CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION 2019

----- X

MAY 14, 2019 Start: 6:05 p.m. Recess: 8:21 p.m.

HELD AT: COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND

B E F O R E: GAIL BENJAMIN, CHAIRPERSON

COMMISSIONERS: SAL ALBANESE

DR. LILLIAM BARRIOS-PAOLI

LISETTE CAMILO JAMES CARAS

EDUARDO CORDERO SR.

STEPHEN FIALA
PAULA GAVIN
LINDSAY GREENE
ALISON HIRSH

REV. CLINTON MILLER

SATEESH NORI MERRYL TISCH SATEESH NORI MERRYL TISCH JAMES VACCA CARL WEISBROD A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

JACK NOLAND,

JOSEPH PENNARONO[SP?], small business advocate

ANDREA GONZALES, Latina activist

TOWSA FASAN, New York Public Interest Research Group, NYPIRG

DIANE SIGNORELLI, Concerned resident

JOE BORELLI, Councilman

ANDREW SMITH, AFSCME

STEPHANIE CASTRO, Student Civilian for police accountability

HEATHER QUICK[SP?], Campaign for an
Elected Civilian Review Board

SISTER SHIRLEY, Forgotten Borough of Staten Island

TERESA FENGINE[SP?], New York Immigration Coalition

MIKE HARE, in favor of an elected Civilian Review Board

FRANK MURANO, Staten Island resident James Lane, Green Party

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

CANDACE CARPENTOR, Green Party

EMMA ALABASTER, Lifelong New Yorkers

LEO FERGUSON, Jew for Racial and Economic Justice and Communities United for Police Reform

MATT BRAYLOW, concerned resident

PATRICIA OKOUMOU, climbed Statue of Liberty

JAY ARENA, Associate Professor of Sociology here at the college of Staten Island, City University of New York

Good evening and welcome to tonight's meeting of the 2019 New York City Charter Revision Commission. I'm Gail Benjamin, the Chair of the Commission, I am joined by the following Commission members: The honorable Sal Albanese, the honorable Jim Caras, the honorable Stephen Fiala, the honorable Paula Gavin, the honorable Alison Hirsh, the honorable Sateesh Nori, and the honorable Carl Weisbrod.

With these members present, we have a quorum.

Before we begin, I will entertain a motion to adopt
the minutes of the Commissions hearing held on May

9th at City Hall. A copy of which has been provided
to all of the Commissioners. Do I hear a motion?

Second? Discussion? All of those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Opposed? The motion carries.

Tonight, we conclude our second round of public hearings throughout the five boroughs in order to solicit feedback from the public on proposals the Commission is considering for changes to the New York City Charter.

2.2

As I have emphasized throughout our public meetings as the city's foundational governing document, the Charter plays a vitally important role in establishing the structures and processes of City Government which in turn effect many aspects of our lives.

It has been our task to evaluate how the current Charter has performed since it was largely put into place in 1989 and to identify areas in which improvements may be made in order to best serve the city for the next 30 years.

At our first round of public hearings in September as well as through engagement online and in person, we have received hundreds of suggestions for changes.

The Commission ultimately adopted a set of focus areas which outlined those ideas which we decided to pursue further and then held a series of expert forums at which we were able to hear from a wide array of people knowledgably in those areas.

Following that months process, the Commission Staff issued a preliminary staff report containing recommendations regarding those proposals which they feel merit further consideration for presentation to

2.2

the voters on the ballot this November. The staff report is what brings us here today. We look forward to hearing your comments about any recommendations in the report that you support or oppose or ideas you may have for how best to craft any specific proposal. Than, following testimony for the public, we will have some time to open the floor to the Commissioners, so that we may discuss with each other the ideas and recommendations that have been raised.

Now, we will begin the public testimony.

If you wish to testify and have not yet done so,

please fill out a speakers slip and submitted it to

staff. We will limit testimony to three minutes per

individual in order to ensure that we can hear from

everyone who wishes to speak.

After you testify, members of the Commission may have questions for you to follow up on your ideas. If you have copies of written testimony that you would like to submit, please hand them to staff when you are called up to speak. We will also accept written testimony via email until May 24th. Our email address is info@charter2019.nyc. And as before for those of you who have been here before and those who have not, I would like to run this hearing

2.2

with a maximum of good manners and if you have a reaction to something somebody is saying, I would appreciate it if you use jazz hands instead of wooing, booing, hissing, or applauding. If you want to indicate you are not in favor, if you do the opposite with your jazz hands, we can see you and we will know your reaction to what is being said.

With that, I am going to call up the first panel; Jack Noland, Joseph Pennarono[SP?], Andrea Gonzales, Towsa Fasan[SP?]. We need a fourth chair.

We will start with Mr. Noland.

JACK NOLAND: May I begin?

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Yes.

JACK NOLAND: Good evening. My name is

Jack Noland. I testified at the start of this round
of public hearings two weeks ago in Queens and I am

very thankful to have the opportunity now at the

final hearing to again, lend my support for RankedChoice Voting in New York City elections and I have

paper copies this time.

I want to take the time to thank all of you serving on the Commission and all the Commission

2.2

2 Staff for your essential work to improve our government and our City.

At its heart, the way we elect our officials is essential to the way our government functions. This Commission has the almost unprecedented opportunity to present voters with a bold reform prime to address a number of the issues we face in that space right now. We are lucky in a sense that deficiencies with our elections are so clear. For example, since 2009, when more than two candidates have run municipal primaries, the winner is advanced with less than 50 percent of the vote almost two-thirds of the time.

In seven percent of multi-candidate primaries, we saw candidates win with less than 30 percent of the vote. The democratic runoff for public advocate in 2013, saw just 7 percent turnout and a \$10.4 million price tag. That's more than \$50 per vote cast.

As you know, Ranked-Choice voting has been — thank you so much. As you know, Ranked-Choice voting has not been raised to gird against hypothetical issues. These are problems that we have grappled with for awhile and ones that we will likely

2.2

face again especially in a year like 2021. Seventy percent of our City Council seats will be open along with the Mayor and Comptrollers offices. Here on Staten Island as you know, open races for Borough President and two of the three City Council seats.

We know New Yorkers want to throw their hats in the ring. This year's special election for Public Advocate should be our guide and that's a good problem to have, but one reason Public Advocate Williams just elected under the current system has spoken out in favor of Ranked-Choice voting is that a majority winner is good for voters and officials alike.

Let's give office holders a clear mandate and the public the right to feel represented.

Building a broader base means building a stronger constituency and it increases the incentives to run civil issues-oriented campaigns.

And voters feeling truly heard in our political process. It's crucial to our system functioning properly. Accountability depends on representation. That's why I am here tonight speaking to you and it is something we can truly offer to New Yorkers with Ranked-Choice voting. We

2.2

have the opportunity to learn from election administrators around the country who have successfully implemented RCV and I will encourage you to continue to reach out to them by allowing voters to Rank a slate of candidates, at least five. In all our city elections, we can greatly reduce ballot exhaustion, increase representation, eliminate costly runoffs, ensure broader support for the officials taking office and eliminate the spoiler effect. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much Mr. Noland. The next speaker is Joe.

JOSEPH PENNARONO: Hi, how are you? Hang on a second please. Good evening, this is Joseph Pennarono. I am a small business advocate. I am a small businessman myself, but I am also very involved in the political process. I am involved in the Staten Island republican party. You know, unfortunately, you know, I don't feel that we are properly representing Staten Island. Although we have a great Borough President who is doing a fantastic job, Jimmy Oddo. You know, he doesn't have enough power to advocate for our borough. Although this might not be raised tonight as an important

2.2

issue, this should be put on your mind because you know, many, many years ago, you said this body equal the board of estimate. In which there will be one Borough President for each borough and although obviously, there will be four democrats and on republican, the republican would have a strong influence on this legislative board or governmental board.

Although it was found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, I don't remember the exact ruling specifically.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: The Board wasn't unconstitutional; the voting structure of the board was unconstitutional.

JOSEPH PENNARONO: Exactly, that's what I am referring to but I want to find a way that we could be able to bring that back so we can have fair representation in City Hall, so that way the Borough President could have more influence because currently there are two roles of the Borough President, the first role is to appoint Community Board members. That's number one and to handle zoning issues. Those are the two important roles of the Borough President. I think we should have a third role for them, in

2.2

which they could be able to represent the people more properly. And not only that, the Public Advocate should have a stronger role.

Now, the Public Advocate does have a role in which the Public Advocate does have some oversight over the Mayor, which unfortunately, this time around, we have a Mayor who does not have the best interest of all the people at heart, especially right here in our hometown of Staten Island with his high taxation, over regulation, and an emirate of other problems that he is causing the city.

The Public Advocate is not really going to oversee the Mayor and I think that we should change the Public Advocate position to a nonpartisan, non-party affiliated position in that manner.

That's another thing, although we had a non-partisan election the last time, I think it should be all non-partisan elections and I think it should be a no party affiliation public advocate because the public advocate should be representing 100 percent of the people and not just those in his own party. So, if we could find a way to be able to implement that, that would be a great idea because unfortunately the public advocate will not hold this

2.2

Mayor accountable. Especially the current one, who has a very long voting history and the City Council with Bill de Blasio and with Bill de Blasio's policies.

So, I think we should have more accountability in government. I think we should have you know, more power to the Borough Presidents, especially the local officials in Staten Island and more power to the Office of Public Advocate and more non-partisanship, especially with the Office of Public Advocate or a citywide office that would hold the Mayor accountable. Because, if you think about it, although the Supreme Court and the United States and other oversight bodies and judicial bodies are considered to be non-partisan technically speaking. They do have party registrations and I think that we should treat the Public Advocates Office as a non-partisan type of an office.

So, if you could find a way to get that arranged, that would be a fantastic thing to do.

Thank you so much. Have a great night.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much Joe. The next speaker is Andrea Gonzales.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2 ANDREA GONZALES: Good evening everyone.

3 My name Andrea Gonzales. I am an indigenous Latina activist and a Staten Islander since the age of two.

Before I begin my testimony, I would like to thank Communities United for police reform and girls gender equity for the opportunity to speak about my experiences.

As we all know, we have a large population of police officers living on Staten Island. They are members of our community and we as a community need to hold everyone accountable.

We are here today to discuss proposed revisions of the City Charter. Specifically, to recommend changes that would increase safety for all New Yorkers by holding all community members accountable for their actions. More and more often on the news, we are seeing cases where police officers are using extreme forms of violence against community members and we know that these cases are only the tip of the iceberg and there are more day to day interactions with officers that dehumanize our communities. Many of these interactions lead to a traumatization and lead to death often.

24

2.2

We suggest that in these cases of misconduct, the Civilian Complaint Review Board also known as the CCRB will be able to determine the discipline in the cases that they prosecute and to include related misconduct.

Currently, the Commissioner gets to decide the discipline which allows for corruption and the obstruction of justice.

We also believe that in cases where the Commissioner does deviate from recommended discipline, the Commissioner should be required to make a publicly available statement that explains his reasonings for deviation.

Another measure that would increase transparency and accountability is that the CCRB would have oversight over Peace Officers, which includes school safety agents within the Charter. In cases in which students have negative experiences with school safety agents, the CCRB would be unable to investigate. Therefore, we need to include language that includes all Peace Officers who we interact with more often.

Students within our public education system depend on this change. There are more school

2.2

safety agents in schools than social workers which result in police interactions when they are not necessary.

Police presence in New York City public schools often traumatize students and they make them feel criminalized an unsafe in their school environments, which are meant to be safe spaces.

I have been in public school since kindergarten and I know firsthand the impact of police officers. My younger sister is still in public school system and deserves to learn in an environment where all safety agents are held accountable for any misconduct.

In order to have a just and safe society, we must strive to hold all members of our city accountable. There is no one above the law and these recommendations enforce that belief.

Community members should be able to feel safe in their homes and in their streets at all times and by holding those who enforce the law accountable, we can protect everyone better. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much Ms. Gonzales. The fourth speaker is Mr. Fasan.

2.2

everyone. My name is Towsa Fasan and I am the Civic Engagement Coordinator at the New York Public Interest Research Group, NYPIRG for short. NYPIRG is a statewide non-partisan not-for-profit research and public education organization. We appreciate this opportunity to share our thoughts on a number of the proposed revisions and we are responding specifically to the 2019 Staff Report. We wrote a very thorough written report. I am just going to give the abbreviated version. Thank you so much for this opportunity.

So, first, I am going to talk about

Ranked-Choice Voting. Ranked-Choice Voting all over
the country in places where it has been implemented,
we are seeing the highest voter turnout that these
places have experienced in years.

There are many theories for why Ranked-Choice Voting encourages voter turnout and one idea is the concept of ballot expression and voter anxiety.

In a multi-candidate race with an all or nothing ballot, some voters find it so difficult to decide who to cast their vote for, but often they

2.2

just don't vote out of frustration. Perhaps they believe one candidate is more aligned with their beliefs, while they believe another candidate is a compromise who is more likely to win. RCV allows voters to express the nuance of their political beliefs much more completely and voters respond well to a system that makes it feel like they are being heard. Rather than being forced to vote strategically, people can vote conscience without feeling like they are throwing their vote away.

NYPIRG supports the institution of Ranked-Choice Voting in primary elections and municipal offices.

Next, special elections, the Board of Elections has testified that currently they don't have enough time to set up for a special election. This may increase the likelihood of lower voter turnout and technical issues allowing the Board of Elections to sufficiently prepare for a special election makes sense unifying the state and city timeline, they also create efficiencies for special elections which occur at similar times for multiple levels of government.

We also want to talk about the redistricting process. So, there is going to be a

2.2

new redistricting process pretty soon and we urge measures that make it more transparent and has more community input. We want to respond to the staff report which wanted to shift the redistricting timeline to provide council candidates with their traditional petition period. We agree with the suggestion, but we also urge the Commission to consider other changes that would increase transparency and community input.

that the Mayor with the consent of the Council, choses the board members of an ethics watchdog with jurisdiction over those same individuals. NYPIRG urges additional steps to ensure the board members independence. The first step would be to guarantee a budget for the COIB. Otherwise, they can just be defunded or underfunded by the very offices they are supposed to watchdog and the second recommendation that we make is to change the structure so that in addition to the public advocate and comptroller getting appointment authority, NYPIRG urges that the Commission explore ways in which the COIB appointment powers be redistributed so that the Mayor does not have majority appointment.

2.2

evening.

There is a lot more that I wanted to

cover but it's all in the written testimony. Thank

you, guys, so much for your time and have a great

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much. Stephen Fiala, I know you have a question and Paula.

STEPHEN FIALA: Quick, let me thank all of you. You are all very, very eloquent.

organizations that address Ranked-Choice Voting, represent us and NYPIRG. We've heard a lot of testimony in favor of Ranked-Choice voting but where there is a divergence of viewpoints is when you get to the number. How many people. You have heard about voter fatigue or voter exhaustion. You may have said it, I didn't catch it in the testimony, is there a magic number? Would you allow voters to rank as many candidates are running or would you limit it to a specific number and if so, what is that number and what is the rational for that?

TOWSA FASAN: So, NYPIRG does not have a position on how many choices voters should get when they make their preferences. There is a lot of data

2 out there. A lot of good practices in other areas

3 which have already instituted this. So, our

4 direction would really be, look at what they have

5 done.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

there.

So, maybe they have done five and that works really well and maybe they have done ten and that works really well. There is just a lot of data out there because this has been implemented in other places, so I would just suggest that the staff look at these numbers and arrive at best practices from

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you, Paula. Oh, I am sorry.

JACK NOLAND: And I would largely echo that point. I think that the best way to approach this is by sort of deep discussion and consultation with the Election Administrators that have done this in the past. Our feeling is generally that at least five will probably be the best way to sort of control for ballot exhaustion while still allowing for representation.

23 STEPHEN FIALA: Thank you very much.

JACK NOLAND: Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Paula.

2.2

PAULA GAVIN: Thank you. Again, I want to thank you all for being here and I wanted to also ask a question on Ranked-Choice Voting and really, it's about voter turnout and what other actions we should take associated with Ranked-Choice Voting to really ensure that voters do come out and vote, because that is the goal.

JACK NOLAND: I could start with this one.

I think that any sort of Ranked-Choice Voting implementation is going to require pretty substantial voter education plan and so, part of that is educating voters on what their ballot is going to look like. What the process of ranking candidates will look like and I think that's how we can mitigate some of the concerns and then also, get people excited.

JOSEPH PENNARONO: Although I didn't bring this up tonight, you know, I am in the marketing business and I can help with that in that aspect and you know, explainer videos, which I know that the CFB does that, but they don't push it enough in terms of adds. I can help you guys in terms of doing that. So, I would be glad to speak with one of

2.2

2 you regarding that issue, in terms of getting voters
3 out to vote.

echo the point that voter education is definitely necessary, but it is not it's not a very difficult barrier to surpass. I think people intuitively make lists and preferences for really everything without even realizing it, so asking them to do that when they vote is really a no brainer. I wanted to mention in my testimony that voter turnout is especially a problem for New York City. Our last election, we had a turn out of 38 percent and outside the city, it was closer to 50 percent. So, it's the city bringing down the average.

So, Ranked-Choice voting as a tool to increase voter turnout, I think is pretty powerful. People feel way more engaged when they are asked about their preferences rather than, do you like one candidate, or do you like another candidate? I mean, just to list like another silly example, listicle's are just very popular right now. I think people are much more engaged with the idea, list your candidates in order, than they are chose one candidate and just discard the rest.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: You don't get to ask him on the record, I am sorry. Alison, you were next.

ALISON HIRSH: Yes, just a follow up on Ranked-Choice Voting, one of the challenges that folks have raised that I've thought a lot about in terms of voter education is that there are going to be times when we have a local city election on the ballot at the same time there is a state or federal election on the ballot that we can't require to be Ranked-Choice Voting. And so, how do you navigate two different types of voting structures in the same ballot?

JACK NOLAND: I forget the examples off the top of my head, but this is not a theoretical problem. There are places where RCV is instituted at the municipal level but not at the state level. Once again, I would just say do the research, there are best practices. There are clerks who have had to deal with this problem already, but it just seems like every single time you implement RCV, the results seem to be all pointing in a very positive direction, so just replicating the steps that they took to figure out those positive results is what I would do.

2.2

Even the idea of creating a bifurcated ballot where you have the municipal elections on one side and the state elections on the other side. Some clerks have just done that, and it really doesn't seem like that's a problem.

ALISON HIRSH: Great thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Sal

SAL ALBANESE: This is for NYPIRG. I couldn't agree with you more that we need to enhance the independence of the redistricting process and I have got my own proposals around that issues. But I am puzzled by NYPIRG's recommendation at the Campaign Finance Board, be the entity that points some members to that commission. Who do you think appoints the members of the Campaign Finance Board?

TOWSA FASAN: I am not sure.

SAL ALBANESE: It's the City Council and the Mayor that appoint those folks. So, that would hardly be a buffer in my opinion, and I would ask you if you studied other proposals for enhancing the independence of the redistricting process?

TOWSA FASAN: Yeah, I would defer because I personally deferred when writing the section on redistricting, but in addition to that

2.2

recommendation, other things that we put in our written testimony and I think that this is something that you guys can relate to, public hearings and public meetings with targeted outreach with community leaders and having them really get involved in the redistricting process is very key.

We have a lot of elected representatives and a lot of city office holders whose job it is to figure out the redistricting process but really getting the people who are going to be effected by this more involved by doing that kind of outreach and getting them in the same room and just getting some kind of input from them, I think is very key.

SAL ALBANESE: Have you looked at other proposals, what California does and what some other states do where they actually elect citizens to the redistricting commission through a process that obviously vets people, but those citizens tend to be — they are not elected officials, they are not related to elected officials, they are not appointed by elected officials. It is truly an independent process. Has NYPIRG looked at that at all?

TOWSA FASAN: I am not sure. I remember when I was sitting in for other Charter Revision

2.2

Commission hearings that that process did seem familiar. It definitely seem amenable with the suggestions that we are making getting regular voters more involved is always a good thing.

I can't say that that's our position, but it definitely sounds like an idea that NYPIRG would be amendable to.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Okay, thank you very much. Carl.

CARL WEISBROD: Yes, thank you and thank you to all of you. I have a question about Ranked-Choice Voting and voter education. Would you favor a phase in of Ranked-Choice Voting to cover for certain offices and later others to first phase it in for primaries and then general elections given the need for voter education and the substantial number of elections and races that we have in a municipal election year? Do you think it all should be phased in at one time?

JACK NOLAND: Personally, I think that passing Ranked-Choice Voting in 2019 on the ballot for the 2021 municipal election would give us fairly substantial time to do that voter education. I understand your concern. Personally, I think the

2.2

uniformity of having all of these offices sort of roll out at the same time in a coordinated voter education effort would be probably for the best.

TOWSA FASAN: Yeah, I would agree with that point. I am not aware of any situation where RCV has been implemented and then you get the situation where the first election with RCV is just a huge disaster and then afterward they kind of start getting used to it. It seems like after RCV is implemented, voters are pretty savvy. They understand, okay, I am ranking my candidates instead of just choosing one. So, I don't think that it is necessary to answer you're question. I think that if implemented, RCV would be a very successful program in the city.

CARL WEISBROD: And just to follow up on that. I am assuming that you believe that Ranked-Choice Voting should apply to all municipal elections. Council members elections as well as citywide elections? Primaries as well as general elections.

TOWSA FASAN: NIPIRG's position is just for the primary and our position is just for municipal offices.

1	CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION 2019 29
2	CARL WEISBROD: Well, clearly, we only
3	have the power to implement this in municipal
4	offices, but just to be clear, your position is only
5	for primaries?
6	TOWSA FASAN: That is NYPIRG's position,
7	correct.
8	CARL WEISBROD: But for all municipal
9	offices including council elections as well citywide
LO	elections?
L1	TOWSA FASAN: That is correct.
L2	CARL WEISBROD: Thank you.
L3	CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: With that, I
L 4	think, oh, I am sorry, Paula.
L5	PAULA GAVIN: Thank you. I wanted to ask
L 6	Mr. Gonzales a question about neighborhood policing
L 7	and whether you have seen a difference since
L8	neighborhood policing has been implemented in your
L 9	community?
20	ANDREA GONZALES: Yeah, I personally
21	still haven't seen much of a difference. I still
22	feel rather unsafe in my community. I think that
23	there still needs to be serious reform done with the
24	CCRB. So, I can feel that someone is out there

making sure that these actions committed by just any

2.1

2.2

kind of officer — they are being held accountable. I know that I will hopefully get my justice if this is reformed.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Okay, I'd like to thank the panel. We appreciate your coming and speaking and we have your written testimony. I believe there is one person who did not have written testimony, if you want to submit it later, that would be great. Thank you very much.

The next panel will be Diane Signorelli, okay, Councilman Joe Borelli, Andrew Smith, and Stephanie Castro. Council Member.

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: Well, hi
everybody, welcome to Staten Island. I am happy to
see two of my constituents, Steve and Sal
Commissioners, thank you very much.

While there is a large number of issues,

I would like to comment on regarding the City

Charter, I'd like to speak primarily about the role

of Public Advocate.

Unexpectedly, I found myself running for this office and have had the opportunity to somewhat study the powers and responsibilities of the office which took about 90 seconds.

2.2

As you know, the job of Public Advocate as it is currently constituted is largely to make sure the Mayor is alive and breathing and certainly a task, I am more than up for.

While that might take up most of the Public Advocates day, the rest is generally spent breaking all sorts of ties that the City Council may have. Certainly, there hasn't been one in my tenure. Gail, you would know better than me. I don't remember ever there being a tie in a 51-seat body.

Not only is the Public Advocate a tremendous waste of taxpayer money, because again, the office can't do anything with any of the complaints that it receives. But when one adds the substantial costs to the taxpayers of eight to one matching funds which cost about \$8 million. This February, the election cost \$15 million, we'll probably spend \$40 million just this year to elect an office with no power but a budget of \$3.8 million; that neither here nor there.

For these reasons, I am urging the Commission to go in one of two directions. Either give the office some real authority or to abolish it entirely.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Based on the recommendations of the preliminary staff report, it seems that you all thankfully are inclined to do the former and give it some power. Now, in addition to the subpoena power, which is a positive step, I would also offer the following changes. First, we should be able to openly say how absurd it is that the Mayor was able to fire a Commissioner who was tasked with investigating his agency. And I won't get into the merits of whether or not he should have fired DOI Commissioner Peters, but the mere fact that the Mayor has the authority to fire the one person whose task, the only task, is to investigate corruption within his administration, is something that could easily be remedied by putting the powers of the Department of Investigation under the purview of the Public Advocate.

It is very tough for s Public Advocate to be corrupt. You can't have quid's without any pro quo's and like I said before, the Public Advocate has no real authority. It would therefore be a better place for the DOI's power to originate.

In order to make sure the PA job is actually meaningful; we should also give him or her

2 appointments on the Boards and Commissions that

3 actually have more of a bearing on our lives in many

4 ways than the actual City Council perhaps. We are

5 | talking about the boards of NYCHA, the Taxi and

6 Limousine Commission, the Water Board, Conflict of

7 Interest Board, Civil Service Commission, ECB, HAC,

8 | Landmarks, BSA, the whole thing. PA has an

9 appointment on the City Planning Commission as you

10 know, but if that is good, why not expand it to have

11 an elective representative on some of these boards.

Can I have some more time folks? Thank

13 you.

12

14

15

25

1

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Don't take advantage though.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: No, I won't. I

17 realize it would take some state law, but as part of

18 your Commission Report, it would be beneficial to

19 even urge that one of the MTA appointments be given

20 to the Public Advocate. I think and I think many

21 people in the audience would agree. Having at least

one person directly accountable to the taxpayers on

23 the MTA Board would only serve the public in a better

24 capacity than just the hegemony essentially that the

Governor now has.

2.2

And finally, if there is no effort to improve the office or give it any power, than I would suggest making another one of the positions, one of the positions that actually has some authority over some government policy; whether it the comptroller or the speaker, or even a deputy Mayor for argument sake, the actual next in line of succession should the Mayor be incapacitated in any way.

And lastly, I wanted to speak just about the Public Advocate. I just want to say with respect to the Civilian Complaint Review Board, the Police Department in this City are doing an outstanding and tremendous job and they are what keeps our city from devolving into a chaotic mess that we have seen in the past. I think the vilification of cops is something which is just appalling and upsetting and while I certainly admit there are certain bad apples in the NYPD, there are already a Marianne of disciplinary actions that they face.

If the Mayor is doing a bad job and the Police Commissioner who you appointed is doing a bad job, you have one solution and I think that is to reelect the Mayor and thank you very much.

2.2

DIANE SIGNORELLI: Hi, my name is Diane Signorelli. I have come before you and you all look very handsome and beautiful.

I am so sorry I have to do this. Ten years, I have been assaulted three times. I have been sexually assaulted and physically assaulted in Mass. 331 19 and Saint Patrick's Church with three female police officers behind me, I tried everything in my power to get help.

I did everything I was taught for the past ten years because since the first assault, when I was assaulted in 2010, the neighbor next door was a union boss and paid off the police officer who retired. Then the second police officer got involved, was paid off by Homers Association. They kept giving me fines but the crazy woman next door whose husband assaulted me, then she assaults me. I go to the precinct for help, I get told to leave. I went to Puerto Rico, I come back, I get arrested because they keep calling 911 on me. I am not even home. This is disgusting, what has been going on. I got assaulted again. I have MRY reports. I went to

2.2

the one, two, three precinct where these people live, it didn't matter. The woman police officer told me the fourth time I get assaulted; they will arrest the person. Then I went to Richmond, to get x-rays of all my damages, they decided to put me in a psych ward from eight o'clock to two o'clock. Of course, they did drug tests. So, now, I would like my priest to be drug tested and him mentally evaluated.

I go to church every day, now I am having a problem going to mass. See this book, I did foil, I did CCRB, I did IOGNYPD, I did New York State Commission of Human Rights. I did the Integrity Division of the Attorney General and you know who helped me? Not one republican in Staten Island.

Mayor de Blasio and his staff, those wonderful people for the past two years, they coddled me. I have been asking Republicans, they laugh at me. I have court transparency, I have court transcripts, that my own attorney is telling me he is on drugs when he spoke to the judge. They named the police officer. I paid for the transcripts, they thumbed it out, the cops name.

My attorneys have my money \$10,000 in escrow. I did all of the court paperwork myself,

2.2

thanks to this man named Joe down at the Court House in Alamo. If it wasn't for him, everything I wrote, everything I did, and I don't want to be a lawyer anymore. I want to be a real estate broker. But it is hard because they black balled me. I can't even get a job; I am on disability. Now, they are telling me I need to go back to the one, two, two. When I went to them, when they told me, after they tried to put me in the psych ward, the officers were very rude, and it just so happened that CCRB was there and this is the paper from CCRB. They are not doing anything. Nobody does anything.

why is this CCRB goes to IAB and you get nothing? I have a book here that goes to 2010, this is criminal. I come from a law enforcement family and for me, this is the hardest thing for me to do. But I want you all to know, April the 10th, I was at the Retirement ceremony at one police plaza and I was so happy and proud of all of those policeman and their families and that day, when I saw all the high rankers, I was happy for them and I didn't think of the corruption. But look at me, here I am again, and I want it to stop. I want them to be held accountable. I want my priest to hand over the

paperwork, because I sent him something that said

that he needs to preserve the audio proof and I guess

it's who you know, that I am not getting any help.

Ten years.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Ms.

7 Signorelli.

2.2

DIANE SIGNORELLI: I am sorry.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: It's okay, I understand.

DIANE SIGNORELLI: I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Take a

minute.

The next speaker is Andrew Smith. You can just move the microphone; you don't have to move the whole stand.

ANDREW SMITH: Thank you Madam Chair. My name is Andrew Smith. I am an AFSCME shop steward in DC 37's Local 1503. I speak to you tonight as a union activist and in support of the proposal for an elected civilian review board. I want to begin by telling you what some unions are doing about police violence.

In recent years, the International

Longshore and Warehouse Union filed a lawsuit to stop

2.2

police violence. Here in New York, DC 37's Local 375 organized a demonstration that 450 participants to protest police violence. A Chicago teachers union supported a proposal for an elected police accountability council.

My own local 1503 of DC 37, voted by an overwhelming majority to support an elected civilian review board. Local 1503 also donated \$1,000 to the campaign for an elected civilian review board. I assure you it is a lot of money for us. We are very conscious of where our dues money comes from and where it goes. In this case, to printing the brochures and posters you see in the hall here tonight and I've seen in all of your hearings this year.

Police accountability is a union issue, because we are among those targeted by police and we want it to stop.

Unions in New York are diverse, much more than people generally think. We are made up for the most part of racial, ethnic, and national minorities as our source of strength and solidarity.

Unfortunately, it means that most of our members and their families and their communities are vulnerable

2.2

2 to police violence. We thus have a deeply personal 3 reason to demand accountability.

There is also a historical reason. We know that any day bosses can call the police to bust our organizing to break up our strikes and other demonstrations of workers power. And even if nowadays police presence is generally there to keep us in line, we know that in the past they have broken demonstrations with arms, indiscriminately shooting down dozens of unionists at a time.

As at the Haymarket Riot, the level of massacre, the Homestead Strike, the Pullman walkout, the Colorado Labor wars. We know about this history; we know that there are armed and dangerous and we know that ultimately, they are not on our side.

So, we have good reason to use our power to push for greater accountability. I urge the Commission to put the proposal for an elected civilian review board on the ballot for this November. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much Mr. Smith. Ms. Castro.

STEPHANIE CASTRO: Good evening, my name is Stephanie Castro. I am a student and a civilian

2.2

fighting for the right to hold the police accountable for what they are doing. I have gone to two hearings and when I hear a member speaking up, every commissioner here stays quite. And let me tell you something, it makes me angry because not only am I a young Latino woman, but I am a woman who grew up her whole life in the hood.

Let me tell you, the amount of police misconduct that happens is ridiculous and they get away with it, and they do not get accounted for.

Look at what happened to Everett Gardner and nothing was done in 2014 until now. It is time for change.

It is time to hold police accountable.

Last week, one Commissioner said, having an Elect Civilian Board will not work and will fail, how would a civilian solve anything? Let me tell you, having a person who is elected by their peers will remove the bias. They will look into the situation and would not be biased against people of color and when I mean people of color, I mean Black, Latinos, Middle Eastern Asians and etc. Versus someone who is appointed by major politicians in this city who are biased against people of color and are more towards the police and ignore the fact that most

2.2

of them go against protocol and do what they please.

It is time for change to happen and listen to what

4 people have to say for once and have an elected

5 Civilian Review Board. Thank you for hearing me out.

6 CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you 7 very much Ms. Castro.

STEPHANIE CASTRO: Thank you, God bless you.

 $\label{eq:chairperson gail benjamin: Alison and the Steve.}$

ALISON HIRSH: I have a question for Council Member Borelli and also for the elected Civilian and Complaint Review Board. I have two questions.

So, on the Public Advocate question about a public advocate appointing the Department of Investigations Commissioner. Are you at all concerned that given the Public Advocate has historically been somebody who wants to become Mayor, is creating his or her own citywide platform, the concern that that would turn the Department of Investigations into just a political arm of the Public Advocates Office and in some ways a weapon

2.2

2 against either an incumbent Mayor or City Council or 3 whoever.

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: Well, I think you have correctly articulated that the Public Advocates role is to do nothing but try to run for Mayor. I think I will commend you on that, perhaps inadvertently for reminding us.

The role of DOI Commissioner is a very vital role and regardless of how we look at it, in a democracy, the ultimate power has to come from some elected source. I don't think combining the too low key of power under the same person is beneficial in any respect. I mean, just imagine the outrage that would have of followed should President Trump have fired Robert Mueller in that investigation and yet, when you look at Mayor de Blasio action, you can certainly see similarities. You could certainly see similarities to Governor Cuomo's disbanding of the Moreland Commission.

So, if the penalty is that the Public

Advocate with improved powers of the Department of

Investigation can some how be a more potent check on
the Mayor, I am not entirely opposed to that. But
you know, if you are saying that someone is going to

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

use their prosecutorial power to a grandstand or to
enhance their own career, than that's probably a good
argument against elected CCRB as well.

ALISON HIRSH: And then my next question is for the folks here for the Elected CCRB and particularly for my Union brother. I am a member of 32BJ and we to have worked very hard to combat police violence and support a number of reforms and communities in Ed for police reform etc., and here is my question to both of you. Can you explain why electing the CCRB is the reform that will change the oversight of the Police Department given the fact that we don't control elections and you could argue that in an elected CCRB, when you have, my understanding of the proposals, you have districts across the city. You could have a situation where the PBA for instance says, we are not going to pay attention to the Mayors raise, we are not going to pay attention to the City Council. We are going to put every ounce of resources that we have financial and membership resources into electing police officers to the Civilian Complaint Review Board and you know, not reformist police officers and thereby potentially nullifying the entire role of the CCRB.

2.2

So, I guess my question is in some ways can you explain to me why you think there is a lot that can be done to reform the CCRB process. Why is the election itself the key reform?

UNIDENTIFIED: Do you want me to answer that?

ALISON HIRSH: I was referring to those folks, but you are free to.

UNIDENTIFIED: I would love to give you that opportunity. You want to talk?

UNIDENTIFIED: I believe why there should be an elected civilian board because I've lived in East New York my whole life. I would rather have someone in my community talk about what's happening in my community. I have gone to school with cops since I was in kindergarten. There shouldn't be cops in schools throwing kids on the ground. I am dressed in sweats and a hoody and bomber jacket. I am in the streets; a cop will stop me. That's not right.

That's not right at all. And there is people of color, if I was dark skinned, that's not right. I believe someone in my community, in every community, in every borough should have a person speak up. And not having someone I'm sorry to say, that's White,

2.2

has never lived in the hood. That doesn't know how it is. That doesn't know that environment and I find that unfair. I find that very unfair.

And I believe someone of color, someone Latino, Black, Middle Eastern Asian, should be up there speaking for us.

ALISON HIRSH: Can I just point out information, can the staff at some point, because I don't know what the current demographic makeup of the CCRB is.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: We can certainly get that.

ANDREW SMITH: Yes, I will respond to Commissioner Hirsh's question as well. First, I agree with everything that she has said, and I think that it is really the important point that you all should be considering. I will also say that I am rather astonished at the suspicion of the democratic process that we've heard from many Commissioners here in the past few weeks. Almost at every hearing, the response to the proposal for an elected Civilian Review Board has been well, if we open it up to the public to vote, you know bad people will be elected.

2.2

I find that quite astonishing and I wanted to highlight it.

As for the elected board, one reason I think that it is so important and so necessary, because the Civilian Complaint Review Board as it is does such a bad job as we know in our bones and you all know in your statistics, is that they are accountable to the Mayor and the Police Commissioner and City Council. They have their jobs to do the work for those people and not for us and the reason we want an elected board is we want a board that's accountable to us, that will care about us in our community that will prioritize our needs as victims of police violence and not the needs of the Police Commissioner.

I think that it's so simple and I am really sorry that you all missed it.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you Steve.

when you try to do everything the right way. I've been in politics my whole life and that's what hurts me more. I was hand picked by Republicans. I was a Councilwoman. I came back to Staten Island, the

2.2

place I was born, and I was so disrespected, but it seems to be the new regime because I did undercover work for Jim Molinaro. I did work for a place called [INAUDIBLE 53:00] as you all know for abusing autistic disabled children. I shut down a place in New Jersey for abusing animals. So, I thought by sticking up for myself for ten years, by being abused, these cops were being paid off.

I just had to claim bankruptcy to save my home. I pay my bills. I have everything, it is all transparent in court and I won't be going to arbitration in Brooklyn, but it shouldn't have to be like this. We need somebody. CCRB is nothing. IEB is nothing, IOGNYPD, the integrity division of the Attorney General and Latisha James did absolutely nothing and I am so sorry to say that.

But Mayor de Blasio and his staff is amazing, and they gave me hope for the past two years until I get assaulted again in church. I feel like there is a hit on me. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you.

Steve.

STEPHEN FIALA: Thank you. Thank you all for being here. Councilman Borelli, you are my

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Councilman. This is the eighth Charter Revision

Commission since the 89 Charter was adopted and I

participated in every single one of them except the

last one and that was by design. And I have had the

privilege of serving now on three. You start this

process hearing, a thousand different ideas and you

can't help you know, our tendency is to immediately

we have an opinion on an idea.

I promised myself that I would adopt Saint Benedict's rule and his first admonition very first word of Benedicts rule, listen. And that's what I've tried to do in every Charter Revision Commission. When you propose, when I read in the newspaper, your proposal, my initial opinion was no. I mean, I am already pretty much against the office to begin with but the idea of granting this level of authority to this office, no. But I listened and tonight you added in something in your remarks that I would like you to expand on. I'm not suggesting that I am with you, but I am suggesting that you framed an argument that I had not thought about when you brought up the notion of a Public Advocate not being beholden to anyone, therefore, that being the logical person with which to entrust the investigatory

2.2

authority to. Could you expand on that angle,
because I hadn't given that sufficient thought or any
thought.

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: Well, first of all, eight times in a row and you still haven't gotten it right. I mean, forgive me for saying that.

If you look at the way government is formed in the United States of America, there is 51 Constitutions essentially. The majority of them in fact, all I can think of save the federal constitution separates the powers of the executive branch into a multiple executive. This has served this state fairly well since its inception. If I recall the Attorney General was a position that existed before New York was a state. So, this state has a very long history, even in the 1800's in the second or third constitution when the powers of the governor were changed. There was always a separation between the executive branch proper, meaning the agencies that provided services and the law enforcement arm.

So, this would be almost duplicating that. Admittedly, the Public Advocate would never be an Attorney General with the power to prosecute

2.2

people on the street. Perhaps that's another

solution for the CCRB issue. But this would separate

as it does in the majority of states that I am aware

of, the roles of the executive branch. I mean, we do

that in it of itself with the Comptroller. Just like

most states have a separate CFO.

So, I don't think this is abnormal or out of any sort of governmental norms that exist in the United States. In fact, it is probably more in line with most other places than we think.

STEPHEN FIALA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Seeing no further questions, I thank the panel and I will be calling up the next panel. Heather Quick[SP?], Sister Shirley from the Forgotten Borough, Teresa Fengine[SP?], and Mike Hare from [Inaudible 58:07]. Ms. Quick.

HEATHER QUICK: Good evening. My name is Heather Quick, and I represent the Campaign for an Elected Civilian Review Board.

Tonight, I would like to read a statement that the Campaign has published in response to current events which is especially relevant tonight in Staten Island.

2.2

Our statement is entitled, With an

Elected and Empowered Review Board, Eric Garner might
be a live today. If you would like copies of this

statement, it is all over our social media. It is

super easy to find.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Okay.

HEATHER QUICK: After five years of justice denied, officer Daniel Panteleo was finally facing charges this week in internal police court due to his use of an illegal choke hold that resulted in the death of Eric Garner. Eric Garner denied as a result of Panteleo's actions but the worst that officer could face is punishment ranging from the loss of vacation days to firing.

And his discipline is completely up to the Commissioners decision. Even if the police courts find him guilty, justice will not be served for Garner and his family. Where are the criminal charges? How is an officer with many complaints on file and a violent history able to continue abusing civilians in committing this crime. And what about the many other officers present who contributed to his death?

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

If we had an elected civilian review board and an independent prosecutor, it would be a different story. Here is how.

First, disciplining can prevent escalating violence. A board of elected and concerned community members representing the diversity of the five boroughs would have investigated and made binding decisions of discipline in earlier complaints filed against Panteleo. elected board with the power to meet out binding disciplinary decisions may have removed him from the force or at least checked his violent behavior with a stiffer penalty than the slap on the wrist of instruction that the police commissioner gave Panteleo in 2011. Thereby, possibly saving Eric Garner's life. It is in this way that effective police oversight prevents death. Abusive officers are effectively disciplined or fired before their behavior escalates and causes a death, like Panteleo's behavior did.

Secondly, an unbiased independent special prosecutor can bring criminal charges against the police. An elected independent special prosecutor unlike the DA would prosecute without bias. Staten

2.2

Island District Attorney Daniel Donovan failed to

convince a grand jury to indict Panteleo, despite

video evidence showing clear use of an illegal

chokehold which has been banned for over 20 years due

to lethal danger.

Like all DA's, Donovan works with the police regularly. This is clearly a conflict of interest. Only a fully independent prosecutor can ensure fair and effective prosecution of the police.

This is why we need an elected Civilian

Review Board and an independent special prosecutor

with jurisdiction over all cases involving egregious

police misconduct. Otherwise the NYPD and Mayor will

continue to protect police, cover up crimes, and

there will be no justice for communities suffering

under police abuse. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much. Sister Shirley.

SISTER SHIRLEY: From the Forgotten

Borough of Staten Island. Okay, first, I'd like to
say that the Public Advocate position is a joke.

Okay, no power or anything. The CCRB unfortunately
in the past, I have had dealings with them. In the
future, it amounted to a valuable waste of time.

2.2

Last year, I had an incident with the cops which called for police discipline. I was told, once again my only recourse was to go to the CCRB. I declined. CCRB needs power, real power to ensure police accountability. CCRB needs to be ECRB with power. Currently, the people who appoint the CCRB are the ones who also need accountability. Mayor de Blasio, he hired more cops and the City Council also voted for more cops. Okay, and we already have cops who are not doing the right thing. They are racist and this whole system is racist against people of color and they are doing the bidding of the racist system.

The Police Commissioner with the quality of life, had this over twenty years ago was battened under Giuliani and they had the system of quality of life. Than de Blasio brings back Bratton and now he is calling it broken windows. It's the same Kool-Aid only different flavors, okay.

My sons over 20 years ago were walking in their own community and one of them got into an argument with a friend of his, a girl. The cops pulled up and said, it looks like you are going to do bodily harm to the girl and proceeded to arrest my

2.2

son. My other son said, what are you doing, that's my brother? The cops said, get out of here before we arrest you to. So, my son went to the corner to call me, at that time they still had phones on the block. The cops came up to him again and said, get off the block. He went around the corner unto the porch of his friends house. The cops came around the corner and said, we are going to arrest you for something and proceeded to arrest my other son and my godson for trespassing on their friends porch. So, that day, my two sons and my godson were arrested. Not only were they arrested, it even went to trial.

This is what we're subjected to. Okay, de Blasio says that he is going to make a difference. He is making things worse and when the cops turn their backs on him, they were rightly doing so, because he had told them to go clean up Staten Island. It's gentrification rightly so.

So, I finally want to say that when the cops did what they did to Eric Garner, Eric wasn't even the first person who was choked to death here on Staten Island by the cops, he was the third. The first one was in 1994. This brother named Ernest Séance. He was just going about his business; the

2.2

cops knew him and everything. They stopped him and they choked him out. Nothing was done. The second one was in 2002, this brother names Charles Nelson. He was going to the hospital, on his own. We call the hospital barely breathing but the hospitals name is Bayley Seton. He went to emergency psych. He did not want to stay there, and the cops choked him out at the gate.

It's a continuation of what's happening. We need a strong ECRB. We need something that makes the Police Commissioner accountable. Even the Mayor accountable. Everybody has to have some type of accountability. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Teresa Fengine.

TERESA FENGINE: Perfect, great. Thank you. Good evening, I am Teresa Fengine and I am the manager of member engagement at New York City at the New York Immigration Coalition. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today and thank you also to the Commission Staff for all their work on the Preliminary Staff Report.

The New York Immigration Coalition will submit a longer written testimony for the record, but

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 tonight, I want to speak specifically about 3 redistricting. I also want to mention I grew up on 4 Staten Island in Saint George. So, this is a great moment for me to be able to testify.

New York City has one of the model redistricting processes in the country. The existing requirements for diverse representation on the Districting Commission as well as clear directives to produce fair and effective representation of racial and language minority groups, provides a solid framework. However, a redistricting process can still be improved. Previous Commissions reached beyond the minimum requirements outlined in the Charter and their best practices could be codified. This includes specific language around transparency of meetings and data and strengthening language related to the fairness of drawing of lines.

Lastly, the Charter must expressly prohibit the drawing of district lines based only on the population of citizens rather than the total population of those residing within New York City.

I am going to talk more about drawing lines based on total population now. In a 1966 case, the Supreme Court left it up to the states to draw

2.2

state level district boundaries based either on the entire population counted by the census, by excluding populations ineligible to vote, such as noncitizens and children. Only ten states legally permit excluding certain populations during the apportionment process, New York is one of them.

In 1969, New Yorkers approved a statewide ballot measure defining "inhabitance excluding aliens" to mean "the whole number of persons." It can be argued; this change prohibits noncitizens from being excluded from the total population count for the purposes of redistricting. However, the phrase inhabitance excluding aliens still appears ten times under multiple sections of the state constitution relating to the apportionment.

Furthermore, the language of the 1969
Ballot Measure reads, that for the purpose of
apportioning state senate and assembly districts.

Just quickly, I just want to also say
that the Charter prohibits separating concentrations
of voters of the same political party. We recommend
adding language prohibiting a practice known as
packing. The inverse of cracking, in which voters
have one political party are intentionally placed

2.2

within fewer districts possible for the purpose of reducing voting power.

We will be submitting written testimony. Thank you so much for you time.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much and if you would do that as we said, before the $24^{\rm th}$, we would appreciate it.

TERESA FENGINE: Yes, I do have five copies here.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Okay, if someone would get them from you, we can distribute them and Mr. Hare.

MIKE HARE: Oh yes, I am here to speak
very strongly in favor of an elected Civilian Review
Board with teeth. I would like to echo all the
sentiments that Sister Shirley had. Sister Shirley
lives in the Mariners Harbor section of Staten
Island, I live in Stapleton. I would like to speak
from a slightly different perspective. I am 61 years
old, I come from Texas, I grew up there. I am old
enough to remember "legal segregation" in the early
60's and what that meant. And then as a youth in
college a little bit, you know, I protested against
the partite in South Africa. You know, I have spent

2.2

more than half of my life in Stapleton. My children, who are White, have gone to the schools there with largely children that happen to be Hispanic or African American or from other countries and I've seen these kids grow up. Not everybody gets choke holed to death by Eric Garner or ends up like Ernest Séance who is from my neighborhood and things like that. But I also see you know, just personally, dozens of people that wind up in the system and are friends of my children. You know, they wind up in upstate prisons and then I have cousins of my children that live in White neighborhood's, Tottenville, you know, you name it and for some of the same crimes, nothing happens to them.

You know, and we have Mayor de Blasio who talks about a tail of two cities and it is a tail of two cities and very much policing in a lot of our neighborhoods in this great city of New York, it is a tail of two cities. You know, the policing is not unlike a partite, it's not like some of the things I witnessed as a small child in segregated Texas.

And you know, one other story, just a personal story and my son you know, hasn't suffered like other kids in the neighborhood. He happens to

2.2

have an Italian American last name, but he grew up in this neighborhood. His friends are Hispanic, his friends are Black. How many times have they been pulled over because they were 14 or 15 years old thrown up against a brick wall, searched, stripped, and a cop gets out and says Lombardi, what are you doing here?

You know, it's like hey, or the next kid might have a name like Torrez, the next kid may have a name like Johnson or William. You know, but this is the reality that it is for hundreds of kids in Stapleton, hundreds of kids in Mariners Harbor, and different neighborhoods all throughout New York City and much like you know, the young woman spoke to it before. So, that's why I think we strongly need an elected Civilian Review Board.

Also, one more thing, Elinor

Buffers[SP?], I think a lot of remember that. My

mother pretty much did the same thing. Nobody cut

her down with gun fire, the cops just backed off and

talked to her and that's the reality. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much. Are there questions of the panel. Seeing none, thank you very much. Oh, Carl.

2.2

2 CARL WEISBROD: Thank you. I had a question, I am sorry, I didn't catch your name.

TERESA FENGINE: Teresa.

CARL WEISBROD: Thank you, you sited language from the State Constitution regarding inhabitance excluding aliens and as you know, we really don't have any power over the State Constitution. There's nothing similar in the New York City Charter and when redistricting commission, considers one person, one vote, do you acknowledge, do they consider all inhabitance as in making those determinations?

TERESA FENGINE: Unfortunately, I don't know the answer to that question, but I can definitely have someone from our organization follow up on that.

CARL WEISBROD: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much. The next panel is Frank Murano, James Lane, Candace Carpenter, and Emma Alabaster. If we could perhaps get another chair, is that going to be possible? There is one other speaker, Leo Ferguson.

Okay, Mr. Murano.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

FRANK MURANO: Good evening Madam Chair and member of the Commission. Welcome to Staten Those of us that live here have a great Island. appreciation of how difficult it is to commute here, so we definitely appreciate all of you making the effort, which especially in weather like this is not easy. Having spoken to you a couple times before, I have tried to add something each time and not to be duplicative of many of the previous speakers, but I absolutely want to reiterate my support for Ranked-Choice Voting generally for many of the reasons that everybody here and in the previous hearings have said. Mainly, it saves the cost of runoff elections. It produces a greater mandate for the winner. eliminates the possibility of a spoiler effect and in my judgement, it produces not only greater voter turn out but greater civility in campaigns.

I am happy to answer any questions with respect to either Ranked-Choice Voting or any of my previous testimony and I have printed out all of my previous testimony, both in the first round of hearings and those that happened after the preliminary staff report. But the words that have haunted me since Thursday night or I guess,

2.2

technically it was Friday morning have been from you

Madam Chair where you said that my arguments in favor

of Ranked-Choice Voting or in favor of star voting as

a tabulation method for Ranked-Choice Voting had not

yet convinced you.

So, briefly, I wanted to go through some of the areas where I thought star voting was superior to the instant runoff voting method of tabulation which is used in some other cities. Namely, if you look at all the knocks against Ranked-Choice voting that we've heard from both experts and the public, one of them, the most common one is that it's too complicated. That people don't want to sit there and rank 13, 14, 15 candidates and that makes sense. I get it and if you just ask people to score five, I strongly approve, one I strongly disapprove, it is simple, it is easy for voters to understand and it creates the same sort of a mandate for whom ever wins in a star voting method as conventional instant runoff voting.

Second, the issue of ballot exhaustion.

Whereas, the more voting continues, the less ballots are actually counted. In a star voting method, there is no ballot exhaustion and I have printed for you a

2.2

pamphlet that an organization that advocated for star

voting in Oregon printed, comparing all the different

methods of Ranked-Choice Voting and I think that

you'll find that star voting is not only simple, but

6 it's fair and it's equitable.

In terms of equal vote and one person, one vote, by definition, while instant runoff voting would be certainly superior to the current system, it's not one person one vote. If you pick the person that's most likely to win, you get one vote. If you pick the person that's most likely to lose as your first choice, you get two votes. So, some people get one vote and some people get two votes in an instant runoff voting system.

Now, I've been reluctant to point out some of the pitfalls of instant runoff voting because I don't want you to point to the one's that I mentioned and say, oh, well, that's why we need to keep the system the way that it is. But if you look at star voting as a tabulation method, it is superior in so many different ways and if you look at what the state legislature has done on pay raises, on matching funds, on redistricting. What they have done is they didn't find the need to find all of the answers to

2.2

every single problem now. What they did is they created a panel. So, should you chose to implement a Ranked-Choice Voting system, there is no reason that you can't leave the details of the proper tabulation method to a panel that convenes in the next year or so. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you Frank. The next speaker is James Lane.

JAMES LANE: Thank you. So, my name is

James Lane, I am a lifelong New Yorker and a member

of the Green Party. I have run for office as a Green

Party candidate three times, twice for Public

Advocate and once for Congress in Staten Island.

Obviously, I think Public Advocate is not a stupid

office, but we just have bad people run it.

I am here to strongly support the effort of Ranked-Choice Voting for all New York City elections and most importantly for the general elections. As a Green Party candidate, I have seen firsthand how broken and undemocratic our current winner take all electoral system is and how the corporate media outlets glued with the two major parties to keep alternative voices silent.

2.2

As a candidate for Public Advocate from a legitimate party with statewide ballot line, I was intentionally excluded from televised debates and from most corporate media reporting in all three of my campaigns.

When I ran for Congress in a special election, right here in Staten Island with only three candidates, I attended every public forum possible, yet my name was often excluded from newspaper and television stories about those events. A system that allows monied interest to shut out alternative voices and candidates is not a democratic system. Voter turnout in New York City and all across our country is embarrassing low.

Yet, other than voter shaming, the two major parties have done very little to figure out why the public is not voting. Low voter turnout is not the fault of us as individuals, instead it is the vault of a system that is completely controlled and corrupted by wealthy donors and corporate interests. The people of our city know that their votes don't matter at all. That's why they don't vote. Poll after poll shows that the public want more voices, more choices and definitely more parties. The

2.2

systematic straggling of our democracy is exactly what has brought us to a climate catastrophe with less than 12 years to figure out how we're going to change this tide for survival.

Many others have testified to all legitimate research showing that RCV increases voter turnout. That it ensures candidates are elected with a clear majority of support. That it ensures that candidates work for the constituents as opposed to their corporate contributors and it eliminates the need for expensive runoff etc. But the most important problem that RCV can fix is the fear of vote splitting.

In every one of my campaigns, I talked to many supporters who wanted to vote for me or wanted to vote for other Green Party candidates. But who were afraid by doing so, that they would cause a victory of another candidate they were really afraid of. We need to free voters from this cycle of fear. We must campion a system where the people can freely vote for candidates that align with their morals and values instead of being forced to hold their noses as they vote for candidates that they don't like simply to avoid victory of candidates they like even less.

2.2

There is nothing to fear with Ranked-Choice unless you feel real democracy. This Commission has the power to give disenfranchised communities unaffiliated voters, alternative parties a chance to have real voice to run candidates on an even more playing field. It would be tragic to waste that opportunity.

The movement for real democracy is coming, whether this Commission votes for it or not, the public is quickly losing patience for corruption, so why not let a New Yorker be a heroic leader in this movement and not just for an adventural follower. New Yorkers deserve to vote for their hopes and their dreams now. Our climate is telling us, we don't have time to waste.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much Mr. Lane. The next speaker is Candace Carpentor.

CANDACE CARPENTOR: Carpentor with an O though, that's correct. My name is Candace

Carpentor, I am the Chair of the Green Party in

Brooklyn and I am a state delegate to the Green Party of New York State.

2.2

I am very excited that one of the issues that this panel is addressing is Ranked-Choice Voting. I believe that reform of our electoral system is essential to turning the tide, as James said.

I am not going to read my speech because despite the fact that James and I did not speak at all, our speeches are virtually identical, and it is pretty amazing. But I do want to say that I think that New York has a particularly unique position because we are who we are and I think by exploring Ranked-Choice voting and allowing a more democratic system, we will have an influence on the rest of the country and I think that is as much an important part of our role as what we do in this city. I think the example that we set is important and for other large cities to take our lead would be a lot easier if we do it first.

I do want to mention however, one of the questions that was asked early on this evening was how, what other ways can we use to expand voter participation and I am not larnite in this field as one of our members is, Craig Seaman but I did ask him that question and Craig said that one of the

1	72
2	strongest ways to enhance voter participation is
3	democracy vouchers because when you narrow the
4	gapping campaign funding, there won't be the
5	disparity in targeting that there is now.
6	Underfunded candidates representing economically
7	disadvantaged communities have to have more limited
8	targets, meaning less outreach for new and periphera
9	voters. If all you ever reach is the prime voters,
LO	than those classified as nonprime don't get the
L1	mailings from the candidates and as a result, primes
L2	are more likely to vote for the well-funded
L3	candidates, widen the disparity and the access. Thi
L4	is one prime reason we have ever decreasing voter
L5	turnout in New York. We are marginalizing the peopl
L6	that we want to give the vote to because they aren't
L7	targeted and that is really because we've got so muc
L8	money in our electoral system.
L9	So, that from somebody who knows more
20	than I do, and I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Emma Alabaster.

EMMA ALABASTER: Good evening everyone.

I am Emma Alabaster; I am a livelong New Yorker and I live in Staten Island. I am also an educator and a

2.2

member of Jews for Racial and Economic Justice, and I

am here to speak a little more about police

accountability.

I live not far from where Eric Garner was killed. I know he has been brought into the room a lot tonight. You know, just today, Officer Daniel Panteleo is finally on trial. The worst that could happen to him is that he would be fired. In the meantime, five years later, he has received raises and make \$120,000 a year and no justice has been sought. All the other officers involved in the murder of Eric Garner have been impacted in no way at all.

Yesterday it came out in his trial that four years ago, there was an internal investigation that ruled that he was in fact killed by an illegal chokehold and yet, the police force still did not do anything about it and the only reason that there is a trial now, is because of the CCRB.

So, I think that's really important when we are thinking about what is the actual real state of police accountability right now, which is to say very little. And in a city like New York, I think that we can do a lot better and I think that it's

2.2

really important to me to believe that my friends and my family will be safe and the people that are supposed to keep them safe are the people that I fear. And that when police do harm, right now, there is no accountability.

So, it's very important; there are some real concrete things that this Commission can do to increase police accountability for killings, brutality, sexual violence and gender-based violence and to increase police transparency.

Right now, there is very little transparency particularly, we want transparency related to the NYPD budget that includes related to surveillance technologies, military grade equipment and expenses paid by private or other sources that are not currently subject to Council oversight.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you very much Ms. Alabaster. Mr. Ferguson.

LEO FERGUSON: Hi, thank you so much for having me. My name is Leo Ferguson, I am with Jew for Racial and Economic Justice and Communities
United for Police Reform. I echo everything that
Emma just said. I am a born and raised New Yorker.

2.2

I have always been very proud of my city. I want New York to be leading the nation when it comes to keeping all of its citizens safe and holding the police accountable. And right now, I am profoundly embarrassed and ashamed of the lack of accountability and what officer Panteleo was allowed to get away with and what his colleagues have been allowed to get away with.

So, what are the concrete things that this Commission can do? One is enable the CCRB to determine discipline in cases that they prosecute by the Administrative Prosecution unit. We can expand the CCRB's authority to prosecute other related misconduct such as lying in official reports, false statements and failure to follow body worn camera protocols and other protocols instead of referring these finding to the Internal Affairs Bureau.

We can expand the CCRB's authority to explicitly include school safety agents and other Peace Officers. We can require that when the Commissioner deviates on CCRB findings, that Commissioner has to say why and give a reason that is public. And as Emma stated, we need fiscal transparency and expanded City Council oversight on

2.2

the NYPD budget and that includes amending the procurement process, so that it would require transparency equity impact statements public input and opportunity for council veto prior to purchases of surveillance equipment, software and technology and other major purchases such as new weapons and military grade equipment. We can require the NYPD to report private sources of income and we can just require more detailed units of appropriation in the NYPD budget. If you have ever tried to look through it as I have it is pretty impenetrable and opaque. I will leave it there. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: I am sorry, he was just asking me your organizations name again.

LEO FERGUSON: Jews for Racial and Economic Justice, Community United for Police Reform.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Sal.

SAL ALBANESE: Good evening. I'd like to commend the Green Party for their enlightened positions on Ranked-Choice Voting and for democracy vouchers, I think both are essential to fixing our broken political system and I would like to say that Mr. Lane, I've watched you at a couple of forum and your performance was excellent and I was disappointed

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 you were not included in any debates or even mention in some of the papers, because you did have a lot to 3 contribute and you had a lot of depth to your presentation and the issues that you raised. 5

I wanted to ask either one of you, how do you feel about the redistricting process, if you have any recommendations or suggestions around that process?

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: We need you to speak into the microphone.

JAMES LANE: So, sorry. I have always been more of a fan of redistricting that makes sense geographically with areas, such for example, like looking at zip codes that make sense. Redistricting as it is now, we know it is completely gerrymandered based on the number of voters in a certain district. It is just ridiculous, but if there is a redistricting that is in support of neighboring zip codes, or something that makes sense geographically, than I am always more for that kind of solution.

CANDACE CARPENTOR: A would add to that that another platform or plank of the Green Party is proportional representation and that helps dissipate the problem with districting and redistricting

CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION 2019 78
particularly if you use a split system where half of
the delegates come from their districts and the other
half are at large. And so, the power of
redistricting loses its impact. And so, I think that
that's one way around this constant gerrymandering
that we do with the districts.
SAL ALBANESE: Did you have a
conversation with Frank Murano about this?
CANDACE CARPENTOR: Laughter.
CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Any other
questions? Mr. Fiala.
STEPHEN FIALA: Thank you. Mr. Lane, Ms.
Alabaster, I am sorry, I don't have my glasses on.
Mr. Lane and Ms. Carpentor with an O. You have heard
the debate about Ranked-Choice Voting. The issue
that seems to really be up in the air is the number.
Do either of you have an opinion on how many
candidates a voter should be able to rank? Should
there be a fixed number? We've been all over the map
with respect to the testimony we've heard on this.
And then I have a question for Mr. Murano.
CANDACE CARPENTOR: I am fairly confident

the Green Party position is that there need not be a number. People are not required to rank 14 if there

24

25

2.2

are 14, they can rank as many as they want to rank
and if they only are happy with five, or feel
comfortable with five, they only have to rank that
many and we do that all the time in the voting booth
anyway right. If you don't know a candidate, you
don't necessarily pull the lever. So, Green Party's
position is there should not be a limit on the number
of people who are in the ballot.

JAMES LANE: That is exactly right. I mean right now, we use a Ranked-Choice voting system where we are doing All Star games and you wouldn't vote for someone that is a crummy right, so you pick for the candidates that you truly support and like as Candace mentioned, we use it in all of our county organizations statewide, nationally, locally and we have never had any problems with that.

STEPHEN FIALA: Thank you and to Mr. Murano, thank you for this voluminous document.

FRANK MURANO: Thank you.

STEPHEN FIALA: That completes with our own. This is your opportunity for a strong close. We have heard a lot from you.

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN:} \quad \mbox{We actually} \\ \mbox{have one more person after this panel.}$

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

and one issue alone that you think is paramount for this year to be placed before the voters. You've read the report, you've dissected the staff report, you have participated in every hearing. So, you clearly know what we've been entertaining. What will that issue be and why?

FRANK MURANO: Well, I think so many of the areas in the City Charter, this is the problem with the document that is not just a barebone sketch of government but actually has a pretty detailed plan for how almost every city agency functions. There is so many different things and that's why I have suggested doing a perpetual Charter Revision Council to continue looking at it. But if I had to pick one, it would be the areas related to electoral reform because whether you are talking the budget, whether you are talking the land use process, whether you are talking governance, whether you are talking police accountability, ultimately it all comes down to our elected officials. And if our elected officials are people that are beholden to special interests and campaign bundlers and non-independent redistricting commission, than the whole system is corrupted. You

2.2

are not going to get a sound budget unless you get elected officials that are truly representative of the public. You are not going to get real police accountability if you get a CCRB that's elected by the very same special interests that control the current elections for every other office.

So, electoral reform in all the areas that it takes, whether it's proportional representation, democracy vouchers, nonpartisan elections, reforming the special election timing process or Ranked-Choice Voting; which I commend the Commission for considering it and being so bold. No other Commission over the last 17 years has even come close to touching upon an issue like that.

else and more importantly it gives us the key, the voters to fix the system for our self and not come begging hat in hand to you guys next time you are convened in the hopes that you have the answers to all our problems because you don't, nobody does.

The only people that can solve the problems of the body politic are the voters themselves. You can give us that opportunity to solve those problems.

2.2

STEPHEN FIALA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: I'd like to thank the panel. Thank you. And our last two speakers are Matt Braylow[SP?] and Patricia Okoumou.

MATT BRAYLOW: Okay, hi, I feel like standing. My name is Matt, I am just a concerned resident here in New York. I have been here over 20 years and I went to the Manhattan meeting, but I didn't get a chance to speak because other people were speaking way over time and I had other responsibilities. But I wanted to share quickly just a few things that came up to me as far as possible ways forward New York, where more people can live here with dignity. With respect and balance in harmony with the earth, with life and to be creators and promoters of life rather than death and needless senseless suffering.

So, first of all, I think maybe possibly the words that we use like Charter and all these banks and the corporations, these are really corrupt entities as we probably all know by now and maybe we want to rethink even the whole City Charter to begin with and maybe start fresh with something new and even call it something different, I don't know. But

2.2

we must have the ability as New Yorkers to be able to quickly vote on this type of thing. You know, there is about 50 people here and really this important matter should involve way more people in my opinion. So, if we had a way to engage people where people wanted to you know, submit ideas and submissions, maybe this process should continue, and this testimony should be opened up for the public to view if people want to do that.

Charter to something else and maybe even throw it out, I don't know. But I possibly was thinking something that reflects more of the law of the land, common law, natural law, flesh and blood human beings rather than corporate fictions or robots or manmade objects. To possibly have it reflect the New York City people's platform. A vision for human, animal, earth dignity, mutual respect and a promotion of non psycho sadistic morally empty people getting away with seemingly endless crime and mass human manipulation causing unnecessary suffering and danger to the vast majority of New Yorkers. Should be grounded and indicated by common law and natural law in an attempt for us to have balance and harmony with

2.2

the planet and cosmos friends, family and don't forget ourselves to be able to live life in New York City with as much dignity and personal collective responsibility as possible. Why call the City Charter — okay, I am getting redundant, but the major thing that I wanted to suggest, is the ability for people to recall any public official to quickly come to a voting mechanism for both ideas and also for any major issue to inform the public, use enough money to promote and inform the public about what all the issues are about a particular vote and then be able to quickly come together and vote on that and get mass input, make it easy inclusive.

So, I am for any method that works, like Ranked-Choice voting or anything. If you would like to know more about what I am doing, I have a hashtag best ideas number four NYC. I also have a website, we share, it points to a blog, I own the domain. Weshare.nyc and my name is Matt Braylow.

I got a gazillion recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Well, you get the same three minutes as everyone has. Thank you.

Ms. Okoumou, would you say it for me, so I can get it right?

2.2

PATRICIA OKOUMOU: Okoumou. Hi everyone.

My name is Patricia Okoumou. I am the woman who climbed the Statue of Liberty. Thank you. I testified over the summer and today I really didn't want to testify because I am hurt, and I am upset about the panel and the way you are disregarding our demands. The way you are not listening and when I spoke the last time, I was certain that I did not trust in the system. I remember that much, and I still do not trust in you and the system. You are not listening to the civilians. You are not listening to the people.

In 2014, when Eric Gardner was murdered by Officer Panteleo, I had an experience in that area of Staten Island. Not too far from base three and victory. I live on Saint George and I have lived in this country for over two decades coming from the Republic of the Congo and we are here talking about police violence and I am testifying which is weird because we shouldn't be having this problem of police murdering our people, but we do.

I had an encounter in 2009 with the NYPD in which at least eight or twelve police officers were yanking me out of my Camaro because KFC had a

2.2

truck driver who would go around and just take people's cars. That was the business, but I did complain to the CCRB and it went to deaf ears.

So, I am here to ask you to pay attention please and elect a civil complaint review board because we do need someone in our own community that can hear our problems and will present us an advocate for our needs. Some of us wouldn't do that unless they come within our community and they represent us.

In 2016, I had an encounter in which you can look online, where again officers over some biased approach, someone had called the police on me for no apparent reason. One of those incidents that's called unconscious bias because that's what happened to us. When the police are called, they discriminate against us because of our color and they make bad judgements against us because of our color.

But I am proud in that incident, again, involving several police officers and I had to be sedated, I broke an officers collarbone and I wish we could do more of that. Break their collarbones, fight back, I don't know, physically if we have to because you guys aren't listening. You are on the other end where you are benefiting for a system that

oppress the marginalized community and there's come a
time where we sometimes have to fight back. You know
why? When I climbed the Statue of Liberty on the
Fourth of July - I need more time please, I won't be
to long. I went to a trial on December $17^{\rm th}$ in which
the judge found me guilty on all three counts of
federal misdemeanors trespassing, disorderly conduct
and interference with government function and guess
what? On March 19, I face my sentence of five years'
probation and 200 hours of community service. But we
are here after four years is it, talking about
Officer Panteleo, still not facing the chargers for
murdering Eric Gardner. This is insane. This is
crazy and because of this trauma he lost his
daughter. We are traumatizing the community and you
are not listening. You need to be listening to us
and you need to stop being stubborn because one of
these days we will fight back, and we may fight back
physically. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you.

Are there any questions? You were our last two
speakers. I thank you very much.

SPEAKERS: Thank you.

25

2 CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: I would like 3 to thank everyone for attending and being part of this important process both today and at all of our 4 borough hearings. As a reminder, we will also accept 5 written testimony via email until May 24th. Our 6 7 email address as I said before is info@charter2019.nyc. The Commission will next meet 8 in June to discuss and vote on proposals that would 9 advance to the ballot in November. Please keep an 10 eye on our website and social media accounts for up 11 12 to date information and specific dates. Now, as I mentioned earlier, we will open 13 14 the floor to discussion among the Commissioners. 15 Commissioners, please be as concise as possible with 16 your comments and respectful of everyone's time. look forward to this being an important and 17 18 productive opportunity to talk through the many issues raised in both the staff report and by the 19 20 public this evening. With that, we will begin. I see Jim, you 21 2.2 were the first out of the box. 23 JIM CARAS: Thank you. Is this on?

just wanted to say a few words about my views on police accountability and the CCRB and to thank all

2.2

the people who have showed up to talk about this throughout all our hearings. I came to this commission supporting meaningful reforms to the CCRB and I have also read all the materials and memos from the advocates who have uniformly testified that it is totally clear that we have the authority to take police discipline away from the police commissioner.

I respect the advocates who have appeared before us, who have worked on this so hard. I concur with their goals, but and now I am going to speak for myself as one single commissioner who is also a lawyer. I think their legal analysis overlooks some critical and complicated points. The whole issue of police discipline is sort of a very complicated coming together of city and state laws in very complicated manners and in one particular regard, there are a number of issue, but the state civil service law says the default for determining the terms of employment is collectively bargaining including discipline.

There is a provision of the state civil service law that says discipline is not a subject of collective bargaining if there was a city law in effect before the state civil service law was passed.

2.2

New York City has that. We have the City Charter provision and the Administrative code provisions that you all have referred to that was in effect before the state civil service law, but there is only one problem with that, if there is a risk, a real risk that if we change that law, we will no longer be grandfathered. And that means that the civil service law will kick in and police discipline not only won't be a matter left to the police commissioner, it will be a matter left to the PBA and everyone of their contract negotiations.

So, I know staff is working really hard on this issue. I know they are doing a lot of work on this. We are listening to you, but it is also our job to look at these kinds of risks of what could happen if we propose something on the ballot that is not on solid legal footing.

So, I just wanted to sort of put that out there for my perspective of having looked at these cases on my own and read your materials. And the other thing I wanted to say because I think everyone should have as much information as possible when we start working on making decisions. I have made a lot about spreading, sort of sharing a little bit

2	broader, the accountability of the law department and
3	I still believe that, but I just wanted to sort of
4	finish up on a story. I had given the Law Department
5	a hypothetical when they were up here about a borough
6	president wanting to sue on NYCHA infill and not
7	being able to. Our office reached out to the Law
8	Department and we have hired Conflicts Council and
9	the Law Department is footing the bill and we sued
10	the Mayor and NYCHA on NYCHA infill.

So, it doesn't change my position, that there still needs to be more spread accountability, but I just wanted the Commissioners to know that.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you

Carl.

2.2

CARL WEISBROD: Thank you Madam Chair. I recognize this is the last of ten public hearings and I think an additional at least four or five public sessions with expert witnesses and so, this is an appropriate moment to thank you Madam Chair and the staff for conducting these hearings in a fair, open and extremely confident fashion. So, I do want the staff and you to know that I think on behalf of all of us, we really appreciate the way you've managed these hearings.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And I do think the public has had an ability to express their views on a variety of issues and as we've heard tonight and as we've heard throughout these past hearings and I think we are all better informed because of it.

I do want to take this opportunity also, at the last hearing in Manhattan, there was testimony regarding the City Planning Commission and a statement that somehow six, as I recall, I haven't reviewed the video tape, but my recollection is the testimony was that six members of the Planning Commission were in fact real estate developers and an additional three were in the pocket of the real estate industry and an additional three were lobbyist's to the real estate industry and that testimony was simply incorrect and I distributed to all of the commissioners including you Madam Chair and to the staff the profiles of in fact all 13 current members of the planning commission. Seven appointed by the Mayor and one each by the Borough Presidents and the Public Advocate demonstrating that that clearly is not the case and in fact that of the current Planning Commission, at least three, have extensive experience as members or Chairs of

2.2

Community Boards, or as Chairs of major communities of Community Boards. At least four are heads of community-based organization and at least five are architects or planners with advanced degrees in City Planning which I think is a broad reflection of what a planning commission should be.

So, I would ask that the email that I don't want to recite here, my entire email just profiling the current members of the commission, but I would ask that the email that I sent to everybody be reflected in the record. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: And we will certainly do that. Is there any — okay, despite as you I know have been told, we have closed the public hearing, but we are going to allow you.

No, no applause folks, just thank you and if you could fill out a speaker slip before you leave and if you could tell us your name again.

JAY ARENA: Again, thank you for allowing me to address this Commission. My name is Jay Arena, I am an Associate Professor of Sociology here at the college of Staten Island, City University of New York.

2.2

And I want to speak in favor of changing the City Charter to have an elected Civilian Review Board for the police with prosecutorial powers and investigative powers. This is a very important issue for our community here and for my own teaching.

I began here in 2008 and you know, with our teaching, the budget is being slashed, the wages are two tier system is expanding. There are a number of tacks going on here that effects our teaching but also, what happens beyond the walls permeates into our classroom.

So, when my students are facing eviction from ski rocketing, gentrification going on in New York, that permeates into my classroom. Also, when my student are being jacked up by the police regularly, that permeates into my classroom. When we have here — we are now holding a hearing, the police are holding a hearing on the murder by Daniel Panteleo of Eric Garner right here on Staten Island, that affected us. But also, right here on this campus, in November of 2011, yards away from where we are gathered today, a long-time cafeteria worker, African American cafeteria worker, who had come, he was not even scheduled to work, he came in special.

2.2

And there was an engagement with the police, he was in the lavatory before he went to work. The police are not even supposed to, under agreements with the police department in CUNY, they are not even supposed to be on the campus. There was an engagement and Cory Holmes ended up dead and nothing has happened. You know, at least with Eric Garner, there has been some kind of you know, attention brought to the case. No justice, but there was attention brought to the case. But in the case of Cory Holmes, it was just brushed underneath the rug. And that is still an open wound here at the college of Staten Island. As co-workers, we had a small memorial made for him that was taken down.

But if we at least had some kind of review board to investigate this killing. This killing, there is nothing, nothing happened at all.

And this happens just all to often here in the City.

And so, as a Professor here, for my students, who are gathered here, right and this is an important issue of justice and of power. We deal in sociology with power. We've got organized money; we've got a lot of that in New York and very closely connected to that is the organized corrosive force. And we need to

2.2

control the corrosive force that is being unleashed by the New York City Police Department on a daily basis. The Garner case gets a lot of attention and it should, but on a daily basis, short of murder, my students are on the receiving end of that. And it comes into the classroom and it needs to end, and I don't see the Civilian Review Board as being the magic bullet, but it would be a step in the right direction.

So, I encourage you on behalf of my fellow co-workers here at CUNY on behalf of my fellow students who are dealing with many obstacles to getting their degree. But one of them is police terror and it needs to end. So, thank you and again, thank you for allowing me to speak.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you Professor Arena.

With that I am closing the public hearing again and is there any other member, Sal.

SAL ALBANESE: I also want to commend the Chair for the way these hearing have been conducted. Thank the public for coming out and thank my fellow Commissioner. I look forward to reading your email Carl about the City Planning Commission, I haven't

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

read it yet. I just want to once again beat the drum that we need to really focus on elections and governance as one of the major objectives of Charter reform because it was mentioned by many speakers. Everything flows from the way the government is organized. And if we can make a major difference in our democracy in New York City, we would have had a real impact. I am heartened by the fact that we're looking at Ranked-Choice Voting, I think that will open up the process. I think we need to be bolder on Campaign Finance Reform. I am of the position as I have said repeatedly that the matching system is really not doing much for the public and for benefits political insiders.

I think there is a better system and it's growing in popularity by leaps and bounds. As I pointed out Senator Gillibrand just proposed democracy vouchers in a national level and although the staff said that they were concerned about the fact that the City Council can do this by local law, I have pointed out repeatedly that legislatures generally do not propose open up the system where competition becomes more prevalent. So, I think we have a responsibility as a Charter Commission to look

2.2

closely at democracy vouchers and I am hoping to advance that as we go along. Once again, I am disappointed. We didn't consider open primaries and nonpartisan elections, but we have the opportunity to look at democracy voucher. Also, lobbying reform is another issue we need to explore and consider for placing it on the ballot.

Redistricting is another area that I think is open for more of bolder action on the part of the commission and I think the public will be responsive to that. I am happy to hear that we are getting more feedback from general public for amenities that were not part of the testimony and I know several of us will be going out speaking to the public about this. And when talk to them about these issues, they do get excited and hopefully over the next couple of weeks, we the Commissioners will share our views and our proposals and come to come consensus that will make the city a much more democratic city because as pointed out, what we do in New York City has a ripple affect across America.

And if we can open this system up more, it will also help other cities and the states across the country.

2.2

So, once again, it's been great working with you guys. I look forward to the next couple sessions.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you.

Oh, I am sorry, I didn't see you Paula.

PAULA GAVIN: Thank you very much. I wanted to echo the compliments and the thanks to everyone. I have a couple things I want to say for the next report. I want to be sure that we demonstrate that we have listened. And that when we report on our next set of recommendations that we speak to the issues we've heard repeatedly. I just think its important that we demonstrate what I know is happening and that's that we are listening, and we do care.

So, that is number one. Number two, I know we are all going to get another opportunity to respond before we go to the vote on June 12th. So, I am looking forward to that and the one area that I am excited about that I think is going to take a real yeoman's job to figure out is the integrated planning that we've been speaking to.

So, I am really excited that that can have some really big impact on our future. So, just

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

to summarize, I want our next report to demonstrate that we've listened and that we are responding to what we think are the right actions to take.

I want to be sure that we get a chance to have feedback once more, which I know is the plan, and finally, that we address integrative planning. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you Paula, have I missed anyone else? And I would like to assure everyone who has taken their time to come here that we are listening. I know that you feel that because we are not responding sometimes, that we are not listening, but we have been listening and we've been talking to try and understand what the limits of what we can do. I certainly would like to be associated with the comments of Jim Caras that for those of you who are looking at an ECRB, I understand why you are looking for an ECRB. However, as Jim stated, I have concerns about whether that is the best way for us to go about recommending to the public that we increase accountability, which is the goal.

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I'll stop there but I did not want people to think that no one is listening to you, we are.

Steve.

Thank you Madam Chair. STEPHEN FIALA: think that's an important statement to make and the frustrating part about sitting on a body like this, you hear people's legitimate concerns and you see their heartfelt feelings played out in front of you and you know, if you had a magic wand, you would like to help everybody. We have to wrestle with so many different parts of this puzzle and Commissioner Caras alluded to a very big part. We are having discussions about this. There are very serious differences of opinion with respect to the legal impediments that exist, not withstanding what the very eloquent folks who have testified repeatedly throughout these hearings. Not withstanding that, but I join you in saying we have listened, and we are not done, but I share the sentiments.

I'd like to just use my opportunity to thank you for your leadership. You have been a model of what a Chairperson should be like. You have been fair to the public. We have not denied anyone the right to speak, to be heard. You have been generous

2.2

to us and I want to thank you for your leadership, and I thank all of my colleagues on this board. I have enjoyed interfacing as you have with the public, but I have really enjoyed getting to know each of you more and what I've learned from you as individuals in our private discussions is immense. It has really helped to shape my own thoughts.

There are two areas that I'd like to make a pitch for. As I said, this is the eight Charter Revision Commission since the 89 Charter had been adopted. I think this is a Charter Revision Commission that can actually achieve the most substantial level of reform since that time. And that's really exciting. I was skeptical in the beginning and I grew more and more comfortable and confident as we went about our business. The staff has done a great job and I want to thank them. And I want to especially thank the public, I forgot to do that for coming out.

Many of them sat with us until 12 in the morning and 1 in the morning and we thank you. Now, we get to do this. [Applause].

2.2

But I really do appreciate them coming out and really educating us and speaking honestly about their concerns.

So, my two areas, I've tried for 22 years to advance a few issues. The twin pillars for me and not to suggest that anything in the staff report isn't what I could support. There is a lot that I don't support and a lot that I do. But there are two areas that I have spoken about extensively in the last two decades and in my two previous Charter Revision Commission and the five that I wasn't on, but I testified. So, I share the frustration.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Were you the Frank Murano?

STEPHEN FIALA: No, I've never been the Frank Murano. I was a show up once and done. Our job, as I said when we started this endeavor a year ago, we're civic surgeons and I use that analogy because I think it is most appropriate. We are supposed to take a scalpel, not an axe. We take an axe to this document and we can really do severe damage, and this is a complex city. Eight plus million people, 300 square miles or there abouts spread out over five boroughs.

2.2

So, we take a scalpel not an axe. Our dilemma as I've also said repeatedly, I am a broken record, is that we have the Goldilocks dilemma. We got to find it just right, it can't be too hot, it can't be too cold. We've got to find it just right and a scalpel helps us do that.

Two areas where I think the 89 Charter didn't get it necessarily wrong intentionally but did not give enough thought to and they acknowledge it.

They acknowledge it.

I just want to read you with respect to boroughs, this is from the Chairman Schwartz of the 89 Commission. The overall thrust of the Charter Revision is not to diminish the role of Borough Presidents or the voice, but to give them a new executive function within their boroughs. Functions which will enable them to and this is the important part, this was the goal of that Charter, initiate proposals, require them to make fiscal land use and service delivery choices and compel public deliberation and discussion about their decisions and their initiatives. September 1989, Fritz Schwartz.

Eric Lane, Dr. Musio[SP?] and others have all testified that they think they fell short of 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

mark. Here is where we are at. We empower the borough presidents and I will use this one example.

Borough presidents are empowered to propose a budget.

That's one of the powers they are given as a counter to the Mayor's proposal.

Another section of the Charter says, but if they propose X, they have to take away X from the Mayor's side. In other words, they have to do equal Sounds good so far. That adds up, oh but offsets. wait, you get to another section of the Charter and you find out, but they can't do that because the Borough President can't get those numbers. If I have a \$100 million in proposals, I have to find \$100 million to cut from the Mayors proposal in my borough. The problem is the section that relates to departmental estimates do not break down the numbers by boroughs. So, the borough president, that person's position and authority is severely compromised and undermined.

So, if we could fix that, we would empower the Borough Presidents voice to I think have that meaningful role in public deliberation and decision making without as Dr. Musio and Executive Director Lane said, that wouldn't undermine the

ی

2.2

authority of the principal players, the Council and the Mayor. That's my first one, Borough Empowerment.

1902 is when Brooklyn, the Brooklyn
Alderman rebelled after 1898 when we got together and
the Brooklyn Alderman said, oh, Manhattan is too
powerful. So, they made some changes. We have been
fighting for a 100 years on this. I'd love for us to
get something done there, that would be really,
really substantial.

And the second thing and my baby, is this notion of a rainy-day fund. I have said you know that a government that robs Peter to pay Paul, always has the cooperation of Paul. We're a quarter trillion dollars in long-term debt. In an age of terminance, no one is thinking about 3 years from now, let alone 30. In 1989, the joke on the Charter Revision Commission was this. The short-term is this afternoons post. That's when we had a morning post and an afternoon post.

The long-term is tomorrow morning times.

It's only gotten worse. In the aftermath of 911, if we had had a true rainy-day fund, a true revenue stabilization fund, we would not have had to refinance the bonds for another 30 years, extend the

2.2

2	financial emergency act, cut services dramatically
3	and increase taxes. We could have dipped into that
4	rainy-day fund and stabilized the ship to weather the
5	storm. That's the responsible thing to do. That's
6	the morally right thing to do to future generations.
7	It's been discussed and debated for 30 years. I would
8	love it Madam Chair if we could do something about
9	it.

So, I will wait until the next meeting to bore you all with more thoughts, but those are the two areas that I have been pleading about and I hope that a majority of you will find it acceptable and that we do something in those areas as well. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Thank you, are there any other speakers. Than may I have a motion to adjourn? Second, good. Discussion? All those in favor?

Commissioners: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GAIL BENJAMIN: Opposed?

The motion carries. The meeting is adjourned, and the business of todays meeting has concluded. While you are welcome, and we hope you take the written materials with you. Please remember

CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION 2019 to leave your blue folders and your name cards, so that we can recycle them and use them at the next hearing. Thank you very much everyone.

Worldwide 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 April 22, 2019