

TESTIMONY OF:

Yung-Mi Lee

Director, Law and Appeals

BROOKLYN DEFENDER SERVICES

Presented before

The New York City Council

Committee on Criminal Justice

Oversight Hearing on Improving Court Operations to Reduce the Jail Population.

June 25, 2026

My name is Yung-Mi Lee and I am the Director of Law and Appeals in the Criminal Defense Practice at Brooklyn Defender Services (BDS). BDS is a public defense office whose mission is to provide outstanding representation and advocacy free of cost to people facing loss of freedom, family separation and other serious legal harms by the government. We want to thank the Committee on Criminal Justice and Chair Brooks-Powers for the opportunity to testify today about the strategies needed to improve court operations to meaningfully reduce the city's jail population.

For 30 years, BDS has worked, in and out of court, to protect and uphold the rights of individuals and to change laws and systems that perpetuate injustice and inequality. After 29 years of serving Brooklyn, we expanded our criminal defense services to Queens. We represent over 40,000 people each year who are accused of a crime, facing the removal of their children, or facing deportation. Our staff consists of attorneys, social workers, investigators, paralegals and administrative staff who are experts in their individual fields. BDS also provides a wide range of additional services for our clients, including civil legal advocacy, assistance with the educational needs of our clients or their children, housing and benefits advocacy, as well as immigration advice and representation.

Decreasing the population at Rikers Island should be a paramount priority for New York City. Deplorable, violent and neglectful conditions have persisted at crisis levels on Rikers Island for decades and the lives of thousands of New Yorkers have been invariably damaged and remain at risk. The current population at Rikers is over 6,600 people. Tragically, four people have died in Department of Correction custody in 2026. The use of force, lack of consistent and adequate medical care, extended lock-ins, lack of programming, and arbitrary practices pervade the daily life of people in custody.

Thousands of the people we serve each year are detained or incarcerated in New York City's jail system either while fighting their cases in court or upon conviction of a misdemeanor (or less serious felony) and a sentence of a year or less. As public defenders representing people held in the custody of the Department of Correction, we see every day the profound human cost of incarceration. Through our work in the jails, our staff addresses urgent needs related to basic civil rights and conditions of confinement for our clients who are incarcerated. We work to secure access to essential medical and mental health care, and address safety and education needs through individual administrative advocacy, participate in Board of Correction (BOC) hearings and numerous working groups. We monitor and document the conditions inside New York City's jails and advocate for the rights, safety and protection of those inside these facilities.

We are hopeful that New York City is on the threshold of change. With Commissioner Stanley Richards at the helm of the Department of Correction and the appointment of Nicholas Deml as the remediation manager for Rikers, NYC has a unique opportunity for impactful change¹ within our jail system and to bring an end to excessive use of force, the culture of neglect and degradation, extended lock-ins and solitary confinement, and lack of basic necessities such as mattresses, food, clothing, and health care. The City Council can partner with the Mayor and agency commissions to help improve court functioning and decrease the jail population. We respectfully offer the following recommendations:

I. Courts Must Treat Pretrial Liberty as the Rule, Not the Exception

BDS urges the Council to treat pretrial detention as a policy choice—not an inevitability. The city cannot close Rikers, reduce harm, or honor the presumption of innocence while court actors continue to rely on bail and jail as routine case-management tools. The Council should use its oversight authority to demand transparent data, identify the practices that are driving detention, and require concrete corrective action from courts, prosecutors, and city agencies.

¹ Raven Blau, 14 People Released From Rikers By New Jail Boss Using Little-Known Power, *The City* (June 25, 2026), <https://www.thecityreporter.nyc/2026/06/25/rikers-early-release-stanley-richards-jail/>.

Despite repeated statewide legislative efforts to ensure that courts give real meaning to the presumption of innocence, New Yorkers continue to be detained pretrial because bail is set in amounts they cannot afford. In practice, money bail too often functions not as a means to ensure return to court, but as a detention order imposed before trial, before conviction, and frequently before the defense has had any meaningful opportunity to investigate the case or present the person's full circumstances to the court.

Judges Must Make Individualized, On-The-Record Findings Before Setting Bail

Judges should be required to explain why release on recognizance, non-monetary conditions, supervised release, court reminders, transportation support, treatment, housing assistance, or other community-based measures are insufficient before imposing bail that predictably results in incarceration. A recent Court of Appeals decision underscored the widespread failure of many courts to make such individualized decisions.² In that decision, the Court reminded bail-setting courts that bail decisions require individualized determinations of flight risk and must be explained on the record. New York's bail statutes require courts to consider a broad set of factors, including the person's activities and history, criminal conviction record, record of court appearances, and other individualized facts. Yet in far too many cases, courts reduce the analysis to the seriousness of the charges and the existence of prior convictions, effectively treating accusation as proof and poverty as risk.

Courts rarely give meaningful consideration to the other statutory factors, even though the consequences of pretrial detention are severe. Thousands of people are currently detained at Rikers Island while awaiting trial, and a substantial portion of that population has identified mental health needs requiring discharge planning.³ Many people detained pretrial come from low-income and under-resourced communities, and their incarceration further destabilizes their lives and the lives of their families. Even where a person is charged with a qualifying offense, courts must not assume that detention is justified. Many qualifying offenses do not involve allegations of serious physical harm (a bail factor), and the law still requires an individualized determination that the least restrictive alternative has been considered and found insufficient.

Second, judges must meaningfully consider the ability to pay. Courts should not set bail at amounts that the person and their family cannot afford. The New York State Legislature intended for courts to use the kind and degree of control necessary to ensure a person's return to court and required courts to set more than one form of bail so that people have a meaningful opportunity to

² *People ex rel. Kon v. Lynelle Maginley-Liddie*, 45 NY3d 100 (2025).

³ Kellyann Bock & Michael Rempel, Flagging for Mental Health Needs in New York City Jails: Prevalence and Timing, *Data Collaborative for Justice* (April, 2025), https://datacollaborativeforjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/MH_Brief-1.pdf

secure release. That requirement is undermined when courts set alternative forms of bail but make the non-commercial option—partially secured or unsecured—functionally unavailable. Unsecured bonds and partially secured bonds must be treated as real, accessible alternatives—not theoretical options that exist only on paper.

Judges often set partially secured bonds at amounts far higher than commercial insurance bonds, creating the appearance that the courts favor commercial bail bond companies over more affordable statutory alternatives. Even worse, some courts make posting a partially secured bond unnecessarily difficult for sureties, family and friends who come forward to help, by scrutinizing these loved ones in ways that have no meaningful relationship to ensuring a person’s return to court. BDS attorneys have seen sureties chastised for trying to help secure a loved one’s release. Some courts have rejected sureties based on income, even where the surety’s income shows an ability to pay the entire partially secured bond amount. A very recent Second Department decision highlights this ongoing arbitrary practice of disapproving sureties even when paychecks and stable work histories are shown.⁴ These practices punish hardworking families.

Courts should also remove unnecessary barriers to posting bail. In appropriate cases, cash bail should be payable by credit card at the courthouse. Families often do not know that posting bail at Rikers Island can include a significantly higher fee than the standard credit card processing fee available at a courthouse. That difference can push families toward commercial bail bondsmen, who impose additional costs and obligations on already struggling households. Rather than setting credit card bail at a much higher amount than cash bail, courts should allow credit card payment on fair and transparent terms so that the method of payment does not become another barrier to release.

Third, courts should conduct regular bail reviews for every person detained pretrial on bail they cannot afford, particularly where detention has become prolonged, discovery delays have occurred, treatment or housing options have become available, or the person’s circumstances have changed. Bail should not be imposed at arraignment and then allowed to harden into months or years of incarceration without meaningful judicial review. If the stated purpose of bail is to ensure return to court, courts must continuously ask whether detention remains necessary and whether less restrictive conditions would suffice.

Finally, court administrators and supervising judges should use data to identify patterns in bail setting, remand, case delay, and prolonged detention. The City Council should require regular⁵ public reporting that disaggregates bail decisions by borough, judge, charge category, race, gender, age, mental health designation, amount set, form of bail, time to posting, and length of

⁴ *People ex rel. Boksenbaum v. Stanley Richards*, 2026 N.Y. Slip Op. 03256 (2nd Dept. 2026).

⁵ See CPL § 510.20.

pretrial detention. Without transparent data, policymakers cannot determine whether the law is being followed, whether similarly situated people are being treated consistently, or whether court practices are driving the population at Rikers Island.

Prosecutors Must Stop Requesting Jail as the Default

Prosecutors also play a central role in reducing unnecessary pretrial detention. Every bail request, every discovery delay, every refusal to consent to a person's release from pretrial detention, every plea offer that requires jail time, and every opposition to treatment, housing, or community-based support contributes to the size of the city's jail population. Prosecutors cannot publicly support closing Rikers while continuing to request incarceration as the default response in individual cases.

First, prosecutors should presumptively recommend release in the vast majority of cases. Poverty, housing instability, mental health needs, substance use, unemployment, or prior system contact should not be treated as proxies for risk or as reasons to seek incarceration. These are precisely the circumstances in which community-based supports are most necessary. The appropriate response is connection to services, not pretrial jail.

Second, prosecutors should stop requesting bail amounts they know many New Yorkers cannot pay. If the lawful purpose of bail is to ensure return to court, then any bail request must be tied to the person's actual financial circumstances and to a record-based explanation of why less restrictive conditions are insufficient. Prosecutors should not use unaffordable bail as leverage to induce guilty pleas, pressure people to waive rights, or extract case outcomes that would not be accepted if the person were fighting the case from the community.

Third, prosecutors should commit to measurable internal policies that reduce unnecessary detention: presumptive consent to release absent a particularized showing, limits on bail requests, prompt discovery compliance, consent to bail review where cases are delayed, and support for treatment, housing, and supervised release in lieu of incarceration. The City Council should demand transparency from prosecutors about how often they request bail, the amounts requested, the reasons given, the demographics of the people affected, and the case outcomes that follow.

II. Discovery Laws Must be Properly Implemented and Complied With

In criminal cases, discovery is the process by which prosecutors share information with the defense. Much of this information comes from law enforcement: police reports, witness statements, video surveillance, body-worn camera footage, identification procedures, crime scene photos, 911 call recordings and transcripts, witness statements, and more. Even a note on a slip of paper is a part of discovery that could lead to exoneration.

Timely access to evidence is critical for defense attorneys to conduct the investigations, research, and analysis necessary for their clients to receive a complete defense. For many decades in New York, prosecutors and police were not required to provide discovery to people facing criminal allegations or their attorneys until the eve of trial. Instead, people were coerced to plead guilty while blindfolded to the evidence, fueling mass incarceration and wrongful convictions.

In 2019, New York enacted comprehensive discovery reforms to ensure that New Yorkers accused of crimes have timely access to the most important information in their case, bringing New York’s discovery law in line with those of the rest of the country. Yet, every year since its implementation, prosecutors have sought to erode this essential mechanism that restored the promise of due process and fair dealing in our criminal legal system. Indeed, by standing firm in protecting our discovery law and refusing to accept rollbacks, New York’s trial and appellate courts have been able to further interpret and clarify the statute, making clear that the legislative intent of discovery reform never demanded a “perfect prosecutor” but rather one who is duly diligent in their work.⁶ In its wake, trial courts and appellate court decisions in the last few years have shown again and again that cases are not being dismissed on “technicalities” or by defense attorneys exploiting “loopholes.” We must not forget that the intent of our landmark discovery reform was to stop blind pleas at arraignments by creating an enforcement mechanism for the timely and open sharing of evidence collected by the government. The law is not “overly burdensome” or “onerous,” and we ask that the Council works to ensure that the law can be implemented as intended.

It is clear that many discovery implementation issues are the result of both the NYPD’s policing practices and their resistance to turning over evidence to prosecutors. In the last decade, New York, like the rest of the country, has experienced a massive shift in the way that we store and access information, including discovery. Digital storage costs have declined significantly, and digital processing speeds have increased exponentially. Capitalizing on these technical achievements, the NYPD spent millions of dollars on document and case management systems, as well as data collection and storage products (often called surveillance technologies). Partnering with companies like Microsoft and IBM, the NYPD built multiple systems to store, organize, analyze and share collected data, including police reports, body-worn camera videos, and other digitally collected evidence.⁷ Despite using multiple systems internally, modern computer science and data architecture make the sharing of information amongst those systems

⁶ *People v. Bay*, 2023 NY Slip Op 06407 Court of Appeals (2023); *People v. Coley*, 244 A.D.3d 122 (2nd Dept. 2025).

⁷ Some of NYPD’s major internal systems include the NYPD Enterprise Case Management System, Omniform, Z FINEST, and the Domain Awareness System. The NYPD also contracts with outside companies for data collection and storage. For example, NYPD purchases its body-worn cameras and body-worn camera video storage from a company called Axon. Axon provides storage, sharing capabilities, and analysis via its cloud-based platform: evidence.com.

and database instances simple and able to be automated. The NYPD uses those data innovations daily to coordinate, collate, and analyze its numerous data sources. As the NYPD noted almost a decade ago, “[t]he amount of information available through [its] Crime Data Warehouse is astonishingly large and incomparable to other law enforcement and public safety agencies.”⁸

For external sharing, each of the NYPD’s data systems are designed to make the collection and sharing of information—particularly the kind of information required by New York’s discovery statute—quick, straightforward, and simple. However, even though it has never been easier to disclose information electronically in a timely manner, turnover of discovery continues to be inexcusably delayed. These delays can be directly attributed to a fundamental lack of transparency about NYPD’s systems and NYPD’s failure to turn over their records to prosecutors, causing pre-trial delays and backlogs in the court system. It is imperative that the NYPD give prosecutors direct access to their digital evidence systems to facilitate faster compliance with discovery obligations. The NYPD has not done this and is not being transparent about it.

Discovery is a critical tool for defenders to properly investigate a case. Access to discovery is necessary for someone to make an informed decision about their case, ensuring people have the information to decide about whether to go to trial or make an informed plea decision. And it is indisputable that access to discovery minimizes the likelihood of wrongful convictions. We call on the City Council to further investigate the NYPD’s lack of transparency and delays in providing access to records, documents, data, and video content.

III. Prioritize Public Health Response to Mental Health Crises

We urge the Council to prioritize a transformative shift in funding from incarceration, surveillance, and punitive measures to comprehensive mental health care, as this investment will not only address the urgent needs of the populations most in need of services, but will ultimately create a safer, healthier, and more just city for all New Yorkers. Without meaningful investment in mental health services and emergency response systems, we risk perpetuating a harmful cycle that criminalizes people living with serious mental illness rather than providing them the support they deserve, which in turn would make all New Yorkers safer.

Expand Access to Low-Cost Mental Health and Substance Use Treatment

⁸ NYPD Information Technology Bureau, Developing the NYPD’s Information Technology, <https://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/home/POA/pdf/Technology.pdf>.

Many of the people we represent have tried for years to access mental health and substance use treatment, but struggle to find providers who accept their insurance, speak their language, or have the skills needed to treat complex conditions. They are often discharged from hospitals without proper follow-up care and lack appropriate resources in their communities. People seeking care remain on waitlists for months or years for Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) teams, supportive housing, psychiatric visits or other care they require. Individuals are routinely discharged from psychiatric hospitalization with nothing more than a referral to first-come-first-serve walk-in mental health care and a list of congregate shelters or are outright denied services for requiring a “higher level of care” or having a co-occurring substance use disorder. Left without viable treatment options, they are funneled into the criminal legal system—policed, arrested, and incarcerated when they should be receiving health care.

For people with co-occurring mental health and substance use treatment needs, there is only one long-term, inpatient treatment facility in New York City that accepts Medicaid. This means many people we represent spend months waiting for an opening—often while incarcerated on Rikers Island—or, if they have “failed” programming in the past, do not qualify for treatment. To address the real treatment needs of New Yorkers and address the jail population, it is critical that the city incentivize other dual-diagnosis providers to provide care to accept Medicaid or offer expanded low- or no-cost treatment options.

End Policing as the Default Response to New Yorkers in a Mental Health Crisis

For years, BDS has advocated for the removal of the NYPD from the majority of mental health responses, including emergencies, and for the expansion of mobile crisis teams staffed by trained professionals. While the city has made some attempts to reform its approach to serious mental illness (SMI) through piecemeal legislation and pilot programs, these efforts remain insufficient. Despite the growing recognition of the problem, the NYPD and the criminal legal system continue to be relied upon as the default responders in mental health crises. This reliance not only fails to address the root causes of these emergencies but also puts lives at risk.

The city should continue to invest and build upon the “Crisis to Care” platform⁹ championed by the Progressive Caucus and the city’s new Office of Community Safety must begin to completely overhaul B-HEARD. BDS supports the implementation and expansion of B-HEARD, and we encourage the Council to work with the mayor’s office to ensure this program is fully staffed and funded to meet community needs:

⁹ <https://nycprogressives.com/crisis-to-care/>

- Clinicians, EMTs, and peers should be available in all boroughs and all neighborhoods to respond to calls in a mental health emergency.
- B-HEARD responders must be fairly compensated to attract and retain high-quality staff, ensuring that New Yorkers in every borough have access to the care they need.
- EMS dispatchers must also be trained to appropriately prioritize this response, defaulting to B-HEARD for mental health emergencies. Mental health emergencies account for nearly 10% of all 911 calls in New York, and yet B-HEARD, though improving in response, has only responded to about a quarter of those calls.¹⁰
- B-HEARD must expand its operating hours to become a 24-hour emergency response service.

Pass a New York City Council Resolution in Support of NYS Treatment Court Expansion Act

New York City should commit to creating more off ramps from the criminal legal system. The City Council should call on the state legislature to pass and the Governor to sign the Treatment Court Expansion Act (S.4547-Ramos)/A.4869-Forrest).

In 2009, as part of the Rockefeller Drug Law Reforms, New York State passed the Judicial Diversion Program legislation. Under Criminal Procedure Law Article 216 (CPL §216), this legislation created a pathway for a small subset of people with substance use disorders to avoid prison and potentially have their charges reduced or dismissed after engaging in a course of treatment. This treatment is monitored by specialized court parts in every county in New York. Judicial diversion has successfully enabled thousands of individuals to minimize or avoid a criminal record while receiving the benefit of potentially lifesaving substance use treatment.

Judicial diversion has also realized the saving of tax dollars, from both reductions in reoffending and the decreased costs per capita of treatment versus incarceration. Unfortunately, CPL §216 diversion is limited to people with substance use disorders charged with a short list of crimes related to substance use. The current law leaves behind people who do not live with substance use disorders, but experience other mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, or cognitive impairments that can be effectively addressed through treatment.

People living with mental health issues deserve treatment, not jail. Mental health intervention through courts can decrease the jail population and provide people with access to treatment they would not otherwise receive if incarcerated. This has been shown to increase mental health program enrollment and completion of these programs reduces homelessness, psychiatric

¹⁰ Lewis, Caroline. NYC program for non-police 911 response still handles a fraction of eligible mental health calls, Gothamist (Jan. 31, 2024), NYC program for non-police 911 response still handles a fraction of eligible mental health calls - Gothamist.

hospitalizations, and rates of recidivism¹¹. New York can become a leader in diverting people with mental health issues out of the criminal legal system and into treatment by passing the Treatment Court Expansion Act.

IV. Address Delayed Transfers to Office of Mental Health Facilities

Pursuant to the Criminal Procedure Law governing mental fitness to proceed with trial under Article 730, when a person is incarcerated at the time a court issues an order of examination of fitness, the examination must be done at the facility where the person is being held.¹² This means people awaiting a mental fitness exam who are incarcerated at Rikers Island, for example, must wait there until they have an exam completed by correctional health services.¹³ As per the city's own data, people requiring 730 examinations remain in jail three times longer than those without serious mental illness.¹⁴ Moreover, if the person is found "unfit" or "incapacitated," they will remain incarcerated until there is a bed available for them at an appropriate institution operated by the NYS Office of Mental Health (OMH). Currently, approximately 200 people are incarcerated awaiting transfer to an OMH facility. The average wait time is more than five months.

The lack of resources for mental health treatment in this area, including lack of trained and licensed personnel and available bed space at appropriate facilities, such as Kirby Forensic Psychiatric Center and Mid-Hudson Forensic Psychiatric Center, is causing people to languish in city jails without appropriate treatment.¹⁵ Another solution exists and is authorized under Article 730. Defense attorneys continue to seek alternatives such as outpatient restorations. OMH utilizes local city hospitals such as Kingsboro, Metropolitan and South Beach. However, without appropriate funding, outpatient restoration services will remain limited and prosecutors will continue to refuse to consent to outpatient restorations.

As discussed above, city jails, and Rikers Island in particular, are ill-equipped to treat those with mental illness. The longer a person remains incarcerated at a city jail without proper treatment, the harder their condition may be to treat, and the more resources it may require to help them

¹¹ Nazisha Dholakia and Daniela Gilbert, What Happens When We Send Mental Health Providers Instead of Police, *Vera Institute of Justice: Think Justice Blog*, 2021, Available online at <https://www.vera.org/blog/what-happenswhen-we-send-mental-health-providers-instead-of-police>.

¹² CPL 730.20 (3)

¹³ According to MOCJ, as of May 31, 2021, about 140 people who were classified as held in jail for a miscellaneous "other reason" are, 53 in fact, jailed pending a mental competency examination per CPL § 730.2.

¹⁴ <https://www.nychealthandhospitals.org/pressrelease/health-system-streamlines-psychiatric-evaluations/>

¹⁵ New York State Nurses Association, A Crisis in Inpatient Psychiatric Services in New York State Hospitals, 2020, Available online at <https://www.nysna.org/sites/default/files/attach/ajax/2020/08/Psych%20Whitepaper%20NYSNA.pdf0>.

stabilize and return to baseline functioning, and rejoin their homes and communities. We urge the City Council to require transparency and accountability. For anyone incarcerated at Rikers, OMH should be required to report on a quarterly basis its decisions on specific designations (Kirby, Mid-Hudson or Manhattan Psychiatric), the wait times for each facility and individual, and the length of stay at each facility. Finally, because outpatient restorations are authorized, OMH should be required to report on the number of out-patient restorations at each local hospital as well as the length of treatment to treat and restore each individual.

V. End the Criminalization of Poverty and Broken Windows Policing

The NYPD is increasingly policing poverty and untreated mental illness or behavioral health needs. This undermines both safety and public health. Waitlists and backlogs to access social services that address the needs of people with mental health and substance use concerns, as well as the houselessness and food insecurity that are the underlying causes of many arrests, should be eliminated. As public defenders, we see people in crisis who are far too often met with legal system involvement, when they should have been met with care. We must free up resources for cases and clients whose needs actually require court intervention. We call on the City Council to use its oversight power to question NYPD Commissioner Tisch as to her ramping up of quality of life policing efforts and require her to justify these low-level arrests, which over the last year have steadily increased the number of court cases and the number of people incarcerated at Riker's Island.

We call on the City Council to continue to question NYPD on their overuse of in-custody arrest rather than issuing appearance tickets for low-level offenses as required by law¹⁶. At least nine New Yorkers died in NYPD custody in 2025, three of them inside local courthouses waiting to be arraigned on low-level charges.¹⁷ This year, at least three people have died in NYPD custody while awaiting to see a judge and another person gave birth while detained in arraignments.

NYPD routinely violates Criminal Procedure Law (CPL) §150.20, which requires them (with limited exceptions) to issue appearance tickets in lieu of arresting individuals charged with violations, infractions, misdemeanors, and certain class E felonies. Custodial arrests for low-level charges are on the rise, are illegal and unwarranted, and contribute to people with medical conditions and mental health issues entering precincts and jails in which NYPD is not equipped to provide needed medical attention.

¹⁶ [Letter re: 10 point plan to address NYPD in-custody deaths](#)

¹⁷ Yoav Gonen and Reuven Blau, Deaths in NYPD Custody Doubled in Recent Years (Sept. 17, 2025), <https://www.thecity.nyc/2025/09/17/deaths-nypd-custody-doubled-2023-2024/>

Additionally, prosecutors' disparate handling of violation and misdemeanor complaints, combined with overly harsh emphasis on pre-arraignment detention rather than issuing appearance tickets as mandated by law (CPL 150.20), should be examined by the City Council. Many of these policies exacerbate NYPD's improper use of in-custody arrests and illegal stop and frisk practices, which can ultimately contribute to the deadly nature of pre-arraignment incarceration. The practice of denying appearance tickets on petit larceny cases because of a potential order of protection for allegations of theft alone should be examined and reformed. Prosecutors, in conjunction with the courts, should organize amnesty days so people can clear old bench warrants without fear, and prosecutors should dismiss outstanding summons part (SAP) warrants.

Conclusion

The city cannot close Rikers, reduce harm, or honor the presumption of innocence while court actors continue to rely on bail and jail as routine case-management tools. The Council should use its oversight authority to demand transparent data, identify the practices that are driving detention, and require concrete corrective action from courts, prosecutors, and city agencies. At the same time, the city must invest in the supports that actually help people return to court and remain stable in the community: housing, transportation, treatment, peer support, mental health care, voluntary services, and defense access. We thank the Committee on Criminal Justice and Chair Brooks-Powers for the opportunity to address this important issue of how we can decrease the numbers of people being held inside our city's jails. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at ylee@bds.org.