CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

----- X

March 3, 2015 Start: 1:54 p.m. Recess: 4:24 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Room

16th Floor

B E F O R E: DEBORAH L. ROSE

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Darlene Mealy Mathieu Eugene Daniel Dromm Deborah L. Rose

Andy King

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

Carmelyn Malalis Chair and Commissioner NYC Commission of Human Rights

Cliff Mulqueen
Deputy Commissioner
NYC Commission of Human Rights

Nicole Salk Staff Attorney Workers Rights and Benefits Unit South Brooklyn Legal Services

Phoebe Todman
A Better Balance

Fred Freiberg
Fair Housing Justice Center

Christine Clark
Legal Services NYC

Natasha Lycia Ora Bannan Latino Justice PRDLEF

Craig Gurian
Executive Director
NYC Anti-Discrimination Center
Fair Play Legislation
NYC National Lawyers Guild

Elizabeth "Ez" Cukor Attorney LGBTQ Law Project New York Legal Assistance Group

Alyssa Aguilera Political Director Vocal New York

Paul Keefe Associate Legal Counsel Community Service Society

Erin Smith
Columbia Law School
Human Rights Institute

Sebastian Riccardi Staff Attorney Legal Aid Society [background conversation]

[gavel]

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: This hearing is called to order. I'd like to say good afternoon. My name is Debbie Rose. Ah-ha, you thought it was Darlene Mealy, right. [laughter] My name is Debbie Rose, and I will be presiding over today's Civil Rights hearing. But before I begin, I'd like to introduce the other members of the Council who have joined us today and two of the prime sponsors. I'd like to recognize Council Member Eugene, Council Member Garodnick, and the prime sponsor, and Council Member Lander. Thank you.

So today, the Committee on Civil Rights will hold an oversight hearing regarding the enforcement of the City's Human Rights Law. New York City has one of the most comprehensive human rights laws in the nation, and it is imperative that do everything that we can to ensure that it is properly enforced to protect citizens of New York. It is important to note that the proper enforcement of the Human Rights Law is especially important to low-income New Yorkers because filing a claim with the Commission is often their only way to seek justice

for what they perceive as wrongful and prejudicial
actions toward them in the areas of employment,
housing, public accommodations and more. Over the
years, the Council has heard complaints that the
Commission interpreting the Human Rights Law too
narrowlyhashas interpreted the Human Rights Law
too narrowly, and that that has been an overarching
concern. Advocates have also expressed concern
regarding the Commission's Lack of enforcement.
Including its failure to initiate the investigations
file formal complaints of discrimination, and find
probable cause where justified. Advocates have also
expressed concern regarding the Commission's poor
funding and inadequate staffing.

Mayor de Blasio recently appointed

Carmelyn Malalis to serve as the new Commissioner and

Chair to the Commission, and I want to say welcome.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [off mic] Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: And we are very happy to have here today to testify before the committee. We look forward to discussing these issues with the Commissioner, and how the Commission's new leadership plans to move forward with proper and effective

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

enforcement of the Human Rights Law. This will also be the first hearing on Introductory Bills 421, 689, and 690. Intro No. 421 sponsored by Councilwoman

5 Mealy, would increase the reporting requirements for

6 the Human Rights Commission to include a reporting

requirement on the number of investigations the

8 | Commission initiates.

Intros 689 and 690 sponsored by Councilwoman Mealy and Councilman Lander and Garodnick would establish employment and housing discrimination testing programs. Today, the Committee will hear testimony from [coughs] Carmelyn Malalis, the Commissioner of the Human Rights Commission, and various interest groups. I thank you all for providing testimony that will help us understand enforcement of the City's Human Rights Law and the impact of Intros 421, 689 and 690. We will also hear from one of our bill's sponsors, Council Member Lander, and we ill now hear from another one of the bill's co-sponsors, Council Member Garodnick. But before we do that, I'd like to thank you, and I'd like to thank everyone for attending this hearing. Also, I'd like to thank the Committee staff Eisha

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

Wright in Finance; Muzna Ansari, Policy Analyst; and
Alesha Brown, Counsel to the Committee.

And I have a statement here from Chair Mealy. And she says: While I am disappointed that I cannot chair today's Civil Rights Committee hearing, I am thankful that Council Member Debbie Rose of Staten Island for agreeing to chair in my stead. am proud to sponsor Intros 421 and 690 and to cosponsor 689 with Council Member Brad Lander and Council Member Dan Garodnick. Intro 690, which requires the Commission to implement a program to test for employment discrimination and Intro 689, which does the same for housing will provide important information to the Council on the prevalence of the discrimination in these two areas. Intro 421 will improve our understanding of the Commission's Proactive effort to rid our city of discrimination. These bills represent necessary forward movement in the Council's goal to fostering a bias free New York. I look forward to reviewing today's testimony to ensure that these bills are as effective as possible. I would also like to thank Committee Counsel Alesha Brown for all her hard work

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

on this hearing. And with that said, we will have a statement from Council Member Lander.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you very much Chair Rose. Commissioner Malalis, it's wonderful to have you here for your first hearing with us, and I'm grateful that the Administration took longer than a lot of us wanted to get a Commissioner. But I'm thrilled that we now have one that, and that you're--I'm optimistic--off to a great start. And I also want to thank the chair in absentia, and also the Speaker for really shining a spotlight on the need to work together with the Commissioner. We really invigorate New York's commitment to confronting discrimination in housing, employment, public accommodations and other venues. I support all three bills on today's docket. I'm proud to be the prime sponsor of Intro 689, which would require the establishment of a housing discrimination testing program.

We know from a lot of different sources that there is ongoing and sadly still pervasive housing discrimination in the housing market in New York City today. Not that long ago HUD did a national study, which continued to find through testing around

the country that White renters relative to Black and
Latino renters showed more units. Rented units at
better costs, a whole range of ways in which people
of color systematically face discrimination in the
housing market. And we can't afford that in New York
City for a whole range of reasons. It's morally
abominable. The housing crisis is dramatically
increasing, and it's something we just have to be so
much more aggressive about. So to have all of that
happen at the same time that we've allowed the budget
of the Commission to be cut to the point where it has
a hard doing reactive work, and does zero proactive
work is just unacceptable. And I hope that this bill
will get us back in a place where the Commission
We've got some great advocates out there doing
testing. I want to thank the Housing Justice Center,
and the Anti-Discrimination Center and Metro New York
and Legal Aid and many of the other groups that are
engaged actively in helping. But this has to impact
via public responsibility. There are Human Rights
Laws, and we must be aggressive in enforcing them.

something. You know, I did this recently where I went on Craigslist. It continues to be the case.

And I'll just give one example of

2 This Council not that long ago passed a law against source of income discrimination, which says you may 3 4 not discriminate against people have a Section 8 Certificate or other public assistance or a subsidy 5 in the housing market. And yet, all you have to do 6 7 is open up Craigslist, or look at one of the many other places where there are online ads to see that 8 source of income discrimination is rampant in the 9 10 housing market. And people so unconcerned about enforcement that they will put in public 11 12 advertisements no Section 8, no vouchers, no certificates. So, of course, you're not going to get 13 a reactive case on one of those situations because 14 15 aren't stupid. They aren't going to go and try to 16 get that unit. What we have to have a proactive enforcement that goes out and finds the bad actors 17 18 who are violating our laws. Especially to look to see if they are systemic violations. If those are 19 20 larger managing agents, or owners or realtors who are really engaging in broader and systematic violations. 21 2.2 Brings those things through the HRC process, and 23 demands justice, and a correction of these discriminatory problems. So that's the intent behind 24 25 689, and similar with the other legislation as well.

2.2

And I'm hopeful that we can work together with the commission to make it a reality, to do what we need to do in the budget. To provide the resources so the Commission can actually do this work, and then over time, but in the not too distant future have a real impact in the housing marketplace to truly reduce discrimination, and open up opportunity more fairly for all New Yorkers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you, and Council Member Garodnick.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you,

Chair Rose. I'll be very brief. First, I want to

thank for you--thank you for stepping up and chairing

the hearing in Council Member Mealy's absence. And

we want to thank her, too, for putting these bills on

the agenda, and pushing what is a very important

issue. And I want to recognize my colleague Council

Member Lander. I am the second sponsor on his bill,

and support the others, too for many of the same

reasons. These are really core responsibilities for

the Human Rights Commission. And to the extent that

we are serious about combating discrimination, and

all of its forms in the City, we need to make sure

that we are taking affirmative steps to figure out

2.2

what is happening, evaluate our results. And develop
clear strategies to be able to take aim at the bad
practices that exist there. And so, that is why we
are taking a legislative route today and we look
forward to working with you Commissioner in your new
role and with the Commission in being able to
activate this process. And to make sure that we are
looking to root out discrimination however we
possible can. And with that, I thank you again,
Madam Chair, and we'll look forward to the hearing.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you, Council Member Garodnick. And so our first panel is-- And let me again say welcome.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [off mic] Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: We're really glad to have you here. We know that the Commission is going through some transition, and we're really glad that you're here, and we're excited about moving forward. And it's good to see you again, Cliff. And so our first panel is Commissioner Malalis and—I'm sorry—and Cliff Mulqueen who is the Deputy Commissioner of the Human Rights Commission. And before you begin, we're going to swear you in. So if you'll raise your

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your 3 testimony before this committee, and to respond 4

COMMISSIONER MALALIS:

honestly to council member questions?

7 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you and you can begin your testimony by identifying yourself. 8 9 you.

T do.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [coughs] Thank you again, Council Member Rose. Thank you also to Council Members Lander, Garodnick, and Eugene for making time for today's hearing. The pronunciation of my name was great I have to say for, you know, [laughter] first out of the gate. As you all know, my name is Carmelyn Malalis, and I'm the new Chair and Commissioner for the City's Human Rights Commission. As the newly appointed Chair and Commissioner, I can say without reservation that the Commission strongly supports what it understands to be the goals of these three bills. Robust enforcement of the City's Human Rights Law; supporting the existing testing work of the Commission; and providing the public with greater transparency of the Commission's work, particularly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

with regards to the investigations initiated by our agency. So that the public can better assist us in identifying the areas and industries in which serious violations of the Human Rights Law occur, and the identities of the repeat violators of the law. These goals are consistent with this Mayor's commitment to aggressively enforcing the Human Rights Law. And safeguarding the rights and dignity of all people in New York City.

Now, as part of that commitment, Mayor de Blasio appointed me to helm this very important agency. And I proudly assumed my role as Chair and Commissioner almost two weeks ago. So, I'm just out of the gate as well. [laughter] My personal stake first of all in building on the prior work of the commission to make it an even more robust enforcer of this very expansive law, proactively educating our different stakeholders in their rights and obligations under the law. And finding collaborative, non-adversarial ways of accomplishing the mandate of the Commission is not insignificant. I'm daughter of Filipino immigrants. My wife is an immigrant from Ethiopia, and we are raising our two bi-racial children in our family and extended family

2.2

of many different faiths and belief systems. So the Commission's mandates to foster mutual respect and understanding among different peoples and communities and encourage equality of treatment for all are indeed personal mandates for me. My wonderful modern family is a daily reminder of why working to combat discrimination and intolerance in this great city is important. And why I accepted the very important responsibility of leading this Commission.

Taking on prejudice, discrimination, and bigotry is my life's work. It is my great honor to bring that knowledge and experience to my work at the Commission. I spent more than a decade representing and litigating on behalf of clients with claims under the Human Rights Law. Assisting and consulting with legal advocacy organizations that work with, and advocate on behalf of individuals and communities affected by the discrimination and harassment that the law was meant to protect against. And, in fact, I see many of those folks here today. And working with counsel for employers and businesses to resolve issues proactively and non-litigiously.

When representing clients who are victims of discrimination, retaliation, or harassment as an

2.2

employee advocate, I always investigated to see if my client was able to raise a claim under the Human Rights Law. Not only is the Human Rights Law expansive in the number of different bases of protection provided. But actually written into the law is the requirement that its provisions be construed liberally for the accomplishment of the uniquely broad and remedial purposes thereof regardless of whether federal or New York State Civil

and Human Rights Laws have been so construed.

I can tell you that I was an avid enforcer of the law as an employee advocate, and I intend to be an even more avid enforcer of the law in this new capacity especially with this Administration's commitment to quality and justice, and the support of the City Council. I am also eager to continue developing and growing relationships with different Commission stakeholders. And creating new collaborations to help the Commission better serve the public in both our Law Enforcement Bureau and our Community Relations Bureau.

While enforcement of the law is important and it speaks to my history as an advocate, I also come to this role cognizant of the fact that much can

2.2

also be accomplished for the very important work of the Commission's Community Relations Bureau. For example, in addition to educating individuals on their rights, we want to support businesses in New York City by providing opportunities for educating and training that are tailored to their needs. A multi-pronged strategy to enforcement outreach, education and training is necessary if the Commission is to accomplish what the public asks of it, and what the law requires.

Given the breadth of the Human Rights
Law's protections, the multiple communities and
stakeholders I plan to reach out to in building on
the Commission's prior enforcement work and community
relations networks, time is a valuable commodity. In
a moment, I will address the three piece of proposed
legislation, and I do want to thank the Speaker and
the Council for prioritizing this agency and these
issues, and putting them in the forefront. As
threshold matter, however, I do ask this Committee
and the Council to allow for a timeline that would
enable the Commission to develop effective lasting
strategies and implement them. And so I was also
happy to hear Council Member Garodnick talk about the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

clear strategies that are necessary, because I, too,
believe they are necessary.

Having been in this role for just shy of two weeks, I am just beginning the process of reviewing all of the Commission's operations, as well as its policies and procedures. Familiarizing myself with the Commission's current docket, and speaking with stakeholders who have already reached out to welcome me into this role, and offer their resources from their firm, their organization or their community. I have been shuttling between our agency's five locations to meet and get to know the hard-working City employees, who in 2014 alone have helped the Commission secure over \$1 million in damages for complainants, and almost \$200,000 in civil penalties through enforcement. And assist over 90,000 people in the city through projects and activities administered through the Commission's Community Relations Bureau. Not to mention the many more people the Commission reaches through its media and ad campaigns.

Building on the successes of the

Commission's prior work in implementing the multi
pronged strategy I have described will take some

time. And I am concerned that placing additional
obligations on the Commission with short timelines
such as those included in the proposed legislation
may actually be counter-productive to making the
Commission more effective, more visible, more
accessible, more transparent, more responsive or mor
impactful. Now, [coughs] I joined the agency at a
time when it was preparing its 2014 year-end report.
I know that a lot of the folks have that with them
today. Now that report shows the work that the
agency has been engaged in prior to my arrival. And
in 2014, the Commission initiated 124 investigations
into employment and housing. Now, that resulted in
the filing of 125 Commission initiated complaints
because some of those cases that were filed in 2014,
were actually investigated in the year prior.

The Commission's testers were involved in all 125 situations leading up to a Commission initiated complaint. Which indicates the effectiveness of the testing program in identifying violations of the law. Consistent with the procedure proposed in Intro No. 689 and 690 Commission testers referred incidents of actual or perceived discrimination to the Law Enforcement Bureau. Which

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- 2 then initiated investigations and filed complaints.
- 3 Currently, the Commission's Testing Program is
- 4 staffed by two full-time staff and six part-time
- 5 staff who identified possible violations of the Human
- 6 Rights Law in employment and housing context. And
- 7 then they go out into the field as testers to
- 8 determine if employers, real estate agents, and
- 9 brokers and other entities with obligations under the
- 10 law are, in fact, violating the law.
 - A January 2015, grant of funds from
 Housing Preservation and Development will support the
 Commission's testing work until June 2015, and has
 enabled the Commission to deploy testers in even more
 situations. Exploration of ways to expand the
 Commission's testing program in target and scope is
 already underway. I have been carefully reviewing
 the Commission's practices and procedures to identify
 types of matters that may be appropriate for testing.
 And time is needed to assess the necessary strategy
 for expanding our program. This includes the

possibility of reaching out to community partners and

collaborating with such groups to further diversity

a diversity of legal advocates to help us

strategically pinpoint appropriate targets.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 our pool of testers, addressing the Human Rights
3 Law's different protections.

In the last decade, the Commission's Testing Program has focused primarily on matters involving gender based discrimination in employment. And to Council Member Lander's comments in the beginning of this, discrimination based on lawful source of income or family status in housing. Matters involving discrimination based on race, sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression, religion, arrest or conviction record and other bases covered by the Human Rights Law would also benefit from the Commission's program. investing time into building partnerships with community groups and legal advocacy organizations and thinking strategically about the Commission's investigations will help us test in those different areas.

The Commission agrees that the type of testing contemplated in Intro No. 689 and 690 would be helpful in combating discrimination in employment and housing. And that such testing is a powerful tool for the Commission's Law Enforcement Bureau. As the Commission's Testing Program has been effective,

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

and considerations to expand the reach of the program are being reviewed, I am concerned that the timelines imposed by the bills may actually be counterproductive to the Commission expanding an effective testing program, which includes community partners and advocacy organizations that can help with a thoughtful expansion.

The Administration has a clear commitment to accountability and understands why the information to be reported under Intro No. 421 helps to keep the Commission accountable, and how it also helps the public assist the agency. However, I believe that allowing the Commission to build momentum while engaging key stakeholders will enable us to evaluate and implement strategy and address the new reporting requirements contemplated in Intro No. 421 in a manner that would best serve the public. accepting this appointment and meeting with members of the community, and legal advocacy organizations, I'm excited to harness the power entrusted to the Commission to seek out and address discrimination, retaliation, and harassment in our city. And to work with Corporation Counsel to that same end.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

As I alluded to earlier in driving the
scope and targets for commission initiated
investigations and complaints for further emboldening
and animating the Commission's enforcement
activities, I want to do so strategically,
thoughtfully, and effectively, which takes time.
Thought the information sought in Intro No. 421 could
be provided in the Commission's 2015 annual report as
contemplated by the bill, I believe that such
information is not likely to capture the efforts
underway. And that are more likely be memorialized
in annual reports for 2016 or 2017. Some of the
information required by Intro No. 421 is already
available in another format in the Commission's Year-
End Report or website. However, other information
sought would not likely be reflective of efforts
underway if reported in 2015. Also, efforts to
address some of the recommendations in the
comptroller's recent audit report are already
underway as a result of this administration's
prioritization and need for improvement. For
example, the Commission is already working with DOITI
to acquire, adapt and implement Law Manager, a well
regarded case tracking software that will help us

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 capture our statistics more reliably. And we expect implementation to begin in the second quarter of 3 Fiscal Year 2016.

Another priority consistent with the Comptroller's recommendations is to conduct a review of the Commission's policies and operating procedures to determine how we might clarify and refinement. Having begun with the Commission less than two weeks ago, I am only at the beginning of this strategic process. Rather than rushing through the planning process, I submit that it is essential to the Commission to take the requisite amount of time to engage the various stakeholders as well as to review and revise necessary procedures, assess and implement infrastructure that strategically responds to the public's needs. And build relationships necessary to create a more robust program from commission initiated investigations with Corporation Counsel.

Make no mistake, I share your urgency in prosecuting more cases of discrimination and across more bases covered under the expansive Human Rights Law. And I understand the utility of transparent reporting so that the public can help us identify areas and targets appropriate for commission

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 attention. I want to proceed thoughtfully, and strategically to accomplish those ends. I thank you 3 all again for inviting me to speak on behalf of the Commission, and I look forward to our continued 5 6 partnership on the important goals of these proposed bills. Than you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you. Are you testifying, Cliff? You're not testifying. Okay. I'd like to recognize that we have been joined by Council Member Cornegy, and with that I would just like to say, Commissioner, we recognize that you've only been there two weeks, and that you have your work cut out for you. And that you have apparently, you know, hit the ground running. I just want to say that when you mentioned that, you know, you would like us to allow the Commission to build the momentum, you know, I just want to say we recognize that that's a necessary step. We want you to understand that we've been frustrated because often times the efforts have been stymied and stagnant. And so, we've charged you with a big task to get the Commission back on track. One of the -- you know we saw such a significant decline in what we--the Council and this particular committee felt was such a

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

decline in the number of cases that were actually litigated. And while we had the most expansive and comprehensive civil rights law, you know, the execution of it has been less than stellar. And we feel that there are reasons for that, one of which was the fact that the staffing decreased since 1992 from 173 to 11. And so, we feel that the agency sort of became a toothless tiger. And so, what are you doing in terms of bringing staffing levels to a--back up to a level where they can be productive. And what does that number look like to you in terms of the needs. So that we could address the over 6,000 or 8,000--it varies--annual complaints, and change the number of actual cases that sort of result in any kind of response or restitution look like.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Well, I guess first of all, I would--I would emphasize and remind folks that it has been only two weeks or less than two weeks since I've been there.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Absolutely. I prefaced my remarks, and we all know. [laughs]

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [laughs] And I appreciated that. And I would say this, you know, I understand your frustrations, as you've expressed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

them, and I understand the public's frustrations with how-- You know, with how budget issues and other issues have affected this important agency. And I would say that, you know, my initial priority in getting to the agency was to create this -- You know, as Council Member Garodnick said, you know, a very strategic plan for how this institutional change needs to happen. I'm coming in at a time where, you know, the former chair of this Commission had been there for, you know, upwards of ten years. And so, the transition coming to this agency will be significant. As I have visions for the Commission as a whole, you know, the three major areas I see are: One, strengthening our law enforcement bureau so it is indeed becoming a much more robust enforcer of the Human Rights Law, and not the toothless tiger that you referred to it as. Expanding our Community Relations Bureau so that we are reaching out to more communities. We have relationships with people on the ground who are able to help us from a very kind of grassroots on-the-ground level identify the areas that the Commission should be looking at. And the groups that we should be proactively working with. And then, of course, expanding and strengthening our

or Law Enforcement Bureau.

2.2

relationships with Commission stakeholders. Who, you know, several of them, of course, are in this room because they have an interest in what's happening or what will be developing with this agency. I think that certainly there will be a lot more communication that needs to happen, you know, internally even with

The agency has done work in the area of Commission initiated complaints, and certainly we could do more with that work. You know, as I alluded to my testimony. For one thing, you know, the Commission initiated complaints have mainly focused on either gender discrimination in the employment context or loss of source of income, or for family status in the housing arena. And certainly because we have such an expansive law with multiple bases of protection. I have great interest in using the Law Enforcement Bureau to also investigate claims of discrimination and retaliation in those other areas.

As I see it, I see the Commission's law enforcement arm, you know, the area that deals with complaints from the public working very closely with the area of the Law Enforcement Bureau that deals with Commission initiated complaints. They should be

working together and collaborating quite a bit on
where the Commission's law enforcement priorities are
going. Similarly, you know, the Commission's
Community Relations Bureau is very important to that
same directive. I see the Community Relations Bureau
as being able to point to the Law Enforcement Bureau
to where we should be investigating. Who are the
repeat violators? How can we proactively train and
educate not just the individuals who will be
complaining, and making complaints of discrimination
and retaliation. But, how can we also work with
businesses, small businesses to educate and train

So as you said, as you noted, there is a lot of work to be done. And that is, in part, the reason that I want this time to be able to conduct a thorough and thoughtful investigation. And frankly, come up with strategic planning for how we should be going ahead in the future.

them on their obligations under the law

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you, and we recognize that you haven't had, you know, really much time to even sort of I guess go through and see all of the areas that you'd like to address. But do you

2	have a sense of what a significant number of staff it
3	would be to meet the goals that you've identified?
4	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: You know, I don't
5	think of it as just the number of staff.
6	CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Uh-huh.
7	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I also just think
8	of it as I'm looking at structuring the agency, and
9	the folks that are needed to bring about also the
10	internal training necessary to make enforcement a
11	priority. I'm looking at not just the number of
12	headcount available to the agency, but also who those
13	people You know, who those individuals would be.
14	You know, supervisors that are competent and trained
15	in the law to help with internal training.
16	Additional human rights specialists perhaps. So,
17	it's allI feel it's premature for me to identify
18	specific numbers for each job category. But
19	certainly, I look forward to working with the
20	Administration and the Council on figuring out what

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: You've come in on a good time. It's budget time. [laughter] And--

the appropriate staffing and resources would be for

21

22

23

24

this agency.

2 COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing] All
3 under--

2.2

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing]

[laughter] Well, true and, you know, this has sort of been a sense of an area where the Commission really hadn't sort of weighed in. Have you had the opportunity to look at the budget, and do you think that it is sufficient and adequate for the mandate that you have based on the number of complaints that you've received in the past?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Well, let me say this, when--you know, when the Speaker delivered her State of the City Address, my phone lit up. And my face lit up.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Right.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I mean what commissioner is going to honestly say that they don't welcome additional funding, or the fact that the Council takes their agency seriously? So again, I'm very grateful for that. I think there's a lot of work that needs to be done. There's a lot of work ahead of us. I would, of course, always welcome additional resources, but I'm also very aware that there's a process that needs to happen between the

2.1

2.2

agency.

Administration and with the Council to figure out what is appropriate and when it's appropriate. So that we can also absorb that additional resources and funding in a way that best meets the needs of the agency. So, again, my thanks to the Council for putting us in the forefront and prioritizing our

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Do you--how would you strategize or so that the agency or-- Have you had a chance to look at how you would or what you would put in place to help the agency be more proactive? You know, to be able to initiate some of these cases, as opposed to only being reactionary in some cases not really able to respond?

you know, I would refer back to some of my comments on I think the level of activity and cooperation that would need to happen within the agency. So that there's much more collaboration between the Law Enforcement Bureau and the Community Relations
Bureau, and I certainly think that that's a part of it. I think another part of it is greater collaboration with Commission stakeholders. That includes not just, you know, communities and

individuals and communitey groups, but also regar
advocacy organizations. And I say that because I
come from the world of legal advocacy groups. You
know, a lot of whom are here, and I think that You
know, I'm describing the folks who are very well
suited to identify where we should be proactively.
As you mentioned, focusing our resources. Because
those are the folks to whom possible complainants are
seeing, and delivering their stories. Those are the
organizations where individuals are, you know,
registering their frustration. So, I think that
there has to be greater collaboration within the
agency. Greater collaboration with commission
stakeholders, and certainly greater collaboration
with other city agencies. You know, in my testimony
I also mentioned working on more commission initiated
complaints and investigations with Corporation
Counsel. And certainly that's also a priority of
this Commission.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: And I know that my colleague has some questions, but in your statement you said, I'm concerned that the timelines imposed in the bills may actually be counterproductive to the

2.2

- 2 Commission expanding an effective testing program.
- 3 What would be a reasonable timeline?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: If we were not at week two, I could probably [laughs] more precisely answer that question. But, you know, again because I'm just at the very beginning of my review of our current procedures and policies, I think it's very difficult for me to be able to provide a specific timeline.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Well, then why do you think it's counter--the timelines that we've established are counterproductive?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Well, some of the legislation would require that they become effective immediately. And having just been there for this short period, I am very excited to do the work to be actually working with the Commission stakeholders I'm talking about. To be able to, you know, really look into what our practices are, speak to my staff, work with the Administration and my staff on, you know, more efficient investigations for our complaints.

Or, on, you know, addressing more bases of discrimination. And, I'm eager to put that time into that work. And I'm frankly concerned about having to

spend much more of that time on fulfilling the
reporting obligations that would be necessary under
these bills. The other thing I would say is, you
know, I want You know, transparency and
accountability are important to me. They're also
important to this Administration, and I think a huge
issue that these three bills raise is transparency
and accountability. Wanting to know why we're doing
it and how we're doing it. If these three bills were
to become effective immediately, I fear that, you
know, the reporting would just not be reflective of
what's down the pipe and what's underway.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: So, what we have in place in the Commission already, testers, right, and you do test.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: So, what would-- I'm not quite sure other than the reporting aspect, would, you know, sort of delay or what would have to be implemented? Is there a training component or something that has to go into this? I'm sure why it's not something that could be implemented in a reasonable turnaround time.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Right. Well, as I
described the testing program, currently we have two
full-time staff working on testing, and we have six
part-time staff working on testing. And there have
been specific areas that our testing program has
focused on. I think that in order to, you know,
provide better direction I think in instruction, and
testing programs I think, too, are you know,
conducive to working with community partners in
organizations especially if we want to test in
different areas. Let's say we want to, you know,
test for gender identity or gender expression
discrimination or pregnancy discrimination. Any one
of the other bases for discrimination covered in our
mandate. I think that having the ability to
strategically point out, and to point to where and
how we can be working with legal advocacy
organizations that can do this work. And do this
work, you know, effectively and efficiently through
the Commission I think will take some time. I don't
want to do it in a way that's just piecemeal. I
don't want to do it in a way that's not thoughtfully
carried out, or in a that doesn't really take into

it as outsourcing. I think of it as partnership,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

partnering. You know, having just been in the private bar and working with clients who also present some of these issues in the employment context, I think that type of partnering is what a lot of the folks in this room are hungry for. I think it only makes for a more effective agency, and I think it

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay. Council Member Lander.

only makes for a more informed public.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and again, Commissioner, welcome and welcome to you, and I was pleased to learn that you're a constituent as well. So that's great. So, look, here's the challenge, and I think the Chair said it well, but I'm going to say it again. welcome. We're thrilled you're here. You've got a great background. You've got some great new commissioners. So I'm enthusiastic and it's hard not to feel like she wants a little patience. She's only two weeks on the job. She's seems great, and you should be patient. And if it were just about you, then we could definitely be patient. But, we, and I really mean we, have let this agency deteriorate long past the point of patience. And there's a lot of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

24

week two.

I'll be honest. So for 20 years we've watched the
Commission be dramatically diminished. And I'm going
to ask just a couple of questions. This is not the
budget hearing, but I want to make sure we understand
the nature of just how diminished it is. Honestly,
this Council should have passed this legislation in
the prior administration. And I'll take, you know,
my share of the responsibility that we didn't. You
know, so we let this happen. You know, we didn't

push. We didn't demand legislation that would have

also want to point out that, you know, you're only in

required reporting. So that's our share. But, I

blame to go around. Some of it on this Council.

The de Blasio Administration is in month

17 | 15, and that was too long to wait to appoint a new

commissioner, to get new commissioners in place, and

19 to start to have a strategic plan. I mean, that's

20 not on you, but that and so-- And now it is this

21 | budget cycle, and I am thrilled that the Speaker

22 stepped up and put this squarely on the radar screen.

23 But we have to hit this budget cycle. And we can't

do that. We can't fight hard for more resources if

25 | we don't--are going to be confident that we've got

2 the additional transparency and the strategy and

3 aggressive additional programming that we need, you

4 know. So I hear you

1

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So I hear you that it's only two weeks and there's a lot to figure out, and it would be nice to have more time. But I also really--to me it sort of seems like those two things go together. The fight for the resources that the Council is going to engage in over the next couple of months. It has to go together with our being a partner and getting the programming and transparency that's essential to do it. So, I just--I want to try to get a little more specific about how we're going to get that done in the-- You know, in this coming timeframe. So let me just start by making sure that I--you know, we kind of are in the same-- You know, obviously the advocates throw around this question of the agency having essentially seen an effective cut of 90% of the resources that it once had. You know, I know there are other statistics that say that in '91 there was a staff of almost 250. And now the staff is at what?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: So we have a reliable headcount right now of 66, and we have 61

2.2

2 employees who are currently working at the
3 Commission.

is not the budget hearing so I won't ask you all the questions about the budget limits. Maybe let me just ask that you come to the budget hearing really ready to look back at that. With no just like one or two years back. And it would also be helpful to know—Do you know when there was at least triple the staff that is currently in place? How big the testing programs were? What the staff was of the firm or the testing division at that point?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I can't say.

Unfortunately, Council Member Lander, I don't have that information.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: [interposing]

Fair enough. This is not the budget hearing. So it would be great if you could come to the budget hearing with that information so we can really engage thoughtfully on it. So, I guess me just ask a couple of different questions or versions of questions that the Chair asked. Given that that budget hearing is coming up, and that you've referred to the need to develop a sort of strategic plan to revitalize the

agency, what's the timeline for that. I mean, do you
imagine putting something out that the Council can
see that identifies, you know, just sort of describes
your plan both on a budget and on an agency
reorganization to move forward and make the changes

7 then.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Well, you know, you've alluded to the budget hearing and what's to take place, and I think about a week and a half or two weeks, right. And so, yes, I think some of the questions that you're asking no are things that we will hopefully address. One, you know, through the conversations that have been happening with the Administration and the Council. But then, certainly some of the questions that you're asking are the things that I can address at that later time. And, you know, as I said earlier, I think your request for information and transparency is something that I also take very seriously. And I--I'm planning on working with the Council. You know, of course, with the Administration on providing that information to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay, and then just before I get to the three pieces of legislation, I do just want to ask a question, too, about the

25

2 Comptroller's Report, which is also quite recent. But it's my understanding that of the-- And for 3 folks who don't know, we haven't talked about it that 4 5 It's really focused on response time to complaints that are filed with the Commission on 6 7 Human Rights identifying that. It's a very long response time. It's something like half the 8 complaints take more than a year essentially to be 9 10 processed. And that's not even the ones that go to some kind of finding. But you--but the Commission 11 12 agreed essentially with four of the six 13 recommendations, but the two of them you didn't 14 respond to. Can you just explain to me what the--15 COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing] 16 Sure. Yeah, and I saw that in the Comptroller's 17 Report, and our comments are actually attached I 18 believe as an addendum to the Comptroller's report. And I think you'll see in our comments that, you 19 20 know, we had intended to specifically address the recommendations one and two in the same, you know, 2.1 2.2 kind of category that we were addressing. One of the 23 recommendations that the Comptroller recognized that we had, you know, said that we were addressing or 24

planning to address. So, I was -- I was a little bit

2 confused as to why it was characterized that way. What I would say, and I think the two specific 3 recommendations that you're talking about are the 4 recommendations dealing with the time it takes to 5 6 investigate a complaint, which you were just 7 referring to. And I will tell you that that specifically has been a priority of mine. So, with 8 my--you know, with my short two weeks there, we are 9 already in the process of reviewing the practices 10 especially with regards to, you know, how we 11 12 investigate complaints, and what the processing time is. And, you know, I look forward to working with 13 14 the Administration and my staff more quickly and more 15 efficiently processing those claims. I will say, 16 too, that, you know, an eye towards processing those 17 claims in the one year--the one-year kind of 18 benchmark that was alluded to in that report. know, that is not a requirement by statute. 19 20 actually a benchmark that the Commission itself had put out there in 2002. And as we are reviewing our 21 2.2 current practices and what's actually needed to 23 investigate complaints, that is certainly something we're going to look at as well. You know, because I 24 25 want to make sure that we're--we have an eye not

2	towardsnot just towards the efficient processing of
3	complaints, but also, you know, what is entailed to
4	give each complaint a fair and thorough

5 investigation.

2.2

that, and I'll come back to that in just one second.

So you are conducting a formal assessment, and you'll have-- Is that something the results of which you'll share with the Council. I imagine with the Comptroller, too, but for us will you share when you're done with that assessment, and you've developed strategies and recommendations, the results of that?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I have--I--I have no--no doubt that the results of that, and as it's unfolding even, you know, before something like a final report would also be something that is worked through, and discussed in dialogue with the Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Great, but you do plan--I mean so I--we definitely want to have more informal conversation--

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing] Right.

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS 46
2	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER:and dialogue,
3	but you are also saying that at some point you'll put
4	a thing on the table, which is the strategic
5	assessment of case process You know, case
6	processing and recommendations?
7	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I will tell you
8	that I have not thought of the format that, you know,
9	such athat the results would take. But certainly,
0	it's my intent to provide the Council and the public

it's my intent to provide the Council and the public
because I think-- I want the public to know what to
expect when there's--

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: [interposing]

It's kind of a trick question when we say will you give it to the Council? Because there's nothing the Administration gives to the Council that the whole public doesn't get. So, yes, absolutely. It's good to embrace that transparency. Okay, well, if by the budget I'll ask this again at the budget hearing. So if you can--can give a little more thought to it by then that would be--

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing]
Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --that would be great. And it is good to hear you talk more broadly.

2.2

Right.

I mean yes, the timeline is one thing, but obviously—

You know, I've talked with a lot of advocates who

are concerned that just finding a probable cause is

so low. You know, we don't--we're not just saying

speed it up. We want it done thoughtfully and

thoroughly and with an eye toward remedying the—

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing]

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --the discrimination where it exists. So I appreciate your adding that.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing]
Well, I mean and I would add something to that as
well, which is that, you know, part of the process
that I was just describing, you know, includes also
looking at, you know, how we are—how we are
discussing and determining probable cause internally,
right. And on the stats, which I think is something
that you're addressing, certainly we want to be able
to be a resource to the public where they feel like
they could come to the Commission and file
complaints. Work with the Commission on filing
complaints. There are also instances I would say in
which, you know, the public comes to—with the intent

of filing a complaint with the Commission. But
perhaps, you know, speaks with our attorneys, or our
law enforcement folks in our Law Enforcement Bureau.
And, you know, for their own personal reasons or
their own issues that they're prioritizing rather
than filing a complaint, would rather that the
Commission engage in pre, you know, investigation.
You know, work or interviews with, you know, the
respondent, you know, the potential respondent. And
so, certainly sometimes there are issues that are
brought to the Commission that are resolved pre-
complaint. I mean I think the other thing that this
points to, and this is also something alluded to in
the Comptroller's Report is that, you know, we want
to make sure that care case tracking system, and our
statistics to capture this information are improved.
Which is why, the Administration has already invested
time and attention in converting to a new case
tracking software.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: All right. Good. So let me move through the bills quickly. So on 689 and 690, you know, I hear you that you want to have these be--these programs be strategic as they're expanded. The bills do provide, you know, they would

2.2

take effect immediately upon enforcement. I think it would be reasonable to give you some defined amount of time in the legislation to develop the strategy for and implement. And know how much money you'd have to implement these programs. So fair enough. How should we think about it. You know, so if we were to consider amending the bills to—to have a start date, by which these programs were to be stood up and we're interested in giving you the time to put the strategy together, what do you think a reasonable time would be?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Right. In truth, the benefit and the burden of being--of saying that I've been there for two weeks is the reality that I've been there for two weeks. And I--again I fully intend that this topic and the subject of these bills will be something that we address again with the Council. I completely agree with the goals of the bills. And so, in just trying to figure out the time necessary to actually implement, you know, on the--what's required of the bills and what the bills would ask the Commission to do in terms of reporting requirements is something that frankly I would just need more time to be able to present to the Council.

2.2

2 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Right. How much 3 more time?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [laughs] You know, I would have to get back to the Council on that.

again at the budget—at the budget hearing. Look, you don't have enough resources to process the current complaints you have. So on your current budget you still don't have the resources to establish these two testing programs. On the other hand, we've got to move all these things together.

We can only put the resources in place if we get the programs and the transparency in place. And we are open to being flexible in the timeline of when those things start. But we're going to need deadline—

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [interposing] Uhhuh.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --that we can put in the law, and that we can move forward on together. So I think we are open to working with you on what reasonable deadlines are. The sooner you can give us some of that, the more confident we can be we've got a good partnership. We'll set them up reasonably,

2 and we'll implement them. So we look forward to hearing that soon. Thank you. Then on 421, though, 3 4 I quess I'm really trying to understand. I could see 5 that you might want many--to tell us many additional 6 things beyond what 421 would require you to tell us. 7 And, of course, you could put those things in the Mayor's Management Report without us having to pass a 8 law to do it. You could put them in the 2015 Annual 9 Report, or you could come to us and say hey we want 10 to amend the Human Rights Law further to provide --11 12 You know, to provide additional reporting. But I've 13 got to say that the things that are required by 421 14 itself are pretty modest. I mean you mostly just 15 included them in your testimony about 2014. And 16 they're not in the report. At least I couldn't find 17 them in the report. You gave us more information 18 just in the two weeks in your testimony. So, I mean, is there anything in 421 specifically that's 19 20 problematic? Again, I hear you and you might want to upon research and thinking decide to track and give 21 2.2 yourself a dashboard and give us a dashboard of 23 additional information. But, it's just hard for me. You know, the total number of investigations you 24 initiate broken down by category of discrimination. 25

421 that is a--that's a problem?

1

5

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

time to develop.

- That you referred to court counsel. And the

 publications that you've put out about them just

 doesn't seem-- I don't know. Is there something in
- COMMISSIONER MALALIS: I think that it's 6 7 less that it's a problem than, you know, wanting the information provided to be more meaningful. I mean 8 I, you know, I imagine that the reason that folks 9 want this information is because there is reaction to 10 the information that's provided. And when I-- I 11 12 quess what I'm saying is for that information that 13 would be provided to be meaningful, I think more time 14 needs to--needs to pass. So that some of the 15 information that it requests. You know, for 16 instance, our work with Corporation Counsel has some

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: But to me this is like we definitely need the information in 421. I mean we've got to have it. It's all pretty reasonable. It's pretty basic. All we're looking for there is the total number of investigations referred to court counsel for the purpose of commencing the civil action. So at a minimum, we have to know that. I don't see any reason why we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

wouldn't move forward to pass 421. We commit. know, it becomes the law. Do you report on these things? And then we'd be thrilled if you'd come back to us and say, now that I've been here a few months, I have some more thoughts on what will be even more useful, but providing an annual report to the Mayor's Management Report we'd be glad to. You can do that on your own. You don't need those--you know, you don't need those things by local law. We can work together to it. But I haven't heard you say anything today that makes me think we don't need everything in 421 or that it's really a problem to do it on the timeline that's in here. I hear you saying you want to do it even better, and be more thoughtful and more strategic. And I believe you, and I welcome that. But I guess I think given how long we haven't taken some basic steps forward, we should move to do that pretty quickly. And if there are things that you see in these three bills that are potentially problems, by all means, if you need a little more time to start up the programs, let us know those things. But let's not let the perfect be the enemy of the good here. Let's get some steps going that we take together to make these improvements. Help us have the case to be

- 2 able to put more resources in to achieve those goals.
- 3 And then when you're ready to ask for even more
- 4 ambitious changes, great. We'll look forward to you
- 5 coming back to us to do it. That wasn't a question,
- 6 by the way.

- COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [laughs]
- 8 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: That's was only
- 9 diatribe, but anyway. So thank you for being here.
- 10 | I'm going to ask you some follow-up questions
- 11 | obviously at the budget hearing. And I really do
- 12 | just want to go back to what I said at the beginning.
- 13 | We really do welcome you, and look forward to working
- 14 | with you to revitalize this agency, and some
- 15 transformation here today. [sic] Thank you.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you, Council
- 17 Member Lander. I have just a few nuts and bolts
- 18 | questions that you need to fill in some of the gaps
- 19 | in your testimony. So of the 4,975 inquiries that
- 20 came in 2014, other than the pre-complaint
- 21 interventions and the cases filed by the Commission,
- 22 what happens with the other inquiries? And what's
- 23 the current status of the rest of those inquiries?
- COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Yeah. Well, there
- 25 | are some inquires that come in that are not based

2 specifically on maybe a specific protection under the law or they may not even being coming in that have 3 4 any relationship to the Human Rights Law or our jurisdiction. For instance, I think something often 5 6 comes in, or a common question area that we get are, 7 you know, folks here that do work in the area of housing. And so, folks--you know, the public. 8 Someone from the public might come in and say, I'm 9 having in difficulty with my landlord who won't 10 provide me with heat. So, you know, is this 11 12 something that could help us with? So that's an 13 inquiry. We track it, but it doesn't cover something 14 necessarily that's under our jurisdiction. And so, 15 when there are cases that inquiries come in, and we 16 are able to refer that individual to another agency 17 that does address those issues. For instance, HPD. 18 We always endeavor to do that. There are some other inquiries that come in that, you know, somebody might 19 20 just have a question about the law, their rights. Something general, but may not necessarily want to go 21 2.2 forward with any particular action. And that is, you 23 know, a personal choice on behalf of that individual. 24 If they want to come into the Commission, if they 25 want to speak to an attorney, if they want to develop

some sort of claim. I know in other situations
that's also a common occurrence that happens. There
are issues where some cases may end up being filed,
and then maybe administratively closed for any number
of reasons. You know, the actual statute I think
lists maybe six or seven reasons why something might
be administratively closed. And that's not an
exhaustive list. So examples of those sorts of
issues could be if, you know, somebody came in. They
were very excited about filing a complaint. They
spoke to one of our attorneys or, you know, asked to
speak to somebody in law enforcement. And then later
on again because of, you know, any number of personal
reasons just abandoned their claim. And so maybe we
had difficulty finding that potential claimant, or
that claimant if they did, in fact, file a complaint.
So there are any number of different reasons that
those inquiries never ended up as something that is
later on adjudicated.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: So do you have a sense of how many are--how many inquiries are not, you know, that were on pre--as pre-complaints interventions are filed? And how many you referred to other jurisdictions because it wasn't within your

almost 3,900 inquiries that were essentially not

2.2

jurisdictional under the law. And we would refer
those people to another agency that could help them,
and, you know, if that was appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Would--I guess would your Education Bureau, would that be something that they would address since it seems that there's a significant number of people that aren't sure of what types of complaints the Commission handles? Would that be a part of the education that your Education Bureau does in terms of community?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: I'll point out that a year or three or four years ago we started ramping up our work with HPD. And we go to a lot of HPD functions and speak about the Human Rights Law. And it was at that point that we--I started to see a lot inquiries about housing that really had nothing to do with discrimination. So to some extent, the fact that we're out there educating people, caused more people to inquire of us to come to us because they thought we could help them.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: So instead of clarifying it, you think it's sort of more needed?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: Well, I wouldn't say that, but I'm just--I'm saying there was

2.2

an increase in those kind of non-jurisdictional inquiries that correlated with our increase in working with HPD and doing presentations.

[pause]

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Is it that maybe the Commission is interpreting the law too narrowly?

[laughs] Because there have been complaints that the Commission, you know, interprets the law very narrowly, and that some of the complaints could actually be within your jurisdiction.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: And maybe you could give us an example of that.

would say this. I would say that, you know, I said that when I came in, I mean I've already started this process of reviewing our investigatory procedures, and how we process complaints. You know, and in part it's because I have heard some of those concerns.

And so, certainly this is something that, you know, while I probably can't answer your specific question right now, Council Member Rose, it is something that I'm aware of. And we do want to address those

2.2

concerns, and that is part of kind of the, you know,
institutional review that I've been describing.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: And in terms of investigations that the Commission initiates, Cliff, could you sort of list the ongoing investigations that Commission has initiated?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: As pointed out during the testimony we have testers who regularly review Craigslist ads and other newspapers ads and other websites. And look for advertisements that may or may not be discriminatory. You know, clearly as Council Member Lander mentioned the source of income is a major issue. And so we try to focus on those. We focus on family status and gender discrimination in advertisements where they looking for a waitress or hostess or just come right out and say female bartender or waitress or whatever. Those have been the focus of a lot of our investigations.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: There was a report that you issued to the Council last week that mentioned ongoing discrimination testing. When will the results of that investigation be ready?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: Which report are you referring to?

2 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: We were told that last 3 week there was an ongoing discrimination testing 4 program 5 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: That we had done--6 7 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] That 8 you--yes. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: That we 9 had done research with Columbia University? 10 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Yes. 11 12 [background comments, pause] 13 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: So we--we-14 -a couple years back we did testing with Columbia 15 University. Not only was the purpose of the testing 16 to measure the discrimination that was there, but essentially the goal was to measure the effectiveness 17 18 of certain messages to these decision-makers in the housing area. But our final report has not been 19 20 completed by these student who are conducing the research. We hope to have them by the summer. 21 2.2 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay. The end of the 23 semester?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MULQUEEN: By the

25 summer.

Τ	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS 62
2	CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay, the summer.
3	Okay. And there's a report that the Commission's
4	Complaint Tracking System lacks the adequate data
5	entry controls since your input data is complete.
6	When was the last time the system was updated, and
7	who is responsible for updating the system?
8	COMMISSIONER MALALIS: If I understand
9	your question correction, Council Member Rose, I
10	think you may be referring to one of the
11	recommendations or one of the issues that was raised
12	in the Comptroller's Audit Report. And, that is
13	actually as the Comptroller noted in the report
14	that's one of the recommendations that we kind of
15	proactively said yes we were planning on addressing.
16	And, you know, I'm happy to say that even before me
17	coming on as Chair of this agency Because the
18	Administration puts, you know, such focus on this
19	agency, and has prioritized it, efforts are already
20	underway to (1) hopefully replace, acquire, adapt,
21	and implement a more reliable case tracking software.
22	I had mentioned the Law Manager.
23	CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Uh-huh.

know, in the meantime we're trying as we are having

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: And that, you

24

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Okay.

2.2

2 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: You almost got away.

3 COMMISSIONER MALALIS: [laughs]

[pause]

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay, and one more question about the report. The report also noted that the Commission plan--had lacked a written--lacked formal written operating procedures to handle and process complaints. So where are you in creating and executing a written procedure? And where and when will--can we expect to see or hear about that?

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Sure, and I think, you know, this is also the subject of question from Council Member Lander that I said that. You know, this is an area that has been-- You know, coming from an employee advocate background, this is an area that's been a priority for me. So even having just been there for two weeks it's something that I've already started. The when of when you'll be able to have something is a difficult question for me to answer right now having only been here for two weeks. But you can-- You know, certainly it's something that I do want to be able to--to be able to not just be responsive to your questions and Council Member Landers in that area, but also provide it to the

2.2

should be.

public. Because I think, you know, whether they are the folks who will be coming in individually pro se to file reports with the agency or the folks who will be representing those individuals. Certainly they will want to know what the procedures are and how they should be followed, and what their expectations

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay. Well, thank you and thank you again for being here, and welcome. And we look forward to working with you, and good things coming out of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER MALALIS: Thank you very much. Thank you for having me.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Our next panel will be Nicole Salk, South Brooklyn Legal Services; Phoebe Todman, a Better Balance; Fred Freiberg, Fair Housing Justice Center; and Christine Clark, Legal Services NYC.

[pause]

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Commissioner, could someone from your agency stay behind to hear the testimony from the advocates? Thank you. Hi. When you're settled in, you can identify yourself, and

year ago, and we are so happy actually about what's

2 happening. Or, happy about that there's a new Commissioner. We're so happy about that. We are 3 also incredibly--we totally applaud that the Speaker 4 5 has--is, you know, trying to work out to put five more--\$5 million more into the budget. That's an 6 7 important first step. We think a lot more needs to go in, but we really want to thank the Council, and 8 we want to thank the Speaker for doing that. It is 9 incredibly important, and it's something that we have 10 been really advocating for. So that's a great, great 11 12 We support the increased use of testing by thing. 13 the Commissioner. However, I'm going to focus my remarks briefly on 421, which will amend the current 14 15 reporting requirements. It amends both the 16 recording--the reporting requirements in terms of 17 reporting on investigations initiated by the 18 Commissioner. As well as pattern and practice investigations referred to the Corporation Counsel 19 20 for the purpose of commencing a civil action in court. And it's really important to understand the 21 2.2 differences between the two, and they're really 23 significant. There are basically three ways that folks can bring cases with the Human Rights Law. One 24 is that individuals can bring a case at the 25

2.2

Commission, and the Commission itself, as the
Commissioner talked about can bring Commission
initiated cases. And there's also the pattern and
practice cases that really at this point only
Corporation Counsel can bring. And if Corporation
Counsel designates attorneys at the Commission to
bring those cases, these are systemic cases that
Council Member Lander was talking about. These are
systemic cases, really important cases. Right now
the Commission as far as we know in the last 20 years
there hasn't been a single one of those. Not a
single one.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: [interposing]

So, they wouldn't be too hard to report. If you're bringing some reporting--

NICHOLE SALK: [interposing] Maybe that's something that could be asked of the--at the--at the budget hearing again. I don't know, but as far as we know, none of--there hasn't been a single one of those. And that's horrible. That was a law that was changed in 1991, and none of those cases have been brought. So, just to--the Commission initiated complaints as well as an investigation and litigation based on pattern and practice, comprise some of the

Moreover, systemic pattern and practice investigations are particularly valuable in ferreting out and prosecuting violations based upon implicit biases held by employers, landlords and others. We

2.2

live in a world where explicitly discriminatory
actions and statements are less tolerated. But we
know that discrimination is not going away. And
discrimination is more likely to manifest today as
policy and practices that disproportionately affected
protected groups. Systemic investigations and
prosecutions based on the Human Rights Law could be a
powerfulcould be a very powerful tool if utilized
effectively. And as we said, they're not really
happening.

So I want to share with you some--really briefly some thoughts about what enforcement around systemic discrimination might look like. As already mentioned, the source of income discrimination is one that's a great example in terms of, you know, where people are blatantly advertising that they don't take certain housing vouchers on Craigslist. That is incredibly important systemic discrimination cases that need to be addressed. Another example of systemic discrimination that could be dealt with is in the area of criminal records discrimination because criminal record discrimination is rampant. And it often serves as a proxy for race

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

discrimination because of the over-policing of people of color.

An investigation of criminal records discrimination may involve sending out testers to employers in order to determine if employers routinely turn away applicants with arrest or criminal records without first allowing them to apply for jobs, and to be considered for employment. This is going to be come even more crucially when hopefully--God willing--the Fair Chance Act is passed, which I think pretty much everybody on this committee supports. And when that is passed, that's going to prohibit employers from enquiring into an applicant's criminal record prior to extending a conditional job offer. Thus, investigations of employers who make an offer increase into an applicant's criminal records prior to interviewing and conditional offers of employment will become crucial. These are just a few of the examples of potential systemic investigation of complaints that we hope the Commission may consider. We recommend that the Commission create an affirmative enforcement unit to address patterns of discrimination that Corporation Counsel assign some of its legal staff to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

work on investigations and prosecutions. And that's something that really probably hasn't been a focus. But really Corporation Counsel has more than 700 attorneys. This commission is so small, so underfinanced even with the \$5 million, which great, but we still need Corporation Counsel to be doing some of that work, and they haven't been doing that. So we are really--we are really looking forward to working with the Commission to help identify patterns of practices of discrimination. And to refer cases to the Commission directly when appropriate. [coughs] Excuse me. We also hope that the Commission reaches out to the community based organizations as the Commissioner indicated earlier that she's going to do, which is wonderful. And anti-discrimination advocates to help to identify systemic discrimination with the Commission and target for investigation and prosecution. Thank you.

[pause]

FRED FREIBERG: Good afternoon. My name is Fred Freiberg. I'm the founder and current Executive Director of the Fair Housing Justice Center. I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to provide testimony on this legislation.

A local law requiring the City Commission of Human	
Rights to utilize testing when investigating housing	
discrimination we believe is very important. As you	
know, the Fair Housing Justice Center is a non-profit	
civil rights organization based here in New York	
City. Our mission is to challenge systemic housing	
discrimination from the policies that foster open,	
accessible, and inclusive communities. And	
strengthen the enforcement of air housing laws. We	
counsel people on fair housing rights, and provide	
investigative assistance, including testing. And	
offer referrals to administrative agencies and a host	
of cooperating attorneys. We're the only HUD funded	
qualified fair housing organization that operates a	
testing program in the City of New York.	

The FHJC does operate one of the most effective fair housing testing programs in the nation. Our program currently employs over 100 professional actors as testers. We developed this program in partnership with the Actor's Fund here in New York City. Our tester pool we have 18 languages spoken among our testers, which his very helpful in New York City. Our testers are trained to participate in both complaint responsive and systemic

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

testing investigations. The FHJC uses state-of-theart technology in the testing program, and other
technology tools that we developed for test
coordinators to aid them when the design and
implementation of the test investigations. We also
equip our testers with concealed audio recorders, and
in some cases concealed audio video recorders on
investigation as a way to gather evidence.

In addition to utilizing testing in our own program, we've offered to provide testing services under contract at numerous government enforcement agencies, including the Office of the New York State Attorney General; both U.S. Attorney's Offices in New York City; the New York State Division on Human Rights and other government agencies. also assisted the Office of the New York State Attorney General to develop its own in-house testing capability. Over the past ten years, FHJC testing investigations have resulted in successful legal challenges to housing discrimination actions that have opened up tens of thousands of housing opportunities to populations previously excluded. Changed housing provider practices and resulted in the recovery of millions of dollars in damages and

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

civil penalties. Last year alone, cases supported by FHJC testing evidence were resolved with extensive injunctive relief and a monetary recovery in excess of \$3 million. Professionally, I've been coordinating testing investigations throughout the United States for nearly 40 years. Over that time I've supervised over 12,000 investigations, personally participated in more than 1,500 tests. I've tested virtually any kind of housing accommodation, or housing related service that you can think of. I've been named as a witness in more than 400 Fair Housing cases, and I've provided deposition and trial testimony at least 52 times in cases filed in state and federal courts across the country.

In the past, I assisted government agencies and private civil rights organizations to develop effective testing capabilities including the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice. I'm also currently involved in a national HUD sponsored training program aimed at achieving greater consistency in the quality of testing performed by more than 75 fair housing organizations across the nation. I only highlight my

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

background for the committee merely to underscore
that I have considerable experience and expertise in
this particular investigator field. I appear before
the Committee on Civil Rights today ten
enthusiastically endorse the intent behind the
committee's proposed testing legislation, which is
aimed at ensuring that the New York City Commission
on Human Rights develop or acquire an effective
testing capability to aid with enforcement of fair
housing laws. We have consistently maintained that
government agencies or private fair housing
organizations cannot really claim to have an
effective enforcement program aimed at reducing
housing discrimination unless they also have a
testing capability. And the value of testing really
cannot be overstated. When investigating individual
allegations or complaints of housing discrimination
often information obtained from testing
investigations can provide the vital corroborative
evidence that enables to complainants to meet their
burden of proof. Courts across this land have
recognized that information obtained from testing
investigations is often the only confident admissible
evidence that can prove housing discrimination is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

actually occurring. But testing also enables a Fair
Housing Law Enforcement agency to be more proactive
and ferret out systemic housing discrimination given
the very subtle nature of most contemporary housing
discrimination relying on a purely complaint
responsive approach or reactive approach as some
people here have said to fair housing enforcement is
at best ineffective, and perpetuates a vicious cycle.

Permit me to take just a minute to explain what I mean. Sadly, systemic housing discrimination based on race, and national origin is still quite pervasive in New York City and throughout this region. You might be surprised to learn how often African-American and Latino home seekers are lied to about available apartments, quoted higher rents or fees, or encounter agents who are engaged in racial steering or other discriminatory housing practices. The FHJC has been able to document these practices through well planned systemic testing investigations. These are investigations have found that often the discrimination is subtle that actual home seekers may have no way to know that illegal housing discrimination is occurring. If consumers are unaware they're being discriminated against, it

2.2

follows no complaints are going to be filed. If complaints are not filed, no enforcement action will be taken. Without enforcement action, unlawful discrimination continues to harm the community. The only way to break this cycle, reduce illegal housing discrimination and achieve greater compliance with the law is to conduct systemic testing investigations to document these invidious discriminatory practices.

For all these reasons, our organization completely agrees wit the sponsors of the proposed testing legislation that the Commission should work to develop and acquire a fair housing testing capability that will aid with the enforcement of the City's Human Rights Law. We do, however, have a few specific comments and suggestions on the proposed legislation. First, we assume that the sponsors of the law understand the Commission already possess the full authority. And we would even argue, duty, to investigate discrimination using all available means including testing. In this sense, it seems to us the legislation seems more symbolic than substantive.

Second, while matched pair testing is utilized by social scientists for research, and by enforcement practitioners including our organization,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

it is not the only or necessarily the most effective test structure depending upon the facts presented in a given situation. While the legislation does not restrict the Commission to only conduct matched pair testing, the stated emphasis on this type of test structure is curious at best. Particularly as it concerns reporting requirements. Other commonly used testing approaches involve more testers, two or more testers and some only involve one. It really depends on the specific circumstances. So why does the committee only want to report unmatched pair testing? The current language seems to confer some greater importance to this approach or that matched pair testing is inherently more valuable in an enforcement context than other types of testing. Which is simply not true. Perhaps oversight could be accomplished by an accounting of the total number of tests completed, and the number of tests resulting in enforcement action.

Third, the other concerning provision in the proposed legislation is the requirement that after one year the Commission report on the location of all matched pair tests completed, and whether that testing yielded evidence of discrimination.

Disclosing the specific address of where testing has
been conducted on an annual or semi-annual basis
could undermine the Commission's ability to conduct
systemic investigations by disclosing information
about targeting strategies or enforcement priorities.
Just as the NYPD does not report the location of
undercover or informant investigations conducted that
do not result in prosecutions because it could signal
how or where enforcement resources are being targeted
to identify those who are violating the law. The
Commission should adhere to a similar practice.
Disclosing the number of tests conducted each year
would avoid this problem. It would provide the
Council with some oversight ability of the
Commission's work while protecting the specific
location of undercover testing investigations from
public disclosure.

Finally, while the Commission should acquire a testing capability, there are number of ways to accomplish this, and it's like to take some time and planning. And I was appreciative of the Commissioner's saying that she needed a little more time to do a thoughtful review and some planning. Who is the Commission going to use as testers to

- 2 ensure it has a pool of testers who are diverse by
- 3 | race, gender, age and other protective
- 4 characteristics? Does the Commissioner--does the
- 5 | Commission currently have experienced personnel with
- 6 | training to plan an coordinate testing
- 7 investigations? And you can testify, if necessary,
- 8 about the investigations conducted. Is the
- 9 Commission planning to equip its--
- 10 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Can you
- 11 begin to wrap up.
- 12 FRED FREIBERG: --testers--? Yes, I
- 13 | will. I'm on the last page. What forms and
- 14 procedures will the Commission use to assign tester
- 15 characteristics. My point is that establishing and
- 16 operating a testing program is not an easy matter,
- 17 | and there are many resources and logistical
- 18 considerations that are going to have to be worked
- 19 out. And suffice to say some care has to be taken in
- 20 developing this program. After years of not having
- 21 an effective government enforcement mechanism at the
- 22 | local level, it is our considered view that the
- 23 Commission is in need of a major overhaul, a gut
- 24 renovation, if you will. We are hopeful that the
- 25 | Commission under the leadership of Commissioner

2.2

Malalis will establish a meaningful intake process
that is available to any New Yorker that believes
that his or her fair housing rights have been
violated. That the Commission will investigate all
complaints, and take enforcement action when those
investigation yield evidence of discrimination.

Our experience in the past and our clients' experience in working with the Commission in the last administration was most unsatisfactory, to put it mildly. But we remain hopeful that the Commission can be transformed into a serious law enforcement agency. One that's more responsive to the community it is serving, and one effective to its mission to vigorously protect the civil rights of all New Yorkers. I welcome any questions you might have for me. Also, as an organization we are ready and willing to make our services available to the Commission as it moves forward to establish a stronger fair housing presence in this community. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you. Next.

CHRISTINE CLARK. Hi, my name is--

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: I'm sorry. We have three more panels, and so could you sort of summarize instead of reading the whole statement? Thank you.

CHRISTINE CLARK: All right. My name is Christine Clark. I'm a staff attorney at Legal Services NYC and I work with Nicole Salk. I work on the Equal Rights Initiative and I represent victims of discrimination. We're also part of this amazing working group that Nicole mentioned also. I'm going to focus my testimony today on budget issues, which Council Member Lander mentioned. As well as training issues, which Commissioner Malalis has mentioned also. You know, I think we all know that the Commission is sort of in a crisis right now. there is some confusion about the numbers. I can clarify just really quickly. Since 1981, the Commission staff overall has been reduced from 241 to That's 70% reduction, and it's City funded that 66. has been reduced from 152 to 11. You know, regardless, it's really an astronomical decline.

And this decline in funding and staffing has really meant that the Commission has become essentially irrelevant. Neither I nor many of my colleagues, if not most of them, throughout the

public and private bar don't refer people to the
Commission. This is really, you know, an important
problem. We refer them to the EEOC or to HUD, which
enforces a less protective law. And so, you know,
restoring faith in the Commission I think is really
important. And part of this more funding and more
staffing as well as more training. You know, I think
it's incredibly important that we recognize that our
client base as Legal Services are low-income New
Yorkers who are mostly unrepresented. And they
really rely on the Commission to be the public face
of the City's commitment to civil rights. And so,
they really need to be fully and comprehensively
trained on the entire law, both the basics and some
of the newer amendments. So, for example, the
Community Safety Act is a new law that has no
monetary damages provision. So you really can't
expect the private bar to step up there. And the
Commission really needs to ensure that all of its
staff recognizes these kind of complaints. And also
enforce them where violations are found.

Something else to mention is that the Commission as they are receiving federal funds needs to provide equal services to the low English

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

proficiency clients, and that means they need to be trained on how to use interpreters, which is a skill that sort of needs to be taught as well as cultural competency. And that the interpreters they do choose to use they need to ensure that they are competent and qualified, and they have been assessed. So they provide an equal level of service to them. course, Legal Services NYC as well as our coalition partners are more than happy to help train the Commission staff wherever the Commissioner thinks it's appropriate. But even so, it's really important that resources be devoted to training. You know, we absolutely welcome the Speaker announcement of more funding. But I've got a couple more numbers for you. But an additional \$5 million in baseline funding when adjusted for inflation still leaves the Commission with about 60% of its 1991 funding. My written testimony says 65%, but I think it's actually 59%. Somewhere around 60%. And that even with 65 new staff members they're still at about 50% staffing levels they were at 25 years ago. But with the new Commissioner and sort of the renewed focus for the Council, we're really hopeful this is going to be sort of an new day for the Commission.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you. [laughter]
3 Well, you spoke really fast.

PHOEBE TODMAN: So I'll be brief. name is Phoebe Todman. I'm a senior staff attorney with A Better Balance, which is an organization here in the city that helps workers across the economic spectrum to care for their families without risking economic security. We have a free hotline and legal clinic where we assist low-income New Yorkers who are facing problems at work really due to pregnancy and other family responsibilities and care giving in the workplace. So I want to thank you all for holding this hearing, and to echo what my colleagues said as part of the Human Rights Working Group. We have been excited to learn about all these advancements and ideas for how to improve the Commission. And I just wanted to drive home, you know, as an organization that's seen a lot of these individuals coming through our hotline. You know for low-income New Yorkers who can't afford representation the Commission is it. That's their avenue for seeking, vindicating their rights. And not only is it a harm to them if that's not happening properly, it's a harm to the city. mean unfair treatment can trigger a cascade of

2.2

misfortune for New Yorkers who have little financial safety nets. And we hear a lot form people who end up sleeping on their relative's couch or in a homeless shelter. Because they didn't really have the proper resolution of claims through the Human Rights Commission on pregnancy discrimination issues for example. Drawing unemployment benefits and other, you know, public supports that are costing taxpayers money. Where they might be able to negotiate something with an effective Commission to keep on the job.

To that point, I wanted to encourage a couple of suggestions around improving transparency and information with the Commission's process. You know, we remain concerned that a lot of people who go to the Commission don't realize that they could be potentially choosing a path that ends at the Commission if they don't have an alternative remedy. Whereas, some of the other commissions at the federal level do. And so, we just want to make sure that people who are approaching the Commission that they understand the process that they are entering. And how it's going to proceed, which we feel a lot of

2.2

people at this point have very little information about it when they initiate a complaint.

They also often find that pro se people don't also understand that when they have other claims outside the jurisdiction that are still—have statutes of limitations that are running, while the Commission takes over 300 days to complete their investigation then they lose the ability to pursue those claims or apply for those benefits. So I think to Christine's point about training, we would love to see the Commission's staff really be informed and fluent in some of these other overlapping laws and benefits that are impacting people who are coming to them for employment or housing discrimination complaints. And that they are able to address holistically the problem that's facing those individuals.

I also just wanted to speak quickly about—to your point about a new amendment. I mean we as an organization worked hard on the Pregnant Worker's Fairness Act, and we're glad to see that the Commission has been doing some public education. We feel that that could be improved dramatically around specifying some of the areas that are covered under

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the law. Educating employers in particular, and even creating sort of a fast track for some of these complaints. Pregnancy by nature is limited in duration, and make accommodations that people are seeking as far as damage. They have a limited time in which they're effective before the issue is moot. And in California where some of the laws has been in effect for over a decade, a lot of these claims have been resolved quickly and informally through good faith negotiations. And if the Commission had a way of actually help pro se clients to engage in that and to resolve their claims quickly. It would not only save money for the Commission by saving a longer investigation. Perhaps also avoid future claims of pregnancy discrimination by keeping those workers on the job. So I think that sort of covers the main points of my testimony. Just to save time for others who are following. So I just wanted to thank you again for having us, and we're really excited for the potential that's coming.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you. I want to thank you for making some very cogent points. We were really trying to get at sort of the systemic cases and the fact that they weren't really engaged

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 and initiating those types of actions. So I

3 appreciate you, you know, really delving into that.

4 And the aspect of training so key, and we're hoping

5 that--We're not hoping. We're going get your

6 suggestions to the Commissioner, and hope that she

7 | will incorporate them into the strategic plan. So

8 that we see a more effective, more responsive, more

9 transparent Commission. So I thank you for your

10 | testimony. Brad, do you have questions?

quickly. First, I'm just going to say, you know, in addition to, you know, referring all your good suggestions to the Commissioner on things that aren't related to the bills specifically, at least on 689, as the lead sponsor, you know, I'm very grateful for the testimony. This is our first hearing on this bill. Sometimes before bills get introduced we do a lot of work, talk to all of the advocates and really ironed things out. And sometimes we know we want to do something. We put it out there and we have a hearing. And so, we're appreciative of the folks who are here to help us strengthen this bill. That's our goal. I think we've already heard some things from you and from the Commissioner. I think this idea of

2.2

Commissioner?

affirmative enforcement broad is the goal behind a lot of this legislation. I think we'll be able to strengthen it thanks to your testimony today. I guess one question I just have is, is there any place that it's working to? You know, I think we're proud we have this great law that was state-of-the-art when we passed it. And then we let the agency decline. Are there places where the combination of agency and private enforcement. You know, sort of where models of affirmative effort are worth looking at as we tighten up this legislation and provide models to the

FRED FREIBERG: Well, I can speak to that only because many of my colleague around the country do have relationships with their local cities and state commissions and so forth. And there occasionally has been at the federal level monies available to foster such partnerships. One of the suggestions I have is I certainly agree with everybody that New York City's Human Rights Law is very expansive, and that's a great thing. There are some ways in which it is still deficient of the federal law that with a few legislative changes you could become substantially equivalent, and apply for

2 federal resources. And New York City is literally giving out money every years because we don't make a 3 4 few minor changes to the law. Your law can be much 5 more expansive than the federal law and still be substantially equivalent. It's just some minor 6 7 tinkering and more federal resources will be there. And then more partnerships could be development. 8 last thing on this I would say is that one of the 9 10 things that's very frustrating to me after ten years of working in New York City on this issue is you have 11 12 U.S. attorney's office, State Attorney General's 13 office. You have local commissions on human rights like this. The State Commission on Human Rights. 14 15 Private fair housing groups, three in the 16 metropolitan area, and very few of us talk to each 17 other. And there's no coordinated effort to attack 18 housing discrimination. And housing discrimination does not necessarily know geographic boundaries. 19 20 so there's a need. Once the Commission is up to speed and you have what you want in terms of an 21 2.2 effective operating enforcement organization, I would 23 strong advocate the next step is to work together. All of us private organizations to try and see that 24 fair housing laws are more vigorously enforced. 25

2	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So that sounds
3	good and I would just ask that on those technical
4	fixes that prevent us from getting all of the federal
5	resources, please provide those. As, I don't know
6	in her State of the City, the Speaker committed to a
7	lot of work in this area to the additional funding,
8	to the affirmative enforcement, and to going back
9	and, you know, modernizing our Human Rights Law. And
LO	that's something that staff are already heard at work
L1	doing. So we would welcome those additional
L2	suggestions. Thank you.
L3	CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you. Our next
L 4	panel will be Natasha Ora Bannan from
L5	NATASHA ORA BANNAN: [off mic] Latino
L 6	Justice.
L7	CHAIRPERSON ROSE:Latino Justice.
L8	Craig Gurian from Fair Play Legislation of New York
L9	City, and Ez Cukor, New York Legal Assistance Court;
20	and Alyssa AgulitaAgulita, Vocal New York.
21	[background conversation, pause]
22	CHAIRPERSON ROSE: You may identify
23	yourself, and you may begin your abbreviated
24	testimony. [laughs]

NATASHA ORA BANNAN: Sure.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Good afternoon.

NATASHA ORA BANNAN: Good afternoon. I'm Natasha Lycia Ora, and you did a pretty good job with Latino Justice PRDLEF. I promise mine isn't too long. So I'll read quickly. So as I mentioned with an organization Latino Justice PRDLEF, which is a national civil rights organization engaged in advocacy and impact litigation on behalf of underserved Latino communities along the East Coast, primarily in the Tri-State region. We appreciate the invitation to address you today. Several years ago we initiated the Latinos at Work or Law Project, which works with low-wage Latino immigrants in New York City specifically. And through this project, we've been able to partner with community based organizations throughout the region to educate and empower Latino workers about their rights under state and federal laws. And where needed and appropriate to be able to provide legal representation advocacy for workers to assert their rights for civil litigation. Last year we developed an more evidenced based understanding across sexual harassment, and gender-based discrimination uniquely affect Latino immigrant workers in New York City.

2	We submitted Freedom of Information
3	requests to various enforcement agencies, and
4	distributed surveys to our community partners to have
5	Latino workers document the type of discrimination
6	and harassment that they've been experiencing working
7	in various sectors in the City. And through these
8	efforts we have subsequently come across many stories
9	of low-wage Latino workers who are often victims of
10	unscrupulous workers who too often take advantage of
11	their labor or immigration status by paying them less
12	than minimum wage and withholding over-time pay. At
13	times, when workers have decided to assert their
14	rights to fair compensation, their employers have
15	responded by firing them or threatening exposure to
16	immigration authorities. Immigrants, as you know,
17	predominantly work in low-wage jobs and industries
18	throughout the city. In New York City Latinos make
19	up 27% of the working population that comprises 44%
20	of restaurant and food workers, and 35% of retail
21	workers.

Latino women are over-represented in the lowest paying job sectors such as Laundromats, cleaning services or domestic work with jobs that fail to offer a structured paths to improve their

social mobility. These types of low-wage jobs
typically provide little to no employment
protections, flexibility for time off or predictable
schedules. Because of both the precarious nature of
some types of low-wage and isolation and desperation,
many low-wage workers feel a climate right for
harassment and discrimination often is created. In
addition to the abusive wage and compensation
practices, discrimination and harassment is often
rampant in the low-wage workplace where there are
both too few opportunities to check or report illegal
behavior. And where many Latino immigrant workers
end up often because they feel that working in an
abusive or discriminatory conditions is their only
option. As a result, they see and experience
discrimination based on gender, gender identity,
gender identity or expression or pregnancy as well as
sexual harassment as a bi-product of both their work
and immigration status.

In New York, one in every three domestic workers has reported feeling harassed and abused at work by their employer, and they attribute such abuse to either race or immigration status. For example, while discrimination claims filed with the New York

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

State Division of Human Rights and the Commission,
the Commission on Human Rights--

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Could you just summarize?

NATASHA ORA BANNAN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you.

NATASHA ORA BANNAN: --suggested that some reports have gone down, pregnancy rates actually have gone up in the last couple of years. Pregnancy discrimination rates have gone up as has sexual harassment complaints. A couple of years ago Latinos were found to be more likely to report that they were fired from a job while being pregnant, as an example of the pregnancy discrimination. So a couple of years ago the New York City Hiring Discrimination Study conducted very similar testing to the testing that is being proposed by this committee. And the results confirmed what this committee already suspects to be true that this type of discrimination in the employment context continues to be pervasive. And exists seemingly on the basis of race, nationality, ethnicity, and that is certainly what we've experienced within the Latino community.

2.2

So our organization supports this

Commission's efforts to strengthen employment hiring

practices and to prohibit discriminatory practices

during both hiring and employment. And we're here to

support anyway we can. I briefly summarized. Thank

you.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you so much.}$ Thank you.

CRAIG GURIAN: My name is Craig Gurian.

Thank you Council Member Rose and thank you for the very pointed questions [laughter] you asked earlier today.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: I didn't get answers.

CRAIG GURIAN: I'm happy to answer them.

[laughter] And thank you Council Member Lander for your leadership on these issues. My day job is as Executive Director of the Anti-Discrimination Center, but I'm here today on behalf of Fair Play Legislation and the New York City Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild. I've been focused on New York City Human Rights Law issues for more than 25 years in terms of the law itself. We've made tremendous progress. I'm proud to have been the author of both the comprehensive 1991 revisions to the law, and the 2005

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 Local Civil Rights Restoration Act. The Restoration Act belatedly forced courts to understand that the 3 city law has to be interpreted independently of and 4 more liberally than it's federal and state 5 counterparts. Don't let anyone tell you that the law 6 7 has not helped many, many victims of discrimination. That is those victims who will now should be able to 8 get into court. There is more work to be done, of 9 course, and I think we're poised to take several 10 major legislative steps this years. Anyone 11 12 interested in details should go to

fairplaylegislation.org, fairplaylegislation.org.

- On the administrative level, though, and there was a little surreal earlier. And I understand the need that the Commissioner has not to alienate current stuff. But, for the last 20 years, the Commission has been an awful, horrible, terrible, agonizing, spectacularly bas disaster just to put it politely.
- CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Tell us how you really feel now. [laughter]
- CRAIG GURIAN: Yeah. Well, among the materials that I've handed up to you is a report I authored back in 2003 describing how much of a non-

enforcement agency the commission had become. Then
at that point the Commission actually still had more
resources than it's had more recently. The last page
of that ancient report contains a series of proposed
indicators. I think I'd probably make some
modification to that now, but it gives a general
sense of how important it is for the Commission to
have a relentless focus on aggressive enforcement of
the law. I want to join my colleagues, and members
of the Committee in welcoming the new Commissioner.
And commending the Mayor for recognizing that it was
essential to appoint someone who recognized that
civil rights law enforcement needs to be take
seriously and pursued as vigorously as other kinds of
law enforcement. And I'd like also to commend the
Speaker for taking an important first step in
reversing the decades long catastrophic decline in
funding for the agency.

A few words about the testing bills.

There are some language tweaks I've suggested in mark-ups that I've provided to you. But the main point is that it really is impossible to overstate the importance of testing. And impossible to overstate the importance of testing by the Commission

2	itself. Most discrimination doesn't announce itself
3	as my colleague Fred Freiberg mentioned. Much
4	discrimination isn't even visible to the individuals
5	being discriminated against. And compared to
6	individual complaints, even if the agency were not
7	just throwing things out, testing is just much higher
8	yield and higher impact. And there was some
9	discussion about the burden of the bills. It could
10	not be less burdensome. If, in fact, the Commission
11	is currently testing, then it is compliant with two
12	of the bills. The reporting obligations of all of
13	these bills will be measured on an annual basis in
14	perhaps hours. Certainly not days. And I thinkI
15	don't want to take a lot of time. So if you want to
16	ask me about it, I'm happy to answer. But I think
17	actually it's extremely important recognizing that
18	the particular deadlines might be adjusted that you
19	really want to get a baseline now. No one is going
20	to be blaming the new crew for what has gone on. But
21	if, for example, you want to see how much improvement
22	there is in terms of referring complaints for action
23	to the City's Law Department, why not have a report
24	that for this past year, and for the 19 years before,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 there have been zero? That just gives you a baseline 3 for where you are.

Let me just say a word or two about the environment within which testing will be done. hasn't been mentioned today, but I always think it's critical to talk about that. You can't go a day without hearing how diverse New York City is. fact, New York City remains one of the most residentially segregated cities. And one of the most residentially segregated metropolitan areas of the country. The maps I've given you give you a visual sense of how racially and ethnically segregated New York City is. Those patterns did not develop magically or by choice. People like to forget this. They were formed by active discrimination over decades if we're serious about tackling the scourge of residential segregation. And that scourge underlies every other serious inequity in our city and testing is essential. And I'm talking about real testing like the Fair Housing Justice Center does. Well, let me not give the comparison. Real testing like the Fair Housing Justice Center, and some other public entities in the country do. If we're not serious about ending segregation, then black lives

2.2

matter is just an empty slogan. We're nowhere close to having the amount of testing we need. I think private and public testing needs to complement one another. Testing has been really done in many important areas that are covered by the Civil Human Rights Law. The housing side is begging for testing to be done regarding discrimination on the basis of sexual—

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Can you summarize?

CRAIG GURIAN: --sexual orientation or citizenship status. The employment sector pretty much has escaped entirely the scrutiny of testing.

And so there's work to be done in bolstering private testing. Private not-for-profit testing. There is essential work in making sure that public testing goes forward as well. Remember, collaboration with groups is important. I want to be collaborated with. But there's a public obligation, and the City is not tied to a particular interest that an organization may have. The City if it's doing its job properly will test where it needs to test on the protected class basis, whether or not that testing is popular or not. And I don't think we can forget about that.

2.2

And I hope that I can participate with the committee

as these bills and this work goes forward. Thank

you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you.

Rose, Council Member Lander and the rest of the bills' sponsors and the members of the Civil Rights Committed for spearheading these three important bills. And, moreover for really centering the need to address bias and discrimination in our city. My name is Ez Cukor and I'm an attorney with the LGBTQ Law Project at the New York Legal Assistance Group. We provide free legal services and advocacy to low-income lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer communities throughout New York City. We offer legal advice and representation in wide variety of poverty related civil legal matters, including employment discrimination and housing.

I'm here to offer our support for the proposed bills establishing testing. LGBTQ communities are disproportionately impacted by poverty and they face alarmingly high levels of discrimination. A 2013 HUD Study found that same-sex couples faced significant discrimination in the

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 rental housing market even in locales such as New

3 York City that banned sexual orientation

4 discrimination. Transgender people, particularly

5 people of color, face rampant denial of housing,

6 eviction and homelessness. In the workplace,

7 transgender people, again particularly people of

8 color, experience alarming rates of discrimination.

9 In one survey that was conducted right here in New

10 | York City, in around 2009, 49% of transgender New

11 | Yorkers reported that they had never been offered a

12 | job while living openly as transgender.

Other studies confirmed that most transgender people report experiencing workplace harassment. This is a crisis. Loss of housing and employment really often triggers a cascade of adverse consequences for low-income workers as Phoebe testified to earlier. One NYLAG client, for example, became homeless as a result of losing her job because of her gender expression and perceived sexual orientation. The New York City's Human Rights Law, as many people have testified, provides very robust protection against discrimination including on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. But too many New Yorkers still experience unlawful

2 discrimination. Testing

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

discrimination. Testing that is well designed to uncover evidence and to support enforcement of our Human Rights Law can be a significant means to address this problem.

We encourage the Council to give the Commission latitude to design and implement a testing program that would be a maximum use in enforcement litigation for any discrimination it may uncover. The Commission is particularly well-positioned to enforce the rights of low-income New Yorkers and people who may have difficulty navigating the legal We recommend testing on the basis of race, system. gender, and sexual orientation, and particularly the inclusion of transgender testers. We encourage testing based on race because LGBTQ people of color are more likely to experience discrimination, than White LGBTQ people, and the population as a whole. We believe testing based on arrest record, criminal history, unlawful source of income will also benefit LGBT communities who are disproportionately system involved, and are often profiled by the police.

Well designed testing sends a message that unlawful discrimination has consequences, and can help realize the potential of Human Rights Law to

- 2 eradicate discrimination. On behalf of the LGBT Law
- 3 Project at NYLAG, I want to thank this committee for
- 4 working to strengthen our Human Rights Law and
- 5 Commission. Ensuring that all New Yorkers can access
- 6 work and a safe home will benefit those most in need
- 7 and it will strengthen our city.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you so much.
- 9 Thank you and again, thank you for your expert
- 10 | testimony, and just the verification that
- 11 discrimination is live and well. And that we need an
- 12 | agency that's going to vigorously address it. Mr.
- 13 | Gurian, you got the opportunity to address why the
- 14 data report--why the Commission's interest--it's in
- 15 | the Commissioner's interest to have a current data
- 16 reported. I think that's what you said.
- 17 CRAIG GURIAN: Yeah, I mean I think so.
- 18 | I mean it's--this is all basic, basic information I
- 19 | think as Council Member Lander pointed out earlier in
- 20 | the hearing. And we're just at a very--we're at a
- 21 | very low point. It's not a surprise to anybody.
- 22 Nobody I think is looking to go backwards. Everybody
- 23 is looking to move forward, but you do need baseline
- 24 measurement as to where--as to where you are.

2 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay. Well, thank

3 you. I thank you all for your testimony this

afternoon, and again, we're going to submit it to the 4

Commission so that --5

CRAIG GURIAN: [interposing] May I just--

7 may I just.

6

8

9

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Uh-huh.

CRAIG GURIAN: May I just add one thing?

10 I'm sorry, Council Member Rose. There was one thing

that was pretty-- That was I think the most shocking 11

12 thing that I heard today in terms of the testing that

is said to be done by the Commission. Now, I don't--13

you know, I take it face value the information that 14

15 was given to the new Commissioner to report.

16 Although, one should ask whether those were actually

17 120 separate investigations, or whether they were 120

18 tests, or 120 people who made a phone call. But

let's just assume that was 120 investigations--19

20 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Uh-huh.

CRAIG GURIAN: -- and on top of that there 21

2.2 are all the other individual complaints. And the

23 Commission reports that all of that, all of that

yielded \$200,000 in civil penalties. The cap under 24

the City's Human Rights Law for one--for one 25

- 2 violation whether it be willful is \$250,000. If you
- 3 were--if you are taking an average, we're talking
- 4 about less than \$2,000 a violation if there were zero
- 5 civil penalties for every single individual
- 6 complaint. I mean that's just--
- 7 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing]
- 8 Absolutely.

- 9 CRAIG GURIAN: --like nowhere in the
- 10 | universe of where things could possibly, possibly
- 11 appropriately be.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: You're absolutely
- 13 | right. Thank you. Thank you for stating that. And
- 14 | Council Member Lander.
- 15 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you, Madam
- 16 Chair and thanks to all three of you for the very
- 17 | useful suggestions. We'll be following up. I guess
- 18 \parallel I want to ask a little more about the experience of
- 19 | transgender and LGBTQ plaintiffs in regard to the
- 20 | Commission. We don't know whether any of the testing
- 21 | that was referred to you, because we don't have the
- 22 report, included transgender or gender identity or
- 23 sexual orientation testing. So I can't really ask
- 24 | about that. But agreeing with you that we need to
- 25 | see it. I just wonder if you have the sense from

2.2

people that have gone individually to the Commission where the experience has been—— I mean unfortunately in general it takes a long time, and usually they don't find probable cause. So that wouldn't distinguish them from any other plaintiffs. But do you have any sense of what the—— And I think your point that this is a place where our law is stronger than state or federal law just makes it especially important that we be attentive to how it's being implemented.

EZ CUKOR: You know, I--I wish I could share success stories of people who have come to us after having a good experience with the Commission.

I can't. A few people have come to us with, you know, bad to horrible experiences. Something that I noticed from the Mayor's Management Report is that relatively few complaints are being filed on a the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. And I do anecdotally know of two people who tried to file a gender identity discrimination complaints and were turned away.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: All right. So let me just suggest to the staff and the Chair this may be an area that we want to actually pursue

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	separately for a hearing or something at a future
3	But I think the point that as we get and help get the
4	affirmative division set up, it needs to be something
5	that's to be much on our mind. And I think, you
6	know, especially in those areas. Not that the core
7	issues of raising gender and things that are covered
8	under the federal law and state law are not
9	important, but especially in those areas where our
10	law provides protections that aren't provided under
11	state and federal law, we've got a real obligation to
12	make sure that the Commission is working and doing
13	its job. Thank you.

EZ CUKOR: Thank you for that.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] I think it would have been helpful if we had the report [laughter] and that information pieced out. It's my hope that the report will, in fact, address the issue. And yes, I will suggest strongly that this committee address that. Thank you.

CRAIG GURIAN:

[pause, background comments]

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Our last committee I mean our last panel is Paul Keefe, from Community Service Society; Sebastian Riccardi, from the Glade;

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

1

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Erin Smith from Columbia Law School Human RightsInstitute, and not Alyssa.
- FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, she was out so we need to call her up again.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Okay. Alyssa Guleda,
 7 Gulada?
- 8 ALYSSA AGUILERA: Aguilera.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Oh, Aguilera.
- 10 Aguilera. Okay. Sorry, Alyssa.
- 11 [pause]
- 12 CHAIRPERSON ROSE: You may in the

 13 interest of time, could you summarize your

 14 statements? And please identify yourself and your

 15 organization and you may begin.

ALYSSA AGUILERA: Sure. Hi, good afternoon. My name is Alyssa Aguilera. I'm the Political Director for Vocal New York. Vocal is a grassroots community based organization building power among low-income people impacted by HIV-AIDS, drug use and mass incarceration. I'm here today to speak to the importance of a well-funded effective and just Human Rights Commission. It's not enough for our city to pass progressive civil rights legislation. Without a strong agency to ensure the

not be able to fully achieve the goals and spirit of these hard fought civil rights victories. And just to quickly I think there are three main areas that really impact our members. One is housing discrimination. Many, many of our members are HASA
to quickly I think there are three main areas that really impact our members. One is housing discrimination. Many, many of our members are HASA
really impact our members. One is housing discrimination. Many, many of our members are HASA
discrimination. Many, many of our members are HASA
1' 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
clients through the HIV/AIDS Service Administration.
And not a day goes by that our members don't tell us
that, you that they have And really HASA is one of
the better programs. They have about \$900 to \$1,150
each month for rent and, you know, they can't get an
apartment because landlords say we don't accept
programs. And, you know, we even joke that our white
staff member when he was looking for an apartment
they would always ask him about his source of income.
And so, even, you know, it's something that's
pervasive and happening. And when our members do,
you know, obviously they really see the HRC as is as
not an effective way. You know, kind of I equate to
like a CCRB. You go there to complain and the
nothing really ends up happening. So this is a major
issue for our folks. And we do support the testing.

Second is employment discrimination.

Many of our members are able to find employment

2.2

because of their criminal record history, and luckily we've been working with CSS and others to hopefully pass the Fair Chance Act, which will ban any inquiry about criminal record history until after a conditional job offer. But as we know, the law only works if there's the teeth and the will to enforce it. So we do hope that the HRC can be that body. And we hope that any testing bills that happen, we can go ahead and expand that so criminal record

discrimination is included in the testing.

And then finally, you know, we're part of Communities United for Police Reform. And, we won a hard fought victory to pass the Community Safety Act, which would ban discriminatory profiling, And again, like the other issues that we raised, a strong enforcement agency will not only ensure that people who are getting justice, who are being profiled by the police. But it also deters future officers and the Police Department as a whole from engaging in this behavior if they know there will be consequences for their actions. And we also suggest a transparent training and evaluation plan for the profiling ban with impact from directly impacted New Yorkers, community groups and police advocates. To ensure

2 that HRC staffing systems including investigators are 3 competent in processing claims related to biased-

4 based profiling by the police. And that's it. Thank

5 you.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

PAUL KEEFE: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Paul Keefe. I'm Associate Counsel at Community Service Society. We're a non-profit organization that has existed for about 170 years helping lowincome New Yorkers. We're also a member of the New York City Human Rights Law Group. I just want to talk with you briefly about the importance of testing to detect and find discrimination based upon criminal record. Since about 2008, our Legal Department has focused on that population. We have a program called the Next Door Project that trains retired senior citizens volunteers to help people obtain the official criminal records, read them, understand them and fix errors on them. And many of those clients would come to us saying I had a job. I got the interview, and then as soon as the background check came back I didn't get a call back any more. Or, people will have criminal records and they'd say, as soon as I check that box I know I'm out of the game.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And so, the Commission knows how important testing is. It commissioned the report in 2005 called Race at Work that used matched pair testing to detect employment discrimination, and found that overall people with criminal records are only half as likely to get a call back than those without. For African-American applicants that likelihood is reduced to one-third. And what testing does is it uncovers the unconscious bias that's present in employment decisions. And it's most likely to be present at the application stage when all an employer has is the job application and maybe a resume. That's when the other impressions about what the -- about the person before them might come into play. And these impressions are more powerful and more negative when a person presents a credential like a criminal record especially when it relates to visual stereotypes.

And so unconscious bias is very powerful. In a survey of nearly 200 employers, 61.7% said that they were very likely or somewhat likely to hire an African-American man with a good reference and interpersonal skills even though he was convicted of a drug felony a year ago and was recently released

from prison. When testers were actually sent to
those same employers presenting those same
characteristics, only 14% of those same employers
called the person back for an interview. And so in
the beginning they first said yes we'll hire them,
but then 85% of them once presented with someone in
that situation would not call that person back. And
so that is why testing is so important. Alyssa
mentioned the Fair Chance Act, and testing will be
necessary to ensure that that law is being followed.
It doesn't even require matched pairs because the law
sets a very clear process for hiring people with
records. You can't ask them for a job interview, if
you're going to use a background check against
someone. You have to give them a copy of it. You
have to give an explanation why they can legally be
denied under current anti-discrimination law and
seven years to respond to that. If those steps are
either followed or denied a tester can monitor that.

Finally, additional funds in addition--in excess of current budget proposals should be given to the Commission so they can ensure the testers are selected, trained and supervised in the way to reduce bias and ensure reliable results. CSS endorses the

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 Council's interest in testing claims for housing

3 discrimination and reporting those results. We're

4 more than willing to work with the Commission and the

5 Council to further those goals. And I think you for

6 the opportunity to comment on this legislation.

[background comment]

Hi, I'm Erin Smith from ERIN SMITH: Columbia Law School's Human Rights Institute. We support federal, state and local government efforts to support core human rights, and my remarks today will focus not so much on the testing side, but on how a human rights based approach can strengthen the work of New York City's Commission. As all of you have recognized and the Speaker as well, which we're very happy to hear, the Commission doesn't currently have the resources it needs to meet its full potential. But we feel we're at a pivotal moment right now, and the Commission is really well positioned to reinvigorate itself and to take action to fully implement the protections of what we have all recognized as our City's very robust Human Rights Including by joining up with other agencies around the country that are using innovative ways to address local challenges for a human rights based

approach. Other agencies are looking beyond visual
acts of discrimination to address systemic
discrimination and to enforce [sic] the bias, which
lays the groundwork for a more affirmative approach
to eliminate discrimination whether subtle or

7 otherwise.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Human rights affirm the dignity and worth of every person, and they enable all individuals to meet their basic needs. They call for fairness and equity, and human rights principles also emphasize that human rights institutions can have adequate funding to both promote and protect human rights. Local agencies around the country are using human rights in a number of ways. They're addressing criminalization of homelessness, housing and women's right. They are using strategies that foster accountability and participation by working with communities. For example to hold hearings on community human rights concerns, to proactively investigate and report on issues, which is something we've talked a lot about today. To make the case for new laws and policies that might be needed, and to investigate patterns of discrimination to inform policy recommendations. We recommend the Commission

2.2

consider using human rights standards and strategies in its work, and we've included more detailed examples in our written testimony of what some other commissions have been doing. But, of course, as we've all discussed advancing the Commission's work is difficult without adequate resources. And as we've also detailed in our written testimony today, New York City's Commission had the lowest budget. And the fewest commission staff members on a per resident basis compared to similar agencies in five other large cities including Chicago, San Francisco and Philadelphia.

And this information certainly is discouraging. New Yorkers face serious discrimination, as we've all discussed, and our Commission lacks the resources to address it. But even worse, this burden falls disproportionately on already vulnerable communities. I know several people here today are here representing those communities in particular. The Speaker's budget offers new resources, which is a great start. We were optimistic that change can happen. And the Mayor's recent appointment of Commissioner Malalis and her team is also very encouraging. And we hope

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 that they will breathe new life into the Commission.

3 So we urge the Commission to join other agencies

4 around the country that are looking to human rights

5 standards and strategies to more proactively address

6 discrimination and inequality. And we call on City

7 Council members to support the Commission in that

8 effort. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN RICCARDI: Hi, my name is Sebastian Riccardi. I'm here from the Legal Aid Society. I'm a staff attorney there, and I have worked in both the housing practice and the employment unit. And so, the City Human Rights Law is an issue of concern for--it has been an issue of concern for my clients in both housing discrimination as well as employment discrimination. We're very excited that there will be some increased enforcement of the Human Rights Law with the new Commissioner, and I don't want to repeat much of what my colleagues here at other organizations have already said. have a large laundry list of recommendations that are in our written testimony. I did just want to focus on some issues having to do with the source of income discrimination work by the Commission and under the We definitely are gratified to see that the

2 Commission has been taking --- is now in the past two weeks taking a new direction in their efforts. 3 4 we were surprised to hear that they actually had a 5 testing program for source of income discrimination in housing. And we think that is critical. There 6 7 are still huge systemic problems in the housing market for many of our clients who use housing 8 subsidies in order to afford shelter. Despite the 9 fact that Local Law 10 was passed over six years ago, 10 many landlords still presumably don't know that 11 12 discriminating on source of income is illegal. 13 Council Member Lander's perusal of Craigslist showed. 14 And so we do stress that it is imperative that the 15 Commission engage in systemic pattern practice 16 litigation in order to really change the dynamics of 17 the rental market. These abuses are still 18 continuing. Just as an example, the new--the new LINC for living in communities, which is a joint 19 program by the HRA and DHS to move families our of 20 shelter. They've issued over 1,500 vouchers to help 21 2.2 families find permanent housing, but only 400 of them 23 have resulted in actual signed leases. 24 clearly an example of discrimination at work in the 25 market. And so we do stress that it is important for

2.2

the Commission to engage in testing. We think that
the, you know-- But we agree with Commissioner

Malalis that perhaps these-- Because of the new
direction that the Commissioner is taking these
bills--some of these bills might be premature. While
reporting requirements probably only take a few
minutes, if they have the right software I guess for
case tracking, then it should be very simple. The
actual implementation of the testing program might
require a little more study.

So, just in terms of a couple of suggestions that I did want to highlight, which is that on the employment side, we think that the Commission is an invaluable resource for low-income New Yorkers who do not have access to the private bar. Because of their claims are of such low value. Not to themselves, but in absolute dollar amounts that it's hard to attract competent counsel. So the use of mediation as a resource in discrimination disputes at the Commission could be a very useful way of leveraging their resources to provide as much help to claimants as possible. We also think that in light especially of some of the newer laws that have been passed like the Pregnancy Discrimination Act

2.2

2	that some policythat the use of policy guidance,
3	opinion letters could be a very useful tool to
4	educate those who are regulated like employers and
5	landlords about their duties under the new Human
6	Rights Law. We also think that in addition to
7	initiating system pattern practice cases, that the
8	Commission should also monitor, the type of

litigation and file Amicus briefs when possible.

And lastly, I just do want to highlight that in order to do any of this effectively, it is important that the Commission be funded at a proper level, and we've very happy to hear that there is additional funding coming. But as our other coalition partners who are part of the Human Rights Working Group, have mentioned that it still leaves the Commission under-funded to the task that is in front of them. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you. Brad, do you have any questions?

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: No, I just think it's good. Thank you and I want to thank this panel. We have a great set of advocates and I think your-the push that the whole community of advocates has been engaged in for a long time is needed. I will--I

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

2.2

guess I'll note just on source of income I was remembering that Local Law 10 of 2008 had as its prime sponsor none other than Bill de Blasio.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [laughter]

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So, you know, it's a shame, and we had an oversight on it under your Chair, under your leadership--

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: [interposing] Yes, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --which was one of the more appalling hearings that we had.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Yes, it was.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So, let's be optimistic now that we're at a moment when that along with other elements of the law can finally be robust and enforced.

CHAIRPERSON ROSE: Thank you and I want to thank you all for your testimony. And I want to thank everybody for sort of reiterating that we're looking for the Human Rights Commission to step up and be the confident and productive Commission that we know that it can be because New York has the most expansive Civil Rights Law, and we want that to be actually realized. And I think everyone addressed

today that there's a vital need to address systemic
discrimination. That we have to look at testing more
aggressively, and training. Training of the testers
so that we get the outcome that we're looking for and
how important that the data gathering and reporting
it is. And so, I thank you all for elucidating on
the issues very well. For supporting the
legislation. For making recommendations that would
only strengthen the legislation, and for being
committed for making sure that New York City is a
just and fair city. And that we're addressing the
tales of two cities in this disparate treatment that
some of the residents face. So I thank you all and
with that said, it is like 4:20 in the afternoon and
this meeting is adjourned.

[gavel]

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

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



Date March 14, 2015