CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

----- X

March 22, 2017 Start: 1:20 p.m. Recess: 3:23 p.m.

HELD AT: City Hall - Committee Room

B E F O R E: Darlene Mealy

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Brad Lander

Rafael Salamanca, Jr.

Daniel Dromm Andy King

#### APPEARANCES CONTINUED

Dr. Danny Jane

Carmelyn Malalis, Commissioner New York Commission on Human Rights

Brittny Saunders
Deputy Commissioner for Strategic
Initiatives, New York Commission
on Human Rights

Dana Sussman
Deputy Commissioner for
Intergovernmental Affairs and
Policy, New York Commission on
Human Rights

Cristobal Gutierrez Make The Road

Allegra Fishel Gender Equality Law Center

Nicole Salk (SP) Brooklyn Legal Services

Isabelle Figaro
Brooklyn Legal Services

2

[gavel]

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: I'm going open up this Committee on Civil Rights for the Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget. My name is Darlene Mealy. the Chair of the Civil Rights Committee. In keeping with the budget process that is mandated by the city charter and which will ultimately lead to the adoption of the Fiscal 2018 Budget, today we will hear testimony from Carmelyn Malalis, Commissioner on Human Rights. In today's hearing will discuss highlights of the Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget and the 2017 Preliminary Management Report. The Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget for the Commission on Human Rights, excuse me, totals \$11.4 million, a decrease in 114,000 from its fiscal 2017 adopted budget of 11.5 million; the 114,000 decrease is due to a decrease in the other than personal services budget a budget of 1.3 million offset by increase in the personal services. The Fiscal 2017 Budget for the Commission on Human Rights as presented in the preliminary plans shows growth of 567,000 or five percent since adoption due to the new needs and other adjustments. The Commission has a budgeted headcount of 130 under the current preliminary plan. We look

# 1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS forward to hearing from the Commissioner, Commission 2 3 on Human Rights on its operational and fiscal 2018 4 expense budget. Before we hear from the 5 Commissioner, Commissioner on Human Rights, I would like to think my committee Inesha (SP) Wright, Unit 6 7 Head; Sheila Johnson, physical analyst; my staff Ashley of my office, my Legislative Director. Once 8 again, I think everyone for being here this 10 afternoon. Before we hear from the Commissioner, we 11 have to swear you in. Are you ready? 12 COMMISSIONER MALALIS: 13 CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Raise your right 14 hand. 15 [OATH ADMINISTERED] 16 CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. I am 17 going to turn it over to the Commissioner. You may 18 begin. 19 COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Thank you so much, 20 Chair Mealy. Good --21 CHAIRPERSON MEALY: I'm sorry, before, we have been joined by my colleague Brad Lander. 2.2 2.3 cannot forget you. I apologize. Forgive me,

Commissioner, you may start now.

2	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Thank you. First
3	of all, good afternoon and thank you Chair Mealy and
4	Council Member Lander and the other members and staff
5	of the Civil Rights Committee as well as Council
6	Finance. Thank you for convening today's hearing.
7	As you know, I am Carmelyn P. Malalis. I am the
8	Chair and Commissioner for the New York City
9	Commission on Human Rights and today I am happy to
10	say I am joined by two of my Deputy Commissioners.
11	To my left is Brittny Saunders, who is our Deputy
12	Commissioner for Strategic Initiatives, and to my
13	right is Dana Sussman, our Deputy Commissioner for
14	Intergovernmental Affairs and Policy. So, just last
15	month, I celebrated my two year anniversary as
16	Commissioner and Chair of the Commission and I have
17	to say I am incredibly proud of what our team has
18	accomplished in this very short period of time. In
19	preparation for today's hearing, I took the
20	opportunity to reflect on the work of the agency in
21	the last calendar year. I can that 2016 was nothing
22	short of a transformational year in the Commission.
23	We built on the accomplishments of 2015 and continued
24	to expand the agency's reach, strategic enforcement
25	and public education efforts. The Commission

continued to fill keys positions with top-notch
personnel across the agency and I'm happy to report
that New York City has no shortage of people standing
up for vulnerable communities and fighting for human
rights. When have job vacancies, the application
pools have been competitive. Applicants with a
demonstrated commitment to social justice seem eager
to contribute to the work of the agency. Our
talented, admission driven staff enabled the agency
to continue an ambitious pace of activity in the
calendar year 2016. We engaged in strategic
enforcement efforts utilizing our testing
capabilities and filing more pattern and practice
cases. We resolved complaints with more damages for
and penalties on behalf of New Yorkers. We created
new and groundbreaking programing to reach out to
more communities across New York City. We continued
to increase our staffs' language capacity to better
reflect the city in which we serve. When I first
joined the commission in 2015, only six languages
were spoken across the agency and by prioritizing
language access we now have a staff that speak 29
different language to reflect our emphasis on hiring
culturally and linguistically competent staff who

2	reflect the diversity of New York City. The
3	Commission built on its major media campaigns of 2015
4	on Stop Credit Discrimination and Employment Act and
5	the Fair Chance Act by launching a nationally
6	recognized and award winning campaign on bathroom
7	access in June of 2016, look past pink and blue also
8	with the #BUNYC. In the face of the passage of
9	transphobic and discriminatory laws across the
10	country. And as unaphobic and Islamophobic rhetoric
11	heated up during the election cycle, Commission
12	responded with a social media campaign, I Am Muslim
13	NYC, in September 2016 to stand with Muslim New
14	Yorkers and remind everyone that that they are
15	protected from discrimination in New York City. We
16	doubled-down on our investment in community and
17	ethnic media to expand our reach, investing about 80
18	percent of our newspaper and radio buys in ethnic and
19	community media and after the presidential election,
20	the Commission quickly reassessed its priorities. We
21	held eight listening sessions with advocates on
22	immigrant rights, worker's rights, LGBTQ issues,
23	racial justice and faith leaders from across the
24	city. We reallocated resources and launched several
25	new initiatives in response to the needs of the

communities with which we work and revamped our media
outreach efforts including issuing new multilingual
materials in a digital, mobile and ethnic media
campaign on discriminatory harassment protections.
In order to appropriately support the work I've
described, we also overhauled the Commissions
technological infrastructure and upgraded our
technology in all areas. Given that I am reported or
the develop of the Commission since we last met in
March 2016, I want to make sure I am focusing my
comments unless otherwise noted on the Commissions
work and accomplishments from calendar year 2016 and
that is consistent with our 2016 annual report as per
the agency's statutory reporting requirements. This
annual report was sent to the Council on March 1,
2017 and I note that the calendar year is the period
we're statutorily required to report which is
different from the period that is covered in the
Mayor's management report which captures database on
the fiscal year and I note that just because I know
from last year there were some questions about that.
So first let me delve deeper into staffing personnel
at the Commission. Thanks to the Council's and the
administration's continued support for the agency.

The Commission expanded our staff to fill nearly all
of our allocated lines in 2016. Moving the
Committee's central office from 100 Gold Street to
its current temporary location at 22 Reed, enabled
the Commission to fill lines added to the agency as
part of the fiscal year 2015 budget. When I began my
tenure in February of 2015, we had a headcount of 56
and as of today the Commission has grown to a staff
of approximately 107 which is just 23 hires away from
the Commission's full capacity of 130 lines. The
only unfilled positions are a result of regular
turnover or were added recently to the Commission's
budget through the January 2017 budget process and
for several of those lines we already have either
outstanding offers extended or they are somehow in
the process with OMB of being filled so several of
them for already in process. We have added staff in
all areas of the Commission including law-enforcement
bureau, community relations bureau. We have also
added key staff to departments that we created when
we revamped our infrastructure in 2015 including the
Office of the Chair, Office of Communication and
Marketing, the General Counsel's Office, Operations
and the Human Resources Department. In 2016, we also

2	hired a director to the Office of Mediation and
3	Conflict Resolution which we had reopened in 2015.
4	The Director is Liz Shampnoi, a well-known mediator
5	and arbitrator with expertise in building and
6	implementing mediator programs. In the law-
7	enforcement bureau, we now have 29 current or
8	incoming attorneys with a caseload and a total of 23
9	staff attorneys. In 2016, the Commission hired 19
10	new people into the bureau including seven attorneys,
11	one Assistant Commissioner, one supervising attorney,
12	three human rights specialist, one in-for-line
13	director, three administrative support personnel, one
14	full-time testing coordinator and two part-time
15	testers. As of today, we have four unfilled attorney
16	lines as a result of attrition and we have already
17	extended offers for three of those lines. Under the
18	supervision of Assistant Commissioner Sapna Raj, we
19	have expanded our testing program to include a
20	testing coordinator, part-time testers and
21	administrative staff and as you can see from our
22	annual report this expansion has allowed us to
23	complete over 557 tests in 2016 alone. We also
24	built-up our info line team to respond to the over 60
25	percent increase in inquiries the Commission

experienced in calendar year 2016. The Commission
now has Director of Info Line and five info line
specialist, answering and returning calls, making
referrals and setting appointments for intake with
law-enforcement bureau attorneys. In the Community
Relations Bureau, we now have a total of 29 human
right specialists, including our community service
centers directors. In 2016, the Commission hired 10
new staff into the bureau, including nine human
rights specialist and one managing director. As of
today, we'll have only eight unfilled lines for human
rights specialist and management staff in the bureau
because of attrition and expend to extend offers for
hire for those lines within the coming weeks. We
have thoughtfully grown this bureau to take into
account the developing needs of our local communities
given pressures they are feeling locally and
nationally. With this in mind, we added a lead
advisor for Muslim, South Asian and Arab communities,
a position we believe is fairly unique for a city
agency and demonstrates this agency's commitment to
reaching some of the most vulnerable and targeted
communities. Our lead advisor in this area, Rhama
Esis (SP) speaks four languages including Arabic,

comes most recently from the Arab American Family
Service Center and the Mayor's Fund and has worked
tirelessly to deeper the Commission's relationships
and credibility with Muslim, South Asian and Arab
communities. As a result of our programming and
focus relationship building in this area, we have
been able to create important strategic partnerships
at time when these communities are facing incredible
hatred and uncertainty. In fact, I am proud that our
work has been recognized by many advocates including
the Muslim Bar Association of New York which is
honoring the Commission on Human Rights with its
Advocate of the Year award next month. We have hired
human right specialists for all five community
service centers which are located in each borough who
bring deep connections to diverse communities
throughout the city, fluency in multiple languages
and cultural competency to reflect the communities in
these boroughs. Other areas of the agency have also
been edified in calendar year 2016 to accomplish the
mandates of the Commission. As you are aware from my
prior testimony, we established the Office of the
Chair to coordinate the administrative, legislative,
administrative and policy functions of the agency.

Ms. Saunders, Ms. Sussman and I all sit in this
office. Consolidating those functions within the
Office of the Chair has allowed the agencies to play
a more active role in legislative and policy
discussions within the administration and with
counsel and with public constituents and some of the
folks in this room are well aware of that. It also
helps us to ensure that the policy decisions
communicated across the agency are consistent whether
they are made through the adjudicatory or role-making
processes. In the past year, we continued to
strengthen these functions by adding a Deputy
Commissioner for Strategic Initiatives, which is Ms.
Saunders, as well as an Associate Policy Counsel and
Policy Analyst focusing on the mixture of policy
development, interagency engagement, adjudication of
appeals and decisions and orders, legislation rules,
regulations and legal enforcement guidance. There
are now four attorneys and a policy analyst working
with me and my assistant in this office. As our Law-
Enforcement and Community Relations Bureau expanded
to near full capacity, we also continue to invest in
the other areas of the agency that support and help
to amplify their work. We continued to empower our

Office of Communication and Marketing which we
reestablished at the agency in 2015. Deputy
Commissioner Carmen Boon, who is also here today, has
built a reliable infrastructure for this office and
has strategically developed the capacity of the team
with the addition of a press secretary to build on
our robust 2015 press outreach and media relations
and do more focused outreach to community and ethnic
radio stations, newspapers and content vertical
websites and also a communications and marketing
coordinator to project manage media campaign
production including procurement and contracts with
MWBE media vendors among other tasks. In calendar
year 2016, we also brought on a Chief Information
Officer and technology support staff to create a
functional IT team focused on upgrading the
Commission's system to help us keep pace with the
increasing demands on our agency. I am very proud to
announce that we are nearly complete in our
transition from the Commission's outdated case
tracking and data management systems, this had been a
topic of discussion in prior testimony, to a new
dynamic system that is scheduled to go live next
month. This was an enormous undertaking that

2	required extensive planning and developing with our
3	law-enforcement bureau staff, our IT staff, Do-It and
4	other city partners. Finally, the General Counsel's
5	Office added to new assistant general counsels and
6	the operations department created in 2015 added a
7	budget analyst in 2016. So now I'm going to focus my
8	comments on the work of law-enforcement bureau in
9	2016. 2016 was an incredibly busy year for the
10	Commission's law-enforcement bureau. Building on a
11	30 percent increase in complaints filed in 2015, the
12	Commission surpassed its 2015 numbers by filing 883
13	complaints in 2016. The Commission also fielded over
14	8,000 inquiries from the public which is a 60 percent
15	increase from the previous year and a testament to
16	the outreach and communications work of the agency.
17	In the past year, the Commission significantly
18	stepped up its affirmative investigation powers to
19	initiate its own investigations into violations of
20	the New York City Human Rights Law through
21	information provided anonymously by members of the
22	public or when the media or community stakeholders
23	report information about general trends of
24	discrimination. The Commission initiated
25	investigations that account for 426 potential

violations with some overlapping areas of protection.
In employment, the majority of Commission initiated
investigations focused on violations of the Fair
Chance Act of which there were 190 and in housing,
the majority of Commission initiated investigations
focused on lawful source of income discrimination of
which there were 137. Similarly, the Commission
significantly expanded its testing program in 2016
and undertook both matched pair tests and unmatched
tests far surpassing the statutory requirements
placed on it 2015 requiring only five matched pair
tests in housing and five matched fair tests in
employment. In the context of employment, the
commission completed 289 total tests of which 16 were
match pair tests. 235 tests based on conviction
and/or arrest record discrimination, it identified
148 instances of discrimination from those tests; 16
tests in the area of credit history and uncovered 16
instances of discrimination in that context; 24 tests
in the area of race of which 12 were match pair tests
and identified no instances of discrimination and 12
tests in the area of gender of which four were match
pair tests and identified three instances of
discrimination. In the context of housing, the

2	Commission completed 257 tests of which 74 were match
3	pair tests and the Commission focused its tests on
4	lawful source of income discrimination and
5	discrimination based on gender identity or gender
6	expression. The Commission completed 200 tests in
7	lawful source of income of which 74 were match pair
8	tests uncovering 53 instances of discrimination.
9	With respect to discrimination based on gender
10	identity and/or expression, the Commission completed
11	47 test and identified 22 instances of
12	discrimination. The law-enforcement bureau continued
13	to implement changes in 2016 to further the promise
14	that the Commission on Human Rights should serve as
15	an equivalent venue for justice to state or federal
16	court. This work required raising the standard for
17	investigations, conducting in-depth investigations to
18	identify pattern and practice violations and
19	obtaining respondents full compliance with all areas
20	of the city's human right law. The Commission is
21	also dedicated to ensuring that complainant's
22	recovery through settlements, conciliation or
23	litigation are equivalent to what they would receive
24	if they chose to litigate the claim in state or
25	federal court. As a result the law-enforcement

bureau may choose to hold cases open longer to garner
a broader impact. This has caused the case
processing time to increase from 420 days in 2015 to
536 days in 2016 but it has also resulted in
increased penalties and damages recovered. Systemic
policy changes implemented in more cases that have
been settled. While the case processing time has
increased, the Commission closed more cases in 2016,
436 than in previous years of which 121 were
settlements through Commission's conciliation
process. In my written testimony, which you all
have, I have also included samples of the
conciliation and settlements that have been reached
through the law enforcement bureau. I know at past
hearings there have been questions about sample
settlements and conciliations so I wanted to make
sure we included that in the testimony but in the
interest of time, I am just going to move on to other
areas of the Commission. The Community Relations
Bureau, our community service centers located in all
five boroughs with one Manhattan co-housed at 22 Reed
Street work actively with local communities, business
leaders, community boards, houses of worship, elected
officials, small businesses, community-based

organizations and schools to provide vital know your
rights and know your obligations information in a
variety of delivery mechanisms. We host quarterly
trainings and workshops in our CSC's and we also
provide trainings tailored in content and language to
audiences based on the needs of the communities. In
2016, we expanded our training and educational
curriculum to include 11 trainings on different areas
of the law. In addition to expanding our rights and
obligations focused trainings, we are also continuing
to expand our work to foster mutual understand and
respect across cultures and identities through the
Commission's first cultural competency training
working with transgender individuals in partnership
with the LGBT Community Center and also through the
development of new a workshop with NYU Islamic Center
called understanding Islam and Combating Islamaphobia
which we are currently rolling out to our sister
agencies. More training in this vein are in
development including one on discrimination based on
race and color which will challenge participants to
confront issues of institutional racism and think
about how people can stand up for racial justice in
their own lives. Our committee relations bureau also

regularly hosts listening sessions and community
roundtables to better understand the needs of the
communities in each borough. In 2016, the bureau
worked very closely with the Mayor's Community
Affairs Unit and Office of Immigrant Affairs to
coordinate outreach efforts and more efficiently
deliver important information and resources to
various communities across the five boroughs. Moving
on to the Commission's work in communications and
marketing. The Commission's communications team
works tirelessly to strategically communicate the
work of the Commission to reach the broadest and most
diverse audiences possible. In 2016, the
communications team increased the Commission's social
media presence dramatically across all platforms: on
Facebook by over 400 percent, on Twitter with an
increase in followers by 50 percent and Impressions
by almost 400 percent and on Instagram with an
increase in followers by over 300 percent. The
Commission invested almost 80 percent of its total
annual radio and newspaper ad budget in community and
ethnic media. The commission's work was featured in
over 500 news media story placements including close
to 60 stories in op-ad placements in ethnic media.

As I mentioned earlier, we're particularly proud of
the commissions #BUNYC campaign which launched in
June 2016 on subway cars, bus shelters, phone booths,
ethnic and community newspapers, social media across
various platforms and digital banner advertisement in
targeted media. The campaign asked New Yorkers to
"Look past pink and blue," and informed New Yorkers
to use the restroom consist with who you are. As the
first campaign of its kind in the country, it
garnered multiple industry awards including the top
prize in the government politics category at the 2016
Shorty Social Good Awards and was heralded by our
community partners at the LGBT Community Center, the
anti-violence project, the ACLU's LGBT Rights
Project, TDLF, GMHC and Trans-Latina Network among
many others as groundbreaking and vital to
transgender and gender nonconforming communities.
The campaign built on the Commission's work in
drafting and implemented Executive Order '16 which
was signed by the Mayor in March 2016 reiterating the
right of all New Yorkers who work for the city and
who use city services to be able to use an access
bathroom or other single-sex facilities aligned with
their gender identity or expression and requiring all

city agencies to post signage developed by the
Commission with DCAS and to train all front-line and
supervisory staff on both the Executive Order and on
inclusion and diversity of transgender experiences ir
communities. The commission worked closely with DCAS
to develop the training and roll it out to other city
agencies. And as Islamophobic and zenophobic
rhetoric continue to dominate the political climate
throughout the summer, as it does sadly to this day,
the commission responded in kind with its I am Muslim
NYC social media campaign in September 2016,
featuring some of the cities Muslim communities. The
objective of the campaign was to convery two
messages: one, that Muslim New Yorkers, New York City
has your back, you are vital and appreciated in our
communities and two, to those that would discriminate
against our Muslim brothers and sisters, you will
face consequences under our law, the Commission on
Human Rights will hold you accountable. The
commission also launched several key publications
including a pamphlet available in 11 languages
regarding protections against religious
discrimination and one-pagers identifying the ten
things you need to know if you are a Muslim New

2	Yorker or perceived as such and the five things all
3	New Yorkers should know about discriminatory
4	harassment. The online campaign was executed across
5	Facebook, Twitter, Instagram featuring real New
6	Yorkers. It generated millions of impressions and
7	dozens of stories in print and online news outlets in
8	ethnic and community media. In 2016, the
9	communication team also planned and coordinated
10	outreach on a variety of human rights related issues
11	including but not limited to Mayor de Blasio's
12	Executive Order in single-sex facilities, the Fair
13	Housing Protections New York City, domestic violence
14	protections in housing and employment, reaching
15	Spanish-speaking New Yorkers, protections and
16	accommodations for people with disabilities and
17	discriminatory harassment across a variety of
18	platforms that include digital and mobile,
19	traditional, emergent, ethnic and community media and
20	public transportation in neighborhood storefronts.
21	Now, the Office of the Chair. As I mentioned, the
22	Office of the Chair is responsible for setting the
23	general policy direction for the agency and
24	supporting the administration in its continuing
25	efforts to advance initiatives aimed at equality and

equity for all New Yorkers. In its increased
capacity, the Office of the Chair has ramped up its
engagement efforts by among other things increasing
its technical support to sister agencies and elected
officials on human right related efforts. Responding
to inquiries from the public and ensuring general
accessibility of our materials, advancing legislation
that addresses gaps in existing protections under the
city human right's law and creating tailored training
in your rights materials that are assessable and
relevant to historically underserved communities in
New York City. In calendar year 2016, the Office of
the Chair worked closely with City Council, advocates
and other relevant stakeholders on developing,
reviewing and negotiating important legislation aimed
at strengthening protections under the city human
rights law. In January 2016, protections were added
to prevent employment discrimination based on an
individual's actual or perceived status as a
caregiver, supporting workers ability to provide
necessary care for their family members without fear
of negative repercussions at work. The city human
rights law was also amended to allow for an award of
attorney's fees in administrative proceedings before

the commission and for the recovery of expert fees
and other costs in civil actions. The City Council
also repealed antiquated language regarding
protections against discrimination on the basis of
sexual orientation and clarified the strong liberal
standard in which the city human rights law should be
applied. The city human rights law was also amended
to bolster protections in the public accommodations
context by expanding coverage to the acts of
franchisers, franchisees, lessors of public
accommodations. New protections were also added to
make housing discrimination based on an individual's
status as a victim of domestic violence or stalking
unlawful. In addition, measures were past that
expanded the circumstances in which it is considered
unlawful discrimination to misrepresent the
availability of a job, housing accommodation or other
benefit for discriminatory reasons. Finally the law
was amended to create an express cause of action for
employers and principals who employees or agents are
subjected unlawful discriminatory practices. In our
continuing efforts to provide transparency and
clarity on the law, the Commission published Know
Your Right and Know Your Obligations fact sheets and

FAQs on the new areas of substantive protection. The
Commission also published its fourth legal
enforcement guidance document following the three
released in 2015 focusing on pregnancy
discrimination. The guidance has been very well-
received by attorneys who represent both employers,
who appreciate transparency, and workers who are
gratified to have guidance that so clearly
articulates their rights in this important and often
misunderstood area of the law. Lastly, the Office of
the Chair held its first public hearing on proposed
substantive rules in the Commission's history
relating to protections under the Fair Chance Act.
With our increased capacity, the Office of the Chair
has worked with many city agencies this past year to
provide support in drafting training and policy
materials, strengthening internal and external anti-
discrimination guidelines and implementing new
provisions of the city's human rights law. In
addition, the Office of the Chair partnered with
DOHMH and DCAS to issue comments calling on the FDA
to eliminate its discriminatory blood donor deferral
policy that prohibits men who have had sex with men
in the past 12 months from donating blood. The

Office of the Chair has also extensively with sister
agencies, City Hall and Corporation Council in
developing Executive Order 16 which was signed by
Mayor de Blasio in March 2016 ensuring that all city
employees and members of the public have access to
single-sex facilities that correspond with their
gender identity or gender expression. The Office of
the Chair also published four decisions and orders in
2016. In keeping with the Commission's promise to be
transparent in its enforcement and provide guidance
to advocates and litigants before the commission on
how cases are evaluated. The cases are outlined in
our annual report but range from source of income
discrimination by a large real-estate broker in which
the Commission order a civil penalty of \$100,000 and
a case where a taxi driver engaged in discriminatory
conduct toward two lesbian passengers in which the
Commission considered a restorative justice approach
to penalties and ordered the respondent to perform
community service in lieu of payment or a fine. I
would also like to talk about the Commission's post-
election response which has been considerable. We
recognized immediately after the presidential
election in November 2016 that our work had to change

2	dramatically. The commission provides a uniquely
3	important service as a resource and as venue of
4	justice for vulnerable New Yorkers whether it is
5	because of their immigration status, race, religion,
6	national origin, disability, pregnancy or gender
7	identity. We shifted priorities in the wake of the
8	post-election climate to respond to the needs of
9	communities most vulnerable to hostility,
10	Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, misogyny, xenophobia,
11	biases, hate crimes and feelings of fear uncertainty.
12	Throughout December 2016 and January 2017, the
13	commission convened eight sematic listening sessions
14	with leaders from community based organizations.
15	Also in December 2016, the commission announced an
16	expansion of its info line be reallocating existing
17	resources to add additional operators who can help
18	victims of discrimination file claims and to also
19	answer questions on immigration matters. The
20	Commission also launched a buyers response team in
21	December 2016 which consists of a team of
22	multilingual community outreach staff responsible for
23	reaching out to victims of bias based instances to
24	address the incidents, inform them of their rights,
25	liaise with the NYPD where appropriate and provide

effective communities with Know Your Rights
information and resources. Because many reports of
discrimination and hate have occurred in or near
transit stations, the Commission with support from
the Mayor's Office of Immigration Affairs, the
Community Affairs Unit, Public Engagement Unit and
Department of Consumer Affairs conducted a subway
outreach and visibility day on December 20, 2016 at
eight major transit hubs in the five boroughs,
distributed multilingual information and religious
protections under the city human rights law as well
as a new bilingual English/Spanish factsheet on
discriminatory harassment that we launched
immediately after the election. To support these
efforts, the commission also launched a landing page
at NYC.gov/NYCvalues as a one-stop venue for
information and resources for concerned communities
along with a Google, Facebook, mobile apps and ethnic
media ad campaign promoting protection against
discriminatory harassment which garnered millions of
impressions. Now, turning to the budget. The
Commission's annual budget for fiscal year 2017 was
approximately \$12,123,998 in city tax levy money,
\$170.750 in additional grant funding through a

contract with the EOC pursuant to a workshare
agreement and \$24,996 pursuant to a grant from DORS
to update our document retention policies. The
Mayor's preliminary budget tax levy for fiscal year
2018 provides for a budget of \$11,443,000. As I have
described, 2016 was an incredibly productive year as
we have worked to reclaim the agency's promise as a
true venue for justice and as a resource for all New
Yorkers. The commission is filing more cases,
mandating broader compliance and deploying testing to
root out patterns and practice discrimination. The
Commission is reaching more comminutes through
culturally and linguistically appropriately outreach
efforts, creative programming and groundbreaking
communications and marketing campaigns and materials.
The Commission is developing policy that serves as a
model for other jurisdictions building coalitions and
earning credibility with communities across the city.
We know we have a lot more work to do but I and my
staff are more committed than ever to fulfill this
agency's mission to protect all New Yorkers
regardless of race, color, immigration status, gender
identity, gender, disability, religion or any other
protected category from discrimination, harassment or

injustice. I thank you again for convening today's hearing and I thank you for the support of this body for the Commission and I look forward to your questions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you for your testimony. For the record, we've have been joined by Salamanca, Dr. Matthew Jane, Danny Dromm and the Thank you for all showing up. Going forward, King. I just want to ask a few questions and then I am going to turn it over to my colleagues. I know Brad would like to have some question also. Okay, he's second now. One thing I want to say is thank you. believe my tenure in Council, there are only a few committees that I have really saw that as soon as we gave the money, you got things done and I want to just commend you for that. You said it for yourself here in your testimony have described 2016 as an incredible, productive year and it has really been productive and one thing that caught my attention was the last one you just said, the case of the outlining report range from income where penalty was \$100,000 and the case where a taxi driver discriminatory conduct toward two lesbian passengers he was able to get community service. How did y'all mediate that

1

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

where he didn't get any time or a fine and he just got community service because to me that is really egregious, you know, offense that he was able just to get community service. Could you explain that how did your staff mediate that?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Right. SO since I have been at the Commission the focus of our work whether it's through law-enforcement or through the adjudicatory process or policy or otherwise has always been the question of how will we have the most impact in the work, how can we really change behavior, how can we really root-out discriminatory practices. I think that we are fortunate that the language of the city's human rights law puts discretion in the commission to order what relief the commission finds necessary in order to accomplish those objectives. So what we have tried to do is lay out in our decisions and orders the decisions and orders are released from my office, the Office of the Chair with the Commission and we have tried to layout kind of an outline for the different ideas and variables that are considered by the commission in trying to decide if there should be a penalty or a fine or damages that are assessed and what those

2.2

2.3

considerations would be. Some of those considerations include the size or a respondent, whether that specific respondent or bad actor cooperated with the work of the commission and part of that is also trying to decide what would have the most long-lasting impact to changing behavior not just for that individual responded but for other such cases so in some cases so in some case what we have determined is that rather than assessing high fines or rather than assessing damages, if a complainant is amenable in those -- in some situations it makes much more sense in order to consider a much more restorative justice approach.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Do you think you will still be monitoring that individual anytime? They get to be with the community a lot so do you think there's any follow-up with that?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Well for future violations of the law, the commission always considers whether or not there's been a prior violation of the law committed by a particular respondents. I would also say since you are asking questions about a case involving a taxi worker, the Commission has been working very closely with

different organizations where there's overlapping communities and issues so for instance the commission has been doing work with both the taxi worker alliance as well as with TLC because we want to be educating drivers on their obligations under the law and we want to explore multiple venues for doing that type of training and that kind of education.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Okay. I have about two others and then I'm going to let the Committee go. You gave us the chart employment convictions and arrest records. I can say overall you tested 215 and 148 was actual so saying that they had discrimination. Do you think your office is doing much better pace than it was like two years ago in regards to that but with the 148 what changed? What do you think that really changed?

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: So you feel the laws that we just put in like the box, all those laws, thank you Brad, was put in place that's made it better for you to -- able now to really assess people who are doing discrimination.

2.2

2.3

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I think there are
substantive laws like the Fair Chance Act, the man-
box protection you're talking about and Stop Credit
Discrimination and Employment Act, I think they were
all procedural reporting requirements that were
placed on the commission when I first joined the
agency so Local Laws 32 and 33 required the
commission to implement five tests in housing, excuse
me, five match pair tests in housing and five match
pair tests in employment, you can see from the
numbers we have far surpassed those numbers. I think
we have consistent with the infrastructure changes
that we have made at the commission over the last two
years, we've really invested in our testing program.
Sapna Raj, who is our Assistant Commission for Law
Enforcement, she is also the Assistant Commissioner
for Commission initiated investigations, she is a
great asset to the agency. We brought her over after
having a history of working at DOJ Civil Rights as
well as building a testing program in another state
that did exactly this type of work in the area of
housing. We now have, in addition to Ms. Raj, we
have four full-time in the staff testing program as
wall as other tester lines which were baselined

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS
2	during the last budget cycle and we have kept those
3	open lines for purposes of flexibility in the context
4	of testing. We have also created strategic
5	partnerships with organizations like the Fair Housing
6	Justice Center and worked with a lot of the advocates
7	some of who are in the room to identify where we the
8	cases where we should be deploying our testers.
9	CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Everything is working
10	out well. One other thing I have to ask, does the
11	Commission plan to submit a new request for the
12	Office of Management and Budget for new needs for
13	fiscal 2018?
14	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: So yes, we are
15	working with OMB in the ministration to assess what
16	those needs will be in the future.
17	CHAIRPERSON MEALY: So you put in some
18	new requests?
19	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: It is in the
20	process.
21	CHAIRPERSON MEALY: In the process, okay.
22	I'm going to turn it over to Andy King for questions.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Thank you, Madam
24	Chair. I appreciate it. It is always a delight to

be in your presence, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: I love the

testimony. I missed some of it but I am trying to
peruse over it quickly but I loved your answers. It
looks like you're own point. You've got your hands
on everything here so I think it's time for us to go
have lunch and call it a day. But I just want to
follow up to get a little bit more clarity on the
work that y'all have been doing. According to your
testimony, you concluded that you were pretty happy
of what you have been able to accomplish since you've
started. I just want to get a feel, are you 100
percent totally satisfied that the work you all have
been doing been have been able to stop, prevent, hold
people accountable, hold systems accountable who have
discriminated against New Yorkers in general in any
capacity as well as all your attorneys that you have,
I think you said your number is 29 or almost at 29,
of having staff attorneys that their caseloads are
not exceeding a level that they aren't able to
maintain so that you have this consistency of
delivering for New Yorkers and third, with the budget
2018 seems there is going to be a reduction from what
you received in 2017, will that hinder you delivering

on the success that you already established this prior year and I will come back too after you answer that?

1

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Okay. So in answer, I guess, to the first question I do you think the work of the commission in the last two years and in 2016 has been effective in addressing discrimination and harassment as we are charged to do across the city. That is of course not to say that I don't think we could do more and we are of course always across the agency whether it is through community relations work or law-enforcement work where with this type of legislative and policy work that we do in the Office of the Chair as well as in our communications and marketing, we are always looking for ways that we can more effectively change behavior, root-out discrimination, address it. definitely want to find different ways that we can work with communities to educate people within their communities not just about their rights but about their obligations. We try to be very strategic in our approach so there's an understanding there is not a one-size-fits-all approach to human rights or to rooting out discrimination and harassment and I think

as I mentioned earlier as this has been a very,
you know, this has been a pivotal year for human
rights and civil rights nationally and certainly the
City of New York is not immune to what we've been
seeing nationally consistent with the dangerous
rhetoric of this past president election cycle. What
we have tried to do as we are putting in mechanisms
for the routine maintenance of this agency and what
would be needed throughout this agency in any period
of time, we have tried to also be flexible enough so
we can address changes we can need to make at the
agency whether it's changes in priorities, changes in
how we address communities, as we grow our staff we
are also trying to be very mindful of the specific
communities that we need to be building cultural
competency in, language capabilities and etc. I think
we are constantly looking for ways that we can both
make sure the legacy of the agency is consistent with
the mandate of the law but also thinking of ways that
we can be responsive to the here and now. As for
looking at the agency and going forward, I think
that, like I said, we want to be strategic about
where we are putting our staff our and resources.
we've been very happy with what we have accomplished

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and as always, as I said last year, we're always looking to continue the conversations that we've been having with sister agencies, with the rest of the administration, with Council on how we can continue to build on those successes in the future.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Let me ask a quick follow-up. I heard you mention about making sure that you are culturally sensitive wherever communities that you are serving. Does the budget allow for you to have attorneys that reflect the communities that they are serving? As a union person, we like the leadership to reflect to membership so if I'm going into a Mexican community, do I have attorneys that are Mexican or identify with that culture, if I am going into a religious communities such as a Muslim community, are there attorneys who identify with their everyday experience so they can deliver on the best representation or service to that community? What is your breakdown and if not, does your budget allow for you to put together a team that reflects New Yorkers?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I think regardless of one's budget, especially at an agency such as the commission, we should always be looking to make sure

the makeup of our agency is reflective of the city
that we serve. I am happy to report that we
constantly have people on our community relation
staff through my office, Office of the Chair,
including myself as well as people in our law-
enforcement bureau who are speaking on different
panels or at different communities, some with you as
well, and we are often told that people are
appreciate of the fact that one, there are people
from the commission who are able to communicate with
the people in a language that they feel most
comfortable, and as I mentioned earlier, when I first
came to the commission we had six languages spoken
across the agency and we now have 29. I am very
proud of that because again I think we need to be
communicating with people in the languages that they
are most comfortable and when we don't have a
language spoken on staff we of course have other
resources like language line and other resources
throughout the administration that we tap into. I am
also very happy to report that our diversity numbers
I think across all the different categories again are
very strong. In fact, when we have our annual check-
ins like with DCAS we're told that we are considered

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

one of the most diverse agencies across the city and the other thing is I'm very proud of is when we talk about diversity, we have true representation of the diversity. We don't just have one person or one individual who might represent that type of situation. I was recently at an event at NYU School of Law and somebody there had mentioned had the commission has really developed quite a strong program in the area of gender identity and gender expression protections and how they are very happy that were not just one but several folks on staff who from a very personal experience perspective can reflect the work being done in that area and how that has really enabled the commission to more effectively communicate and build relationships across some of those communities.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: I appreciate that and I am going to end with this question and then if there is a round two I will come back. According to a 2016 annual report, the commission saw an increase in investigation areas of income discrimination with housing, employers refusal to provide pregnancy accommodations, such discriminations that are happening so I would like to know there was a recent

2.2

2.3

roundtable with legal services and social providers and there was discussion about housing and discrimination and unscrupulous landlords so I would like to know how hard are you going after and making a difference with those who discriminate whether it's because I can't take off because I'm pregnant and I don't get a lunch break or you make life difficult for me because I live in a housing complex and I don't have legal representation or whatever the challenges are, I would like to know what the commission has done to really set a tone for those who violate New Yorkers that this behavior will not be tolerated?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: There's a few things I would mention especially with the specific areas that you have mentioned. One on housing.

Source of income discrimination and going after people who violate the law in the area of source of income protection has been a huge priority of our agency, it has been a huge priority for this administration. I can say in our first year in 2015 we quadrupled the number of cases that we do in that category of protection which has existed under the law since 2008. Building on that, if you look at the

2.2

2.3

numbers from 2015 which were quadrupled from 2014 and you look at 2016, we have built on that by 45 percent. It accounts for, I believe, a third of our entire housing docket because we're so keen on addressing that --

interrupt? I just want to know has anyone gone to jail because they have violated people in the City of New York? It's been happening for so long years that you hear of someone getting community service but it's comes to a point that we've got to figure out how people get hit upside the head so they stop behaving the way they're behaving and hurting other New Yorkers? I guess that's what I'm trying to find out.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Then to that directly, the Commission on Human Rights and under the city human rights law is a civil statute so we don't have the ability to send someone to jail. That is just not a remedy that someone would seek under our law as a civil law. What we do do is try to make it very comfortable for people to discriminate in the future and part of that is we do have the ability to impose fines. So in this past year, we imposed th

highest ever fine in this area. There was a case involving a broker that was found to discriminate against somebody on this category of protection and we fined that entity \$100,000 because of all of the units that entity had control over there will be another source of income related discrimination decision order that will be coming out in the next few months and with the settlements and conciliations that the law enforcement bureau has assigned in the last year, we have made it also very consistent that if you're going to violate the law in this area you're going to pay a very high price.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: I thank you for that and I take it whatever fines get paid goes back into the city's coffers to continue to make your commission more --

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: They go in the general city, not to the commission.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Just to piggy-back on that. Could you, for the benefit of the committee, could you discuss what issues and concerns out of the eight telematics listening sessions you held in December 2016 and January 2017 and maybe that can

2.2

2.3

2 answer some of his questions also? Those sessions,
3 what was the main concerns of the people?

2.2

2.3

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I think there were several. What we wanted to do so after the election we waited a month and a half. We wanted communities to have the ability to speak to their own constituents and figure out what was going on on the ground but we also wanted to make sure we were convening roundtable discussions in enough time that people felt they had an avenue to respond to -

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: What was the most of it, was it immigration, was it discrimination, was it housing?

think it was several. There were several different areas that people are feeling victimized in or feeling uncertain in. I think immigration is certainly one area people were very -- people have raised a lot of fear about what to expect either because of the immigration status or because people are perceiving them to have a certain immigration status, people wanted to what their likely rights were that were immigration related which of course is more of a federal issue then it is a local issue but

they were also interested in how that would affect
local issues like discrimination and harassment and
access to services. There's a lot of folks I think
who are also wondering what federal executive orders
mean for them in the context of the religion that
they practice, their expressions of those religions
that too was another area that people had felt a lot
of uncertainty over and continue to feel a lot of
fear over. Race discrimination and racial justice
issues, that is another huge area where unfortunately
because some of the rhetoric that has come across in
the last year people are uncertain of what their
status would be here locally so it has been incumbent
on local governments and local agencies such as ours
to let folks know that we're not going back to
certain policies that have caused further alienation
of those communities with government. We very much
want the Commission on Human Rights to be sending out
the message that government can actually be something
positive. They might not find that with federal
government but certainly people should feel that
their local government, City of New York we're
protecting them and is there to support them.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: So you did have eight
sessions?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Eight sessions on
-- that convened different types groups depending on
the issues.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Did y'all keep databases on these sessions just to go back and analyze to go so we don't have over it again next year?

very much in line with some of the uncertainty and fears I think that there a hug concerns across different communities on privacy. There are huge concerns people have on being monitored and making sure that they themselves and their communities aren't somehow being tagged so what we wanting to do during those sessions rather than creating a database, we wanted to make sure we had enough people in the commission across the different areas of service that we had the commission there in the room to be listening to the needs and the desires without keeping record of that for purposes of being respectful of people's privacy and security concerns.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: But you're just
listening to their needs for your information, you
can keep something in regards to it if it's the
highest thing on immigration right then you could
start doing a new initiative on that listening
session you had a start an initiative on it. If it
was something totally different than immigration, the
regular ones that we normally have, you could start a
new initiative. I am just saying it's not about
people's privacy, you shouldn't had a listening
session then. With a listening session you came up
with maybe some more ideas that you didn't know
because when you have an opening place where people
can talk they tell you things that the councilmembers
wouldn't know, only people in the community would
know so from those secession you should take
something from that and then build on it and I'm just
saying just build on the ones that you haven't heard
from us or anyone else, not a database not keeping
their names just information; that is what a session
is all about.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: And I would say to that certainly the information that we receive during those listening sessions has affected the

2.2

2.3

commission's work and has and continues to inform our work and basically as a result of those listening sessions we have already done a few things. We have done outreach events on discriminatory harassment which is a fairly unique provision of law that we have. We have done things on biased based profiling by law enforcement, we have created a biased response at the Commission. There are several ways in which what we heard at those sessions has impacted our work.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: That's what I'm talking about. Thank you, okay. Mr. Lander?

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you, Madam
Chair for this hearing and the leadership over the
last couple years and I'll just add my voice to the
Chair's and Council Member King's, what a difference
these two years have made. It is great. The 2016
annual report is very impressive and for an agency
that had been decimated in the prior administration
and really was not able to achieve its charter
mission of defending and protecting the human rights
of New Yorkers, what you and your team is doing is
extraordinary and in many different areas in
processing cases and initiating your own

investigations and significantly expanding the
testing programs and the outreach and I was pleased
to be out there with you on a freezing day in
December. Maybe next year we can have the outreach
day when it's a little warmer and in all the work
after the election and obviously especially at this
moment in time with what we are seeing as an upswing
in so many different forms of discrimination and hate
and bias and what we know will be just a dramatic
withdraw of the Justice Department from protecting
people's civil rights, it is excellent to have a
local all right, yes. I was here early so I got
my copy earlier but now I see that while I am glad
it is a tremendous report and it really reflects
significant and impressive work at the time when we
needed it two years ago but we really need it now so
thank you for all of that. I was certainly struck by
the caseload growth and I want to ask about one piece
of it because you have in the and I cited a couple
times and I realized I didn't know the numbers behind
it. You cite in your message a 46 percent increase
in claims around race, religion and citizenship
status and I guess it's on page 1 but then I got
asked by having cited it what the numbers were so T

wonder if your staff knows just from 2015 to 2016 on those three areas that you cited the 46 percent rise in do you have what the numbers behind that are?

2.2

2.3

moment please. I will -- I can give you numbers right now and I am also referring you to page 19 of the annual report that basically has the claims broken down by protected class and by kind of areas: employment, housing, public accommodations, etc. So the numbers -- we could add up these numbers by all of these different areas by protective class and provide them to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay. If you could just on that one staff that is in the report which I have now cited to others and would like to be able to back up if you could do that one that would be great. For other things we will go ahead. The one thing I noted is I asked staff to do a little digging that citizenship status was up really, the claims based on citizenship status were up significantly. Can you give a little flavor of what those cases, those claims have been?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure. One, I think that one of the reasons they are up is we have

2.2

2.3

done incredible outreach on that and I say that because I think in the past people did not even realize that being discriminated against because of their immigration status would actually serve as a claim under the city human rights law so especially in the last year and what we've been seeing in the last year we wanted to make very clear that that is in fact an area of protection including putting it in some new materials that we have created with the Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Those look like they are mostly in housing so that is a situation where essentially a landlord tries to take advantage of someone based on their immigration status and either whatever, deny them their rights as tenants which they would otherwise have by threatening or making them fearful.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Correct. So tenant harassment related, claims where somebody is being harassed or manipulated or intimidated by a landlord because they are seemingly more vulnerable because of their immigration status, situations in which landlords may refuse to make necessary repairs or provide basic amenities that one would expect from

a landlord again because they believe the person to be vulnerable because of their immigration status.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: All right. yes, if you can follow up on that number. looked and this is the flipside of all your growth and I think the outreach has obviously gotten a lot more people to reach out to you. Obviously we won't be able to know how much there is more discrimination versus how much people are more aware of their rights under the law which is important which is good. has the downside, as you noted in your testimony, and as we saw in the MMR that case processing times are up pretty significantly so I assume that means that even as we have provided some money over the last couple years for your to increase your staff essentially caseload volume has increased in a way that means it takes longer to get all of the cases SO one thing I have a question on is you processed. said in your testimony that case processing time has gone from 420 days to 536 days so that is a big jump and a long time. The MMR and I know part of the challenge is where we've got different time periods and it may be a different category actually because the average age of complaint caseload in the MMR went

2.2

2.3

from 250 to 340 from FY15 to FY16. One, is can you just help us square those numbers but more important help us understand, those are big jumps in caseload processing and we don't want New Yorkers who have been discriminated against waiting more than a year or close to two years for justice. Help us understand. It seems to me we need to advocate for you guys to get the staffing increase to get the caseloads down.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: So first I will talk about the actual case processing time and then I am going to ask Deputy Commissioner Sussman to kind of reconcile the MMR number with the annual report number because again we had anticipated this would be an issue because of the different period.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I am more interested in making sure we provide the resources necessary to get them down.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: So the case processing times are up. I don't -- that is in line with the fact that has been a 60 percent increase in reports to the commission but what I would also say about case processing time is it is also impacted by the fact that we not -- in line with my testimony and

in line with what I have said in the past, we want to
make sure that justice of the commission same is the
same as justice in court so that means not resolving
cases, one off for smaller penalties or smaller
damages awards. If somebody has been damaged or
distressed in a certain way and they would receive
one amount at court they should frankly receive that
amount at the Commission on Human Rights. The
Commission on Human Rights is not a place where one
should receive discounted justice, right? So part of
that means sometimes holding open cases for longer
than they may have been held open before. The other
thing is we sometimes hold cases open longer if we
are not satisfied that the subject in person, the
respondent satisfies the human rights law in other
areas meaning that somebody can be before us because
they are responding in a complaint of discrimination
on let's say disability related discrimination and in
the context of our investigation we might say to
ourselves hey, we're concerned that what we have
uncovered here also uncovers the fact that we're not
satisfied, they truly understand their obligations
with respect to pregnancy discrimination or pregnancy
accommodation related issues. Rather than just

resolving that one issue and moving along, we will hold those investigations to make sure that again from the place of impact we are able to affect respondent and everyone the respondent then impacts on all areas of the city human rights law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MS. SUSSMAN: And just to comment on some for the differences in numbers between the MMR and the annual report, some of it is fiscal year versus annual year. The other though is the MMR actually looks at all open cases at one point in time and backwards to see how long they have been open so that would include cases that were filed the day before for example that's only been open for a day. When you look at our annual report, we look at all cases that were closed during that calendar year and then take an average of how long those cases were open so naturally that will represent a longer period of time because those cases are actually closed. They are not still pending.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So the annual report in an average of cases closed in a year and the MMR is essentially the average of cases opened in a year and of course some take longer than a year that's a -- Commissioner, I don't want to drill down

too much more on this but I appreciate that there are
some cases that you might decide make sense to hold
open. My hunch is the significant reasons for the
increase in that case processing, it's big, 420 days
to 536 days is a big jump, and we don't want a system
where case processing times get so long that people
are less likely to bring their cases to you because
it seems like it's going to take forever. It just
seems to me given the magnitude and volume like I was
even looking the four month actuals on caseload in
just the first four months of FY17 are 1457 which are
way bigger than the 952 in the first four months of
FY16. It seems pretty clear that what has grown is
your caseload and that is good in the sense that we
want people bringing their cases but it seems to me
that is evidence that we need to provide you with
more lawyers and staff to be processing these cases
so that we can get it back down to where it was a
year ago. I can leave that as a statement rather
than a question but Madam Chair I will just it
seems pretty straight forward from the data that is
here and again this is not a criticism of your
leadership, if anything the opposite. I'm glad
people are bringing you the cases but I want us to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

able to get to them in a timely fashion and we need to give you the resources to do it. I want to ask a little bit about the testing program and again it is really wonderful to see how much you've ramped it up. I added in what's up from our report. In 2015, by our data there was one match pair test and in 2016, 90 and overall in 2015 25 tests of any sort and 499 as I tally it up and again I'm using our Council's data but big increases in any case. One thing I want to make sure I understand this right in the areas of Fair Chance Act, employment conviction or credit history employment, you don't use match pair testing because you don't need to essentially the violation there is if they are that's a violation and so if someone goes in and if they are asked for their credit history or if they are asked about their criminal history too early in the process that's a violation so there is no need for match pair testing I mean if a tester --

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Correct, correct.

We want to be smart with the resources that we are using and the testing program so that if we are deploying a match pair it makes sense in those areas and your observation is accurate, there are certain

instances where you need not use a match pair because on its faith there's been already an expression that would constitute discriminatory intent.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Now the high percentages in both Fair Chance Act, employment conviction and credit history as a percentage. With credit history, you did 16 tests and found 16 incidents of procedural actual discrimination and on employment conviction 235 tests, 148 incidents of actual or perceived discrimination so almost two-That says to me that we are not getting the word out enough that there is that we have word that those are very high -- well I am trying to ask this the right way. When you are doing these tests, how much are you basing it on a place where you are suspicious that there is -- let me use source of income. Obviously in source of income, if you find an ad in the paper from someone that says no vouchers that you've got a pretty good guess that if you send a tester to that landlord there will be discrimination that is a much higher likelihood than if you randomly pick a landlord to go test. With how much of your testing is based on places where you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

have reason to be suspicious that discrimination is occurring?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: The great majority, if not of all of them. Usually there is some indicia of discrimination like something has occurred, we've heard some information either from an elected official or a community's organization or because of something else that somebody has witnessed or experienced or sometimes it is even for something that we see in the media so there's a variety of There are situations in which it is known that an industry is particularly bad at not aligning itself with its obligations under the city human rights law for xyz reasons and so we will deploy testers in that context as well so there are a variety of reasons but we are never just kind of blindly sending testers out to areas. always something that is calling our attention to that specific industry or target.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Can you give me an example from one of the three either, you know, Fair Chance Act enforcement, employment credit checks or source of income which seem like three big places where you deploy these beyond the individual case

enforcement has that led you to do outreach differently or to adjust how we're thinking about enforcing those laws more broadly?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Well, you know, I think in -- you said source of income, Fair Chance related, I'm sorry what was the third?

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Employment credit checks.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I feel like those are three areas where there is no shortage of cases to bring to the Commission. It is not an area where we necessarily need to change our outreach because people aren't coming in raising those claims. think it is more of a situation where there's a great deal of education to be done in the community whether it is from a know your obligations perspective or know your rights so what we have tried to do is to partner with different partners for both of those areas whether it's working with different chambers of commerce to make sure their membership is aware of these changes to the law especially in the area of fair chance and credit, changes of the law that should be impacting their policies and practices. Ιt is also working with different CBOs and different

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

organizations so as they are doing outreach on whatever particular issues they are working with, so specifically working with more organizations that work with formally incarcerated individuals or reentry communities to make sure we're getting information out there that is fair chance related.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: My last question, can I ask my last -- just one quick final one. right. I was interested to see on page 19 and I think this is the first evidence I've seen it of claims brought to you biased based profiling by law enforcement which is another law that the Council, we worked hard to establish, and I guess it looks like there's five housing status cases and obviously you can't reveal the individual but I wonder what you can tell us about that category, how you are seeing it show up and again I am encouraged people know they have that? Obviously we wouldn't have created the law if we didn't think that was happening that people know they have the right and finding you as a place to bring their claims.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure. So that has been a category of protection under the law as you are well aware. Since 2013, when I first got to the

Commission, there were zero cases filed at the agency
under this area of protection. I made a promise when
I first started at the agency that we would be
enforcing the full spectrum of rights and protections
that you have under the city's human rights law and
so with that we wanted to make sure that in areas
that we thought had been under enforced, in areas in
which we thought the public was not aware of their
rights we wanted to make them priority areas where we
would be either creating campaigns or putting
outreach materials, doing more that I think the
agency should have been doing in the past on building
relationships with the different organizations that
would bring these types of claims to light.
Specifically, in that area I think that some of that
relationship building has really paid off and that's
why you are seeing that number has increased. I
think also there had been doubts to the credibility
of this agency in the past. I think that more
advocates who would be bringing these claims and
certainly more people in the community I think that
they understand that we will investigate all claims
brought before the agency regardless of who the
respondent is and we will provide a thorough

investigation regardless of who the respondent is.

Also in the past month we just released new outreach materials on the specific category of protection and I think that was also fairly novel for any kind of government entity to do that but I think this is an administration that cares very deeply about equity and equality and true equity and equality and that means also making sure that where there are issue to be addressed with other sister agencies that those issues are addressed and we have had great cooperation across the administration and with I think the advocacy community on making sure this area of protection is given more public, I guess, engagement.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: That's great to hear. I assume most if not all of those are still open. When they are disposed and you can tell us what happened in the cases that would be great if you could report to the committee on the nature and disposition of those cases.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: We could check with our law-enforcement bureau to see if there are any closed cases on that yet and get back to you.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you and thanks Madam Chair and my apologies to my colleague for all the questions.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. Council Member Dromm?

much and also kudos to you and the agency for the work that you've done. I am very, very pleased by the numbers and the changes that we have seen and also by your visibility in the community, not just the agency or the commission I should say but yourself as well and you're highly visible and I think that that's really important for people to know and to see you out there so that is very much appreciated. I have some questions. Can you tell me on page 19 of the report what is the difference or what does alienage mean versus citizenship status?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So reading of citizenship status is strictly speaking, you know, I'm sorry I know my answer is going to be somewhat circular but strictly speaking somebody's citizenship status.

Do you want to?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS:

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Are they present legally in the United States or not?

2.2

2.3

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Whether
they are citizens versus noncitizen, I think
generally how it is interpreted and certainly whether
or not they, you know, whether or not they are
undocumented is certainly something that comes under
the area of protection. Alienage, I think there is
some -- could be some overlap with that so frequently
when something as broad as alienage it could be
actual or perceived, there could also be overlap with
for instance national origin and race.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I don't know how concerned you are with labels but I would consider using different a word than alienage as well moving forward. It's just jumped out at me being somewhat involved and the Former Chair of the Immigration Committee, I'm like what is the difference and why the use of that word.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I believe it is the language of the statute that uses the alienage.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I think this one's on us, Council Member Dromm. It's in our law.

2.2

2.3

the next -- so we may have to look at that because I do find that to be a little bit off-putting. But I also wanted to in terms of the list on page 19, are the classes that are mentioned are they all the protected classes or would there be other protected classes that were less than one reported case of discrimination?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I am told that it does not include all. If there were zero, it is not included here. What we can do is go back and tell you for which areas there was --

Say if there are areas where we have not received cases of discrimination and not been reported and I'm just wondering why that would be, wondering aloud and maybe that something we could look at together moving forward to see why that is happening because certainly I want to applaud you on the numbers that are here but we may be overlooking something by virtue of them not having been reported and in particular in relation to sexual orientation. Does sexual orientation also include gender identity when you report it like that?

Τ	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS
2	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: No, they are
3	separate categories.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Different
5	categories. I don't think I see here gender
6	identity. I see gender but not gender identity.
7	Have we had cases of gender identity discrimination?
8	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Yes. In fact, I
9	think we've had a 30 percent increase involving
LO	gender identity and gender expression but again this
11	what is reflected on page 19 of the annual report
L2	is largely reflective of the language of the statute
13	and so under the city human rights law gender
L 4	includes gender identity and gender expression within
L5	its definition.
L 6	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So would you know
L7	or can you get back to us on how many cases actually
L 8	there are of gender identity?
L 9	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: For 2016, I want
20	to say 29.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And that is in
22	which areas: employment, housing, public
23	accommodations or?
24	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: That I would have

to get back to you on.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I'm always curious to know in terms of biased based profiling by law-enforcement particularly as it relates to gender identity if there is any information on that?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: We will have to get back to you on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: That's because I notice in your report, a quick review of your report, but I will go through it more thoroughly later on, on page 41 you do mention that your work for the Trans-Latina Network in Jackson Heights and Queens

 $\label{eq:commissioner malalis:} \mbox{We do quite a bit} \\ \mbox{there.}$ 

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And that's been an issue there and that's why I'm curious to those know about numbers.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I also want to say this is a huge difference from two years ago when I believe at the end of -- when did you come in?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I came in February of 2015.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So it was within the administration I believe when I would come to a

hearing and we had two cases for four years of discrimination based on sexual orientation, two in the whole city over the course of four years so these are really good numbers to see and we don't like to see discrimination but we certainly like to see people knowing about and coming to the commission for relief when they have been discriminated against. that is something I think that is really important. There were something else that I wanted to mention in the book and I'm forgetting right now what it is but I will come back to it. Let's just go to the chart which I don't know that you have but you might have the numbers in front of you, and I think you briefly addressed the issue a little bit with Council Member Lander's questioning but in terms of the number of test cases for conviction and/or arrest record it was 235 total, I believe, 148 incidents which were actual or perceived so is that -- does that mean the number of tests overall and then of those 235, 148 were found to have a basis for further examination.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Or were found to have been -- that there had been a discriminatory act.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So it is almost half and that's seems like wow, an incredible number in that area but then again I think you did say because of some changes in the law so would these numbers reflect the -- what are we going to ban the box issue on there and can you give me a little bit of an overview on that? What those 148 cases would look like?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure. So I quess a few things were wrapped up in that question. would say the city human rights law already had protections in the area of criminal history. In 2015 we added ban the box protection that is considered the -- thank you to the council and the administration, the nation's most robust protection in that area. When that became effective, the Commission launched a city-wide campaign, you know, including ads in transit stations, outreach materials, etc. We created a new workshop and training, both know your rights as well as know your obligations that we provided to employers and business across all the five boroughs for free in each one of our borough based offices and that is an area where we have really kind of stepped up our

relationship building with other organizations that
work with formerly incarcerated individuals or
reentry communities, reentry issues and so I think
one we're seeing that we're getting a lot more
information from the public in that area because it
is a new category of protection. We have done a lot
to make sure that people are aware of that category
of protection and also in a way that is fair to
businesses and to employers because I think it was a
significant change for those entities so we have
really kind of put the information out there and we
have been getting so much information because, I
think, as returns for that relationship building and
the issues we're seeing. We are still seeing however
that there are business entities that in their
advertisements or in their postings are violating the
law or that in the context of their job application
process are still unaware of areas of inquiry that
should not be asked or are still unaware of, you
know, the fair chance process in some situations but
we are seeing still a lot of the ad and posting cases
that would, you know, almost be violations of the
law

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Is there any particular industry that is violating the law more so than others or?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I would have to get back to you on that.

that would also be a way to look at educating folks if we see it in one industry more so than others but maybe also a similar question because I am beginning to remember now what it was. The discrimination on sexual orientation and/or gender identity, can you give us a little bit of an idea where we are seeing most of that happen, is it in housing, policing, you know, what does that look like, how does that occur?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I think we have a fair number in employment, housing and public accommodations. Biased based profile by law enforcement it's not broken down by specific category or protection other than housing status on page 19 of the annual report but frankly it doesn't jump out to me as something that we have seen a great deal of activity on but I can get back to you on that. But I know certainly there have been more cases filed in

2.2

2.3

employment, housing and public accommodations in that area.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And in terms of educating the police department, do you do workshops with them or how does that work?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: We do a lot of work with NYPD as we do with several of our other city agencies. I think it is a very important part of this agency's mandate is to be working with other city entities including other council members and other elected officials. One of the reasons that we tried to create a more substantive docket under Deputy Commissioner Saunders' docket was so that we could also be focusing more of our work, you know, with larger sister agencies so we have certainly done work with NYPD in the past and we will continue to do that in the future. I would say as an example the biased based profiling by law-enforcement materials that I mentioned earlier, we included them in the process.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So does that training take place in the Academy or do you do rollcall trainings or how does that work because, you know, I used to be invited to a lot of those things

and I found that during rollcall training is more valuable because you get officers who have been on the job longer who might not have necessarily got that training in the Academy?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: That's helpful for us to know and we will certainly take that into consideration as we continue our --

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Particularly as it pertains to gender identity and sexual orientation which often times when I do do those trainings I'm met with a complete wall of silence and no questions are asked or anything like so I would really encourage you to look at that area more closely. also Chair of the Education Committee of City Council so I had some questions about peer mediation and according to the 2016 annual report, the Commission in late 2016 overhauled its school-based peer mediation curriculum and staff engaged in public schools further to offer the peer mediation program and schools school focused programming such as sexual harassment, conflict resolution and cyber bully in 2017. For the benefit of the committee, can you discuss some of the commission's finding in overhauling its peer mediation curriculum?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Our findings I
want to stay with the peer mediation program it is
probably less about assessing findings as it working
with students in specific schools to make sure that
they have an awareness of the law but they also have
an awareness of kind of the ethos behind the law in a
way that will help them navigate issues including
school bullying that take place at their different
schools. We are increasingly looking towards not
just working through peer mediation but working with
other organizations like the LGBT community center in
things that would effect not just students in schools
but also ways of communicating human rights related
protections to the parents of the students, what, you
know, I think you have raised this before with our
agency, that working with parents of student is very
important. It is one thing for students to know that
they can be who they are but certainly we want to
make sure that parents have a full understanding of
what that means to their children and what that means
to students as well so we have been increasingly
exploring other ways that we can be working with
parents on workshops.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I find that to be really important because, you know, one of the things that we have been doing on the Education Committee is trying to stress the importance of restorative practices in the schools and I think peer mediation is a part of restorative practices and often times we will hear, particularly from parents, like I want zero tolerance policies, you know, this kid does that he should be suspended for the rest of his life from school but peer mediation would explained I think better to parents as well as students in the school that students can be responsible for other students in terms of behavior and stuff like that as well. maybe at some point we can look at this a little bit further because I think it really fits into some of the objectives of the Council as well as the direction in which the Department of Education is going.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure. And in 2016, we actually revamped our curriculum in the peer mediation area. We came out with a new kind of manual and book and we would be happy to show that to you in your office.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Yeah, I would really love to see that. Thank you very much. Good luck with everything.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. I just have one last question and then I know Mr. King. Can you describe -- discuss with the committee how many requests for U Visas?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: So Deputy

Commissioner Sussman also our UNT Visa --

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: T Visas also. Yes.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: -- officer so I will let her.

DANA SUSSMAN: In 2016, what I count as a request is a formal request, we do get a lot of phone calls and questions from attorneys and advocates about what kind of cases do we certify and sort of what the process looks like. I don't -- I wouldn't count that as a formal request so when we receive requests as a formal letter or a memo or something like that, we received 12 requests in 2016 and we certified eight U Visas, U VISA applications. We have one currently pending as well and other -- I think anticipating more requests coming in soon.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. You're doing an awesome job. Andy King, last question.

2.2

2.3

awesome sauce. Okay, I got it. So just a follow-up to my question and what Council Member Lander was talking about. I am not sure if I got an answer on the attorneys and their caseload to get an idea of what is the average caseload of every attorney and once identifying that do the numbers that you talked about where the numbers go from 420 to days to 536 days for cases based on the law-enforcement field might say they might want to hold it open to get more detail, get more information. Now is that activity the norm or is it the exception to the rule that the cases make go longer and based on a caseload figuring out how do we shorten those days if possible?

currently, the average caseload is at 72 per agency attorney. Cases can range, there are attorneys who on the high I guess have cases that are between 80 to over 100. I would say that it is kind of impossible to say what is the norm in terms of what, how the lifeline of a case because it depends on the what that case is, and it depends of the size of the

2.2

2.3

respondent, could depend on if there are multiple complainants, it could depend on several factors. So I guess I wouldn't put an -- like what's the average timeline on your case. It is very kind of fact specific and I think one of the reasons why there is this differential from maybe years past is because the agency attorneys that are working on these cases as really trying to look at the individualized circumstances underlying the complaint of discrimination which I will tell as somebody who practiced discrimination law will offer several years that is how discrimination cases should be looked at rather than fitting them into kind of like a one size all fits one box approach so I think that in part accounts for some of the variation.

up to that. I know you have your attorneys that are with you and if that 72 is a bit much, maybe you can assess what is a caseload that makes sense for an attorneys to handle so they can deliver so the days do grow and grow and grow. I say that, I was an ACS caseworker and I know after 30 cases we were drowning depending on the -- because of the work that we done.

15 to 20 cases are manageable. It comes to a point

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that the number gets too big no matter how great of an attorney that you are, you know, 420 days can turn into 820 days. So I would ask if in your system to assess what makes sense for a caseload for any attorney so that you know you get maximum output of all your attorneys on any and every given caseload that is being maintained so I just want to share that and get an idea of what's what and then also your communications and outreach. Is there a schedule that you work with the Council Members, there is 51 one of us, is there a schedule that you are constantly working with our offices to get information out to what you do, how you do, how great you do it to help because if some communities don't have a lot of discrimination cases, how involved are they with your agency if Brooklyn gets more cases than the Bronx, how does that breakdown, how are we able to more involved with you?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Quite honestly, there are certain council member's offices that we work with probably more than others. We continue to try to do outreach to more of the council members to get the information out there. We also have a commission newsletter that I always encourage, we

encourage, everyone whether they are council members or members of the public or to sign up for because that is also a really good way of finding out what kind of what are new issues we are working on or new offerings from the agency but we will certainly give thought to providing more structured approach so that we can have consistency with more of the council members.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Thank you, thank you, thank you, awesome sauce.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: You just said your new committees. You have a community relationship bureau?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Community Relation Initiative.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Could you tell us because the team is responsible for reaching out to the victims of biased based incidents to address the incidents and provide effective communication with know your rights information. Can you provide the committee with more details on the bias response team.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Quickly.

2.2

2.3

2 COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure.

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{\sc MEALY:} \quad \mbox{Sorry and we have one}$   $\mbox{\sc more question.}$ 

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure. So the kind of backbone of our Community Relations Bureau are our five community service centers that we have across the five boroughs. There's one for each borough. The Manhattan one is housed at our central location. They are specifically at the boroughs to make sure that we have people on the ground in those boroughs that are working with communities in their area. Postelection we found that we wanted to make sure that as we were hearing more media reports of hate and bias attacks across the city and as we were hearing more information from our partners across the city, there were people who were ready to go to those locations and respond and also had language capabilities in the areas that we were seeing an increase of these bias attacks. We have identified staff from each one of those community service centers to be part of this bias response team and when we see incidents or hate or violence that we think are specific to kind of what the trends are postelection, those are the people who will go out,

respond to that situation. Usually it is because there's a community partner that's involved in that or another elected official who has reached out and asked us to come and provide support.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Okay, thank you. Mr. Dromm, the last question that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: All right. I will try to be good. I will be direct and quick.

Language access in terms of signage and posters, how is that decided? I noticed in gender identity issues it seems like it is mostly English and Spanish and I'm wondering if we can get it into another languages. That is the first part of it and the other one is that I was surprised to see that there were eight UNT Visas. Is that partially because of the requirement that they, especially for the U Visa, be a violent crime attached to it?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: So on the language accessibility related questions, you know, for our outreach materials all of our outreach materials are available on our website and all of them are translated into, you know, I think 8 to 12 languages or are in the process of being translated into those different languages. For the actual poster size type

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

things that we have that again, you know, may have been from some of the city-wide campaigns, I would have to get back to you on what specific languages for each of those campaigns because I do think that they differ but we try to be mindful of, you know, where we are seeing the need for that especially with different communities. With regard to UNT Visas, do you want to...

DANA SUSSMAN: So Commission has a little bit of a unique role with respect to U Visa certifications. We are a civil law-enforcement agency so we are somewhat limited to the kind of cases we can take to certify. They have to demonstrate a violation of our law. We have to have jurisdiction to investigate so that will often show up in cases involving let's say sexual harassment that rises to where we can sort of uncover in in the course of our investigation a violation of the Penal Code for civil touching or sexual assault. We have seen in the tenant harassment context where undocumented folks are being harassed or threatened with deportation, I'm going to call ICE If you don't sign a surrender agreement so that would potentially rise to the level of criminal extortion.

2.2

2.3

are sort of narrow areas and obviously we don't have the kind of jurisdiction that criminal law enforcement would have to certify in broader context so I think that is probably the reason why. We are also somewhat of a nontraditional certifier so more and more advocates are learning about what we do but it is in somewhat narrow context. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. I want to thank you Commissioner and your staff. Thank you.

This has been an awesome hearing and it could not have been only if you had not done your job and you did an awesome job. You came in 2015.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Thank you very much.

know my committee says the same thing so [off mic conversation] ah, cut up. It is Woman's History Month, sheroes. All right. Thank you so much, Commissioner. One of our sheroes, all of our sheroes here. Thank you. We have one panel. Can we have Cristobal Gutierrez, Crystal Ball. Could you come sit at the table, please? From Make the Road. We have Allegra Zeller -- Zissule -- Fishel, I said it, Gender Equity Law Center. And we have Isabelle Fargo

-- Figaro, Legal Services New York City and Nicole
Salk (SP) from Legal Services also. You can start,
Make The Road. Hello, you can identify yourself and
you can start.

2.2

2.3

CRISTOBAL GUTIERREZ: My name is

Cristobal Gutierrez and I am an employment legal

advocate of Make the Road.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Could you say your name again?

CRISTOBAL GUTIERREZ: Cristobal Gutierrez. Chris is fine.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. My apologies.

CRISTOBAL GUTIERREZ: Make The Road is an organization that builds on power in Latino and working class communities to achieve dignity and justice through organizing policy innovation, education and services. We are based in three immigrant communities around New York City, Jackson Heights and the Queens, Bushwick in Brooklyn and Port Richmond in Staten Island. I work at the Workplace Justice Project that supports low wage workers to combat exploitation they face on a daily basis through integrated strategies of popular education

and Know Your Rights training through workshops,
individual counseling and advocacy. Make the Roads
community education and legal support works and is
crafted to arm and impact by community members with
knowledge, tools and the skills they need to tackle
the problems they face. As an organization, we would
like to congratulate the Civil Rights Committee,
Speaker's office and Commissioner Malalis for their
amazing as Commissioner Malalis just said, our
country has radically changed over the course of the
last year. The resentment of many of our population
has come to light and white supremacist and (??)
xenophobic ideologist is no longer hidden in the
dark, it is out there and we have seen the rise on
hate attacks all over our community. I will just
skip a few paragraphs. At this critical moment, the
Commission on Human Rights is considerably
understaffed. It is still roughly a 50 percent the
amount of staff that it had in 1991 even through New
York City's population has increased by 1.6 million.
The Commission is in dire need of more enforcement
personnel to adjudicate the large number of
complaints coming in to ensure that New York City
human rights law remains a powerful tool to protect

New Yorkers from discrimination. While it is a
positive sign that more people are coming forward to
report discrimination the agency, as I said, is not
adequately staffed to handle the flow of complaints
they are receiving. While the commission now fully
and thoroughly investigates the filed complaints they
just not look at individual complaints but they also
review the policies for example of company if it's an
employment case, they review the policies of tenants,
landlords in the housing context They just don't
focus on the individual case, they also look at the
circumstances surrounding it and that takes a lot of
time because they are doing their work well but if it
takes a lot of time for the weak party usually the
worker, the tenant that means basically a denial of
justice. It has taken almost two years to adjudicate
[bell sound] is that for me? Okay. I will just
wrap it up. It has taken almost two years to
adjudicate cases and it is just not good enough and
even though the commission is making wonderful work
they do need more budget to hire more people and
enforce this amazing human right law that we have.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: I'm going to answer that afterwards. Thank you. Next?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ALLEGRA FISHEL: Good afternoon. you very much for allowing me to testify today. name is Allegra Fishel. I am the founder of the and the executive director of the Gender Equality Law Center. Our mission is to break down barriers that limit opportunities for individuals to succeed in both the public and private sector on the basis of gender, gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation. Among the most significant part of our work is that we litigate cases including before the New York City Commission on Human Rights. quite frank before 2015, almost no civil rights lawyer in New York City would have thought about filing a complaint at the City Commission. Cases were either not accepted, statutes of limitations were missed and cases often languished and died there. That has radically changed and we really applaud the Council's increased funding as well as the really truly amazing turnaround at the City Commission. But I think as the annual report showed and we've heard extensive testimony from the Commissioner and her staff there is significant

increased demand for services and we are deeply
concerned that without significant corresponding
increases to the budget of the City Commission there
will be numerous adverse effects and I am just going
to try to mention four quickly because so many other
areas have been covered. First of all, the
Commission is one of the most important places where
individuals can represent themselves and although I'm
a lawyer and we represent people, many people come to
our organization who cannot afford counsel and we
cannot represent them not can many of the other
employment law projects and agencies and nonprofits.
This is a place where individuals can go, file a
complaint, have their case investigated and actually
get counsel at the commission to prosecute their
cases before OATH. This is hugely important and with
reduced funding there will be serious limited access
for folks to have this really one avenue they can
redress discrimination complaints, something they
cannot do in state and federal court without a
lawyer. Secondly, it is critical to increase funding
in order to maintain staffing levels not only numbers
to be able to for instance investigate complaints in
a timely manner but also to be professional.

culturally competent, language accessible people who
can truly move cases and be sensitive to the clients
that they serve. There also must be additional
people to go out into the community and tell folks
about what their rights are. This is the broadest
most comprehensive civil rights law in this country
and you would be surprised how many people
particularly disenfranchised or poor in communities
that just don't know their rights so great piece of
legislation simply isn't served if it's not enforced.
Okay, I am quickly going to sneak in two other quick
points because I am a lawyer and I talk a lot. One
quick point in that is there is one mediator in the
mediation program. One. That is all the budget has.
We strongly believe that mediation can help move
cases along, can bring resolution faster and can free
up the commission's resources to handle more complex
cases and then just quickly two other points, it's
really critical that the private bar stay involved in
handling these cases and there is now some
credibility with this organization. If you underfund
it and make it more difficult, less lawyers will take
on cases for low income folks and finally, compared
to federal jurisdiction, there is no really body of

2.2

2.3

law that has been developed under this amazing statute and the city commission has played an instrumental role in creating guidelines in developing role making, in prosecuting cases before OATH in the way they interpret claims brought which is broadening and creating an amazing source for people to continue to litigate these cases in the future. Thank you and thank you very much for letting me speak over time.

### CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Next?

NICOLE SALK: Hello, my name is Nicole
Salk. Good afternoon. I am from Legal Service NYC
and Brooklyn Legal Services which is a part of Legal
Services NYC. I am also here on behalf of the New
York City Human Rights Law Working Group and in part
of my testimony, attached to my testimony I included
a letter that we sent last week to the Speaker that
was signed on to by many, many organizations
including the organizations that are here including
Vocal, Better Balance, including all kinds of
organizations where we were expressing many of the
sentiments that the commission here is doing a
wonderful job under incredible leadership with
incredible staff but is incredibly underfunded. all

of the things that that have already been said. In
party said and in particular we wanted to point out
that there is a huge underfunding that really
happened after the Dinkins administration 25 years
ago and when Giuliani came in there was a huge
defunding of the commission and the commission really
became effectively invisible and so people don't ever
know what it does and why it's there and what's
really needed is to make it an institution again and
that's what's happening now but it has to be an
institution that can really fully do its mandate and
you give it, the City Council produces passes and you
have produced some of the most fantastic law in the
country in terms of protections but there has to be a
place especially for people without lawyers
especially low income folks to go and the commission
is that place. So I think what is really needed is
to really make the commission and institution again
historically for what it was and what it can be under
all the amazing laws that are being passed especially
in this time where the President of the United States
is basically undermining the civil rights of so many
groups and so many people and so that is essentially
what I want to say and take an opportunity to read

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

this letter since it is signed onto by so many folks. Just to give a few numbers because I want more time but that is what I wanted to say initially. commission is a victim of its own success. the large number of complaints now being filed, 883 in 2016 along, resources are stretched thin and many cases are taken far too long to be processed and resolved. The Commissioner really -- it is true that some time is needed to do what Cristobal was talking about which is to really do a whole survey which is what they are doing now. Every time there is a complaint filed, they look at the employer's practices and that does take time. They just don't look at the individual, they are giving a great impact. It is an amazing thing that they're doing and we are so glad they're doing it but that does take time but they really need more resources to do that and to be able to do it quicker. People are waiting way too long to get justice. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MEALY: The last panelist?

ISABELLE FIGARO: Good afternoon. I am going to read my comments to save time. Good afternoon Council Members and esteemed colleagues, my name is Isabelle Figaro. I am an advocate in the

Education Unit at Brooklyn Legal Services. I would
like to think New York City Council for inviting us
to comment on the proposed budget for the New York
City Commission on Human Rights. Legal Services NYC
is truly impressed by the efforts of the human rights
commission to address the most critical issues of
civil rights and human rights facing our city right
now. In light of legal service's mission toward
racial and social justice, we recognize that racial
discrimination and segregation in New York City are
issues that greatly affect our work and our clients
especially with respect to public education. We are
thrilled that the budget committee is taking these
important issues into consideration in deciding to
allocate additional funds to the commission. {??}
education advocates assist New York City public
school students and their families in the range of
areas including race, disability and other
discrimination. Through our local offices we assist
hundreds of families every year with disability and
education matters. Our clients are largely low
income people of color who live in under-resourced
communities. Over 90 percent of our student clients
are children of color and/or immigrants ranging from

ages three to 21. As a part of my job, I represent
these students in disciplinary and special education
hearings. Most of my clients attend schools that are
deeply impacted by segregation and its accompanying
disparities. In New York City, over 60 percent of
public school students attend schools that are more
than 90 percent non-white. Segregation in schools is
an issue that sits squarely at the intersection of
every issue faced by their communities. By funding
the demographic reporting that many in this city and
perhaps even in this room that have worked to
develop, we have come to better understand the link
between race and NYC student. For example,
statistics show that students of color are suspended
at disproportionate rates and for longer periods of
time than white students. In addition, not only are
black and Latino students overwhelming more likely to
be suspended than their counterparts they are also
more likely to be suspended for more minor offenses
such as insubordination and the use of profanity even
though the discipline code itself discourages
suspension for these kind of incidences. Yet despite
these disparities, segregation often remains an
elephant in the room, uncomfortably absent from the

direct confrontation. But when my black 13-year-old
client called me the night before a disciplinary
hearing and genuinely asks what is the use of me
standing up for myself anyway, I will just get blamed
for something else, that's just the kind of school I
go to. It is clear that even the students I
represent are acutely aware of the way structural
segregation impacts their lives both within the state
and across the country, New York City strives to
serve as an example in the public education. With
over a million students, New York City's public
school system is the largest and among the most
diverse in the world. However, New York City is
still one of the most segregated school districts in
the United States. Legal Services NYC is aware of
Intro 1378, a bill proposed by Council Members
Ritchie Torres and Brad Lander, who was here with us
earlier, among others that would create an Office of
School Integration within the city's Human Rights
Commission and introduce reporting requirements to
study of the prevalence and impact in New York City
schools. This bill appears to bridge the gap between
the existing demographic reporting and the issue of
segregation that it highlights echoing the comments

2	of my Legal Service's colleague, Nicole Salk, we
3	applaud and support the efforts of the City Human
4	Rights Commission to address and give voice to the
5	most critical civil rights issues facing New Yorkers
6	including segregation and public education. In
7	particular, if Intro 1378 passes the Commission will
8	be tasked with the crucial job of researching and
9	reporting on school segregation, a substantial
10	undertaking empowered by the standards and framework
11	of the New York City Human Rights Law, the City Human
12	Rights Commission is uniquely poised to excavate the
13	policies and practices that maintain structural and
14	functional segregation in one of the most diverse
15	cities in the world and to effectuate the city's
16	stated goal of promoting diversity and education.
17	Sufficient funding will ensure that the Commission is
18	resourced to carry out the research and reporting
19	that this bill requires effectively. We thank New
20	York City Council for soliciting comments on the
21	proposed budget. Should you have any further
22	questions or require any further information, please
23	do not hesitate to contact us. I am more than happy
24	to answer questions and provide my contact
25	information after the session. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: I must say, everyone
is saying the same exact thing, we need more funding.
If you recall, I did ask her was there any other
budget requests, she did not say. You said that we
given more funds that has not been said as of yet but
with this budget dance we gonna do with the Mayor, I
know we will be asking for more funding and just to
say, one mediation I didn't catch onto that. That is
a definite mediator, I will definitely start
pushing for more mediators. That will help the
process also. It is the pink elephant in the room
with the disparity of discipline in the schools and
no one is talking about that right now. So I hope
that I can talk with you later in regards to that and
bring that to the forefront and let the Commission
know that maybe we should do testing in the schools
and with that, with that, with that thank you all
for coming this afternoon and this meeting is
adjourned.

23 [gavel]

### C E R T I F I C A T E

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



Date April 13, 2017