI has actually resulted in any number of kids in any one year that are actually being supervised by the Department of Probation, receiving services such as the ones that we provide with JJI or mentorship programs that have actually shown particular success especially recently that actually are allowing young people to be kept in the community with the right supports and the right accountability. That's the story behind why the numbers are so low.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So do you have a specific dedicated mentorship program or is it a part of the services that goes on?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: It is something
that some folks here know better than I do but when
the city decided that we wanted to ensure that only
those kids that needed to be removed from their homes
needed to go to Close to Home, the city created an
array of opportunity placement programs. They
include the biggest one is JJI which is run by ACS
which are programs that are focused on the family and
intervention where we go to the home and sign up for
one of those programs. The Department of Probation,
very wisely, also set up programs that are more
focused on peer networks at least short term and
created an alternative to placement that are based on
credible messengers and mentorship. They are one of
the things that are doing very with in New York City.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So in which programs or how many children who are in the programs have mentors? I'm glad for the peer to peer but there's another interaction that comes with a mentor who is perhaps a little older a little more experienced, someone who may have gone through that same type of social conditions and has some type of insight to share. So how many children actually get a mentor?

2.2

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Again, I know how successful the program is, it's run by our partners at the Department of Probation and I would be more than willing to work with them to get you the answers that you need. But it's one of the great stories of New York City, it's working really well.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. I was very pleased to hear about the students that are coming to the facility and are able to gain significant credits and to increase their reading competency. I think that's so important and the question that I have is how long, what's the average length of stay that a student has in your facility, the two. . . in detention, what's the average placement? Detention I would imagine is much shorter.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Yes and I think it should be better to think about youth in detention in three cohorts at least that's the way I try to think about it. We have a significant number of young people who come to us for a very short amount of time. They may spend one to four days with us. They go through the court process again partnering with Probation and may do an adjustment and they go home safely with supervision. There's a group of kids

that actually are through the family court and some
of them, 20% of them get placed in Close to Home.
That length of stay tends to be about 27 to 29 days
and again those are the young people where John
talked about we have a meeting and we create
meaningful transition to placement and then we have
juvenile offenders that actually account for the
majority of kids in detention. So these are young
people who've committed some serious crimes and
actually their case is being heard in the criminal
court. Their length of stay tends to be 90 days or
more.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And the students who might come to you who have IEP's, who I might imagine be quite a large number, are there specifically special ed teachers that assist these children with their learning activities or are they sensitized dedicated teachers doing the best they can?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Again, with our partners at the Department of Education reassess every youth when they come to detention and placement and I think they would be better than I would to

2.2

2	explain	the	resources	that	they	have	available	to
3	them.							

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. And what are the actual staff title positions in the placement facility or the detention, what are the titles of the people working in that location?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So in detention, we have juvenile counselors, juvenile counselor series. They are our frontline staff that work directly with the children. We also have associate juvenile counselors and what we call tour commanders which is a mid-level supervisory position. We have operations managers. We have case managers. And we have a whole range of supportive staff; we have clinicians but they're contracted.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Do you have any medical staff?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, we have floating hospital is a non-profit organization that provides all of our medical care.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And they're on site?

2.2

		UNI	DENTIFIE	D FEMALE	: T	hey're	on	site
24/7.	We	have	medical	doctors	and	physic	cian	' s
assist	ant'	's.						

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, I think that's it. Thank you Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KING: You're quite welcome

Council Member Barron and you're always welcome to

chime in again as well as Council Member Joni(?) at

any given time but I do want to just follow up on

something that Council Member Joni(?) and you were

discussing. You were discussing health services and

on-call doctors and 24 hour services. So when a

student is discharged after all is said and done, who

is the one who monitors their health records and do

they have access to their health records when they

leave? How does the system operate when a child is

leaving the system?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If the youth has an ongoing medical issue, our medical doctors contact their doctors in the community for continuity of care.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I think one of the things that is unique and something that other folks are looking at is that we provide the care for

2.2

detention and placement in New York City. We
actually have the ability to do what Associate
Commissioner Prusak(?) talked about. Our doctors
have on many occasions made appointments for young
people in their own primary doctor to ensure
continuity when necessary.

CHAIRMAN KING: I'm going to back up on the health question again because I would like to know in the population, if you have a young person who is sick or has a transmittable disease, how do you manage that into your population?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Most of our youth don't have that but if we cannot treat a youth within our own we would bring them to a hospital or emergency room. But we do have isolation rooms but we, other than with the flu, we don't have that much of an issue with things that are long-term communicable diseases.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I was at Horizons two weeks ago and there was a young person with the flu. Our medical clinic has dedicated beds so that kids can get care in the facility.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KING: Okay because I know that can be a real issue if one gets sick, another one gets sick or if another one has a disease.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have experienced that with chicken pox and flu in the past. I should knock on wood somewhere. We've been very fortunate this year so far we haven't had any major outbreaks.

into another couple of questions and follow on something you said about crossover youth. How many of them, do you have a number of how many crossover youth of how many of our young people in the system were receiving services and they broke the law and then all of a sudden they had to be crossed over and when you've identified that number, whatever happens to that person. Do they end up staying in that new system for them or do they transition back after assessment is done? How does that play out?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Before we get into the specifics I think we open up talking about a known fact now that young people who actually go through abuse and neglect sadly are likely to end up in the juvenile justice system. So it's actually a testament to the commitment to our youth and child

2.2

welfare at ACS that we made an investment in crossover youth practice. Commissioner Hanson and all of us truly believe that we want the best welfare for the youth in the child welfare system and we truly believe that the juvenile justice system is not a good outcome for any of them. So we work really hard to ensure, there are people who struggle. There are young people in foster care who struggle with behavior challenges that they aren't penalizing them or victimizing them and that's what the crossover youth system does.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So in terms of numbers, as I mentioned the Confirm Unit sends out notifications of young people who are in foster care who are receiving preventive services or who are under the supervision of the Division of Child Protection, we send out notifications to certain parties when that happens and in 2016 there were 744 notifications sent about crossover youth and of those several youth had been arrested more than once so multiple notifications went out. So of the 744 notifications, there were 430 individual youth. So 430 youth individuals arrested 744 times. And I can give you the breakdown of the child welfare category

2.2

if you want that but there were 144 youth that were receiving supervision by Division of Child Protection, 211 youth in foster care, 337 who were involved in our preventive services, and 52 youth who were being served by the family assessment program.

CHAIRMAN KING: I would like to get that report after to see how those numbers [cross-talk] because I like to know those kids, the 400 plus have they made their ways back over to the other side and are they stable again or is there a point in time that the system says okay, this is your third arrest, no you're not coming back over, we're moving you into something more secure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right, so once a young person is in our child welfare system, they don't leave. So even if they go to detention or Close to Home, the foster care agency, if the youth is in foster care, still has to maintain contact with that young person and plan for that young person if they were to leave detention or Close to Home. So they cannot, and that is part of this model, is saying you just can't just drop this child because they've been arrested and are in one of our other facilities.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KING: I guess the question I'm
trying to ask, even if I've been in the system for a
year and I haven't done anything, going through my
counseling and I'm getting my and I get
arrested and then I come back and then I get arrested
again, and I come back and I get arrested again, is
there ever a point in the system that says no you
just can't come back to the group home but we're
going to put you in one of our secure facilities
because your court case is pending and you no longer
come back to this group home? I'm just trying to
find out is that how we're operating?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So the foster care agency cannot say that. That would be a determination up to the family court Judge whether to place them in detention at that point or not.

CHAIRMAN KING: Alright, that's good to hear, good to know. Talking about the kids who are in the system. I want to know as you educate them because not every child is struggling because they are just bad people and they're broken souls. Not every child is a broken soul and there's some discipline and they're just young people making mistakes and it puts them in certain places. So for

2.1

2.2

that child that has. . . How do you maintain whatever culture that they are growing up in or environment or any religious beliefs or anything that was a part of their makeup. How is the system able to have some continuity for that child?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: So we pay particular attention to access to the faith based community throughout the continuum. Stephanie can talk about what we do in detention and then we can talk about Close to Home.

STEPHANIE: So as Commissioner Franco said, we do have a lot of faith based folks that come in. We try to have a lot of family engagement activities with our families. We have visiting four times a week and we have family days once a month where we put on performances and we invite everybody in; siblings, cousins, all sorts of family members to engage with the kids and see what they've doing, look at their artwork. We celebrated every month, we have different cultural events that we celebrate. We just went through black history month. This month, next month is women's history month. We engage a whole group of providers to provide activities for the youth to increase their skills. We have DYCD that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

comes in and that provides sonic which is an after school program and we have all sorts of providers coming in providing music and dance and all sorts of cultural activities for the youth.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: The advantage of Close to Home compared to what it used to be is that people are close to their families and their communities.

If I can just go back. I would agree with you. I would say though 100% of our kids have made mistakes. They are not hardened criminals. They're not destined to a life in adult corrections and as a result of that we want to look at what are those needs that do correlate with predicting future criminal behavior for each kid and make sure we address those individualized needs. For our kids, it's family circumstances and parenting. education. It's how they use their leisure. who are they hanging out with. Who are their peers and what are they doing when they're with their peers? It's about substance abuse. So for Close to Home we want to make sure we address those needs. We assess and address those needs very specifically and then there's the other side of that child where we

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

want to make sure that they're connected to those positive youth development activities that are built on their strengths, built on their interests and as a result of an individualized plan we then want to identify all those things and make sure that while the kid is in placement with us and as we think about them transitioning back to the community on aftercare that we are connecting kids to services in their communities that they're going to not just attend while they're on aftercare and under our supervision but hopefully long after that so that they're able to develop and sustain long-term relationship with the faith based community with other cultural centers and activities that exist for them. So they have an opportunity while in placement to experience those and hopefully stay involved once they're out.

and I have two more questions. I just want to put it down that I'm joined by another one of my colleagues from the Boogey Down Bronx, Council Member Richie Torres. Thank you for joining us today. When we start talking about this whole discharge and family planning and involvement, could you give us an idea of the percentage of families who stay engaged with

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

their children as they reeducate, not just the child being reeducated but the family be reeducated at the same time they're dealing with the scenario that they're dealing with?

So this is a good story and then JOHN: it'll speak to one of the other challenges in terms of Close to Home. Most of our kids, the vast majority of our kids return home to their families. I can give you the specific number, we can send that as a followup but the vast majority, while they're in placement, stay connected to their families. We have services while they're in placement that address family issues through counseling. We rely on aftercare services as you heard from Associate Commissioner Hemider that go out into the home and work with the families to make sure communication is effective and it's addressing the needs of that family. So we're very proud of that. Unlike any other system I've seen, families are engaged and when families are reluctant, we're partnering with our community agencies where the kids are living and we're making sure that we're doing everything we can to keep them engaged. That said, as our population's gotten smaller the needs of that population have gone

up as a whole and unfortunately then the number of
kids who are placed in other than family residences
have gone up in Close to Home over the past few
years. Sometimes they come in as crossover youth so
they're already involved with the foster care system
but we still then want to reach out and try to do
everything we can to reconnect those kids to their
parents and/or extended families. But then we also
see because these kids have presented such challenges
to their families over a long period of time, we see
families that are then while that child is out of
their home parent and attend to the needs of their
other children. Reset in a way and so what we've
seen is an increase in the number of families that
then stop participating over time and so that's
something that we're working hard to address.

CHAIRMAN KING: And one final question as we start wrapping up, I'm going to pass it off to my colleagues. I would like to get an idea of the ethnic breakdown of these young people that are in the system because I got some disturbing news and I just want to hear from you all what is the ethnic breakdown of our young people in the system?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We talk about that
when you came to Ryder and you immediately pointed
out that everyone of the young women that you've met
were either African-American or Latino. So I want to
get you the right numbers. So African-American youth
comprise 64% of the youth in detention and 61% of the
youth in Close to Home. Hispanic youth comprise 30%
of the youth in detention and 30% of the kids in
Close to Home. So to your question, the reality is
is that our system serves mainly African-American and
Latino kids.

CHAIRMAN KING: Right and I have a problem with that is that 13 year olds are 13 year olds, it doesn't make a difference if you're black, Puerto Rican, white, yellow, green, whatever they want to call it. You know 13 year olds do the same dumb things on any given day. So I'm trying to understand how come that if young black males make up 5% of New York City's population, how can they make up over half of the population in a system that can lead them to incarceration? Do you have an answer for that? Is that an NYPD issue? Where are we with this?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I can answer with
what we're doing at ACS and I think we open up
talking about the significant reduction in the number
of young people in the juvenile justice system.
Again, there are so fewer of them are in the system
is a good thing that we should celebrate. I think
it's about young people that come from certain
neighborhoods and from certain any backgrounds are
going to be in the juvenile justice system what kind
of juvenile justice system should that be? And to
this I can speak with some authority because having
run the state system, the fact that mainly 1,000
young people from New York City, not that long ago,
were placed in facilities far from home where they
were being managed and supervised by folks who have
maybe never been in New York City and it's not what
we want. The fact that young people now are in Close
to Home sites where their guidance and counseling and
supervision is coming from folks that come from the
same communities that can talk with some credibility
about this is how I made it. This is how I was able
to focus on school. This is how I was able to
graduate. That has a big value and that continues to
decrease the number of vound neonle that are coming

2.2

into the system. We have a system now where if you
go to your facility which you've been too and I hope
every one of you to come, the folks who are actually
guiding our young people are folks who made it out of
the same neighborhoods and the same community. They
made it like you and I did and they can talk with
that credibility about you can make and I'm a proof
that you can make it. That's not the case across the
nation. Most young people in the juvenile justice
systems elsewhere are placed far away from home and
managed and supervised by people who have no
relationship or connection to their neighborhoods.

CHAIRMAN KING: Well, I thank you for that answer. I'm going to come back to this conversation but I want to turn the mic over to Boogey Down Bronx Council Member Reggie Torres.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Thank you Mr.

Chairman. If I ask questions that have been posed, I apologize but it's been said that in politics everything that has been said might have been said but not everyone has said it. So I will...

Obviously there's a state law that requires the transfer of 16 and 17 year olds from Reikers(?)

Island by October of 2018. There's a recognition

2.2

that Reikers(?) is a criminogenic environment, is a
culture of violence, the dock officers at Reikers(?)
are ill-equipped to supervise 16 and 17 year olds.
That would seem to be the recognition and the logic
behind that law. I have concerns about the plans to
have dock officers to supervise 16 and 17 year olds
in the new detention centers. That would seem to
undermine the purpose and logic of the state's law.
So can you reconcile that for me? I worry that we
run the risk of effectively exporting the culture of
violence that this law was intended to end.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: The law as created by the state, requires a partnership between the Sherriff's Department and the juvenile justice system across the state of New York. In our case, the Sherriff's Department is the Department of Corrections so the law was enacted with an intentionality to have a partnership between DOC and ACS in our case in New York City. Having said that, I would agree with you.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: The law does not require the transfer of dock officers to these ACS facilities.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So why couldn't we have ACS officials who are specially trained to interact with 16 and 17 year olds?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: The city is in the phase of figuring out the transfer. There's two things to the Raise the Age Law. One is actually the servicing of the Raise the Age Law issue of the first group of youth coming to us in October 2018 and then the second group coming in 2019. There's also a unique mandate to New York City that doesn't happen across the state of us moving the kids out of the jail, in our case Reikers(?). We are doing everything we can to figure out how to do that and the intent of the city is to sustain the spirit of the juvenile justice system. The regulations are very clear. They require most of the practices, most of the staff was at the training to abide by juvenile justice standards.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Yeah, but standards on paper on one thing right? Culture is something else. In theory, there should be no culture in violence. There's no law that legitimizes the culture of violence at Reikers(?) Island but there's a disconnect between what the law requires

2.2

and what is actually unfolding in real life and I
worry that we're replicating the dynamic at these
detention centers. My understanding, when did you
find out that these specialized secure detention
centers could be collocated with or what's the
invenile detention centers?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: That's two different licensing processes so the facility is licensed as a secure detention facility will have to go through a different process to be licensed as a specialized secured detention facility. One licensing process which is the one that we have now is under the jurisdiction of OCFS. The other one is under the jurisdiction of OCFS and state commission.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: But the law allows you to, for existing juvenile detention centers to function as SSD's right?

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER FRANCO:} \mbox{ Once you make some} \\ \mbox{modifications to them, yes.}$

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And so when did you find out that that was going to be the case?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: When was it that regulations came out?

1	
2	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Last year at some
3	point.
4	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Some moment in
5	December. If I remember correctly, December.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Because I have
7	apparently there was a memo from OCFS to secure
8	detention administrators dated September 11, 2017
9	which is more than a year from October 2018. So I
10	would think within the span of a year, we could hire
11	and train officials who are professionally equipped
12	to supervise 16 and 17 year olds right? If we can
13	implement the largest pre-K program across multiple
14	agencies within a matter of months, why can't we hir
15	100 ACS officials who are specially trained to deal
16	with 16 and 17 year olds? It seems like we're New
17	York City.
18	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We intend to hire
19	as many amazing juvenile justice counselors or some
20	new titles as we can.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: But I guess, why

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: You mean transferring dock officers where?

actually get it. . .

are we transferring dock officers when we can

22

23

24

25

1	
2	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: To these SSD's.
3	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: The city hasn't
4	determined which facility will be the special secure
5	facility and in that facility they will have to be in
6	partnership with the Department of Corrections and
7	ACS.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And I'm all for
9	partnerships [cross-talk]. But can you guarantee us
10	that there will be no dock officers supervising 16
11	and 17 year olds?
12	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: No I can't.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And why can't you
14	guarantee that?
15	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Our (inaudible) is
16	as amazing as our staff is right now we don't have
17	enough of them to manage our operations and our main
18	focus is to [cross-talk]
19	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So why can't we
20	hire new staff to meet the need? What is the
21	barrier?
22	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Right now we have

23 significant challenges in terms of attracting and 24 retaining staff within the current (inaudible).

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER	TORRES: So you feel like
you're not able to hire.	How many officials
would you need to hire to	supervise the 16 and 17
year olds in these SSD's?	

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: The number projections mean that we need to have in place around 120.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So you can't find

120 people in a city of eight million people?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Not in the current

(inaudible) service.

accept that. That's unacceptable. Within the span of a year, we are the most well-oiled municipal machine in the country and we cannot find and train 120 people to supervise 16 and 17 year olds in SSD's? That strikes me as implausible. And if we can't do it within a year then at what point can we do it?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We're working very closely with our partners across the city to figure out a way to bringing on board the right staff that gets to do the work that we want them to do in the juvenile justice system.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

it's unacceptable. We should be able to hire proper officials within a year and even if you're technically complying with the letter of the law I think we're failing to honor the spirit of what this reform was intended to achieve. So with that said, that's the extent of my questioning.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you Council Member Torres and I thank you for leading us into the conversation. You didn't say anything no one asked because we actually waited for that part for you and Council Member Williams to get in so we can jump right in too. So right on time. Yes, the whole Raise the Age is going to cause some new activity for a lot of us in a way of thinking and one of the things that Councilman Torres hits on and I wanted to bring that up, I propose how do we create a new staff because it is kind of almost unacceptable to bring a corrections officer where the child sees that person as someone who helps me engage or manage a certain behavior and that might not be what I need if I'm going into a new facility where I'm supposed to be reeducating myself when I have the disciplinarian not the educator that's before me. So as I know we have

union brothers in the room and sisters in the room.
Maybe we can look at creating a new environment of
worker who can help facilitate this Raise the Age and
that means open it up to ACS workers, open it up to
the corrections officer to come in and say we have a
new position that we're looking to create and pay a
comparable salary so this way the correction officer
who happens to be a correction officer because they
have social worker degree, they've been a case worker
but corrections may have paid better than doing some
other work, so I went to corrections but in my heart,
I'm still looking to help redevelop a person, than
the ACS worker who's already made the commitment.
Put something there so you don't have the union
problem of someone trying to take a correction
officer because they're going over to a city worker
job and you avoid that union issue that might arise
when you just create something new and different. So
I think that might be your best way to get the best
qualified people who are committed who want to do
that while creating a salary and a new workforce
that's going to handle this because we have to come
up with something to maintain this new population
that we're going to have to accommodate in October

2.2

- and again, as we talked earlier, how do we make sure
 we put a system in that's going to be stable. Not
 rushing into something and not having the pieces of
 the puzzle together. So thank you Council Member
 Torres for starting this conversation and we've been
 joined by the Island of Brooklyn again, Council
 Member Jomani Williams is in the house. Peace out.
 City of Brooklyn. Make it do what it do then. Do
 you have a couple words, comments you'd like to share
 at this moment?
 - COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I guess I don't know what questions to ask.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN KING: Go for what you know brother.}$

just had some of the back and forth. One, I think the state could have gone a little further but I was happy with what they did. I wasn't surprised to learn that something that had Como's name on it had mirrors on it to make it look a little bit better.

So I wasn't shocked to find out that there wasn't funding to it. So I'm very disturbed about that and I think someone said the city is putting \$200

25 | million, is that correct?

2.2

2			CO	MMI	SSI	ONER F	RANCO	: We es	timate	that
3	the	cost	will	be	at	least	\$200	million	dollar	îs.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Are we doing it? Is that what's happening?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We have to do it.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay, what would be the cost if it was a clean raised age? If it was all 16 and 17 year olds would be processed through the family court without exception?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I don't know what would be the differential.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I know that it's not all. . . What's the current law right now in the state? What does the current state law say?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: So anyone who commits an offense below the age of 16, based on the offense could either be seen through the family court or if it's a serious felony, could be seen through the juvenile offenders part in the criminal court. So there's actually that distinction in New York State as it is. So in our detention facilities that we serve now we have juvenile delinquents which we talked about before and we have juvenile offenders

2.2

2	that	are	young	people	who	are	awaiting	through	trial
3	in t	he c	riminal	court	iuv∈	enile	e part.		

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So this is 16 and 17 years olds?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: That's the current state of affairs.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: 16 and below. What if we want to include 16 and 17 year olds?

the state again maybe to use in your term is not a clean Raise the Age law. It is not that you move every 16 and 17 year old to go through the family court. We actually created a (inaudible) between juvenile delinquents that are going to go through family court who are 16 and 17 and this new category called adolescent offenders that would go through the criminal court based on their cases.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: My question is you're saying the cost now is \$200 million correct?

What would the cost be, do we know, if it was a clean version?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: You mean to have this new category?

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yes, if 16 and 17 year olds going through family court.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I don't know the difference but it might be significantly costly anyway. When you think about the processes of the services that we're going to provide to youth and families and those are going to be the same no matter what door you go through. You go through the criminal court or you go through the family court.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I just want to know if the cost would be significantly more or is there. . .

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: I don't know.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay. The DA's may file motions showing extraordinary circumstances to keep a youth accused of a non-violent felony.

What are some of the circumstances that would have a required extraordinary to keep non-violent youth in the court?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So there's a subcommittee that's working on this, the court processing subcommittee and no one really knows yet what extraordinary circumstances is going to look like. The DA's are going to have to answer that

2.2

question because they are the ones that are going to be making that application.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yikes. So we don't know and I guess it can be different from borough to borough which means Queens and particularly Staten Island are going to be in bad shape. That's not good. I caught the tailend of my colleague. I just wanted to. . . Are you trying to get ACS workers to post to the corrections officers that were at Reikers(?) to cover the SSD's or what's the plan?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Yes we are. We are committed to hire more staff. We're committed to hire more staff now. We were committed to hire more staff yesterday. We are short staffed in detention. As low as the numbers are, we had a significant conversation before about the high needs of the young people that we serve. Their individualized needs and how they have to be met and the best way to do that is by having frontline staff. We have an amazing staff in detention now. They play a very difficult role of providing guidance and supervision, structure and discipline at the same time they try to connect to kids and teach them new ways of doing the work.

2.2

M	le hav	7e	struggled	in	attracting	the	staff	and	keeping
t	he st	:a	ff.						

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Joe, is it you need money to hire or is it bureaucracy that's preventing you?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We're working really hard to figure out a way to hire the staff that we need.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Alright, I think I asked a different question. Is it money that you need or is bureaucracy preventing you from hiring?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We're doing everything that we can to figure out a way to attract and keep the staff that need. We're hoping that. . .

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Let me break it up. Do you have enough money to hire the new staff that you need?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We actually have a request to the OMB and to the state to get the funding necessary to attract the right staff.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So you currently don't think you have enough money to hire enough staff?

24

1	
2	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Yeah, as I said
3	before Raise the Age is going to cost at least \$200
4	million dollars. A significant part of that
5	investment is going to be in frontline staff.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So if you get
7	the \$200 million dollars you'll be able to hire the
8	additional ACS staff that you need?
9	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: If we have the
10	resources to attract the staff then we will work wit
11	our partners in labor and others to figure out a way
12	of attracting the right staff.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay, you need
14	additional funding to hire adequate staff? We clear
15	on that one?
16	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Yeah.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: You're saying
18	\$200 million dollars is the correct amount of money?
19	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: \$200 million
20	dollars is the estimate that New York City has to do
21	the full implementation of Raise the Age that goes
22	beyond just staffing detention.

25

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Yes.

include staffing that includes ACS?

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Does that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

council Member Williams: Okay, so based on that, if you have \$200 million dollars you should be able to staff up at a quick rate so that it's not just the same folks who were there before but ACS workers who have more experience dealing with it as well as I think different connections to social services that might be needed, correct?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay, I'm not sure why it took that long to get to yes but I want to make sure that hopefully we have that. I'm not expecting to get any additional funding from Andrew Como. I hope that state reps, particularly Senator Mehacy(?) will push really hard to push that in the state but like you said, it has to get done. just want to thank you for this opportunity. you Mr. Chair. I'm glad that we're moving in right directions in how we're dealing with our young people, how we're dealing with criminal justice to begin with. I would say that people say we have to reform the system. I think it's operating the way it was designed to operate so we just have to completely change, uproot the system and put another one in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

place. That's a difficult thing to do but hopefully we can get there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you Council Member Williams and as we wrap up with this panel. I think we go the jest of a little bit of about what you all do in the juvenile justice system from the time of a young person enters into your doors that you have secure, non-secure. You have family services, treatment, counseling, foster care homes, and you have a staff that's responsible for making sure they deliver on all this and the challenges are not just financial but from limited staffing or just policies and Council Member Williams said it best and I believe that the system today is doing what it is designed to do. We do need to make some corrections and all when it comes to justice, not just juvenile but the criminal system altogether needs some shaking up in order for it to deliver on what it needs to deliver and when you change the policies, the money tends to follow. The policies that are in place, the money is there for the policies that they want to deliver on whether it trips us up or whether it serves us up. So at the end of the day I want to say thank you for educating us on this first conversation

that we're having today in regards to what the
juvenile justice system looks like in the city of New
York. Of course, there's going to be more
conversations we're going to have and I'm going to be
calling on Julie Burley who is from the Mayor's
office administrative side for the follow ups on all
the outlines and data that we've asked for in this
hearing and I definitely want and look forward to
seeing the material that you send in regards to the
successes that you've had in your system. We can
understand what the successful numbers look like then
we can figure out where we need to improve as well.
So I want to thank you all for today's testimony and
I'm going to ask you if you can stick around for just
a minute because the next person that's coming is a
young person that I want you to hear from so we all
can understand what his conversation is going to look
like. I just got a question that was asked of me to
ask of you.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Is that through Twitter?

CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, good one. But it's asking is there a plan to have separate facilities and if not how long will you manage cominglin?

1	
2	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Regarding what?
3	CHAIRMAN KING: Are there separate
4	facilities for the older and the younger? Will ther
5	be any comingling coming in?
6	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Our intent is to
7	look at, we have two facilities, both of them are
8	certified and are secure juvenile delinquent
9	facilities. We are looking at certifying one of the
10	as a specialized secured detention facility and we'r
11	looking at having more than those two facilities
12	which I think some of you have heard about where we
13	asked the state to make (inaudible) available as
14	another specialized secure detention facility to be
15	able to meet the demands of Raise the Age.
16	CHAIRMAN KING: Okay, and
17	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So the question
18	is will there be comingling because I asked that
19	question when you came before. So what is the
20	answer?
21	COMMISSIONER FRANCO: They may be
22	comingling when we feel that it is developmentally

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I don't think that's the answer you gave me before but I'm glad

appropriate and safe to do so.

23

24

2.2

that we're hearing that now because I think that
that's very important.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: You know, we hear loud and clear from everyone. I think we did answer that way. I think I heard particularly from you the importance to have developmentally appropriate placements with in housing units and we believe that. We do that now. We have housing units where we have young people who actually in middle school. We have housing units where young people are in high school and detention facilities. We know that's important.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: We do the same for Close to Home.

and I think what's going to need to happen is we're going to have to have the conversation on Raise the Age hearing and when you return, you all being able to express your plan so we can get a real idea of how your handling what's been imposed on us by the state and if there's any real deficits on delivering then we need to know that at that hearing so we can figure out how to plug those holes up.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: One thing that I
want to implore from the council and others here is
that Raise the Age is not just about the beds in
detention, it's not just about Close to Home. It
would be an opportunity for New York City not to take
advantage of Raise the Age to kind of be a juvenile
justice system that does what we actually have been
doing very well so far that is based on education,
based on family supports, on neighborhood
interventions to keep young people out of the
juvenile justice system. Sometimes we're so focused
on just the kids who are moving out from one bed to
another that we forget that what we need to do is
invest in families and communities. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you for recognizing that. Thank you. Our next panel up, Beth Powers, Kate Rubin, Anthony Wells, Luis Padilla, those four there. So I want to thank you all for your commitment to serve our children and our young people who are in need of reeducation, redevelopment, and just some genuine love to help them become productive adults. So thank you all for coming to today's hearing and testifying. So before, everyone is going to get four minutes. I ask you to respect the bell.

2.2

I understand that if you're in the middle of an important statement we won't pull Sam in and Sims out here and we won't snatch you off the stage but we want to just ask you to stay in respect of the timeframe somewhat. We are here talking about a system that's catered to handle and manage and educate our young people. So I would like to start with Luis Padilla, our young brother that's here today to have a conversation with us. So Mr. Padilla, it's on you.

MR. PADILLA: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Luis and I'm a youth leader with Youth Speakers Institute. First off I'd like to thank Chairperson and Councilmember King for hosting this oversite hearing and for the chance to testify.

Today I'll focus my testimony on why the New York City Department of Corrections and corrections officers should not supervise children in ACS facilities. I'm going to focus on one specific reason based on my own experience. DOC correctional officers have militarized training while juvenile facility staffs are trained to deescalate and promote positive youth development. When I was 16 years old I spent several weeks in Reikers(?) Island. I

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

remember one time when an inmate flooded his cell by clogging his toilet. A few correctional officers entered his cell with turtles, their emergency service unit and the rapid response team who are equipped with shields, tactical gear, batons, and pepper spray. The ESU and RO2 units beat him in his cell and took him out like an animal by his arms and feet. I felt sad for him and was scared for my own safety as well. It's sad to see a child whose mind is not fully developed and who is literally crying out for attention get beaten and dragged out of his cell by adult men. Now where's the youth development training in that? I was scared at Reikers(?) because I knew I could be easily misunderstood and beaten by the correctional officers with no way to hold them accountable. Furthermore, whenever there were fights, correctional officers would go to turtles and the turtles would beat kids with their shields and sticks to stop the fights and to subdue the rest of the housing unit. After that the kids fighting would be sent to the box solitary confinement. Now, in juvenile detention centers fights are addressed completely different. When there was a fight in Crossroads, we would get

restrained but not with shields and batons. Also
after a fight we were not sent to solitary
confinement. We were sent to speak with counselors
who were trained youth professionals and who cared to
understand what was going on with us and why we were
acting the way we were. While in Crossroads, I was
in many fights. I was always counseled. During that
period, no one was visiting me. No one was there for
me but my counselor. My counselor understood that I
was acting out because I was seeking attention and
that my mind could not grasp all of my family
dynamics at that moment. She provided me with coping
techniques and ways to address some of my anxiety.
Reikers(?) was like a hell with no way out. I got
lucky but others suffered abuse and scars that they
will never be able to recover from. We cannot have
our kids in juvenile facilities open to this kind of
abuse. The militarized training of the DOC would
just create a new Reikers(?) in Horizons. We need
fresh staff trained to deescalate and promote
positive youth development.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you. Thank you. Good job.

MR. PADILLA: Thank you. Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KING: Next.

MS. RUBIN: Yeah, I'm happy to follow

Luis and just say thank you for the opportunity to

testify and for holding the hearing. I submitted

longer written comments so I will just summarize them

briefly and say we also focused on the continuum of

New York's juvenile justice system as it relates to

three essential elements of Raise the Age

implementation. The first is specialized secure

detention.

CHAIRMAN KING: Yeah, I'm sorry to interrupt you but we still don't know who is speaking on the microphone right now.

MS. RUBIN: I'm so sorry. Thank you. My name is Kate Rubin and I'm the Director of Policy at Youth Represented. Thanks so much. So the first is specialized secure detention for older youth which Luis just spoke to and I'll just say a couple more things about that at the end. The second is the need for a robust monitoring body that includes youth, families, and community members directly impacted by Raise the Age to ensure that the implementation of the legislation meets the goal of reducing youth incarceration and arrest. I know there is a very

robust task force that the city has and that they'er
doing fantastic work. I don't know how many members
of the community, how many young people, how many
family members are part of that task force. We go
into some recommendations we have both about the
makeup of it and what an implementation task force
for the city could look like and what kind of data we
think is really important to collect, both from
agencies and from young people themselves. And then
the third, which has been talked about a lot but the
need for funds for comprehensive programming both for
adolescent offenders, the 16 and 17 year olds in
secure detention but also for older youth who will
still be at Reikers(?), the 18 to 24 year olds who
still are really in need of programming and we hope
that they don't lose out as part of Raise the Age.
Just to add a few more points on specialized secure
detention to what has already been said. The thing I
really want to emphasize is that in the past five
years, the city has made tremendous efforts to
improve the conditions and reduce violence at
Reikers(?) especially for youth. They've brought in
some of the best progressive corrections
professionals from around the country to provide

technical assistance and leadership. They ve put in
place first rate training. They've funded expansions
in programming and legal services. They've reduced
ratios of staff to youth, in some cases even to
levels below required by lawsuits and settlements and
it's not enough. None of it has been enough. It
hasn't changed the culture. I mean, and if that
experience isn't enough to teach us that with
tremendous effort, money, intentions, all of the best
ideas we can't change the culture at Reikers(?)
Island and there are so many examples of
documentation of the limitations on that progress
both from young people themselves and I really
encourage everybody to read the Forth Nunez
Monitoring Report that came out last fall. I won't
read from it. I think my colleagues from Legal Aide
might read a little bit from it and I included some
excerpts in our testimony but it really makes clear
that the problems with staff continue unabated, is
the word that they use. That the problems are not
just with line staff but also with supervisors and
that all of the efforts that have been made aren't
enough and I mean just listening to Deputy
Commissioner Franco's testimony about all of the

2.2

really incredible things that have been put in place
and the much better culture in our ACS facilities, I
understand that there are significant operational
barriers that make hiring and training ACS staff in
time for an October deadline extremely difficult but
that will not be as difficult as uprooting the
culture of DOC once it establishes itself in our
youth facilities.

CHAIRMAN KING: Correct.

MS. RUBIN: We are eager to support the council and the city in any way that can to develop alternatives. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you. And if anyone gets happy and they want to clap, this is how we do it. Thank you Kate. Thank you.

MS. POWERS: Hello. I'm Beth Powers.

I'm the Director of Youth Justice at the Children's

Defense Fund New York. Thank you so much for the

opportunity to provide comments today. I've also

submitted longer testimony. I'm just going to hit a

few talking points today. Also, thank you Luis for

sharing your experience. So the Children's Defense

Fund provides an independent voice for all children

who cannot vote, lobby, or speak for themselves and

we pay particular attention to the needs of poor
children, children of color, and those with
disabilities. We also co-lead the Raise the Age New
York campaign, a statewide advocacy effort that
helped to bring attention to the need to raise the
age of criminal responsibility in New York and we
continue to advocate to ensure that the law is
implemented and funded in a way that ensures best
outcomes for the young people who will be impacted by
the law. One of the most significant changes to New
York City's juvenile justice system occurred with the
passage of Close to Home in 2012 of which we heard
extensively the benefits of today compared to the
previous system. I'm going to skip over that and
head straight into some of the Raise the Age
implementation concerns. So, as you know, in April
of 2017, legislation passed to raise the age and it
is truly an opportunity to examine New York's
juvenile justice system and ensure that front end
community based solutions are prioritized and that
deep end confinement based settings are used as a
last resort. Raise the Age requires the creation of
new specialized secure detention which we've heard
about extensively today for adolescent offenders and

these facilities are to be jointly operated by ACS
and DOC. One of the main points I want to make today
is how alarmed we are at the city's current plan to
staff these facilities with DOC staff for the first
24 months. We're concerned that staffing these
facilities with DOC officers will import an adult
correctional culture that will not be easily, if at
all removed after 24 months. We appreciate that ACS
will offer case management and programming
responsibility for youth. We heard extensively today
their expertise with young people and the success
they've had in decreasing detention populations and
evidence based practices and trauma informed care.
However, this measure cannot negate the use of DOC
staff to provide security for youth. We acknowledge
that DOC has made strides to address the treatment of
youth in their care such as the elimination of
punitive segregation for 16 to 21 year olds, an
increase in positive programming for adolescents but
despite this progress, DOC is not in the best
position to respond to youth and should not be tasked
with overseeing 16 and 17 year olds in the new youth
facilities. In addition to DOC representing an adult
focused approach to corrections, they have a history

of mistreatment of youth which is well documented and
which we just heard from Luis just now. Raise the
Age is an opportunity to genuinely change the culture
that has been perpetuated in DOC and transform the
experiences of youth who are detained in New York.
We urge the council to ensure that the benefits
intended by removing youth from Reikers(?) are not
lost by allowing DOC staff and other adult
correctional practices into the new youth detention
facilities. This is critical for the youth being
removed from Reikers(?) as well as the younger
children in secure detention who have the potential
of being exposed to this new structure. Finally, we
recognize that New York City faces significant
potential financial cuts proposed in the governor's
executive budget, particularly ACS, particularly the
most vulnerable children and families in New York
City. Most notably the risk of loss of state funding
for Close to Home, a cap on child welfare
preventative and protective funding which includes
juvenile justice preventative programs and aftercare
and the risk of not receiving funding at all from the
state to implement Raise the Age. We encourage the
city to continue to prioritize alternatives to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

placement and detention as well as other innovative approaches to youth justice through Close to Home and the implementation of Raise the Age in this challenging fiscal environment. Thank you so much for the opportunity to testify.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you. Yes sir.

MR. WELLS: Good afternoon Chair and thank you and Council Woman Barron for the opportunity to testify. My name is Anthony Wells and I'm the President of the Social Services Employees Union Local 371 representing juvenile counselors, case workers, and social services staff both at Reikers (?) and at juvenile justice. Let me also compliment Commissioner Franco on his presentation and where they've come from. Mr. Pruzak(?) and myself, we're probably the only ones in the room that were in the Department of Juvenile Justice in 1979, We actually saw the creation of this and now we see the termination of it and know how this has evolved. Let me just tell you the point. And we all have different issues on (inaudible). Especially the correctional officers speak for themselves. don't want to be a part of this. Their President has made it very clear to the City of New York they do

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

not want to be a part of the transition. It is the city who is insistent that there be a transition period. Let me be clear. I thank you for the compliment for my staff. Two of them in the room, Alex Parker and Doug Robinson who are both at Crossroads and Horizons and so we're glad to hear that our people make a difference which is our argument in the first place. We went to the city and said you need to create a title of people who want to be in this program. First of all they were given a A year is not enough. My friend Jomani said what they've been doing. They've been working OCFS had to put out their policies, their communications could be better and it's improving but beyond that this is about the kids and you need a program that's going to be in place October 1, and I submit to you that it will not have one. The issue of even comingling where OCFS said that these populations can be comingling, we don't agree with that. They should not be comingling. But that has not been determined as of yet. So we're trying to meet with the city. There's also some upstate downstate mayor governor stuff going on here and it's getting in the way quite frankly. I testified in many places and we need to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

talk about having a program. We have addressed to the governor and to the leaders up in Albany they need to move the October 1 date back. If we're talking about the security of these young people and the security of the staff that are servicing them then we must give it appropriate time. (inaudible) that he wants to use in Brooklyn, what's it called Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Ella McCray.

MR. WELLS: Ella McCray. They don't even have the authority yet to use that as an intake center. Once again, comingling, they're going to have to have a separate staff to take one population to court and another. Maybe they have to be in court at the same time. They're going to have to have two lunch periods. They're going to have two different activity periods and the same for Sylvia(?) they comingle does not make any logistical sense or security sense. But there's one place where they can comingle and that's in the medical office. Not every young person is in a gang but if you don't think there's gang activity you need to open your eyes up. There is gang activity and guess what, gang activity, they know how to talk to each other. You're not

going to convince me that a 17 year old gang member
is not going to be able to get to a 13 year old gang
member and meet in the medical office and talk right
in front of our eyes and we don't have a clue what
they're talking about. So there are serious security
exchanges. The state has put money in, you're
talking about a course. There's \$100 million dollars
that the city is not eligible for based on some
<pre>public tax structure, they don't even get it. Also,</pre>
only New York City has to remove their youth out of
jails on October 1. If you were incarcerated in Val
Hallow you don't have to be moved October 1. People
don't know that. So, though they're doing their best
efforts, I'm not here to praise Cesar or bury Cesar,
but I'm here to tell you honestly that there are
serious concerns that will not allow this to be
implemented in the proper form. I know I have three
seconds but I'm going to take five.

CHAIRMAN KING: You got three more.

MR. WELLS: I got three more, I appreciate it. In terms of staffing, I think the agency agrees with us you need social service staff to provide most of these services but there's also adequate training. Now, we can also not close our

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

eyes, I'm not blaming the COO's or the residents for the culture that's there but the culture exists. lot of the balance in Reikers(?) is putting this population and so we have change the culture too. They're not going to change because you put them in another building. It's not going to be overnight. That's fantasy land and Luis can attest to that. you want to get to somewhere you've got to start off on a plan that's going to promote your ability to be successful and to be successful is to change the culture, provide adequate security, provide real programs, real training programs. You know, bring shops back into. . . I know people doing it. One kid may not want to do the books but he can put together an engine. He could put together a computer. So we need more time and we need more time for us to be involved in all these other stakeholders to be involved and you need to tell both of these legislatures, you guys and the state, cut it out. Let's sit down and have a real idea about how to get this done for the safety of these kids and the safety of this staff that's going to be in these facilities. Thank you for the opportunity. You can read my testimony. I never read it anyway.

2	CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you President Wells
3	and I want to thank the panel for testifying. All of
4	you added something to the conversation that
5	definitely brought it back to reality. I'm glad
6	Deputy Commissioner that you're still here to hear
7	the conversation. I do ask when you do return back
8	to the other side of the building that we need the
9	adults to be in the room on this one. You know,
10	politics tend to get in the way of delivering true
11	services for the New Yorker's. So whatever you're
12	hearing here, I'm asking you to figure out how do we
13	take it back and put together a real strategy and
14	again I'm shocked to hear that the City of New York
15	is the only city responsible with an October 1 date
16	and we're being pressured and rushed to deliver
17	something that might require a little bit more time
18	and commitment to putting together a structure that's
19	stable. We don't want to get it done just to say we
2,0	got it done. We want to get it done because it will
21	last long because we got it done the right way. So
22	whoever you're talking with on the mayor's side,
23	let's do this the right way and yes, we will as a
24	council and as a committee will reach out to the
25	speaker of the state assembly as well as the

governor's office and say hey listen, let's just do
this the right way and I think we do it the right
way. You know, you have new staff and you have new
trained staff and you won't have a corrections
officer. I end with this. People have bad thinking,
misconception, when you call NYPD to your house
because your child and you are fighting, they're not
coming in to be a social worker, they're coming to
diffuse the situation and shut it down and we have a
bad habit of thinking when you call the police you're
going to get an ACS worker. No you're not. You're
going to get a police officer. So that's what we
have here and we have to make sure that in this
transition that we have people sensitive enough and
trained enough to manage the scenario as opposed to
coming and implementing law enforcement. So I want
to thank you all for your testimony. You wanted to
add something sir?

MR. PADILLA: So basically like we working so hard to change the whole system for the youth. So if we sit there and take the DOC staff and we move Reikers(?) Island to Horizons we working so hard for nothing. We going to turn Horizons into a mini-Reikers(?) Island and all we doing, we basically

2.2

saying we raise the age but we still condone

Reikers(?) Island at Horizons so I feel like just

stop it there. Let's train the right people for it.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you young man. I appreciate it. Thank you again everyone. Our next panel up we have Grant Cowells, Lisa Freeman, Julie Peterson, Giselle Castro. Okay, next panel please organize whoever wants to go first is fine. Just introduce yourselves and. . .

MS. FREEMAN: Good afternoon. Thank you so much Chairman King for giving us the opportunity to testify. My name is Lisa Freeman. I'm from the Legal Aide Society. I'm the Director of the Juvenile Rights Special Litigation Unit. The Legal Aid Society, as I imagine you're aware, represents the vast majority of children in the family court system both those charged as juvenile delinquents as well as those whose parents are charged with abuse or neglect or otherwise involved with the family court. We represented approximately 34,000 children last year in the family court system and approximately 1,500 children who were arrested as juvenile delinquents. In addition to our juvenile rights practice we also have the criminal defense practice and as part of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

that criminal defense practice we have an adolescent intervention and diversion practice. The head of which is Nancy Ginsberg who is sitting with me here which handles the cases that were discussed earlier of juvenile offenders who are young people ages 13 to 15 generally who are charged as adults in the criminal court system and that will not change with Raise the Age the juvenile offender laws were not altered in any way by the Raise the Age legislation. So first I want to recognize the comment that you made earlier that we have to be very cognizant of who the population is that we're talking about and that the vast majority of children in the juvenile justice system are black, brown, minority children and that that's completely inappropriate and really an intrusion upon those communities in the vast majority of the time there are completely over-represented in our system. There are also disproportionately numbers of the LGBTQ community also that are over policed and runaway and homeless youth in New York City are also disproportionately represented in the We commend the city for the incredible reforms that have taken place in the last several years and Commissioner Franco spoke to many of them

and one of the points I would like to make at the
outset is a point that he made at the very end of his
testimony which is that we should not only be focused
on youth who are in detention and in placement and
that the juvenile justice system provides a whole
host of benefits and that that's the goal of Raise
the Age is to offer those benefits to an older
population who frankly should have been included in
the juvenile justice system long ago. So I'm very
concerned at the suggestion that we should somehow
delay implementation of Raise the Age or delay taking
16 and 17 year olds off Reikers(?) Island. New York
State was one of only two states in the country that
continued to treat all 16 year olds as adults in the
fact that we finally got that legislation passed I
think is way overdue and that we should absolutely
not delay that implementation and that we should
rather accelerate and focus our efforts on making
sure that it's implemented effectively. But by no
means should we consider delaying that
implementation. I also think that the concerns that
have been expressed about the DOC and their role in
the SSD's is deeply, deeply troubling. The Legal
Aide Society has brought the lawsuits, the Nunez

litigation on Reikers(?) Island and while we
absolutely think it has brought some improvement to
Reikers(?) Island, it by no means has brought the
kind of improvement that we would hope and certainly
has not provided the kind of change in attitude
towards that population that we would then want to
bring over to the juvenile justice system. I also
would just add that the educational benefits of Close
to Home have been enormous but that there is still
room for improvement that the mayor had a task force
that issued a series of recommendations to address
this population because the problem of the school to
prison pipeline is a real one and that those
recommendations needs to implemented.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you.

MS. PETERSON: Hello. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Julie Peterson. I am a senior program officer at the Pinkerton Foundation and I also co-chair the New York Youth Justice Initiative which is a group of funders concerned about youth justice in New York City. I had the privilege of testifying before the City Council on these issues in December. I want to say that Pinkerton funds after school programs for

young people in New York City and it also focuses on
programs for young people involved in the criminal
justice and child welfare systems. We applaud New
York's efforts to Raise the Age of criminal court
jurisdiction and we would absolutely speak against
any delay in moving 16 and 17 year olds off of
Reikers(?) Island. As my colleague said, we have
waited long enough for the age to be raised in New
York. Today I bring my voice to bear on two
important issues. The first is the importance of
supportive youth programming for all youth in the
juvenile and criminal systems. It's imperative as
the age is raised to support transformational
programming based on positive youth development for
young adults both within and without incarcerative
settings. Youth need programs and people around them
that believe in them and inspire hope for their
future. In the last few years, the Administration
for Children's Services, the DOC and Probation and
the DYCS have made efforts to improve programming for
justice involved youth and Pinkerton supports many of
these programs. As the age of criminal court
jurisdiction is raised, the city must support
 increased programming for the 16 and 17 year olds in

ACS facilities as well as robust programming for the
18 to 24 year olds that will remain on Reikers(?)
Island. The second issue I wish to address concerns
the administration's plans to use DOC staff at ACS
juvenile facilities. On February 6 of this year, 35
foundations signed a letter to the administration
urging them to reconsider these plans. I speak today
on behalf of these funders when I say that we believe
these plans are misguided and dangerous for young
people. There's a clear and well-documented history
of children being subjected to unacceptable abusive
conditions on Reikers(?) Island. We've heard a lot
of testimony to that today. Using DOC staff at ACS
facilities for even two years leaves young people in
harms way. It also has the real potential to import
the well-documented culture of violence and
corruption at Reikers(?) to the city's youth
facilities. The legislature did not mandate 16 and
17 year olds off Reikers(?) Island because of the
condition of the facilities. Rather, they acted
precisely because of the culture of violence that
exists there. We urge the city council to stand with
us and act to prevent the use of DOC staff in ACS
facilities. I speak for the funder community when I

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 say that we are eager to partner with the city to 3 help find alternatives. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you.

MR. COLES: Good afternoon. My name is Grant Coles. I'm the senior policy and advocacy associate for Youth Justice at Citizen's Committee for Children (CCC) as an independent multi-issue child advocacy organization dedicated to ensuring every New York child is healthy, housed, educated, and safe. CCC does not accept government funds or provide services, we just advocate on behalf of kids. Thanks for holding today's hearing and there are just two. . . Our full testimony provides a lot more remarks but I'll summarize for two points. The first being the DOC issue in ACS facilities and the second being the state budget cuts. So CCC agrees with the consensus in the room it seems like to urge the city council to strongly oppose the city's plan to staff ACS secure detention facilities with DOC staff. mentioned, there's been a lot of evidence about the culture of violence and how sticky that culture is and how moving buildings cannot adequately address that. We absolutely want to emphasize and commend ACS for the major reforms and new initiatives that

have fundamentally improved the juvenile justice
system as mentioned today. The great programs and
services that have benefited the kids that are in the
secure detention facilities are a tremendous
improvements and it's precisely because of those
improvements and that beneficial treatment that's
taken root there that we don't want to see that
taking a step backwards with the introduction of
adult correctional staff. So, though we absolutely
want to see this addressed and no DOC staff used in
juvenile detention facilities, in the event that if
they are used nonetheless, we have some
recommendations. First, that CCC strongly recommends
that every precaution is taken to ameliorate the
threats that DOC staff might have on the juveniles.
We recommend that no DOC staff be permitted to come
into contact with youth under 16 or any non-DOC
supervised youth under any circumstances. So
essentially the comingling. We also recommend that a
selection process be used that identifies DOC staff
that have a true interest and ability to work with
youth and the selection process does not only
consider seniority. CCC recommends that the
selection process needs to begin immediately so that

the staff coming to Horizons can receive that
extensive training. The staff need to learn ways to
<pre>interact with youth that doesn't include Reikers(?)</pre>
type tactics such as using pepper spray or
handcuffing youth to desks. We encourage them to
learn about the entire philosophy and background of
adolescent development and juvenile justice best
practices including things such as trauma informed
care. Finally, turning to the second point about the
state budget cuts. As mentioned in the prior panel,
these are serious financial cuts being threatened to
the juvenile justice continuum in New York City.
There's kind of three big ones; the access to Raise
the Age funding, that's \$100 million dollars that New
York City is not going to have any access too. The
second one is the Close to Home funding cuts. The
state budget proposes reauthorizing Close to Home
initiative but cuts all \$41.4 million dollars of
state funding. The Close to Home is going to be
needed for the existing youth and now it's going to
also be for the new youth, the 16 and 17 year olds in
this population. It seems entirely counter intuitive
to be cutting the program that's now needing to grow.
And the third as mentioned is the Child Welfare and

2.2

Services cut. These programs provide preventative services such as alternative detention, alternative placement programs. Talking about the importance of the juvenile system as being those set of services and programs beyond just simply the facilities of detention and placement facilities but it's this whole continuum of programs. Many of them are funded by the Child Welfare Services funding and so this cut which is expected to be \$67 million dollars in the first year is going to be really traumatic for this juvenile justice continuum.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you.

MS. CASTRO: Good afternoon. My name is Giselle Castro. I'm the executive director of Exalt(?) Youth. Thank you Chair for having us this afternoon to speak on a very important issue. We work with young people who are court involved in New York City, ages 15 to 19 and we do understand that young people who are released from Reikers(?) Island or sometimes even a detention facility they come in with added trauma and we agree that DOC should not be having any oversite or creating or perpetuating a system that we're trying so hard to change. At our organizations, one of our biggest principals and

philosophies is to humanize and to validate and to
inspire our youth. We do this through a structure
that is an educational internship model but with a
curriculum that is culturally relevant and one of our
biggest strengths is our ability to collaborate with
so many people who have been really fighting the good
fight for so many years. We get referrals from the
Department of Probation, from ACS, we work with Legal
Aide. We work with Brooklyn Defenders. You name the
person, I think that we are involved. It is one of
the most critical times I think in our era and the
last thing that I want to say because we testified as
well in December, it's a real opportunity and at
Exalt(?) we have been able to serve many young
people. Our data is really encouraging. We have 15,
16, and 17 year old youth who are in school. We have
been able to, particularly in Brooklyn, have the DA's
office reduce sentences and this to me is really
important and critical because we then have our youth
gaining the opportunities to go to college. It
really is an opportunity to give them access to life.
I want to close out, you know once again, by thanking
all of you. Thanking you for listening to all of
use, our concerns and Exalt is hopefully one of the

2.2

group of people or partners that will be able to help in this critical time. So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you. I do have a question too. So the first one is to Ms. Giselle Castro from Exalt(?). You said you help and you get referrals, what is the capacity and number of people that your program can handle?

MS. CASTRO: That's an excellent question. Currently we serve 180 young people brand new to the organization. We just endorsed a scaling plan to serve more young people. We know there's a big need in terms of young people being referred to us. Our capacity at this point is limited. It is because of funding which is our inherent challenge for every single non-profit organization. And our goal is to serve more young people.

CHAIRMAN KING: What is the success rate of the students that come into your program and go out and never return back to the system?

MS. CASTRO: Sure. That's a great question as well. At this point it's a 68% success rate. Currently for two years out, less than 5% of our kids are reconvicted of a crime. We will say that a lot of the great work is in our partnership.

for instance, we have one or our internship partners
that Children's Defense funds, we are very careful
and thoughtful with who we partner our youth and
ensuring that they have a plan. There's a lot of
rigor to this and accountability and a lot of
thought. I would say that the other aspect in terms
of what makes our organization or the experience that
we give our kids significant to them is that we give
language to their experience. Week one in the
curriculum is a school to prison pipeline, mass
incarceration, the challenges on raising this country
and all of this really helps a young person begin to
take What we always want them to do which is
ownership which is a big challenge I think even for
adults.

CHAIRMAN KING: Well, I thank you for that answer. Now Grant or Lisa, either one, right now do you know what is the number of 16 and 17 year olds on Reiker(?) that October 1 goes as well as. . . I know. . . what that number will look like that will transition out of Reikers(?) into the New York City system?

MS. FREEMAN: I think we think it's about

25 135.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRMAN KING: 135.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just wanted to clarify my answer in regard to the comingling. union president was talking about the older kids influencing younger kids. We actually support comingling because ACS already is managing a population that includes kids up through 18. because at the moment in detention they only have children and placement, have children who were arrested for something that took place prior to their 16th birthday but they may well stay in their custody through the age of 18 and so they are already dealing with that issue and it seems to us that the question is really that they need to have a strong classification system because otherwise what will happen is it will be impossible for them to really provide the kind of programming to the whole population that needs to be provided. So that's our concern.

CHAIRMAN KING: I thank you for that and I do understand the difference of comingling in the positive sense so someone can be amended and someone who is comingling to organize disaster and I think that's where President Wells was going because if you

2.2

are a gang member and you're not in the business of empowering the 13 year old, you're empowering him to destruction then no, we've got to manage that conversation and we've got to realize what that population looks like when you get them in the room. Of course you can get a 17 year old whose got it together whose been there like you say you should turn who might have been in the system for a while whose turned stuff around and then yeah, that's a person that you can comingle but if you're whole population where you've not been able to identify their strengths and weaknesses then you might create more chaos in that environment than protecting the environment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right, absolutely.

But I think the question that they're addressing is

whether the 16 and 17 year olds that are coming in as

adolescent offenders can be comingled with comparable

16 and 17 year olds in ACS custody with JD's and JO's

in their custody. So it's not necessarily, I think

they already separate out by age based on their

classification system.

CHAIRMAN KING: Well, this conversation shall be continued and we will look forward to

of you do your thing.

2.2

helping our young people be greater young people. So thank you panel for being here and for your information today. Our next panel up is Alissa Perone, Karen Thor, and Sophia Morrell. Okay, so we have Thor and Perone. What's the first name? Alissa. Alright, so we have room for two more. So if Lizette Nayevez and Gabrielle Pienzo. Did I say it right. Oh Prisco, it must be the ink, somebody ran out of ink on the paper. Well, at any given moment the four

MS. PERONE: Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Alissa Perone. I'm a staff attorney with the School Justice Project at Advocates for Children of New York where I provide educational advocacy and legal representation for youth who are involved or at risk of being involved with the juvenile or criminal justice systems. My testimony focuses on the educational needs as you had brought up earlier of New York City's court involved youth while they're in juvenile detention and placement and while they return from those settings. So as you probably know, court involved youth are an extremely vulnerable population of student's in New York City and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

nationally many of our court involved students have complex educational and mental health needs that have been inadequately addressed prior to their arrest. Over half of all court involved youth are students with disabilities and many are over age and under credited and performing far below grade level. fact, 94% of youth in juvenile detention are reading below grade level and 40% of youth are reading below a fourth grade reading level. So this data clearly demonstrates the need in all settings for high quality education and social and emotional supports that are individually tailored to address the unique and complex needs of the students that they serve. So with that goal we make some recommendations, longer in the written testimony from the mayor's leadership team on school climate and discipline for these youth. So first we strongly recommend that all facilities serving court involved youth provide a safe and supportive environment. And towards that end, we strongly recommend that juvenile facilities be staffed by ACS as we've heard here today rather than the DOC and that all staff working with youth be trained in therapeutic crisis intervention and other evidence based techniques to enable them to safely

and appropriately address the behavioral needs of
students in their care. Second, because most court
involved youth enter the facilities performing well
below grade level, we strongly recommend facilities
provide intensive research based remediation services
and extend schooling to 12 months to help students
catch up academically. And the data and our
experience also reflect the continued need to improve
educational transition planning for students leaving
juvenile detention and placement to ensure that youth
stay engaged in education and to reduce the
likelihood of recidivism. So we strongly recommend
that ACS, the DOE, and provider staff collaborate
with the family well in advance of the students
release from the facility to determine an appropriate
educational setting and supports upon their release
and then to follow up for several months afterwards.
Fourth, since court involved youth often have long
histories of disengagement from school, it's
imperative that schools educating a disproportionate
number of court involved students receive systemic
supports to meet the high needs of those schools. So
we call on the city council to urge the mayor to
include the following funding in the fiscal year 2019

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

executive budget; \$2.875 million per year for direct mental health supports and services for students using a medical model with coordination between schools and mental health providers as an evidence based alternative to disciplinary action in 20 high need schools in Brooklyn and the Bronx and a million per year for whole school training and support for school staff in high needs schools using the evidence based model of collaborative problem solving to help students with significant behavioral challenges and the staff that support them to resolve those problems in a skill building and collaborative way. So we look forward to working with you to ensure that court involved students are provided quality education in court ordered settings and upon their release. you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you.

MS. THOR-LESSER: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Karen Thor-Lesser and I'm here representing the Prospect Hill Foundation. The Prospect Hill Foundation is a New York based philanthropy founded by the Bineky(?) family more than 50 years ago. We promote the leadership of former incarcerated youth and their families and a

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

concept of justice that advances rehabilitation. Ιn December we spoke at the committee's last hearing on Raise the Age. Since that time we've become increasingly concerned about two main issues related to the implementation of Raise the Age. First it is important to remember that 16 and 17 year olds are children and should be treated as such. Juvenile facilities must be staffed exclusively by individuals focused on a rehabilitative approach. The United States government and the general public accept that children require different treatment with regards to things like smoking, enlisting in the military, and voting. We should also recognize that children require different treatment by detention and prison staff. Therefore, like Councilman Torres and virtually everyone in this room, we strongly object to having the staff of the New York City DOC inside New York Detention facilities for 16 and 17 year olds. While the mission of ACS is to serve children, the mission of DOC is custody and control. presence of DOC staff will bring the same harmful practices and abusive culture from the adult facilities on Reikers(?) into Ella McCann, Horizons, and Crossroads. Young adults who have spent time on

Reikers(?) also attest to the stark differences
between their treatment by DOC staff and the more
understanding treatment they receive from ACS staff
like Luis. Second, in keeping with the spirit of
Raise the Age, we strongly urge the city to expand
funding for programs for 16 and 17 year olds. The
Prospect Hill Foundation is fully committed to
supporting the city's efforts to implement Raise the
Age. We will continue to fund advocacy efforts and
community based alternatives but the city must also
do its part to make new funds available through ACS,
DOE, and DYCD to expand programs for youth.
Empirical and anecdotal evidence from formerly
incarcerated youth shows there are many excellent
cost effective community based programs in New York
City such as the ones here today like Community
Connections for Youth, Lineage Project, Exalt Youth,
and Youth Speakers Institute. And those programs car
reduce recidivism while supporting youth in education
and employment. However, it is simply impossible for
these programs to serve substantially more people
without a commensurate increase in funding. These
organizations much receive expanded contracts and
funding as part of the city's commitment to improving

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the way youth are served while they are detained and incarcerated. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Thank you.

MS. NAYAVEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Lizette Nayavez(?). I'm the Deputy Director of Programs at Community Connections for Youth. We are an organization whose mission is to empower grass roots faith and neighborhood organizations to develop effective community driven alternatives to incarceration for youth and while we are grateful for the Raise the Age legislation, let's be clear that our stance as an organization is that we believe in no kids in cages. The United States disproportionately incarcerates children at a capacity that is just ridiculous. We've had interns that come from Germany and Belgium and a young person who commits a crime at the age of 14 is not incarcerated, they're provided with services, imagine that. As a different reality but within the confines of Raise the Age, we are vehemently opposed to having DOC staff transplanted from Reikers (?) to Horizons. We are transplanting a culture that exists at Reikers (?). It's real. It's been documented and we have worked very closely with ACS to partner with the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

facility to transform the culture. We are in the intake unit when young people come in and these are not hardened criminals. We have 12 year olds, 13 year olds, 14 year olds who come in crying because they don't want to be jail. So it doesn't automatically change when they turn 16, 17. Like our previous panelists said, they are still children. are vehemently opposed and there shouldn't be. . . I think one of the council members was alluding to the fact that there is bureaucracy that's getting in the way of this transition and they're not focusing on who they need to focus on, the children. So it is clear that DOC staff are not equipped to work with children. So we are vehemently opposed to that and the other point that I want to address is that there needs to be more community involvement in this discussion. There needs to be community members. There needs to be young people, families, that are impacted by the justice system who are on every task force. There need to be conversations and CCFY is committed to facilitating those conversations where we have the stakeholders and the representatives, the judges, the city council people, the ACS workers, everyone who's involved in making these changes to

2.2

involve the community to hear our concerns. I think
this hearing is a good first step but there needs to
be more community conversations where the people who
are impacted at the frontline, who are our young
people, our families, need to be part of this
conversation.

CHAIRMAN KING: I agree. Thank you.

MS. PRISCO: Hi. My name is Gabrielle

Prisco. I'm the executive director of Lineage

Project. I want to thank the committee and its

leadership for this opportunity to testify. I want

to begin by reading a poem by a young man named Juan.

It was written while he was detained at Horizon

Juvenile Center. It's called Karma.

"Karma always knocks on your door. Kill him today and you close in the door. They curse their birth for fabrication. I make a line of separation. You care for clothes. I walk in Horizon rags in desperation. It sickened me their brain is mold. A younger body, mind of gold. Prepare for the future juv untold."

Lineage Project brings mindfulness

programs to incarcerated, homeless, and academically
vulnerable youth to help them manage stress, build

inner strength, and cultivate compassion. We also
work with the frontline staff of youth serving
organizations. We also lead Sonic Horizon which is a
ground breaking arts and mindfulness after school
program for young people detained at Horizon. It's
funded by DYCD. Under this contract we provide 12
plus hours of weekly programming serving about 300
youth a year and we subcontract with ten or more
community based organizations in consulting to
provide arts and mentorship like from Community
Connections from Youth and we provide our own
mindfulness classes. We bring kids drama, poetry,
beat making, film making, and a whole range of
beautiful and life changing programs that you can
read more about in our testimony. I'm here today
because as you've heard from other panelists to the
best of our knowledge, the city has not increased
funding for programs for youth in the justice system
despite the fact that the population is set to
exponentially increase on October 1. Given the Raise
the Age legislation and the mandate of moving kids
off Reikers(?), it's our understanding that by about
October 1, Horizon will be at capacity which is
roughly 106 young people which is an approximate 341%

change from the current approximate rough census of
24. The census varies at any time. I just want to
repeat that. It's an approximate 341% change yet our
contract for example, and those of other providers
have not been set to increase. In addition to the
dramatic increase just in the number of youth, the
341% increase, the programming must expand to meet
the diverse needs of the new populations. Because of
the legislative changes as you know the young people
being charged as adolescent offenders, young people
charged with juvenile offenses, young people charged
with juvenile delinquencies, young people coming off
of Reikers(?), kids of very different ages and
experience and socio-emotional learning literacy
levels, developmental stages and it's critical that
providers have funding to tailor programming to all
of these needs. In addition, and we've also heard
about the New York State regulations which are going
to set limits on which kids can and cannot be
programmed together, and that too will require that
there be an expansive amount of programming to stay
within compliance of the regulations. It's just
incredibly concerning that programming, which really
should be central to the creation of a system, not ar

afterthought, again, to the best of my knowledge,
there have been no contracts released to offer
programming to the young people once they come into
place. The contracts that are in place, to the best
of my knowledge, have not been increased and
programming provides a myriad of critical
educational, social, psychological benefits. It may
reduce recidivism and also programming reduces idle
time which is a well-established contributor to
incidents in youth serving institutions. As the city
prepares to engage in what is a historical
transformation and one that many of us in this room
have fought for many years to have these things
happen so I really want to be clear that we support
this transformation but it must be done in a planful
way with regard to thinking about young people's
needs about their development, about the programmatic
needs beyond that of just containment and custody.
So I have five recommendations that I'm going to say
very quickly because I heard the bell. The first is
that programming be a central part of the city's
planning process. The second is that the local
community based organizations that provide these
essential services be at the planning table to help

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

design programs to serve young people along with the families and community stakeholders that Lizette spoke about. The third is that robust funds are allocated to programs for all youth in the justice system, including the kids moving off of Reikers(?) and the 16 and 17 year olds. The fourth is that meaningful and effective programming be tailored to the unique needs of the populations within the city's justice system and we don't have a one size fits all approach. And the fifth is that programming is offered with enough frequency so that all eliqible young people can routinely participate and I can tell you right now that when we have incidents inside the facility it can be because young people feel that they're unfairly being denied programming that their peers have access too. In conclusion, I just also want to echo my colleagues concerns around not delaying the process of moving kids off Reikers (?) and on the DOC staffing, all of the very serious concerns that have been raised around the DOC culture and institution and the real brutal torture that has happened on Reikers (?) Island and ensuring that that isn't replicated in the youth justice system. you.

CHAIRMAN KING: I thank you all for your
testimony. I do have a comment/question and as I'm
hearing normal(?) folks saying about we need to make
sure whatever we put in place is stable. I'm also
hearing that we can't delay. I'm not sure if
delaying is the answer but if we're going to be doing
this and we're going to be, as a matter of fact, we
will be the first, biggest, largest city to do this,
then we have to be an example of getting it right.
So I'm saying to each and all of us who are saying
don't delay, don't delay. Like I say, I'm not
advocating delay but I want to make sure whatever we
establish that it makes sense because we talking
about five months out and you just brought to the
table that there are questions about programming that
hasn't even been brought to the table. They're still
trying to figure out how they're going to staff this.
They're still trying to figure out rules. They're
still trying to figure out locations in five months,
that's a lot of work to get done and I'm just saying
you know sometimes we can put pen to paper and say
let's do it, let's do it but how realistic can we do
something in the amount of time that's given.
Whatever they've done in the last year or haven't

done is having an impact and is going to have an
impact on the next five months. So while we're here
advocating for get it done, get it done, we just got
to make sure that when it does get done that those
young people that walk into the door don't get so
discouraged that they go into another frenzy and then
we have a whole host of new issues that we have to
deal with because we didn't have the system stable
enough when they walked in the door. Now they see a
brighter light than from the darkness that they just
came out of. So I wanted to give you that because
I'm hearing what you're saying and I want you to be a
part helping us continue to help the city figure this
out and when we do have the conversations,
specifically on Raise the Age, I'm looking forward to
seeing all of your faces again and many, many, many,
many, many, many, many, many, many, many, many, many,
many, many, many more. So thank you for your
testimony today. And the last of the Mohicans is
Janette Boganegra(?). How are you? Good to see you.
MS. BOGANEGRA: I feel like I need more

CHAIRMAN KING: I'll tell you what, I'll give you seven.

than four minutes so I'm going to sit in each chair.

MS. BOGANEGRA: Thank you. I didn't want
to speak today. I think I spoke enough since 2010
when my youngest son introduced me to the system. So
I had to bring the voice of a parent. I'm here also
as a director of family engagement for Community
Connections for Youth and if you look at our website,
we were able to create a strong family engagement
portfolio for the families that have been impacted by
the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice
system, the child welfare system. I came in as a
lost parent. Not understanding the language even
though I did much community work for a non-profit
organization working with families in the public
school. I was able to help parents, train parents,
parent coordinators, members of a school leadership
team, help parents understand IEPs. I understood
that but when my youngest son, out of six, introduced
me to the system, the first thing I was embarrassed.
I was embarrassed because it was not something in my
home. But I was hungry to learn while sitting at
Horizon, who is working with families understand
these systems. If I speak two languages and I'm
lost, I could just imagine a parent that only speaks
Spanish or a parent from Africa that doesn't speak

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

English. So I decided to make this my passion. work with families. Children don't need to be locked up. Opportunities and we heard questions about what's going on with education. We're not funding public schools properly. I heard about mental health, the wellness of a young person, there's no consistency when a young person returns from placement to follow up. Reikers(?) became a nightmare when I had to step my foot into Reikers (?). I felt like I committed a crime and speaking about closing facilities upstate which Close to Home came very strong. I was part of Close to Home. Raising the Age I spoke about the things that were happening to young people in the custody of adults that are supposed to care for them. But if I do those things that are being done to these kids in Reikers(?) I'll be arrested for child abuse. When going upstate to talk about Raise the Age, I heard folks that profit from the prison system and their jobs are keeping our kids locked up, let's keep it real. The kids that are being locked up are the kids that look like us. Children across boarders commit the same mistakes but they don't treat those kids the same way as they treat our kids. So let's be real. Racism exists.

And I heard those folks say well are we going to put
the sharks with the guppies and I said you didn't
think about putting the guppies with the sharks when
you sent our kids to the adult system and the more
families that I work with and the more young people
that I support and even visit in facilities, they
have no business in there. I think I've been very
fortunate that at one point I got to work with
everyone that spoke in all these groups. Gabrielle,
what you're doing is amazing. Continue doing the
work, don't give up on our kids. Beth, like I could
go on and go on like everyone here I want to thank
you for embracing me and learning about this work and
it became a passion for me. Councilman King, it is
your responsibility to make sure that our kids are
better today than they were yesterday. Council
Member Jamal spoke about the system is doing what it
was created to do. So we need to demolish this
[beep]. The system is doing exactly what it was
created to do and I learned that it's a modern day
slavery because they take away so many rights from
our young people and families. Families care about
their kids but families feel also like there's so
many systems that aren't really supporting them. We

need to build stronger communities, support families,
and it's really about the money, invest in our
communities. Every time I walk out the door all I
see is the deli, the chicken spot, the beauty salon,
the nail salon, the check cashing place, the liquor
store. You walk another block it's the same
business. I want to see yoga programs in my
community. I want to see art centers in my
community. I want to see youth groups in my
community. I want to see some of your young people
coming and mentoring our young people. This can be
done but it's also about the money. Put some of that
money back in the community. Invest in our kids and
our families. I always say you can't help the kid
unless you support the family. You can't support the
family unless you're embracing the kid. So I think
I'm saying the blank, thank you for not cutting me
off but we also have families here that have been
impacted by the criminal justice system and their
kids have no business being locked up. They need to
be in a school, learning a trade or ready to go to
college. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KING: Well, what a way to close out our first hearing on juvenile justice committee

for 2018. I want to thank everyone who came out
today to educate each other and educate the public
and those who were watching on TV of what we're
talking about, how we're going to improve the lives,
more importantly correct the system that does have a
lot of flaws and we need to make sure that we hold
them to the fire and let them know that we won't
tolerate the missteps and the mishaps but stand
together united to correct those mishaps to save a
life, to save a family. You have a commitment from
this committee that we will do all that we can to
have the right conversations and the real
conversations as difficult as it might be and
uncomfortable for some of us but in order for us to
recover we have to uncover it first. So I thank you
all for coming out today and this adjourns our first
committee meeting on juvenile justice. Thank you.

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

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



Date March 21, 2018