



R. SETH WILLIAMS
District Attorney

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
THREE SOUTH PENN SQUARE
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3499
215-686-8000

**PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
R. SETH WILLIAMS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
FY 2012 BUDGET HEARING STATEMENT
APRIL 26, 2011**

Good afternoon Council President Verna and other members of City Council. It is an honor and privilege to appear before you today.

Just one year ago, I sat here as the newly elected District Attorney of Philadelphia on my 100th day in office and outlined my goals for improving the delivery of justice and making Philadelphia safer. I spoke about the unacceptable number of cases that were dismissed, the feeling of helplessness among victims and witnesses, the need to be smart on crime, and the necessity of changing the way the District Attorney's Office does business. With deep appreciation to the men and women of the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office who fight for justice and victims every day, I am pleased to discuss how far we have come in such a short amount of time, what we can do to sustain these great achievements, and how we can implement new changes to make Philadelphia safer.

You will recall that when I came into office last year, our criminal justice system was broken. When I sat before you last year, I vowed to be smart on crime. And I said that being smart on crime did not mean that we would go easy on violent offenders or sexual predators, or that we would diminish our resolve to fight hard for victims every single day. Instead, I said that we would implement evidence-based practices, find appropriate alternatives to incarceration to reduce recidivism rates, and help to make sure our kids stay in school.

I am pleased to report that we are being smarter on crime and are beginning to address the systemic problems in the Philadelphia criminal justice system. Justice as a whole is no longer delayed, denied or dismissed, more cases are decided on the evidence, and cases are proceeding faster through the system. What is particularly encouraging is that so many of our achievements have been done in a collaborative manner. We have worked closely with the police, the courts, the mayor, the Commonwealth and with you. We are all stakeholders in our quest to make Philadelphia safer. We all have obligations, responsibilities, and a difficult economy to address, but we must prioritize those efforts and investments that we must all make in order to reduce violence in Philadelphia.

There is an added benefit to what we are beginning to accomplish: much of what we have done has also saved the city money. In other words, we have made changes that will improve public safety and, as a collateral consequence, save precious taxpayer dollars. I want to be clear – we should never sacrifice public safety in order to save money. The government's first priority should always be to keep its people safe. But implementing policies that make us safer and save money is nothing short of a best practice.

In just one year and few months, we have done so much. I would like to discuss with you our major initiatives and accomplishments.

Charging What We Can Prove: Changing Our Charging Unit

Our efforts to fix our criminal justice system started with what I did on my first day in office, when I revamped our Charging Unit. While I spoke at length about this major change last year, I do want to briefly remind you about this important reform, because many of our other

major accomplishments could not have been implemented or sustained without the changes to the Charging Unit. As I said last year, the Unit used to be a punishment assignment – a place where prosecutors were reassigned following a problem. Such staffing decisions were detrimental, because misjudgments in charging decisions clogged the courts and impeded on our ability to secure meaningful convictions.

When I revamped the Unit, I appointed as supervisor a highly qualified and respected veteran trial attorney in my office, who is now my Deputy for Pre-Trial. And I assigned fourteen senior prosecutors to the unit as well as victim-witness coordinators. The reality now is that the Charging Unit charges what we can prove – no more and no less. This means that we get it right from the start, and everyone involved knows that we have sorted through the evidence and made serious reasoned decisions based on the facts presented to us.

Following our revamping of the Charging Unit, we have implemented a significant number of ground-breaking changes to the way we administer criminal justice. These changes aim to make punishment more swift and certain, to reduce case dismissal rates, and to provide a criminal justice system that is more user-friendly for victims of crime.

Transforming Delivery of Criminal Justice: Community-Based Prosecution

In November, working closely with members of our judiciary, including Chief Justice Castille, Justice McCaffrey, and President Judge Dembe, we implemented what may be our most ambitious achievement thus far: community-based prosecution. I believe that community-based prosecution will serve as the lynchpin for improving public safety and fostering good community relations.

We now assign most of our cases based on the police district in which the crime occurred, while at the same time centralizing criminal proceedings in the Criminal Justice Center (CJC). We have broken the city down into six neighborhood zones. Each zone is located on a dedicated floor in the Criminal Justice Center. As a result, police witnesses will only need to go down the hall from courtroom to courtroom, rather than attending hearings at scattered locations across the city and on different floors in the CJC. That means fewer cases will be dismissed due to witness unavailability, and more cases will be decided based on evidence, not on attendance.

In addition, more cases are now handled from the beginning of the process by the same prosecutor. This is called vertical prosecution, and enables victims, families, witnesses and law enforcement officers to always know who is handling a certain case. Prosecutors will also have a more thorough knowledge of the case and will be better equipped to make decisions from the very beginning. In the past, the newest prosecutors in the office would handle most preliminary hearings for felony matters, and more seasoned prosecutors would take over the cases once they reached trial. Although my office has utilized vertical prosecution for many years in specialized cases like rape and homicides, we are now using vertical prosecution for other very serious cases like non-fatal shootings and other gun crimes.

Moreover, and equally important, community-based prosecution is a valuable way for my office to build bridges with the neighborhoods, so that the assistant district attorneys learn about

the needs of the neighborhoods and the characteristics of the community. By changing how we prosecute cases we are giving all Philadelphians the opportunity to help us fight crime. This is a chance for residents to empower themselves to make the city a safer place to be.

Diverting Low-Risk, Non-Violent Drug Offenders: Small Amounts of Marijuana Program (SAM)

For far too long, we were woefully inefficient in the way we handled cases involving small amounts of marijuana – that is, cases where the amount was less than 30 grams, which is about an ounce. State law permits only a very minor sentence for this minor offense, and judges seldom imposed even that. Usually, offenders were placed on a few weeks of probation, or were simply allowed to go free with no sentence at all. Despite the negligible results, these cases nonetheless clogged our courts and took up valuable time that assistant district attorneys and police could have devoted to cases involving firearms and other forms of violence. And, by the time we disposed of the case, we had spent thousands of dollars with no meaningful penalty. That was not smart.

We have designed a smarter way of addressing these thousands of cases per year. Through our Small Amounts of Marijuana program (SAM), we are diverting these cases so that we will not need full misdemeanor trials. Under our new procedure, the cases are treated as summary offenses if the offenders agree to attend a one-day, three-hour educational course about the impact and effects of drugs on individuals and the community. The result of this new process is no attorney fees, no formal discovery, no drug testing, no subpoenas, no court costs, and a final disposition typically within the month of arrest. In just the first six months of this program, more than 2,300 small amounts of marijuana cases were diverted as summaries, rather than misdemeanors.

This is faster, cheaper – and actually yields more significant penalties. Instead of walking out of the courtroom with no accountability, these offenders now have to receive instruction about the consequences of their conduct, and must pay the cost of the course up front.

Ensuring Swift and Certain Punishment: Accelerated Misdemeanor Program (AMP)

We did not stop with minor marijuana cases in our efforts to rationalize the treatment of less serious offenses. I have also implemented a program that accelerates appropriate misdemeanor cases for diversion into community service. This program ensures swift and certain punishment, which we know is critical to reducing recidivism rates, and simultaneously improves efficiencies within our criminal justice system – primarily by putting police back out on the street, instead of in the courtroom. This program is based on a community court model that we observed in Brooklyn last year. Following that visit, my staff devised and implemented a similar program for Philadelphia.

Under this program, our Charging Unit identifies and diverts appropriate misdemeanors and ensures the offenders do not have a record of violence. The Charging Unit recommends a period of community service, depending on the charge and the defendant's prior criminal record. If the defendant accepts the program and successfully completes the community service, then the case is closed. This means that no subpoenas were issued, no court dates were scheduled, no police testimony was needed, and no taxpayer-funded lawyers had to be paid. And most of the cases were disposed of in the police districts, not the Criminal Justice Center. In just the first four months of this year, approximately 700 were diverted through AMP, meaning that we expect nearly 2,400 by the end of the year.

In short, the AMP program removes low-level misdemeanors from the trial process, while ensuring both swift and certain punishment and offender accountability to the victims and to the community.

Assessing Cases Early and Offering Appropriate Plea Offers: SMART Program

Instead of dragging every case through the full maze of the criminal justice system – resulting in frustrated victims, wasted police time, and excessive dismissals – we now identify cases at the beginning of the process that are appropriate for early plea agreement offers.

This process, called the SMART program (which stands for Strategic Management ARC (Advance Review and Consolidation), Readiness and Trial), has dramatically changed the way that plea agreements are negotiated in felony cases. We offer plea agreements as soon as possible. After a case is held for court at the preliminary hearing, the assistant district attorney in the appropriate SMART room will now review each case prior to arraignment. The ADA assesses the merits and severity of each case as well as the defendant's record. Based on this review, a plea offer is in most cases made. During this period, the defendant and his or her attorney have ample time to review the offer. These offers are one-time offers: if the defendant rejects an offer, we do not re-offer it or negotiate downward; instead, the case will be listed for trial. This new approach to cases allows us to review and potentially resolve cases that previously would have languished at the trial level in an already overcrowded criminal justice system.

The SMART program is also smart on crime because, by dramatically reducing the time it takes to secure a guilty plea, we dramatically increase the swiftness of punishment. Finally, it allows our prosecutors and police to spend more of their time on cases involving gun violence and repeat violent offenders. This is a practice that several other large-city district attorneys across the country utilize, and which for too long we ignored. We are estimating that about 500 cases per month are being resolved in SMART rooms, cases that otherwise would likely have gone to trial.

Removing Roadblocks to Victim and Witness Testimony: Changes at Preliminary Hearings

Working collaboratively with my staff and me, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court issued important rule changes on February 28, 2011, that will no longer require the presence of civilian witnesses at preliminary hearings in certain non-violent property crimes, such as burglary and car theft. In such cases, witnesses literally needed to spend the day in court in order to testify that the item the defendant stole from them was theirs and that they did not give the defendant permission to steal it. This practice was hardly efficient, and was a complete disservice to victims, who had to endure continuances and repeated trips to court simply to state the obvious. The new rule changes will significantly reduce the number of times a preliminary hearing must be scheduled before it is resolved, and will therefore significantly reduce police court overtime.

Recall that last year when I testified before you, I highlighted another set of critical rule changes the Supreme Court made in order to reduce the delays and continuances that had become a regular part of the system. These changes require that judges in Municipal Court criminal cases must first determine whether defense counsel is ready to proceed and must give officers and witnesses ample time to arrive in court rather than immediately continuing the case if not all witnesses are present.

These changes and improvements have occurred within the past 15 months. Each of these achievements is itself a major accomplishment. The fact that we have implemented all the changes in such a short period of time is remarkable, and the men and women of my office, as well as other criminal justice stakeholders, should be congratulated for their enormous efforts and dedication.

Measuring Our Success: Reducing Delays, Denials and Dismissals

Our monumental and historic innovations have very quickly made a difference. Fewer cases are being dismissed, more cases receive a disposition on their merits, and cases are proceeding faster. We know this because we are analyzing the data; we are no longer relying merely on anecdote. Data collection and analysis is difficult and laborious, particularly with our antiquated computer system and lack of a modern case management system. But we do have some very encouraging preliminary numbers to present, by comparing data from the first quarter in 2011 to the first quarter in 2009:

1. Fewer cases are dismissed:
 - a. A **5 percent decrease** in non-felony cases being dismissed or withdrawn without ever receiving a decision on the evidence in Municipal Court.
 - b. A **9 percent decrease** in felony cases being dismissed or withdrawn without ever receiving a decision on the evidence during felony preliminary hearings.

2. Cases are proceeding faster:
 - a. **18% more cases disposed within 100 days**, and 13% fewer cases disposed in more than 200 days (both in non-felony cases in Municipal Court).
 - b. **13% more cases disposed of within 100 days**, and 9% fewer cases disposed of in more than 200 days (both in felony preliminary hearings).

This preliminary data demonstrates that we have begun to meaningfully address the problem of justice being delayed, denied and dismissed in Philadelphia. Our new approaches are just months old, and we are already beginning to see significant results. These changes show:

1. An increase in the number of felony and non-felony cases that are decided on the evidence, not on whether a witness was able to show up over and over again.
2. A dramatic decrease in the number of days until final disposition of both felonies and non-felonies in Municipal Court.
3. A significant increase in the conviction rate in Municipal Court.

Indeed, an improvement of just 5 percent fewer cases dismissed during one quarter means several thousand more cases per year are receiving dispositions on their merits – that means several thousand victims are having their day in court. These figures are particularly encouraging because the impact of our changes could not be felt until our switch to community-based prosecution occurred just six months ago. As we continue to assess our data and make necessary adjustments to our programs, our results will only get better.

Reducing Recidivism and Witness Intimidation: Innovative Programs, Outreach, and Relocation Efforts

In addition to all these changes and their accompanying successes, we are taking additional steps to reduce recidivism and to improve our standing in the community. Recidivism reduction is one of the most effective ways to drive down our crime rates and increase the trust of our communities. Without that trust, we will have continued difficulty in ensuring that victims and witnesses appear at trial, particularly with the continued threat of witness intimidation.

The Choice is Yours

We continue our work to implement a program which I spoke about last year called The Choice is Yours (TCY). Modeled in part on a program from the San Francisco District Attorney's Office called Back on Track, TCY recognizes that the most effective way to reduce crime is to reduce the recidivism rate. It further recognizes that too often non-violent drug offenders cycle in and out of jail without the comprehensive employment, education, life skills and job training that they need in order to help them live law-abiding lives.

We know from research and experience that simply letting offenders out early does not reduce the likelihood that they will commit more crime; we know that doing nothing with offenders while they are incarcerated does not reduce the likelihood that they will commit more crime. And we also know that some offenders have made the economic decision to sell drugs, and not necessarily use drugs. These are the offenders we will be attempting to enroll in TCY, and they will quickly learn that if they fail the program, the consequences will be severe and they will see significant prison time. We have been working closely with Public Private Ventures and have received funding from private foundations, including the Lenfest Foundation, to begin this program later this year. We believe we will be able to enroll between 100 and 150 first-time non-violent drug offenders who are subject to a mandatory minimum sentence for selling drugs under state law. This program will help to reduce their recidivism rate, as well as save costs of incarceration, both on the local and state level. We will be collecting and analyzing data about the successes and challenges of TCY.

Community Relations

The people of the District Attorney's Office must be viewed as protectors, not persecutors. The changes and improvements I have described will help us achieve this critical goal. When Philadelphians see that we are charging the right crimes, investigating cases more fully from the beginning, contacting victims and witnesses within days rather than weeks of the crime, reducing the number of times victims and witnesses have to appear in court, demanding accountability from within our office, and working with our partners in public safety, they will begin to better see that our fight is a fight for justice and accountability. But we are doing more to improve our relations with the community, in particular those who may have been distrustful of our office in the past.

We are engaging directly with the community. Over the last 15 months, we have organized nine Town Hall meetings throughout the City. We have held six Take Back the Streets community walks. We have held 10 comprehensive series of presentations to over 250 students between the sixth and ninth grades in order to educate them about the criminal justice system and to encourage them to make the right choice when faced with peer pressure to do the wrong thing. And we have opened two community action centers, which are satellite offices of the District Attorney's Office, where constituents can come in and ask questions, make inquiries, or report suspicious or otherwise illegal activity. These community action centers are ways of bringing the District Attorney's Office to the neighborhoods. Thus far, we have two centers open: one in Northern Liberties, which opened in September, and one on Germantown Avenue, which opened in November. In just a short period of time, about 100 people have visited the centers, with issues including concerns over nuisance bars, questions about case listings, questions about the criminal justice system, or referrals to victim advocates. Over the course of the next year, I expect we will fine-tune the centers, launch a comprehensive outreach strategy, and attract more visitors.

Additionally, as we began our system of community-based prosecution, we trained the assistant district attorneys about the communities whose cases they would prosecute. We brought them to their geographic bureaus, and they met with leaders and other representatives of those particular areas. We also provided our prosecutors with fact sheets about their particular

geographic bureau in order to help them become familiar with important and relevant information.

Witness Intimidation

We also continue to fight against one of the most troubling aspects of our criminal justice system – witness intimidation. Unfortunately, the reality in Philadelphia is that virtually every homicide case is negatively affected by witness intimidation. People are literally afraid for their lives – or the lives of their loved ones – to testify. The result is that murderers can literally get away with murder. And the problem is becoming worse. We are finding that violent cases that do not result in homicides are now affected by witness intimidation.

Governor Corbett’s proposed budget for FY 11-12 continues the same level of funding for witness relocation as in the last fiscal year, or nearly \$1.2 million, which we were pleased to see. And we are making good use out of the \$200,000 that Councilman Jones and the Mayor were able to secure for us. We have used more than \$120,000 to provide more comprehensive assistance to intimidated victims and witnesses, as well as their immediate household. All funding goes directly to service providers or to the victim and witnesses for assistance with security deposits, rental assistance, storage costs, transportation costs, moving costs, and temporary lodging. In addition, we have been able to extend the relocation period of witnesses beyond the previous limit of four months in cases where it is required. At the same time, we are collaborating with the Philadelphia Housing Authority to identify additional sites in which to house victims and witnesses who fear that they will be harmed if they testify.

In addition to all these great new public safety enhancing innovations and programs, the men and women of my office continue to do the critical day-to-day work of representing the City of Philadelphia and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, fighting for justice, and standing up for victims. But this has been an especially busy year. We are handling two complicated cases that have received national attention – one case against abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell and others, and another involving the sexual abuse of children by members of the Catholic Church as well as a lay teacher at a Catholic school. We conducted extensive grand jury investigations in each of these matters, which took approximately one year. The grand jury issued two detailed and lengthy reports and issued numerous charges against the defendants in both cases. Many members of my staff have worked and continue to work tirelessly on these matters, which warrant the attention they are receiving.

Improving Criminal Justice and Reducing Costs: Investing in Public Safety

The major achievements I have outlined will, first and foremost, improve the delivery of criminal justice in Philadelphia and, as a result, make our city safer. But there is a second important consequence – these initiatives are saving taxpayer dollars by eliminating inefficiencies and redundancies in our system. You will note that I am discussing cost savings toward the end of my presentation. This is intentional. When we make changes to the criminal justice system, they must be geared primarily toward improving public safety, not simply saving a few dollars. Saving money must only be a collateral impact. When we implement programs

that both improve public safety and save precious taxpayer dollars, then that is a win-win. And that is precisely what we have done here.

Our AMP, SAM, and SMART room initiatives have saved and will continue to save Philadelphia money. We have reduced the number of officers who have to leave their patrols and testify in court, often earning overtime. Moreover, as officers spend less time in court, they have more time to patrol our streets fighting crime. The cost savings also include money saved from obviating the need for court appointed counsel, since thousands of cases are being diverted out of the criminal justice system.

As you know, our county prison population is down by almost two thousand in the last two years. Much of this decline is attributable to the work of my office. As a result of the initiatives and changes to our Charging Unit I have discussed above, which have significantly decreased the number of pre-trial defendants coming into and staying in Philadelphia's prisons, legislation in 2008 that requires offenders with maximum sentences of between 2 and 5 years to serve their time in state prison, and great collaboration with our courts to improve operations and efficiencies, we are keeping considerable numbers of individuals out of county prison. All told, the Philadelphia Prison system costs \$3 million less now than it did last year.

We have calculated that as a result of our efforts, these efforts combined will save Philadelphia more than \$6 million per year.

Incentivizing Innovation and Overcoming Funding Disparities: Justice Reinvestment

What is particularly promising and exciting about these cost savings is that we can use the savings to reinvest in the criminal justice system, funding further changes to further reduce delays, denials and dismissals. We need justice reinvestment because it is a best practice and because my office continues to be insufficiently funded to permit me to make significant additional improvements.

Let's talk for a moment about overall funding levels. As you can see from the chart behind me, of the district attorney's offices in the 21 major counties in the United States, Philadelphia's is the 2nd lowest funded, based on the rate of violent crime. We were able to come up with a rate by measuring the amount of money appropriated against the number of incidents of violent crime. Only Wayne County, Michigan, which includes Detroit, receives less money based on this measurement. And our rate of funding is not just lower than just about every other major county – it is a lot lower. All but four of the other major counties are funded at a rate that is more than double ours. And some offices do not handle the volume of cases we do. City prosecutors in Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Chicago and Seattle do not handle some or all misdemeanors. And in New York City, the city law department handles juvenile matters for all five boroughs.

To be sure, I appreciate the slight \$1.9 million increase from last year's adopted budget, to \$31,054,996, and I know the Mayor appreciates our great efforts. I am committed to making groundbreaking changes to my office that will improve public safety. I will continue to do so in the most efficient manner and with full transparency.

But we cannot continue to make such public safety improvements and sustain them on the cheap. Most of the public safety initiatives I have discussed require us to make upfront investments of capital. In the end, however, as I've demonstrated, they actually save more money.

The disparity in funding has real-life consequences:

1. **Case Management System.** We need to invest in a new case management system that will allow us to capture relevant data and case information from the moment the information comes to our office until the case is ultimately disposed of. The proper management and application of technology can help the District Attorney's Office enhance justice, streamline case processing and improve the overall effectiveness of the criminal justice system in the City of Philadelphia. One of the difficulties we have experienced when trying to quantify the impact of the changes we have implemented over the past year is our lack of electronic data collection. The data available in electronic format is not integrated in one database. The design and functional improvements to be incorporated into a new case management system will result in several significant benefits, including allowing us to exchange discovery electronically and sending court notices electronically. These changes would reduce staff time sorting through paper, improve accountability and efficiency, reduce police overtime and provide an automated check to prevent the scheduling of officers for court dates that conflict with other obligations.
2. **Community Courts.** We need an infusion of funds to implement viable and sustainable community courts. With proper resources, we can divert thousands more offenders out of the criminal justice system, directing them to the appropriate programming they need to reduce the chance they will commit new crimes. This is a topic near and dear to many, especially Councilman Jones, and I would love nothing more than to be able to partner with Councilman Jones and others to achieve this important goal.
3. **Family Justice Center.** We need funding to sustain our family justice center, which we hope to begin later this year. This project will help victims of domestic violence in securing protection from abuse orders against those that have committed acts of domestic violence against them.
4. **The Choice Is Yours.** If our Choice is Yours program is successful, we will need funds to sustain the program.
5. **Technology Improvements.** We need funding to begin to replace our crumbling computer infrastructure and construct appropriate links among databases within the city's technology infrastructure that cannot speak to each other now.
6. **Prosecutor Salaries.** And we need funding to permit us to retain talented attorneys who will otherwise depart for far greener pastures. In particular, we must be able to promote attorneys who are being asked to take on additional responsibilities and duties under our new system of community-based prosecution and other innovative programs. Salary freezes encourage our prosecutors to look

for other jobs, and when they leave, the quality of work suffers, and we must actually spend more money to bring in and train new prosecutors to the office. Without enough of the right prosecutors, our programs will lose efficiency and effectiveness. I must emphasize the great work, dedication, and sacrifices of the men and women of my office. They impress me every day, and without them the impact of our success would be diminished.

Mindful of the current economic climate, I am not asking you to simply write a blank check. Instead, I am asking that you allow us to reinvest a portion of the savings we have helped to realize back into our office to fund some of the important priorities I have just discussed. What I am asking for is by no means radical or unprecedented. What I am asking for is Justice Reinvestment, which is among the leading best-practices in criminal justice today. Justice Reinvestment incentivizes criminal justice agencies to identify ways to both improve public safety and reduce costs simultaneously by allowing the agencies to keep a portion of the savings and put it back into the criminal justice system. It is an approach lauded by PEW, the Council for State Governments, as well as the U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies. It began on the state level, and those states, like Texas, that have been able to reduce corrections costs and improve public safety have done so only after adopting a Justice Reinvestment Model.

A source of funding from which we should be authorized to draw a portion of the cost savings we helped Philadelphia realize is the Department of Technology's Capital Budget funds. This is a pot of money that is not typically made available to the District Attorney's Office. But the City no longer can have it both ways – underfund the District Attorney's Office and de-prioritize our ability to make significant innovations and infrastructure improvements. Something must change.

Again, I am quite willing to peg reinvestment to the amount of cost savings we help achieve. There are many ways we can approach this task, and we should do so together and quickly. But put simply, we cannot be the second lowest funded large county District Attorney's office and continue to make transformational changes that both improve public safety and save taxpayer dollars, sustain these changes, and engage directly with the community – unless we have access to the savings we have secured through other funding sources that are available to other entities in the City.

Justice Reinvestment allows you to avoid having to simply increase our budget to the levels of say, Brooklyn or Manhattan. Instead, it rewards innovation and cost-savings and puts into place a way of ensuring continued innovation and cost-savings.

I recommend that, between now and the time this budget is approved, Council should request that our Criminal Justice Advisory Board identify and formulate a justice reinvestment plan for your review. Justice Reinvestment is a topic that Councilman Green has been encouraging for some time now, and as a member of the CJAB, I have full confidence he can ably lead these efforts on behalf of Council.

Conclusion

Thank you for your attention and consideration of my requests. The District Attorney's Office has made historic changes this past year, and with your assistance, we hope to be able to continue our efforts to improve public safety.