1	C	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION	1
2	CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YOR	ひ	
3			
4		X	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF T	HE MINUTES	
6	Of th	ne	
7	COMMITTEE ON IM	MIGRATION	
		December 19, 2018	
8		Start: 1:37 p.m. Recess: 1:57 p.m.	
9			
10	HELD AT:	COUNCIL CHAMBERS - CITY HALL	
11	BEFORE:	CARLOS MENCHACA	
12		Chairperson	
13	COUNCIL MEMBER	RS: DANIEL DROMM	
14		MATHIEU EUGENE MARK GJONAJ	
15		ROBERT F. HOLDEN I. DANEEK MILLER	
16		KALMAN YEGER	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 2
2	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
3	Bitta Mostofi Commissioner of the Mayor's Office of Immigrant
4	Affairs, MOIA
5	Steven Banks Commissioner of the New York City Department of
6	Social Services, DSS; Overseeing the Human Resources Administration, HRA and Department of
7	Homeless Services, DHS
8	Axel Rolando Harry Herrera Speaking on Behalf of the Safe Passage Project
9	Amy Taylor
10	Co-Legal Director of Make the Road New York
11	Andrea Saenz Attorney in Charge of the New York Immigrant
12	Family Unity Project, NYIFUP, team in Immigration Practice at Brooklyn Defender Services, BDS
13	
14	Sarah Deri Oshiro Managing Director of the Immigration Practice at Bronx Defenders
15	
16	Terry Lawson  Director of the Family and Immigration Unit of  Bronx Legal Services, the Bronx Office of Legal
17	Services NYC
18	Rich Leimsider Executive Director of the Safe Passage Project
19	Hasan Shafiqullah
20	Attorney in Charge of the Immigration Unit at the Legal Aid Society
21	
22	Lauren Reiff Supervising Attorney at the New York Legal
<i> </i>	Assistance Group, NYLAG
23	
24	Franco Torres Special Project Attorney at Catholic Charities

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 3
2	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
3	Camille Mackler
4	Director of Immigration Legal Policy at New York Immigration Coalition
5	Marc Valinoti
6	Managing Immigration Attorney at Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation, NMIC
7	Anne Pilsbury
8	Director of Central American Legal Assistance
9	Persephone Tan Associate Director of Immigration and Policy at
10	Asian American Federation
11	Carlyn Cohen Chief Policy and Public Affairs Officer of the
12	Chinese American Planning Council
13	Jojo Annobil Executive Director of the Immigrant Justice Corps
14	Bridget Crawford
15	Legal Director for Immigration Equality
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

[gavel]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: We're going to get
started in, in the next minute, so if you can find
your seats. I'm Carlos Menchaca, Chair of the New
York City Council's Committee on Immigration and I
would like to recognize the members of our Committee
who are here today right now, and I want to welcome
Council Member Holden from Queens. This is our last
immigration hearing for the year and it's allowing us
to actually take stock of where we've come and where
we will continue to go as we fight for the rights of
our immigrant families. You know specifically our
Committee today will focus on ways in which the need
for legal representation in immigration court has
changed since the inauguration of President Trump.
Since the beginning of the presidential campaign
Trump has made aggressive immigration enforcement a
policy priority. Since his inauguration, they did not
waste time, Trump and the new White House team have
exposed their true nature though proposing
xenophobic, xenophobic measures that we knew that we
know are designed to fuel white supremacy policies.
He has used every tool at his disposal; executive
orders, rulemaking and agency guidance to radically

2	change the immigration landscape in this country with
3	the focus of removing through deportation and
4	detention our black and brown immigrant neighbors.
5	Trump wants a whiter America, an America that is
6	ethnically cleansed. And this reality has shaken us
7	to our core. I feel this personally as a proud
8	Mexican American who grew up on the border in El
9	Paso, Texas, that watched the militarization of a
10	wall and as a gay man this administration has made
11	every attempt to strip protections of the LGBTQ
12	gender non-conforming community as well. In fact, we
13	are all, all feeling these changes on a personal
14	level and we will begin today by hearing from members
15	of our community about their experiences under this
16	administration. It was almost two years ago that a
17	rushed executive order led to what is now known as
18	the Travel Ban and many of you outraged protested,
19	organized that protest against the cruel and ill-
20	conceived policy at JFK and across the country at
21	other air ports. Because of the court challenges and
22	the public outrage of this at this Islamic phobic
23	policy we witnessed the President issue a new
24	executive order tailored to avoid court objections
25	and we saw it upheld in the courts this last summer.

2	In October 2017, Trump announced the rescission of
3	the deferred action for childhood arrivals, DOCA
4	jeopardizing the futures of more than 700,000 DOCA
5	recipients nationwide and at least 30,000 DOCA
6	recipients in New York City. Similarly, the
7	Department of Homeland Security under Trump has
8	failed to renew their temporary protected status, TPS
9	for Sudan, Haiti, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and
10	Honduras putting thousands of TPS recipients at risk
11	of falling out of status, many of whom have been in
12	this country let alone our city and surrounding area
13	for over a decade. In April of 2018 with the
14	announcement of a newly implemented zero tolerance
15	policy at the US, Mexico border, we heard of the
16	shocking family separation policy that has been
17	underway since at least October 2017 under Trump. We
18	sat in this same room and heard from the service
19	providers and the Mayor's Office about the
20	approximately 300 children who were removed from
21	their parents at the border and sent to foster care
22	agencies here in the city. To this day it remains
23	unclear if every child has been returned to their
24	parents and it has… recently as of November 27 <sup>th</sup>
25	ProPublica reported that there are at least 16 new

2	child separation cases in New York City and the
3	number of unaccompanied minors continues to grow.
4	Simultaneously we are seeing a rise in immigration
5	enforcement as Trump used executive orders to discard
6	previously established criteria that limited
7	removals. In the first eight months of the Trump
8	Administration, Immigration and Customs Enforcement,
9	ICE, arrests rose 67 percent, the number of arrests
10	of individuals with no criminal convictions rose by
11	225 percent. Not only this but it is now commonplace
12	for ICE to detain individuals at administrative
13	check-ins, visa interviews, military bases,
14	workplaces, court houses, and in our own
15	neighborhoods. It breaks my heart every time I hear
16	stories that are coming out and this overenforcement
17	has become every day commonplace and it's that that
18	destabilizes our communities and so we ask what are
19	we doing as a city? Most recently we have a we most
20	recently we have experienced the harmful impacts of
21	the proposed public charge rule and by expanding the
22	categories of government programs that are grounds
23	for denying a green card or visa this proposed rule
24	penalizes poor immigrants forcing them to choose
25	between their wellbeing and being able to stay in

this country in this country lawfully. This rule
proposal has caused mass confusion throughout our
city with legal and social service providers
reporting a spike in calls from impacted individuals
and families asking for simple basic information. As
we can see from this brief retrospective, the
immigration landscape has shifted radically, the need
has grown dramatically, and it outstrips the services
that we have. Where we may have previously matched
the need under prior administrations however
unevenly, we are now in unchartered waters. How are
we, the city of New York preparing to continue the
long battle to protect the rights of our immigrant
families. I believe that we, the people, the people
of this great city of New York have a moral
responsibility to protect due process and the right
to counsel of all our neighbors, our immigrant
families. Every person must have the opportunity for
a fair day in court and data and research, research
show that represented individuals experience
exponentially more successful legal outcomes than
those without representation. Because individuals
with cases in immigration court are not entitled to
government appointed legal representation those who

2	cannot afford legal counsel may have no way to
3	adequately protect themselves in immigration court
4	proceedings and they may face serious consequences
5	such as separation from their families and
6	deportation from their home. This is unacceptable,
7	what is our city doing about this? And that's where
8	our legal service providers come in, they have
9	stepped up to this need and responded with tremendous
10	courage and perseverance against the impossible odds
11	Many of our legal service providers are here today
12	and I thank you for being here today. Thank you for
13	the work tirelessly to fight against this federal
14	administration's cruel and discriminatory policies
15	and I thank you and I thank you for fighting to keep
16	our communities and families together every single
17	day again going above and beyond. As the policies and
18	the guidance and the executive orders continue to
19	pile up and the legal landscape becomes more crowded
20	and convoluted, the need for legal expertise grows
21	exponentially and that's why we are here today. We
22	want to explore how the needs of immigration legal
23	services have shifted and how those needs have grown
24	and how we as a City Council can continue to support
25	the legal service providers and ensure that all

immigrants, all immigrants, all our neighbors have
access to representation that they deserve. We look
forward to hearing testimony from the administration,
advocates and community members as we better protect
our immigrant communities from this indiscriminate
and rapidly growing deportation machine. And before
we begin with our first public panel I want to thank
our staff who put this incredible hearing together
and if you haven't read the, the briefing, this
briefing reads like a book, I mean it's a horror
story of course but it is really important to kind of
capture the actual understanding that we have today
and with the new data that we're going to get
presented today I think we're going to have a fuller
picture of the gap of services. And with that I want
to thank our Committee Counsel Harbani Ahuja;
Committee Policy Analyst Elizabeth Kronk; Finance
Analyst Jin Lee and my staff including my Senior
Advisor Cesar Vargas and Socheatta Meng my Chief of
Staff and Communications Director Tony Chiarito. With
that I also want to welcome Brooklyn Council Member
Mathieu Eugene and our first panel oh, you know what
also we, we have to mention this, the breaking news,
I think all of you have probably received already but

for folks who are listening online, just moments ago
news broke that a federal judge struck down Donald
Trump's policies that were designed to ban victims of
domestic violence or gang violence from seeking
asylum. Our courts are working. US District Judge
Sullivan ruled that the Trump policies were unlawful,
he also ordered that the administration he, he also
he ordered the administration to return to the US
asylum seekers who were unlawfully deported under the
policy so we're going to be welcoming back those who
have been deported. This is a major victory that
could help Sara and Henry, two of my Sunset Park
constituents who came here from Honduras escaping,
escaping awful gang violence. This legal win however
comes with challenges as these vulnerable groups of
immigrants mostly women and children from central
America who are seeking asylum under these grounds
will now be in dire need of legal representation
hence our hearing today. And I'm going to hold I'm
going to bring the first panel; Axel Henry from Safe
Passage Project if you can please come on up and
Samantha Norris from the Safe Passage, Passage
Project, this is our first public panel and is there
a Christine Johnson in the room? Okay, thank you. And

Axel you can start. Make sure the, the light is on,
the red light. Thank you for... [cross-talk]

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

AXEL ROLANDO HARRY HERRERA: Thank you. Good afternoon, thank you to everyone for being here and listening to me this afternoon. My name is Axel Rolando Harry Herrera. I am 19 years old. I am from Honduras from La Lima Cortes. I currently live here in New York in the Bronx. In June I graduated from Harlem Renaissance High School. Now I study in Guttman Community College, I study human services to be able to continue my goal of becoming a social worker. I came to the United States in 2013, I decided to immigrate from my country because there is a lot of delinquency there and less chance of getting ahead. Also, I had my mother here in the US, I wanted to reunite with her because it had been seven years since I last saw her. When I came, I was 14 years old, it wasn't easy to separate from my grandparents and make the decision to leave because I knew that the trip was dangerous, but my biggest motivation was to get ahead and see my mom. My first dream was to be an actor and have the opportunity to be in the theatre and to be in a movie where I could act, sing and dance at the same time. Then with time I

discovered other motivations to be a social worker
because I liked to communicate with and help people
just like they helped me. In August of 2014, my mom
and I contacted safe passage project. We went to the
office and they interviewed me. Afterwards they
called me to tell me that they found a lawyer who was
interested in my case. I felt happy, but I also felt
nervous because I knew that I was going to have to
tell my story, there were moments that were really
hard to express myself because a lot of hurtful
things had happened in my childhood but with time, I
established a trustful relationship with my lawyer
and she made me feel comfortable. I felt more secure
in court, with my lawyer I learned to feel more
confident in myself to tell my experience and respond
to the questions they asked me. More than giving me a
lawyer, Safe Passage gave me other opportunities to
know more youth like me who immigrated to the United
States and know their stories. Four years after my
first interview with Safe Passage I received a call
from them telling me that immigration had accepted my
application for permanent residency, I felt very
happy because therein I realized that all of my
efforts to come here were worth it. Being an

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
2	immigrant without documents is not easy, one doesn't
3	feel part of the United States, sometimes I walked in
4	fear that I could be returned to my country. But more
5	than anything I thought about my grandma and the
6	possibility of never being able to go back and see
7	her. When I received that call, I remember that I
8	cried from the happiness. Now with my residency I
9	have more motivation to get ahead and excel, what I
10	thought was an illusion is now a reality. All of this
11	is thanks to Safe Passage for having helped me all of
12	this time in my immigration process and helping me
13	achieve my dreams. Thank you for listening to me
14	today.
15	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: [foreign dialogue]
16	AXEL ROLANDO HARRY HERRERA: [foreign
17	dialogue]
18	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: [foreign dialogue]
19	AXEL ROLANDO HARRY HERRERA: [foreign
20	dialogue]
21	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Awesome, I just I
22	asked a little bit about… I don't know if you want to
23	translate but I, I asked a little bit about… or
24	commented on, on the fact that the testimony really

focused on love for family and this is all what we're

talking about, how to how to bring families
together and that kind of bond of love makes, makes
the world better and it, it forces us to, to be a
better, better world and, and that's what the core I
think of what we're trying to do here and what, what
work does he do with youth people that come to Safe
Passage that might not be so confident to come and
talk to a lawyer and, and I think his story is one
that talks about lawyers doing a lot of the work to
bring people in and make you feel like family and,
and that's, that's beautiful. Thank you. we're going
to move on to the administration and thank you for
being here today. We are oh and before I do that, we
have Council Member Gjonaj from the Bronx here and
Council Member Yeger from Brooklyn, thank you so much
for being here today. So, if we can have Commissioner
Steve Banks and Commissioner Bitta Mostofi. We're
going to swear you in.

COMMITTEE CLERK: Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee and to respond honestly to Council Member... to Council Member questions?

STEVEN BANKS: Yes.

2	BTTTA	MOSTOFI:	Vac
_	DIIIA	MOSIOLI:	IES.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

3 COMMITTEE CLERK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: You may begin.

BITTA MOSTOFI: Thank you to Chair

Menchaca and members of the Committee on Immigration. My name is Bitta Mostofi, I'm the Commissioner for the Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs. I'm joined today by Commissioner Steven Banks who will testify about the Department of Social Services/Human Resources Administration's Immigration Legal Services program. Thank you very much for calling a hearing, hearing on this crucial issue. The Mayor and the City Council have made historic investments to promote access to justice for immigrant residents. With these investments and in collaboration with other city agencies, legal service providers and community partners, MOIA and HRA's Office of Civil Justice have worked to address the legal needs of immigrant New Yorkers at a time of, of acute crisis. As the Trump Administration continues to attack immigrants on all fronts, New York City's investment in immigration legal services, which is the largest municipal investment in our country's history, stands in stark and proud contrast on the side of immigrant's rights.

While today's hearing is about legal representation
and immigration court, we as a city have recognized
that the need for immigration legal services extends
beyond immigrants facing deportation. It is also
critical to provide representation for immigrants
filing family-based applications, applying for
citizenship or seeking affirmative humanitarian
relief. This is not only because a change in status
can provide an avenue to new economic and civic
opportunities, but also because naturalization and
regularization of immigration status can prevent
deportation and protect families from being ripped
apart. In today's testimony, I will speak briefly
about the need for immigration legal services in a
hostile federal climate, discuss the city's response
and give an overview of the success of MOIA's
immigration legal services program. In this second
year of the Trump Administration, we have seen an
assault on our immigrant communities and on the
immigration system as a whole. Our analysis of the
latest ICE data shows that the Trump Administration
ramped up its overbroad immigration enforcement
actions in 2018, total civil immigration arrests in
the New York City area are 88 percent higher over the

2	last federal fiscal year than in the last year of the
3	Obama Administration. Even more shocking, arrests of
4	individuals in the New York City area with no
5	criminal conviction whatsoever is now 414 percent
6	higher than in the last year of the Obama
7	Administration. Moreover, through a set of regulatory
8	actions, the Trump Administration has made it making
9	a more… even more complex and risky for immigrants to
10	apply for immigration benefits. With high processing
11	times at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
12	and an ever-growing backlog in the immigration
13	courts, the federal government's actions have
14	highlighted the fact that our immigration system is
15	indeed broken. Legal services are crucial for
16	immigrants. But there is no right to appointed
17	counsel funded by the federal government for
18	immigrants, detained or non-detained, in immigration
19	court. Instead, the lion's share of immigration legal
20	services provided in New York City today is funded
21	through the historical investments of Mayor De Blasio
22	and the City Council. Access to high quality, trusted
23	immigration legal services can be the difference
24	between becoming a citizen and languishing in
25	detention. Immigrants who do not have access to

immigration legal services are particularly
vulnerable to exploitation and to fraud. In response
to these challenges, the De Blasio Administration and
the City Council have invested historic amounts.
These investments and the hard work of our legal
service providers and community-based organizations
and partners, many of whom are here today, are what
make New York City a model for other cities across
the nation. Given the scope of the administration's
attacks on immigrants, the De Blasio Administration
and City Council have focused on funding the
provision of wide spectrum of services, which allows
us to respond quickly to the ever-shifting federal
landscape. The investments of the administration and
the Council work hand in hand in addressing some of
the deep problems plaguing our immigration system. Ir
Fiscal Year 2018, the De Blasio Administration and
the Council dedicated 48 million dollars in funding
with about 30 million as baseline funding from the
from the administration, to a continuum of free legal
services programs for immigrant New Yorkers. Our
funding supports the provision of crucial and timely
information about immigrant's rights, support for
affirmative applications to adjust immigration status

or naturalize, and legal representation to defend
against deportation. This includes city programs like
ActionNYC, the Immigrant Opportunities Initiative and
federal community services Block Grant fund services
at HRA as well as council funded programs like
NYIFUP, the Unaccompanied Minors Initiative/Immigrant
Child Advocates Relief Effort and others. This
funding structure provides great flexibility for the
city to respond to the new needs. For example, and as
Commissioner Banks will testify, the IOI program's
contracting model allows for rapid deployment of
staff and resources to address the continuum of these
legal needs from brief legal counseling to full
representation and removal in asylum cases. Of
course, the city and the Council are not the only
funders for immigration legal services. In
coordination with the Mayor's Fund to Advance New
York City and other sister agencies, MOIA has
engaged, engaged extensively with private funders to
support additional resources for our community
partners and to help address any gaps. Turning to
MOIA's work in this area. MOIA plays a critical role
in the provision of immigration legal services in the
city. We engage with providers, review data, monitor

shifts in immigration policy to inform the city
investment and ensure that resources are being
allocated to respond to urgent needs. It is in this
role that MOIA is able to provide guidance to and
work in partnership with our sister agencies as we
survey the immigration legal landscape. As an
example, in the wake of the family separation crisis,
MOIA worked closely with DSS/HRA's OCJ to identify
further legal services needs for separated children
and children and their families. In response, the
city announced an allocation of 4.1 million dollars
to provide assistance for migrant children, including
both unaccompanied minors and separated children in
our city. MOIA also operates two immigration legal
services programs in partnership with HRA: ActionNYC
and NYCitizenship. ActionNYC is a citywide,
community-based immigration legal services program
that provides access to legal services for residents,
as well as resources for providers to grow the
immigration services field. Immigrant New Yorkers
receive free, safe, and high-quality immigration
legal services in their community and in their
language. Through its citywide hotline, centralized
appointment making system and accessible service

2	locations at CBOs, in schools and hospitals,
3	ActionNYC serves as an entry point for New Yorkers
4	seeking immigration legal services. For those who
5	need straightforward legal help, these providers
6	provide full legal representation in these matters
7	including but not limited to citizenship
8	applications, green care renewals, and TPS renewals.
9	When capacity permits, they provide full
10	representation in complex cases such as special
11	immigrant juvenile status and U visas. For legal
12	cases outside the team's scope of services or
13	capacity, ActionNYC connects clients to the city
14	funded programs such as IOI. MOIA also provides
15	connections to ActionNYC through outreach and Know
16	Your Rights programming. Responding to the need for
17	immigration legal services among New York City's hard
18	to reach immigrant populations, earlier this year
19	ActionNYC selected six additional CBOs to provide
20	services to underserved groups. ActionNYC has also
21	increased local providers' ability to provide high
22	quality legal services through a capacity building
23	fellowship started last year in partnership with the
24	Office of Economic Opportunity. Demand for ActionNYC
25	services has remained consistently high throughout

the life of the program, including in Fiscal Year
2018. In 2018, ActionNYC providers screened about
8,600 clients at community-based sites, schools, and
hospitals. Of those clients, we found that the
majority had straightforward cases, about a tenth of
all cases were complex and about a quarter of
screened clients had no relief available. In Fiscal
Year '18, ActionNYC opened 5,600 cases and filed more
than 3,200 applications. New York Citizenship
provides free citizenship application assistance,
including screenings and full legal representation,
as well as financial empowerment services. MOIA
operates NYCitizenship in partner, partnership with
the Brooklyn, Queens and New York public library
systems, DSS/HRA, New York Legal Assistance Group and
the Mayor's Fund to Advance New York City. In FY '18,
NYCitizenship provided services at 12 public library
branches across all five boroughs. Through a
partnership with DSS/HRA, the program also offered
services to vulnerable populations, including seniors
and those facing health barriers such as disability.
In total, in, in 2018, New York Citizenship provided
legal screenings for about 1,700 immigrant New
Vorkers As I have described it is crucial to

recognize that the need for legal representation for
immigrants stretches from removal proceedings to
assistance with naturalization applications. Across
this entire swath of need, MOIA has consistently
provided important policy guidance and leadership for
the Administration. MOIA works to identify needs and
trends based on changes in federal, federal law and
practice and we are committed to continuing to do so
My colleague, Commissioner Banks, will speak to the
Office of Civil Justice's important work
administering additional immigration legal services
programs, including the Immigrant Opportunities
Initiative and the Council's crucial initiatives. I
want to thank Chair Menchaca for calling this
important hearing. I also want to thank the legal
service providers and community-based organizations,
our partners truly in the fight against cruel and
draconian federal immigration policies, for the
extraordinary work that you do day in and day out to
protect immigrant New Yorkers. Simply put, this work
would be impossible without the partners in the
field, many of whom are here today. The Trump
Administration's continuous attacks on our immigrant
communities have created a deep and enduring need for

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

immigration legal services. Both the Council and
Mayor De Blasio have stepped up to help meet this
need and we look forward to working together with our
partners in the community and other stakeholders to
provide further resources for immigrant New Yorkers.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you so much.

STEVEN BANKS: Good afternoon, thank you Chair Menchaca and members of the Immigration Committee for giving us this opportunity to testify today. My name is Steven Banks and I am the Commissioner of the New York City Department of Social Services, which oversees the Human Resources Administration, HRA and the Department of Homeless Services, DHS. I would like to thank my colleague Commissioner Mostofi and the Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs for their partnership in this essential work that this Administration has undertaken to provide legal services for immigrant New Yorkers. Before proceeding with the testimony for this hearing, I'd just like to restate my remarks from the testimony that I gave Monday before the General Welfare Committee to address the extremely troubling incident at one of our Brooklyn client locations which culminated in the arrest of an HRA

client. What happened at the Human Resources
Administration's DeKalb Center on Friday, December 7,
was completely unacceptable and should never happen
again in New York City. On behalf of our agency and
our dedicated front-line staff in all five boroughs,
I apologize to Jazmine Headley and her one-year-old
son and to the people of the City of New York for the
actions that were taken that day. As reflected in the
NYPD body worn camera videos, there were multiple
points at which this incident could have and should
have been defused. Last Monday, I placed two HRA
Peace Officers on modified duty with no client
contact. Consistent with their collective bargaining
agreement, last Friday I suspended these two officers
without pay for the maximum period of time and DSS
will file disciplinary charges against them that
could result in termination. Going forward, unless
there is an immediate safety threat, I am directing
that HRA Peace Officers shall not request the
intervention of the NYPD without first contacting a
Center Director or Deputy Director or her/his
designee to attempt to defuse the situation by
addressing a client need. Within the next 90 days,
DSS will conduct retraining sessions for all HRA

Peace Officers, with an emphasis on techniques for
deescalating disputes in HRA Centers. Thereafter,
this enhanced training will be a mandatory annual
requirement for each officer. I intend to attend each
of these retraining sessions to speak to the HRA
Peace Officers about the importance of deescalating
disputes. DSS has directed the City's contracted
security services vendor to provide retraining
sessions for all security guards assigned to HRA
Centers, with an emphasis on techniques for
deescalating disputes at HRA Centers. Thereafter,
this training will be a mandatory annual requirement
for any contracted security officer assigned to an
HRA office. In addition to existing DSS customer
service staff training, DSS has requested and
received an OMB funding commitment to develop
implicit bias training for all 17,000 DSS staff
members to promote diversity in the workplace and
dignity-centered client services. Building on our
reforms through which 85 percent of SNAP/food stamps
applications and recertifications are submitted
online without the need for clients to even come to
an HRA office, HRA will continue to move forward with
expanding online access to cash assistance clients,

subject to any necessary State approvals. Together
with the NYPD Commissioner, we will take the
following actions: The NYPD and DSS will develop a
protocol for determining appropriate instances in
which HRA Peace Officers in HRA Centers should seek
the assistance of the NYPD. The NYPD and DSS will
develop a protocol to deploy an NYPD supervisor to be
part of the NYPD response team for any such HRA
assistance requests. And finally, the NYPD and DSS
will develop a protocol for transferring control of
an incident to the NYPD when the NYPD arrives at an
HRA Center. Now I'd like to begin my testimony today
and focus on our continued commitment to immigrant
New Yorkers. It's important to me at a time when the
policies of the Trump Administration have become
increasingly inhumane and punitive, to unequivocally
restate our commitment to ensuring all New Yorkers in
need, including immigrants, have access to our
agencies' benefits and services. Each year HRA
addresses the needs of more than three million low-
income New Yorkers, including immigrants. This
Administration, in partnership with the City Council,
has made a historic and unprecedented investment in
legal services for immigrant New Yorkers, to

dramatically increase access to a range of legal
supports through a variety of programs. At the same
time, the Administration and the Council have created
and fostered the infrastructure to allow the our
City to respond quickly and forcefully to an
immigration legal landscape that changes often and to
meet emergent legal needs of immigrant families and
individuals in New York City. I am pleased to report
that New York City is a national leader in providing
access to justice for people in need. We work to in
close partnership with our colleagues at MOIA and
with legal services providers and community-based
organizations to understand the legal needs
experienced by immigrant New Yorkers and to design
and implement the most effective service to quickly
respond to those needs. As Commissioner Mostofi said
we couldn't do this important work without the
tremendously important work of our partners in the
community, the legal services providers and
community-based organizations. One major component of
our effort is HRA's Office of Civil Justice. The
Office of Civil Justice was created in 2015 pursuant
to Local Legislation to oversee, manage and monitor
the City-supported civil legal services available for

2	low income New Yorkers and other residents in need.
3	The establishment of the office coincides with New
4	York City's unprecedented investment in civil legal
5	services programs for New Yorkers at the start of the
6	De Blasio Administration 2014. This fiscal year, the
7	Administration committed 142 million dollars towards
8	civil justice programs at our Office of Civil
9	Justice. The De Blasio Administration's investment in
10	civil legal services in Fiscal Year 2019 includes 31
11	million dollars, 31 million dollars in legal services
12	for immigration legal services. This represents a
13	thirteen-fold increase in Mayoral funding for
14	immigration legal assistance programs since Fiscal
15	Year 2013, when it was 2.1 million. With this funding
16	the Administration supports programs that address the
17	variety of legal needs of immigrant New Yorkers by
18	providing access to high-quality legal assistance. As
19	you have heard from Commissioner Mostofi, the
20	ActionNYC program provides free, safe, and high-
21	quality immigration legal services to immigrant New
22	Yorkers in need, including free comprehensive legal
23	screenings for possible forms of relief at locations
24	across the City as well as Know Your Rights forums
25	and other outreach efforts designed to widely

2	disseminate accurate and reliable information about
3	the immigration legal system, to reduce fraud,
4	misinformation and confusion in the community. At
5	HRA, the Office of Civil Legal Justice, the largest
6	and most expansive of our immigration legal services
7	programs is the Immigrant Opportunity Initiative or
8	IOI. Through this program, which was first
9	established through the award of discretionary
10	funding by the City Council, networks of nonprofit
11	legal providers and community-based organizations
12	conduct outreach in immigrant communities across the
13	city and provide legal assistance to primarily low-
14	income immigrant New Yorkers in matters ranging from
15	citizenship and lawful permanent residency
16	applications, to more complex immigration matters
17	including asylum applications and removal defense
18	work. Starting in Fiscal Year 2017, following an RFP
19	and a competitive bidding process for multi-year
20	contracts, the Administration increased our funding
21	for immigration legal services through IOI. IOI was
22	initially funded by the Administration at 3.2 million
23	annually, but in the spring of 2016, after working
24	with the Council, including the Chair, and in
25	recognition of the need for additional quality legal

representation for immigrant New Yorkers facing more
complicated legal cases, IOI providers received
supplemental Mayoral funding of 2.7 million for to
provide representation to 1,000 complex immigrant
immigration cases, including asylum applications,
Special Immigrant Juvenile Status or SIJS cases, and
U and T visa applications. Baseline Mayoral funding
for immigration legal services programs was
dramatically increased again in Fiscal Year 2018 and
the outyears to include 16.4 million in additional
baseline funding to respond to the pressing need for
representation in removal proceedings, support
assistance with seeking alternate forms of
immigration relief for Dreamers and other immigrant
New Yorkers, as well as to meet the increasing
challenges posed by a shifting landscape for federal
immigration law and policy. With this investment the
Administration has been able to continue to support
our support for legal representation in complex cases
as well as dramatically increase the availability of
free legal representation in removal proceedings. The
flexibility of the IOI program has enabled the City
to provide additional funding to a variety of legal
services providers including community- and borough-

based nonprofit legal offices and groups. These
partners specialize in providing legal services to
vulnerable populations such as children and domestic
violence survivors, as well as citywide legal
provider organizations, allowing for a rapid increase
in much needed service capacity. Particularly in
light of the ever-changing federal immigration policy
landscape, it is more important than ever to have a
nimble structure that allows us to stand up legal
services where they are most needed. The contracts
with the IOI service provider consortia that HRA
administers through the Office, Office of Civil
Justice allow for rapid deployment of funding and
staff and resources to assist the immigrant community
across the continuum of services, from brief legal
counseling to full legal representation in cases like
removal and asylum matters. In total, the City's IOI
program is funded at 22 million in Fiscal Year 2019,
including 19.5 million in Administration funding as
well as 2.6 million in Council discretionary grants,
and funds over fifty different nonprofit
organizations and legal providers serving immigrant
communities across the city. This funding is expected
to provide legal services in over 10,000 immigration

matters this year, including legal representation in
approximately 2,500 removal cases in defense of
immigrant New Yorkers ensnared in the Trump
Administration's deportation machine. The
Administration's support for IOI includes a dedicated
4.1 million in Mayoral funding this year to help
address the legal needs of unaccompanied youth here
in New York City facing the threat of removal,
including legal help for those children separated
from their parents or loved ones at the southern
border by the Trump Administration. This funding was
finalized this fall following the rapid response to
the border crisis and it has allowed us to partner
with legal services providers to: Further increase
capacity for legal defense in deportation proceedings
for over 900 separated and unaccompanied immigrant
youth; to increase funding for social work and case
management resources to address the acute needs of
these children; and to provide resources to address
legal screening and risk assessment needs of family
members seeking to be sponsors of separated children
in facilities in the custody of the federal Office of
Refugee Resettlement in New York City, facilitating
their release from such facilities. In addition to

2	IOI, HRA manages immigration legal services programs
3	funded through federal Community Service Block Grants
4	totaling 2.1 million, administered in partnership
5	with the Department of Youth and Community
6	Development. With CSBG funding, legal services
7	organizations provide a range of services such as
8	legal assistance to help immigrant adults and youth
9	attain citizenship and lawful immigration status, as
10	well as services targeted at groups such as immigrant
11	survivors of domestic violence and human trafficking,
12	low-wage immigrant workers at risk of exploitation
13	and violations of their employment rights, and
14	immigrant youth in foster care. In addition to the
15	Administration's commitment, I want to again
16	acknowledge the ongoing commitment of the City
17	Council, Speaker Corey Johnson. the Chair of this
18	Committee and this Committee in expanding access to
19	justice by funding legal services. HRA also oversees
20	immigration legal services programs funded through
21	Council discretionary grants. This year, in addition
22	to the Council's 2.6 million allocation for providers
23	through IOI, the New York Immigrant Family Unity
24	Project or NYIFUP is funded by a City Council
25	discretionary grant providing legal representation

for low-income detained immigrants facing removal at
the Varick Street Immigration Court. This year,
NYIFUP is funded at 10 million and is expected to
serve approximately 1,600 individuals in deportation
proceedings. HRA also administers the Unaccompanied
Minors Initiative and the Immigrant Children's
Advocates Relief Effort which, which were developed
by the City Council in partnership with the Robin
Hood Foundation and the New York Community Trust to
provide legal and social services to address the
surge of immigrant children living in New York City.
The program provides unaccompanied immigrant and
refugee children in New York City with counsel and
the opportunity to apply for relief from removal, and
the opportunity to receive much-needed social,
medical and mental health services. Many of these
children are eligible for a range of statutory
protections, including asylum, for those fleeing past
and future persecution; Special Immigrant Juvenile
Status, SIJS, for children who have been abused,
neglected, or abandoned; U or T visas for those who
have been victims of certain crimes or human
trafficking and other relief. With 2 million in City
funding for FY '19, the program is expected to serve

approximately 550 immigrant youth facing removal. In
all, the City's total investment in legal assistance
programs for immigrants exceeds 48 million in FY '19,
an exponential increase from just 7 million in FY $^{\prime}$ 13
that's including the Council and the Administration's
resources. Moving forward, the importance of
continued citywide collaboration. As Commissioner
Mostofi aptly laid out in her testimony, this City
has much to be proud of regarding the accomplishments
in our efforts to provide a continuum of legal
services to immigrant New Yorkers, whether they need
accurate and reliable legal advice on their options,
help with adjusting their status, expert guidance in
the naturalization process, a defender in their
removal proceedings or emergency legal assistance in
immigration court. Still, there is more work to be
done and we remain committed to working closely with
our partner agencies, legal service providers, and
community-based organizations to build on our
progress to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency
of these programs. New York City is a proud city of
immigrants and we will to do everything we can to
mitigate the impact of the federal government's
divisive actions and rhetoric. We are committed to

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

continue providing services that evolve with the ever-changing federal policy landscape to address the most pressing needs of immigrant New Yorkers. With the partnership of this Council, our unprecedented investments to these programs continue to place New York City as the leader in ensuring that low-income New Yorkers have access to justice. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I look forward to your questions.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: I want to thank you both for being here testifying, describing I think what we can all feel proud of right now in terms of what the city has done not just in here... not just here in the city but the impacts to other cities who are actually following our lead, I think that's an incredible testament to the work that we do and how we do that in partnership and so I don't want to ... I don't want to ... I don't want to miss that opportunity to say thank you as a... as a real partner in this. I also want to thank you for, for ... Commissioner for restating your, your work around, around Jazmine and her family and her son, I think... nothing can take away the impact that happened both the physical and psychological impact to her, her

son, the people around her and as we all watched
that, that trauma is, is real. I think what makes it
so important here in this discussion is we, we think
about the gravity that these instances have in our
country and in our borders and when, when families
are ripped, ripped away we, we have a response, an
emotional response but here you have taken action,
you've taken action as a city Commissioner and with a
lot of power to make influence, an impact. As we move
towards the immigration conversation we have that
same feeling when we see families separated and our
and our role becomes more complicated and so the
focus today is to think about how we can understand
that gap, what is that gap so that we can get to
justice in the city way as I believe the city is
we're almost we're the courts and the courts today
just delivered a great, great blow against Trump but
our city has a role and responsibility to respond and
to get it right for families and so that's our, our
role today. and the two different bullets that we're
going to be asking questions around are really the
mechanism, when you talk about the nimble mechanism
and how we support our service providers and work
together and then also the dollar gap, what is that

2.2

dollar gap and what are we what are we talking about
in terms of, of funding need and I think those are
the those are the two different categories from all
the different questions that we have and prepared for
you today? And so what I'm going to start with is
the… part of the mechanism conversation is really
thinking about how, how, how you're doing this work
and so I want to ask Commissioner Mostofi to talk a
little bit about the task force and whether or the
not the task force is involved in this question about
legal services and have, have you conveyed the task
force for this question at hand about, about legal
services and that gap in a time of Trump?

question, as it relates to I guess the way that other agencies have interacted or been involved in conversations with... around legal services we have not centralized this issue with the task force yet, its... that's something that we could, could certainly do and I think would be an important conversation to bring. We have worked closely as you heard from Commissioner Banks together in ensuring that the work that we're doing across our agencies both in terms of understanding the landscape and the need is closely

in sync, we've also worked with agencies who have
addressed issues with us including the Mayor's Office
to End Domestic Violence and Gender Based Violence
and in looking at funding needs that they had to
address the needs of the clients that they were
serving or rather are serving that's one area, we've
worked in coordination with many city agencies to be
responsive to the particular shifts in immigration
policies, most recently around public charge and in
so doing recognizing that there is an efficiency at
the agency level to be able to have the right
information on how they're able to direct people to
those needs and so kind of doing cross agency
education on how to direct how to direct clients or
New Yorkers that are coming interaction interactions
with our agencies to immigration legal services,
we've additionally done that work really closely with
the Department of Education, that's one of the
tenants of the ActionNYC program is actually bringing
the legal services within the school system so being
responsive to what the needs are at the individual
school level and then separately with H and H at the
hospitals. So, looking directly at what the needs are
of the patient base that they're seeing, and I know

the council has increased funding as well to
immigration legal services in H and H. So, there's a
couple of key agencies that we've worked with to
actually provide the provision of legal services
through the agency's work and then more broadly
across all agencies how they can actually direct
people to those services, we've done that education
at both senior levels and programmatic levels but
also at training outreach teams.
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Alright, so what

I'm wondering... and understanding is that you haven't activated the, the task force for this conversation but you're working individually with all the different agencies to get a sense of access points for legal services and developing ways to either bring that to the agency or, or... that's, that's it?

BITTA MOSTOFI: Or training their...

[cross-talk]

20 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Direct... [cross-21 talk]

22 BITTA MOSTOFI: ...staff so that they can
23 direct... [cross-talk]

24 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Training staff at...

25 [cross-talk]

2.2

BITTA MOSTOFI: ...yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...at city agencies, okay and that's, that's the agency side. Tell me a little bit about your, your communication with the legal service providers and... well even before the providers how are you getting the information about legal representation needs of immigrant New Yorkers directly, is there a mechanism that, that's allowing you to, to get that data rather than an agency or a service provider but directly from New Yorkers?

BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure, so a couple of ways

I would say that that comes in recognizing that it's
all a little bit imperfect so from a purely kind of
data perspective we look at what's publicly
available, data mostly through track on the
immigration court system. From a sort of on the
ground perspective, MOIA as well as OCJ are on
constant conversation with providers understanding
sort of what their needs are, they raise with us
where they... when they see sort of an increase or a
spike in case load. We, through ActionNYC very
closely monitor our hotline that's a really key
indicator for us when there are increased spikes or
demands in appointments, why, understanding it,

2.2

making sure we're effectively triaging it and then I would say the, the last piece that's really important is through the know your rights programming work. So, last year we required in partnership with the Robin Hood Foundation with that initiative that at every single forum we were noting how many legal referrals were needed from it so to kind of gauge what the need in the communities were where folks were deeply engaged, that's part of what we'll continue to do and track this year.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And is... [cross-talk]

STEVEN BANKS: If, if I could just add to that answer, I mean as you know I spent most of time outside of government but I, I think one of the things that's unique about the approach is actually the collaboration between MOIA and HRA and so, so often you see, you know agencies just replicating the same thing but the partnership here gives the ability and relationship from MOIA to be analyzing and that sort of interaction with, with community groups and, and, and the advocacy community and at the same time HRA has the role of managing the legal service relationships and so we're getting multiple sources

2.2

of information and of course the groups that we contract with are on the ground, trusted organizations and so the, the process of... that, that goes into each federal change for example is information coming to MOIA, information coming to us from the providers, collaboration where, where we're both analyzing what the change means and there's an ability to respond in real time because there's already... we set up the relationship that's there before the crisis and I think that is helping us through a very difficult time for New Yorkers and for our providers and, and for all of us watching what's going on and responding to it rapidly.

the, the source of this question is really around understanding, understanding how, how nimble this is internally so that we can at the City Council figure out how, how the mechanism for gathering data and its really great to hear about the know your rights piece, how we can actually see that ourselves as well, so how are you tracking that so that we can get a report about, about this in real time as well. I think it benefits us when we think about budget priorities and we're going to soon be in the middle

$\Pi$
of the budget throes and I welcome our Finance Chair,
immigration committee member, past Immigration Chair,
Council Member Danny Dromm to this conversation and,
and, and really kind of think about this together
and, and so it's helpful for us to get that
information as well. So, I, I don't know how you can
prepare that and, and share that with us, we'll
probably put that in a letter requesting some of that
and, and how what data you're getting so you can we
can we can learn together about that. We have our
ways of doing that through our district offices of
course but, but more data gives you a better picture
and sharing that would be would be good. I'm
specifically wondering if you have track changes in
case outcomes or the length of case over time using
the EOIR data, is that something that you've used
before and have been able to analyze?
BITTA MOSTOFI: You mean the track data?
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: The track data.
BITTA MOSTOFI: She's shaking her head
[cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Well there's data that we... the EOIR data using... so we're trying to

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 figure out if, if, if you've seen a, a change in case 2 length of time... [cross-talk] 3 BITTA MOSTOFI: Uh-huh... [cross-talk] 4 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...using the EOIR 5 data, I think that's the question. 6 7 BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah, so I think it is the track data that you're referring to, which is the 8 EOIR data but I... but... [cross-talk] 9 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Is it just like 10 we're, we're just on... we're not saying the same... are... 11 12 is there a data... 13 BITTA MOSTOFI: I just want to make sure 14 we're speaking my language... the same language. 15 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yeah, me too. 16 [off mic dialogue] 17 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, so it might 18 be the same data... 19 BITTA MOSTOFI: Okay... 20 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: How bout you give us the data and then... [cross-talk] 21 2.2 BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure... [cross-talk] 23 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...we'll, we'll 24 confirm... [cross-talk]

2	BITTA MOSTOFI: Okay, that sounds good.
3	So, I think as, as you're aware EOIR is not super,
4	super forthcoming with all of their data so what ends
5	up happening is track, which is I believe based in
6	Syracuse requests all of this data and then they
7	publish it. So, back to your question in terms of
8	what we're seeing in terms of backlogs, is that what
9	you indicated?
10	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And backlog and
11	also just the case the length of time for case
12	BITTA MOSTOFI: For per case [cross-
13	talk]
14	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:in real time as
15	we move from Obama into… [cross-talk]
16	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah [cross-talk]
17	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:Trump.
18	BITTA MOSTOFI: So, I think it's hard for
19	us to speak to that quite yet, I think largely our
20	understanding of what that looks like is based on the
21	increase in cases that are backlogged and what we're
22	hearing from providers in terms of cases being
23	scheduled out two years plus for their merits
24	hearings and so… and even a delay for continuation.

We've separately engaged in conversation with the new

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
2	acting Chief Judge of the Immigration Court on this
3	question to understand what they're seeing and to see
4	what their plans are to address this issue. They have
5	plans as they've stated to us to expand the number of
6	judges in both the non-detained and the detained
7	courts and we have asked to remain in continued
8	conversations to understand what those changes will
9	look like and obviously to work and share that with
10	providers so that there can be better coordination
11	and preparation for, for those changes.
12	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it. So, I'm
13	just going to read what my Council is telling me here
14	that the track uses EO EOIR data to do the analysis
15	[cross-talk]
16	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah [cross-talk]
17	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:so [cross-talk]
18	BITTA MOSTOFI: Okay [cross-talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:so, I think
20	we're, we're good [cross-talk]
21	BITTA MOSTOFI: Good, great [cross-talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:on that but I
23	guess what I want to actually what I want to do now
24	is, is hand it over to Council Member Dromm, he has a

specific question and then I'm going to have... I'm

going to continue with, with mine, Council Member
Dromm.

2.2

much. My question really is around language accessibility. I think I've asked this... asked this before but... [clears throat] excuse me, I have a bit of a cold and I had a vote before this which is why I'm late getting here but my understanding is that the largest number of deportation cases are among Asian Americans and particularly Chinese speakers and I'm wondering if there's any demographics or statistics on what types of services are being provided to those communities in particular because that's really important in terms of preventing those deportations.

BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah, thank you so much for that question, I want to see if we have some break downs, I think we do that we can share with you and I'll start while searching for that by quickly stating that we recognize through our first sort of run, running things with ActionNYC that even though that was an area where we were seeking to increase services in underserved communities our first... the first grantees, there were still gaps, right, we were

seeing real strong gaps in underserved communities
include, including the Asian community both Chinese,
Korean services, south Asian services so we issued a
new RF, RFP process to directly get at some of those
concerns, I'm happy to say that through thank you,
through that through that we were able to provide
do grants to community based organizations that are
particularly focused on serving some of the
populations that you described so that includes Chia
CHI, SEDC, COPO, the Chinese Planning Council and
Korean services center so that is new for this fiscal
year and I think I think directly goes to what we
also had seen and observed and, and your question I
think in terms of break downs about the top five
languages spoken as kind of a control in, in speaking
to this question in our fiscal '17 IOI NCSBG cases
about four percent were of Chinese dialect so
Cantonese, Mandarin, Fozu and, and others. So, we
agree underserved are just part of why we did that
grant funding.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Excuse me, so with the... with the grant and the RFP that went out that's currently in the works now?

BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah, so... [cross-talk]

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 2 COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And we don't have 3 numbers on how successful that's been yet? 4 BITTA MOSTOFI: Not yet, this is... [cross-5 talk] COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: When will that... 6 7 [cross-talk] BITTA MOSTOFI: ...the first year... [cross-8 9 talkl 10 COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: ...come back? 11 BITTA MOSTOFI: So, this is the first 12 year for that programming, we, we definitely modeled 13 it recognizing that the need was in smaller 14 organizations, so the model is for slightly lower 15 cases, caseloads but targeted for those populations 16 so we'll have something soon to speak from on, on 17 what we project will be the cases for those... for 18 those grounds. COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And Commissioner 19 20 how are we making folks in the Asian communities in 21 particular aware of the services and the programs that are available? 2.2 23 BITTA MOSTOFI: A couple of different

ways. So, that, that grant funding and the program as

a whole also included money for outreach in the know

24

your rights forums so those service providers are
able to use a community based navigator to boot both
do intake but also outreach and engagement and they
do use that, they go to ESL classes that the
providers might be doing, they do off sight events
and, and so on and so forth to engage their
population. Additionally, one of the things that we
aim to do as MOIA is increase access to information
through community and ethnic media, we, we did so in
response to the robocalls that we heard were going
out, meeting directly with different community media
outlets, actually producing a one pager about what
was happening and how they could access free and
confidential legal services that was published in, in
papers directly Chinese paper outlets and we do also
through the know your rights programming so in this
recent initiative for the next several months one of
the providers is AAMF who will focus primarily on the
Asian community.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Okay, so by... when did you say it was going to be done, finished, you'll have an update on it?

BITTA MOSTOFI: We can get you an update on where we are, but this is the first full fiscal year.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Okay, because when we go into the budget season, I would really like to know what those numbers are.

BITTA MOSTOFI: Okay...

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Okay. Alright, thank you.

BITTA MOSTOFI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Agreed and, and we'll work together on that. Alright, Council Member Dromm. And so I, I want to start kind of big and ask both of you as Commissioners and, and the team effort that you're putting into this larger question about legal representation and, and if you've identified any specific gaps in city funded services related to ensuring legal serve, services, legal representation and immigration court, have you identified that gap, I'd like kind of your... both of your perspectives on that?

BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure, so I can start and largely I think as you heard through our testimony a lot of what we've done in the last two years is set

the set this sort of larger landscape or spectrum of
how people can kind of start and enter into getting
immigration legal services in the city and how these
different programs are speaking to one another
through the work that we do. I think we've heard from
providers as we've started to make decisions around
the increased funding on what the needs are, we had
really hoped and targeted a lot of that funding
resource to be around removal defense and deportation
defense. We that is the reality but we also heard
from providers that given the moment in time we're in
with the sort of complexity of the federal
immigration legal landscape with the end of TPS, with
the end of DOCA, thankfully not on both fronts
exactly yet and Muslim ban and so forth that there
was a need to, to maintain more flexibility in other
kinds of cases at this time and not to, to solely
focus on deportation defense so we were responsive to
that and it makes perfect sense in, in the way that
we structured the funding stream which, which
Commissioner Banks can speak to. We also know that
this is a lot of new resources infused in the
community and a lot of organizations are hiring so I
think it will time a little bit of time will tell in

terms of kind of where remains big gaps and what that looks like.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And Commissioner before you go... Commissioner Banks before you go, Commissioner Mostofi I just want to get a sense from, from you... because you're right, the, the testimony really kind of gave the work that's done up and to this point and it sounds like what you're saying is that the gap here really is, is one, allowing for the, the services to kind of mature in some ways both through hiring, there's a lot of infusion of money into the services world, the legal services world and we're... you're still kind of waiting to kind of see how, how its going but I didn't hear necessarily that there was a... there's a real gap of, of need, is that... I just want to... is there... do we have a gap in need from your perspective and I guess that's the question, is there a gap in need?

BITTA MOSTOFI: I mean if, if the question is are there people who don't have representation who are immigrants in the city, I think the answer is yes, right going... [cross-talk]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right, so and so
3	how are you defining that [cross-talk]
4	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yes [cross-talk]
5	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: How are you
6	defining that need?
7	BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure, so… [cross-talk]
8	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: For those this
9	immigrant, immigrant community members who aren't
10	getting legal services… [cross-talk]
11	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yes [cross-talk]
12	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:today?
13	BITTA MOSTOFI: So, in terms of in terms
14	of the removal defense context, you know I think as
15	I said some of that is, is fluctuating and hard to
16	know because of the backlog in other things but
17	estimates could be anywhere close to 10,000 New York
18	City residents who are in removal proceedings who
19	might be unrepresented at this time. I think that the
20	broader question that you're asking in representation
21	generally I think that's something that through the
22	work that we're doing particularly in the outreach
23	space and in the work that we're doing with agencies
24	just to be in locations we are, you know being

responsive where we see that there's a need, we're

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

trying to triage and be smart about that, I think it's hard to pin point like a particular area at this time. We felt good in the last several months at the capacity to make appointments for people who are calling through ActionNYC that's something we're closely monitoring to see what the needs are there.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you.

STEVEN BANKS: So, I, I think there's a, a couple of I think pieces of information that I want to provide you with in answer to your question but I also want to emphasize something that you said and Commission Mostofi said and I said too, we're in an ever changing environment and there are things the legal services providers are responding to today that none of us could have imagined two years ago so to me that's why the work that frankly we did together Commissioner, Commissioner and myself MOIA and, and HRA, Jordan Dressler the Civil Justice Coordinator and the US Chair that we did several years ago to actually create a way to respond, it ... you know it seemed very bureaucratic at the time when you talk about building an, an infrastructure but I do and I, I think it merits putting on the record because we worked together on that with the Council, I, I do

remember, you know when I ran legal aid every time
there'd be a new problem there'd have to be a new RFP
and a and a new procurement process and that meant
delay and delay responding to need so when
you use the word gap I keep thinking to myself are we
able to respond to emerging need quickly, that's an
important indicia of, of responsiveness of the
infrastructure we put together so creating those IOI
contracts two years ago or so that were consortia
based both large organizations and community based
organizations that part of the approach there was to
say let's create an ability to respond without having
to issue a new RFP every time something new happened.
The number of new things that have happened since
January 2017 were certainly not anticipated in 2016
when we began this route down this path with you but
I think we're all in good stead in terms of
addressing gap that way, the ability to respond
quickly because second and, and the issue with
respect to, to any question about a gap between need
and, and, and availability of service is capacity and
you know as, as you know and, and you were, were very
supportive of this and helpful actually, all members
of, of the council were, the issue about implementing

greater access in housing court cases. We found we
had pilot we had put pilots in place, we found what
the issues were but it wastn just a question of
money, it's a question of building capacity, we have
terrific legal services providers on the ground and
so I don't mean building their capacity to serve but
building the capacity to absorb and expand and have
and have the same trusteed quality assurance that the
legal services communities had historically;
supervision, training, oversight, that's how clients
can be assured when they come to a legal services
provider they get something that meets their needs to
go back to that word, that if they go to somebody
who's going to file some application and charge them
money for something that they weren't even eligible
for. So, another important piece of analyzing need
versus available services is the that capacity
building function and I think what we've seen as we
expanded the funding in this dramatic expansion over
the last several years is the need to make sure we're
respectful and working collaboratively with the legal
services providers so that the capacity can expand.
Lastly, I just want to highlight the council had the
foresight to require us to have an annual report.

it's due in March and we will certainly be considering based upon available information what we're seeing on the ground but I want to caution us all that part of how we think about planning and, and MOIA and, and HRA is space within the capacity to respond to new things that we haven't even projected might occur and that's a really important part of capacity, not just saying well how many people are seeking your services today and how many can you serve, we think it's important to continue to build in that responsiveness which has really characterized these last two years or so in the community being very responsive to things that the council and we have identified as the most imergent issue of the day. So, it's... there are multiple levels in, in looking at this need question, I think.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And I guess my,
my, my immediate question is trying to anticipate
that nature of need that might not be present today
but will be, all you have to do is look at the last
two years, how much of that unknown will prevent us
from moving forward and will it even have an impact
in allowing us to move forward?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

STEVEN BANKS: Yeah, there, there again I think you really have to look at that second part of defining a, a gap or a need is building capacity to absorb increased funding and to expand services and I think one of the things that we're very much engaged in with the providers now is believe it or not the three years of the contracting process have, have gone past us and now we're in a renewal, all those baseline contracts are registered and so it's a question of working with already existing registered contracts becsuae of the things that you and we did together a couple of year ago to build this delivery system and we're very much engaged in those conversations with the providers now in terms of what they're seeing on the ground and, and, and what the capacity is to respond.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And we're going to hear from some of the service providers too later which is... which is good and I guess maybe it's an opportunity to go into the IOI questions that, that we have really with... in, in some ways you're kind of giving us that update that, that you're kind of moving through it, you're working with the legal service providers to understand capacity, is, is

there... is there a way that you can give us a breakdown of the 19.6 million and categorically kind of give us a sense about how the IOI is being spent.

STEVEN BANKS: So, let me... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Through, through

IOI?

2.2

maybe try to give you a, a top line of it and then we can proceed from there. So, in, in looking at the... I guess I'm going to define it as the HRA administered programs so IOI, CSBG, not ActionNYC, we saw in '17 that approximately 6,250 cases were handled, we saw in '18 8,000 cases were handled and we're projecting in '19 again looking at IOI and CS, CSBG only we're projecting approximately 11,000 cases being handled so you can see... and the same way we saw in the housing area... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Uh-huh... [cross-talk]

STEVEN BANKS: ...our investments and, and working together with providers there's... there is a significant increase in the capacity of the providers and then ultimately the actual services that New Yorkers are getting. I also want to lay out a little

bit again sort of more of a, a top line level about
sort of the, the breakdown if you will of the
services. About ten percent of the 16-million-dollar
number, you know that was really the increase but ten
perdcent of that is specifically budgeted for case
management and social work outreach and
administrative costs and I know this was something in
our prior I thought very productive conversations you
had wanted us to focus on. I also want to you know
sometimes I used to feel this way when I ran a legal
service program but sometimes there's a lot of focus
on cases instead of case load and I think what we're
trying to contract for is a case load as opposed to a
certain, you know mechanistic view of, of cases, why
do we say that because these are terrific providers
and for example you might invest in removal defense
but they're also going to need to do an asylum case
because the defense of the of the removal is only
part of what needs to happen so we're looking at it
as a holistic case load of what needs to get done to
deliver the services and so I think we're projecting
in FY '19 about 32 percent of the case load and I
want to be careful with that term, 32 percent of the
case load is going to be removal defense and the

$\mathbf{I}$
other 68 percent are going to be both straightforward
and complex applications to obtain status, to obtain
or maintain a status so like asylum, SIJS cases, DACA
but again this, this is operating very much the way
when we first had some of those conversations about
the interplay between complex cases and other cases
and I think you can see a lot of what you were, were
asking us to do reflected in, in the way we're trying
to approach this, you know having said that again if
FY for FY '20 we're very much engaged in
conversation with providers about the next iteration
of this going forward.
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: When, when is the
next contract renewal, renewal for IOI?
STEVEN BANKS: It is for effective July
one '19 to FY '20, begging of FY '20.
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: July one July so
that… [cross-talk]
STEVEN BANKS: July, July one of, of
calendar year 2019 but it's in FY '20 budget… [cross-

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: FY '20, got it so the, the, the renewal will happen in July?

talk]

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION			
2	STEVEN BANKS: Yeah, the but the, the			
3	negotiations… [cross-talk]			
4	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Are happening now			
5	STEVEN BANKS: Are happening now			
6	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it.			
7	STEVEN BANKS: And again [cross-talk]			
8	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: So, when, when			
9	does that end, when are when do the negotiations en			
10	for that?			
11	STEVEN BANKS: So, here's, here's the,			
12	the sort of complexity of negotiations			
13	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Uh-huh			
14	STEVEN BANKS: At some point if you say			
15	well this is it, take it or leave it you don't get as			
16	good a result if you keep having the iteration back			
17	and forth or back and forth, if you keep having the			
18	back and forth then you have why did it take you so			
19	long but I actually think the back and forth is a			
20	valuable exercise in and of itself.			
21	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it, I think I			
22	got it. On the… on the point that you made about the,			
23	the flexibility is [cross-talk]			

STEVEN BANKS: Uh-huh... [cross-talk]

2	CHAIRPERSON	MENCHACA:	the

2.2

administration considering change in the policy of the contracting with the groups, you talked about case loads so is this one of those conversations about the back and forth of... and you, you described the issue here with case load versus the kind of case specificity but are you thinking about reconfiguring that for the next contract for IOI and I, I think... I think you kind of said it, but I just want to kind of hear some clarity around, around how, how we build in the name of flexibility and ability for, for one case to bring five others and be able to kind of move forward.

STEVEN BANKS: I think that's part of the, the very good conversation that's going on, look in the immigration area… [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: So, you're open... that's, that's something that people are... and your administration are open to discussing?

STEVEN BANKS: I think we're certainly
having a productive engagement, I guess I would put
it that way but I, I think for context, you know when
we do a housing legal services contract kind of
representation, the trajectory of the case, there

2.2

are... you know nothing... no two cases are necessarily going to go the same route when you... when you look at them to begin with but there's some parameters of how they're going to proceed. In this area with these changes, with the... with the emergent issues that are rising a case could be very active this year and in a dormant state next year and then active three years from now, this is what the challenge is, is for the providers and for us to come up with a framework to deal with this... with this complexity because its not only the complexity of what the Trump Administration is trying to do to our clients, it's the complexity of the ability of the providers to manage through it with all of these different factors going on.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Any... and I... we, we need to understand it on our side as well, one just for the budget piece and really pushing for budget but also joining you in thought around how we construct these, these contracts as we think about our, our constituents and the legal service providers as well so thank you for sharing that. I think one of the other things that comes up a lot in discussions with legal service providers are supervising attorneys and whether or not... how do... how do they

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

become part of the discussion not just in negotiations but the system itself, the nimbleness of the system, the responsiveness of the system?

STEVEN BANKS: And look, I think... I was a supervisor in legal services, I think... a line supervisor at one point, I think that supervisors are an important part of the service delivery, I know that, you know our, our criminal... our civil justice coordinator, Jordan Dressler is carrying on those negotiations, I think he knows how I feel which is important to have supervisors be an active part of the delivery system, I think, you know from our prior conversations I always had some cases that I handled, the case load so I think all this is part of a conversation about the best way to, to take the resources we've got, the needs of the providers and the needs of the clients and come out with an appropriate, you know way of proceeding forward for the next year.

BITTA MOSTOFI: I'll, I'll just add to that by saying a couple of things, so, I think Steve, you know aptly noted that part of it is, you know your... you as a provider are thinking about what it takes for your operation to, to deliver on this

deliverable and we hope that that takes into
consideration the importance of supervision and all
of those things. I think separately and this builds
on the capacity question to one of the reasons that
we structed ActionNYC the way that we did is because
of this, this need to support newer providers,
smaller base smaller community based providers and
being able to build their capacity to do this work
and you can't do that without supervision so the, the
whole program is structured so that there's a
partnership between the community based providers and
the legal services organizations that brings in the
supervision and so that is specifically delineated in
that way for that program because it seeks to address
I think the question that you're asking which is how
are you ensuring that you have kind of different
kinds of providers able to do this work and that
supervision is at the heart of their ability to do
it.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right and I think it's important for everyone to know who is trying to follow this really technical conversation, ActionNYC is not part of IOI.

BITTA MOSTOFI: Right...

able to kind of maneuver through a different program, smaller program through supervising attorneys that have shown some good responses and now the question is how do you put it into this larger contract, negotiate with a lot more and different providers mostly I think, some, some overlap but, but how... and how... and how do we keep moving that forward for a better... a better program and you're saying ActionNYC has actually shown and proven the value of additional supervising attorneys, is that what I... [cross-talk]

BITTA MOSTOFI: As a way to... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...heard?

BITTA MOSTOFI: As a way to build capacity in smaller organizations and I think that is a question that's probably different depending on the organization that you're talking to, you know if you're talking about some of the larger providers who do this work kind of day in and day out and it's their bread and butter and are doing the complex and revomal defense work that, that fall within the IOI contracting there might be a different calculus on, on what matters in the way that you're structuring

2.2

your contract and I think that's part of our ongoing conversation.

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

STEVEN BANKS: But... and just again for context take for example, you know the IOI... the IOI program as a series of, you know several consortia in addition to some citywide providers. So, take the Urban Justice Center consortia for example, like within... under the Urban Justice umbrella you've got African community together, Catholic Charities Community Services, Catholic Migration Services, Chinese Staff and Workers Association, Desis Rising up and Moving, Make the Road, Min Quan Center, National Mobilization Against Sweat Shops, new immigrant community empowerment, Workers Justice Project so you've got a... you've got both sort of are strands of work here that are connected that ActionNYC with very much on the ground organizations plus the legal overlay and then within IOI you have a similar approach so we're, we're trying to get at trusted, respected, expert legal providers in, in, in collaboration with on the ground respected community based organizations.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And final question on this... but I think it's important the, the whole

conversation about supervising attorneys, do the contracts today prohibit organizations from hiring additional supervisory attorneys?

STEVEN BANKS: I think that's part of the budget negotiations, we're looking for... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: That's for the next contract but... I guess I'm talking about these current... [cross-talk]

fair to say... I, I want to be fair for answering the question to make sure that I'm being fair to both what we're trying to accomplish and what the providers are interested in accomplishing, its part of a budget negotiation whether its our current budget for any particular provider's contract or next year looking at awht we're... what we're trying to procur as the case load from a particular provider which ultimately is individual New Yorkers getting help that's what the... I referred to before is we think it's important to keep going back and forth rather than saying here's what it is eventually you do get to, hey we're at the end but I think it's an important to enter a process.

2.2

2	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, well, I
3	think… I think you know what, what I'm pushing anyway
4	is, is a real look at, at an ecosystem that is
5	healthy and I'm hearing additional as per ActionNYC
6	kind of showing us the model, the ability and the
7	flexibility for that. You mentioned the four both of
8	you mentioned the 4.1 million dollars allocated for
9	legal assistance for migrant children back in
10	September
11	STEVEN BANKS: I just need to reply to a
12	text message.
13	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay.
14	BITTA MOSTOFI: I can start, yeah.
15	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Well, Commissioner
16	Mostofi if you can start… [cross-talk]
17	BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure… [cross-talk]
18	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:the breakdown
19	that we understand is the… there's 3.2 million for
20	legal services and then the 907,500 for case
21	management services, is this allocation only for FY
22	'19, is this like a one time shot for, for this
23	community specifically the migrant children community
24	and, and then I guess the, the, the kind of other

question is what was this money doing back in FY '18 and did that change?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure, so this money was part of the, the expansion of money, the 16 or so million that we were speaking with providers about and, and having the back and forth about what capacity there was to take how many cases. As we had sort of ended that back and forth... initial back and forth and allocated the funding but the providers had indicted they would be able to take there remained some additional funding for this fiscal year and in the aftermath of the family separation crisis based on the structure created by the council over the ICARE program and the providers really coming together and assessing what the increased need for unaccompanied children were and separated families in the city, they came to us and indicated that in order for them to meet the need they could increase their capacity and indicated to us what that would entail so we were able to allocate the remainder of those funds so they're part of the IOI administration so similar to the, the newer conversations about those contracts we'll engage those but it's baselined funding.

2	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Baseline funding
3	recommitted in a prupose with a specific focus?
4	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And, and it it
6	was because you had extra funding coming into the new
7	Year, money that was not [cross-talk]
8	BITTA MOSTOFI: We had unallocated
9	funding from the conversations we'd been having
10	around capacity from the providers.
11	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it, this is a
12	really important piece… [cross-talk]
13	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah [cross-talk]
14	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:so we're, we're
15	saying what, what you're saying is the bud the
16	budget is X and the need that was presented was Y and
17	there was a there was a, a kind of unallocated need
18	that the providers… after talking to, to providers
19	left you a gap of extra money and this extra money
20	in, in coordination with what we were seeing at the
21	separate for the border allowed you to reprogram that
22	money because there was a gap or there was a not a
23	gap a… [cross-talk]

BITTA MOSTOFI: Unallocated... [cross-talk]

BITTA MOSTOFI: ...sum, yeah, that's right.

2		CHAIRPERSON	MENCHACA:	excess	[cross-
3	talkl				

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: So, that's, that's really interesting in this conversation about need because how, how does that happen and, and we're going to get to a point where we're going to define soon what the gap is because I'm assuming, I think we're assuming, I asked you earlier, we're all assuming that, that there are 10,000 New Yorkers who do not have... that are... that go unrepresented in the city so how, how does... how does that happen?

STEVEN BANKS: Again, I'm sorry that I had to turn away to do something that was urgent. It, it really is like that question of capacity that I talked about before which is the mere fact of making the dollars available doesn't mean that the capacity to provide the services are available. We are... the capacity is there now to make use of all the dollars but the... that period of time where tehre was a lag between capacity to deliver the services and now gave us the benefit of having these extra... these additional dollars to respond to yet another emerging problem.

2.2

BITTA MOSTOFI: And I think, you know credit goes to providers for sort of coming together to figure out how they could take an increased case load in an urgent time for unaccompanied children and you know coming to us with ideas and proposals on how they would do that. So, I think they were also responding to the moment and sort of figuring out how to expand their ability to do that work in a sensitive crisis.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And, and I think we're, we're all thankful that we had that ability to do it... [cross-talk]

BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah... [cross-talk]

Question is really trying to understand how, how real the situation is on capacity so I think what

Commissioner Banks was saying is we... which begs a question about the 16 point... what is it, four million for IOI, the... that number became a number because of a reason and that, that was a reason that... I think you have to go back a few years how we came up with that need, IOI and then now we're at a point where essentially we can't spend the money fast enough because it's difficult in our legal service provider

2.2

world and the ecosystem that's still trying to take this money leaving us with excess for a crisis moment and so I guess... I'm trying to figure out how, how we... how we get better at allocating funding or maybe this is a strategy, right, you just kind of like over, over budget and have flexibility but that's not the policy that we all agreed on and there was a 16.4 million that said this is the need, here's, here's the spend down and, and yet here we are.

challenge for both you and us is that we make decisions about how much money to allocate but at the end of the day the providers still have to be the ones implementing it and that's why I think this process of iteration and working through together is so important here that you're right, neither you, nor we or the providers would have wanted not to be able to provide services on day one but there, there is a reality of hiring and training and having people on board and able to provide these services and making sure that the quality is the quality that the organizations have, have traditionally provided.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And if that is the goal then I think we can align on that goal and then

make some decisions in this next budget those that
are directly connected to the contracting component
but also just the larger understanding of need as we
get towards some and I have some other questions
about, about that but [cross-talk]

STEVEN BANKS: Just, just to maybe close that up but I, I can show you in '19 and, and moving forward into '20 all... everything is aligned between dollars and, and capacity for the ability to not have that... not have the issue that arose with, with '18.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: So, it was a special moment, it was a... [cross-talk]

STEVEN BANKS: Yes... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...it was a, a fluke of the system and now you're, you're ramping up and you can kind of get more dollars out, you... I mean you gave us 6,000 dollars... 6,000 case, 8,000, 11,000 cases so the cases are going up which means that more dollars are getting out into the community... [crosstalk]

22 STEVEN BANKS: Yep... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...and, and I still...

I still... I guess I can't... I'm not the legal service

provider but I'm trying to understand it as the Chair

2.2

of this Committee how, how you can respond to a crisis with 4.1 million dollars when you can't spend it already but you're going back to the same service providers to address a very specific issue, how... so help me unpack that.

STEVEN BANKS: Yeah, this is honestly some... this is something that providers have done since they've been providers manage the complexity of the funding process and the ability to get, get staff on board and provide services to clients. So, I think its part of... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: So, this is just how, how it works.

STEVEN BANKS: Part of the benefit of actually having these contracts in place with, you know expert well regarded providers that they're able to manage many of these challenges so I mean its easier for them, doesn't mean its easy for, for, for responding at all but it, it means that it... the... having enough time to train... hire, train and make sure that people are ready to do cases is part of what they do best.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right, so my, my last questions are about ActionNYC, but I have a... I

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

have a more broad question for both of you. What is the administration's position on due process and the right to counsel for immigrants without the means to afford representation, we'll start there?

BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure, so, I think as, as you all know, and I noted in my testimony there is no right to counsel at the federal level for immigration... immigrants who are in removal proceedings or period. Our position broadly is that we, we believe that all individuals should be able to access a right to counsel and would advocate at the federal level that that be something that becomes a requirement piece of the, the federal administration's deportation policies. I think you, you are well aware as, as well as others in the room that the city and the Council have made a decision as to individuals who are public safety risks in the city who have been convicted of one of a, a series of violent or serious felonies for which the city would corporate with immigration enforcement and in so doing the Mayor announced that the use of city funding immigration legal services funding specifically would not go to those, those particular individuals for legal services. We believe very

2.2

everybody to get a universal screening and so have created such programs where individuals can get universal screening like ActionNYC, like NYIFUP that have no income barriers to them and so everybody can get those screenings and at a very minimum know what, what they might have the right to or how they might be able to proceed in getting access to counsel if we're unable to do so. So, I think that's the question you're asking so hopefully I responded it.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Commissioner Banks.

STEVEN BANKS: I, I don't have anything to add to Commissioner Mostofi's very comprehensive answer.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: I, I do... I want to make sure that we, we kind of clarify the, the policy that you spoke to or I'll, I'll step back and say the, the, the goal here is similar I think, universal representation for all immigrants so that anyone who needs a lawyer can get one in the city of New York and we do not have that at the federal policy and I... and I... and I agree with you that is far, far away in possibility but where that begins is here in the city

2	and, and so we do… we have been fighting on this for
3	a while now because it is not the policy of the City
4	Council that this carve out exist, it's not ti's not
5	what we want, it is what the Mayor wants and so
6	that's why it exists and so, so that's, that's
7	we're, we're at a crux there but we're at we're at a
8	bigger quesoitn here, what, what are we doing as a
9	city, where… what's our role as a city, what can we
10	do as a city, this is something that we can do, we
11	don't need the federal government to tell us its okay
12	to fund these cases and all cases and that's the
13	power of your response to Jazmine, that's our power
14	when, when we responded to the separation of families
15	and that's our duty, that's what we can do and I
16	think that's where we're going to be focused on
17	understanding what that gap is and getting there with
18	every ounce of power from our community
19	neighborhoods. So, I know we're in disagreement there
20	but… and I guess… I guess the next question would
21	have been understanding exceptions, other than the
22	carve out, the criminal carve out as we understand it
23	what other exceptions are you thinking of in terms
24	of, of almost getting to the universal
25	representation, are there any other things that we

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 2 should be aware of as we move into budget 3 negotiations that we should all know with service providers in the room who are also going to be part 4 of this ecosystem that we're trying to provide. 5 6 STEVEN BANKS: That was a... I apologize I 7 didn't realize there was a question posed. 8 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, well... [cross-talk] 9 10 STEVEN BANKS: I, I think that the ... [cross-talk] 11 12 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Do you... do you get 13 the question? 14 STEVEN BANKS: I Think I know... [cross-15 talk] 16 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay... 17 STEVEN BANKS: I, I... [cross-talk] 18 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: I think it's important. 19 20 STEVEN BANKS: No, I do too I just wasn't, wasn't quite tracking to your... to your 21 2.2 question. I don't think there's any thing new, I 23 think that always in legal services delivery you 24 think about income for example that's certainly been

how we've looked at legal services delivery in the

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

housing area in terms of income eligibility and the legal service providers themselves all have income eligibility of different sorts so that's certainly... it, it has been an issue and I think it will continue to be an issue.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, well again we're going to continue this debate, I think it's an important debate, I think we're aligned on so many other policy goals here and I think... I think what's important here is that our times are, are filled with crisis and our city has a, a moral obligation to respond to our community the backbone of our... of our... of our neighborhoods and our city and so when we think about giving immigrants just a screening and the understanding of their immigration need and not be able to provide them a lawyer because they might be part of a carve out of some sort. One carve out creates opportunities for other carve outs and so it's a slippery slope and I want to just make that very, very clear that universal representation is powerful because it's exactly what it is, it's everyone getting a lawyer if they cannot afford it and, and this is going to get even more and more intense as we get through the next two years and

potentioally the next six years and so how and we
got to prepare for that and I htikn that the, the,
the dismantling of our of our system and the new
land of immigration is different today and it's going
to have long lasting impacts, it's going to take a
while to reverse and so we're, we're not looking just
for screening we're looking for full representation,
we're not looking just for spending down X amount of
dollars, we're saying we're going to commit all the
dollars necessary and the mechanism that is nimble
and proactive not just reactive with our legal
service providers and help them be healthy and that's
everything that we've been doing already but if there
are very specific things that we're hearing from our,
our service providers and our members, city council
members that are doing the work on the ground in
their districts we're goling to present that and
we're going to we're going to confront that and
we're going to do that here because we have the power
to get to universal representation, we have that
power, we have that moral responsibility the question
is how we do that and it's going to be through the
will of the people and that's how we're going to do
that and let's do that together.

2.2

STEVEN BANKS: I'd just add to that,
we've had a lot of productive discussions with you
and with the Council as a whole that have gotten us
to the place we're at and I'm sure we'll continue to
have productive discussions.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Good and there are two very specific questions that are going to be important for us, have you done any assessment of the need for immigration legal services at other H and H sites speicifically H and H sites?

conversations with H and H about this in, in looking at sort of what the needs are and how we're meeting those needs with what our existing locations and, and existing services, certainly I think it's through this fiscal year there's increased funding through the Council so that creates a whole lot of taking that need where it exists, we also had funded a discreet long term care legal services funding in H and H so we're looking at what that continue need looks like as they've really done a tremendous job of exhausting folks who are in long term care so definitely something that we're looking at and evaluating with H and H.

2	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And then moving
3	over to schools, the ActionNYC held clinics in I
4	think over 33 DOE schools
5	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah
6	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: What do these
7	clinics, clinics consist of, is tehre a legal
8	component to the clinic if so, which group provides
9	the legal services at the clinics held at schools
10	right now?
11	BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure, so we slightly
12	restructured the schools programming this year and I
13	can report but so far it seems to be going even
14	better which is great in that we've focused outreach
15	to be really narrow on building out the school's
16	clinics and so we're seeing an increase in
17	participants in the schools. The outreach [cross-
18	talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Participants, like
20	just people coming to the schools for [cross-talk]
21	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah [cross-talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:legal [cros-
23	talk]
24	RITTA MOSTOFI: narents narents and

students.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay...

2.2

BITTA MOSTOFI: The providers who do the outreach engagement include Make the Road New York, Little Sisters of the Assumption, Atlas DIY and the providers who provide the legal services are Catholic Charities, they, they take every... almost every single case that comes from those clinics and if they're unable to are able to refer it to one of our other providers.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And does... how does MOIA identify the, the school?

BITTA MOSTOFI: So, part of that is a coordination between MOIA and the outreach providers so we work really closely with DOE, we look at schools where there are large foreign born populations and work directly with the principals and administrartive staff at the schools to assess and try to undersstant what the needs would be to provide the clinics and also the outreach community organizers many of whom have their own independent relationships with schools will, will make recommendations so its kind of a shared coordination process between MOIA and the providers in deciding where we should be and working with DOE to make sure

we have a, a larger kind of understanding of what the need throughout the city is.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you for that, I think it's, it's really important to understand how the, the kind of tentacles of access points... [cross-talk]

BITTA MOSTOFI: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...are decided and, and, and I think those offer new touch points for need and understanding need and how that need changes and, and really if we're going to get to universal representation these are... these are critical access points, we know that our immigrant families have trusted partners and that changes family to family and so this is... this is really critical; hospitals, schools, organizations, their adult literacy class whatever that is, they should be able to connect and what I'll say... I think that's it for questions unless... no. I'll say that the responsibility isn't just on the city, this responsibility is also on the state and we have leadership that's coming into the state and I hope that this becomes an agenda item for all of you, for you and definitely for us as we advocate for not just funding but structurally

changing the laws to ask for new ititiatives that can
allow for the empowerment of our immigrant brothers
and sisters, our families in our in our communities
and that's going to require real leadership and
connection and conversation and coalition building
and I think I think we have more, more than any
other city probably in the state, a model that we can
take to the state as well to, to support us because I
think we do more than the state does period. And, and
so there's that's a lot that's a lot of pride there
but we need to do more.

BITTA MOSTOFI: I'll just add one thing on that note in particular is we're often outreached to from other cities and localities in counties throughout the state to provide technical assistance and best practice which is something we readily provide and something we're... we will continue to do as is helpful.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Great and it'd be great to report back to us to kind of see what, what's, what's happening there... [cross-talk]

BITTA MOSTOFI: Sure... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...as a partner...

25 [cross-talk]

2.2

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
2	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yep [cross-talk]
3	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:who you're
4	talking to, how, how [cross-talk]
5	BITTA MOSTOFI: Uh-huh [cross-talk]
6	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:things are being
7	implemented in other cities [cross-talk]
8	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yep [cross-talk]
9	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:thank you both
LO	[cross-talk]
L1	BITTA MOSTOFI: Thank you [cross-talk]
L2	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Happy holidays
L3	[cross-talk]
L4	BITTA MOSTOFI: Likewise [cross-talk]
L5	STEVEN BANKS: You too, thank you
L6	[cross-talk]
L7	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:happy new year
L8	[cross-talk]
L9	BITTA MOSTOFI: Hope you get a break
20	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: If I can say that,
21	yes and I hope are you leaving staff as well from
22	HRA and [cross-talk]
23	BITTA MOSTOFI: Yes [cross-talk]
2.4	STEVEN BANKS: Yes[cross-talk]

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, great, so
I'll, I'll, I'll ask you to identify yourselves a
little bit later, thank you. Thank you both. And
thank you for all of you who are staying to testify,
thank you so much and I hope this was as productive
for you as it was for us. We're moving to our next
panel; Amy Taylor, Make the Road come on up please;
Rich Leimsider from the Safe Passage Project; Andrea
Saenz from the Brooklyn Defender Services; Sarah Deri
Oshiro, the Bronx Defenders and then Terry Lawson
from the Brooks the Bronx Legal Services in Legal
Services of New York City. Thank you, Amy do you want
to start? Make sure that the, the, the light is red

AMY TAYLOR: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Amy Taylor, I am Co-Legal Director of Make the Road New York. Thank you to Committee Chair Menchaca and to the Committee on Immigration for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of Make the Road New York and our 24,000 members. First off, we than the City Council for supporting increased funding for immigrant legal services which has begun to address the vast unmet need for immigrant legal representation in New York City. City funding has greatly increased the capacity of organizations like

ours to represent immigrant clients and the city's
commitment has sent a powerful signal of standing by
the immigrant community in funding access to counsel.
However, despite the increase in funding for these
services over the past few years, we still turn away
individuals seeking legal services every day. Make
the Road is here today to support a bold
recommendation to create a program in New York City
to guarantee universal representation for all
immigrants in removal proceedings. New York City's
NYIFUP program is a nationally recognized successful
model for universal representation for detained
immigrants. Today we propose that this model be
expanded to non-detained individuals. The communities
we represent are under greater attack than ever
before. Our federal government is increasingly
hostile to immigrants of all backgrounds, even those
who are the most vulnerable and the most and the
most in need. The Trump Administration is working to
end DACA, TPS, asylum and is waging a piecemeal war
to slowly tear apart our nation's immigration system
and deport as many of our neighbors as possible. It
is New York City's responsibility to be a model city

initiatives that protect immigrants. A universal
representation program for individuals in removal
proceedings would vastly increase their likelihood of
success in proceedings that are harder to win and
more resource intensive every day. Without access to
counsel, immigrants are forced to either represent
themselves against trained government attorneys in
one of the most complex areas of law or spend money
many do not have to hire a private attorney. We urge
the Council to take this step in the face of
unprecedented attacks from Washington. This new
program will set the stage for replication across the
country to fight back against the assaults on
immigrant communities happening everywhere. Absent
universal representation, what we know as a fact is
that New Yorkers will continue to be deported not
because they lack a valid claim to status but solely
because they lack access to counsel. We also want to
highlight the need for support for community-based
emergency legal representation arising out of raids
response work that many community-based organizations
are engaged in. Every week community members come
through our doors to report a family member recently
detained by ICE. This emergency support includes

legal advice and counseling, time sensitive bond
hearings, preparation for reasonable fear interviews,
filing motions to reopen for people with prior orders
of deportation and habeas petitions in federal court
This is work that requires legal resources and
expertise on emergency timelines that most
organizations are unable to provide. We also support
continued and expanded funding for two initiatives,
I'll just quickly say NYIFUP obviously which is an
incredibly successful program and faces more
challenges than ever interfacing with EOIR and ICE
and the city's support and flexibility in order to
address each new challenge when fighting the
detention and deportation machine is more important
than ever and also the ICARE program. We fully
support the City Council's endeavor to provide
guaranteed representation for all unaccompanied
minors and I did also want to ask the City Council to
resume its fight to oppose the criminal carve out.
Thank you for your question just now. We feel that
limiting legal representation in this way stands in
conflict with everything that we stand for as a
community. We know you're on our side in this fight
and we really just want to reiterate that we know

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

that this will cause families to be separated and individual... you know people will lose breadwinners and parents and this is a huge priority for us and our membership. Thank you very much, sorry to go over time.

SARAH DERI OSHIRO: So, Andrea and I are here to talk about NYIFUP together, she's going start... [cross-talk]

I'm going to go first and... ANDREA SAENZ: okay, thank you. Good afternoon, I'm Andrea Saenz, I'm the Attorney in charge of the New York Immigrant Family Unity Project team at Brooklyn Defender Services. And since 2014 we've been proud to have the Council's support to work alongside the Legal Aid Society and the Bronx Defenders to represent over 3,000 detained immigrants who would have otherwise faced detention and deportation alone. Having done detention work since 2008, I can tell you that detained deportation defense has always been time intensive, complex, adversarial and draining. However, it's also incredibly rewarding and meaningful and under this administration it's also now more difficult than ever. I want to quickly touch on three aspects of how changes in court practice and

policy have affected our work and made immigration
court a more hostile place for immigrant New Yorkers
even a part of how many there cases there are. I'm
focusing on the detained docket because I know other
people will speak to what's happening at federal
plaza. First as you know, as of June I stopped
producing our clients in person to their own hearings
and forced them to beam in via video conference
causing serious due process issues, clients who can't
understand interpreters of their own hearings, make
eye contact with their own family members in the room
or speak confidentially to their attorneys until we
drive hours out to the jails. Second, the Department
of Justice is exerting unprecedented political and
job pressure on immigration judges to prioritize
speed and deportations over due process including
case completion quotas, instructions to rush parents
and children to final hearings with or without
counsel and warnings to issue fewer continuances. And
third, the attorney generals issued new case law at
an unprecedented rate certifying long standing cases
to himself and replacing them with anti-immigrant
decisions that strip judge's ability to close low
priority cases and narrow or destroy grounds for

asylum for people fleeing life threatening violence
that their governments will not protect them from.
And I regret to say that today's court victory
doesn't apply to immigration court or it doesn't yet,
so we're still fighting that fight. And in addition,
ICE counsel in New York do not exercise prosecutorial
discretions to close cases and on a daily basis
especially on the detained docket almost never agree
to release or grants of relief, in fact they
frequently appeal our victories of requiring us to
fully document and litigate nearly everything that we
do and work on frequent appeals and federal court
actions. All of these factors have made it harder and
more resource intensive to provide the services that
we now provide on the cases we already have and are
continuing to intake every day including today under
our contract and we look forward to speaking more
with you about how to continue to provide high
quality legal services to detained New Yorkers in the
face of these challenges. I know you're going to
continue to hear a lot of bad news today, so I also
wanted to take this time to say that my team at BDS
is tired but not defeated and we plan to stay in this

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 fight for the liberty and the humanity of immigrants 3 with your support. Thank you.

SARAH DERI OSHIRO: Hi, good afternoon, my name is Sarah Deri Oshiro and I'm the Managing Director of the Immigration Practice at the Bronx Defenders, so I oversee our NYIFUP program and our Padilla practice and I'd like to thank the Council for it's consistent and generous support of immigration legal services and as Andrea started to outline for the Committee we are faced with numerous different challenges right now to the delivery of legal services and again I'm also only going to be focusing on the issues we're seeing on the detained docket but in addition to the significant problems that have been caused by the refusal to produce our clients for in person hearings and the, the ways in which we're seeing no prosecutorial discretion in our cases and, and in... and in addition to the just ... you know every week it feels like there's a new terrible presidential decision from the attorney general that are limiting our client's ability to have due process under the law and seek the protections that they are entitled to we're also seeing the indiscriminate enforcement in terms of whose being arrested by ICE.

We're seeing as the Commissioner was testifying on
the previous panel, it a stark increase in the sheer
numbers of how many people are being arrested and
we're also seeing a spike in the numbers of people
who have no criminal record whatsoever being
arrested. Some of these are sometimes they're
referred to as collateral arrests but ICE might go to
one house looking for a particular person and pick up
other individuals as well and I think we can
confidently say that under the previous presidential
administration with a system of, of the priorities
for whom they were prosecuting for removal there we
could serve more safely say certain people were not
as, as subject… as, as vulnerable to be arrested and
put their proceedings and we can't say that anymore
and the other I think one other huge problem is the
spike in courthouse arrests that we're seeing in New
York City and outside of the city as well but, you
know in terms of what we're seeing here in New York
City this problem is it's, it's penalizing people
who are responsibly attending court hearings, this is
a problem for immigrant community members and their
families and it is exacerbating actually the court
backlog and the and the numbers of people who are in

detention because essentially what they're pitting
people's fear of deportation against somebody's
desire to exercise their rights within the criminal
justice system or any of the court systems and when
people end up in ICE custody with open criminal cases
the impact on those on those people and on the
process is it, it prolongs the amount of time the
case lasts because then those people don't go forward
with their deportation cases seeking bond or seeking
relief because they can't because the criminal case
is opened and you actually have instances where the
public defender and the and the district attorney
are working together to get their clients produced
back to the court to, to the jurisdiction in which
they have a criminal case to resolve that case and
ICE won't honor those writs of production. So, you
know that in addition to being a problem for the due
process rights of the person who has to go to court
or the witness or whatever it might be its also then
creating more problems for the immigration proceeding
to finish and particularly to finish favorably
because of the those open cases. So [cross-talk]
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Can I ask about

25 that one, one piece… [cross-talk]

SARAH	DERT	OSHTRO.	Yes	[cross-talk]
DUIVUII	דונים	ODITINO.	T C D	CIUSS CAIR

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...is, is that situation in which ICE will refuse to allow for the criminal... open criminal case to be resolved is that... is that essentially the final decision or is that... is that... can that be challenged by a district attorney, what happens when you get to that point?

instances in which you can have a resolution of a particular case through like a paper plea if your client is still in ICE custody and you... and you just cannot get ICE pick them up and bring them to that court hearing, that presumes that the client is willing to plead guilty to something for, for a paper plea but you know it's, it's, it's not easy and frankly, you know not everybody wants to plead guilty and, and shouldn't have to so I suppose theoretically there are court actions one could take in federal court maybe to seek the mandamus to compel ICE to produce that person but again that's, that's capacity that we just don't have right now because we're just flooded in the immigration courts alone.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And that's the point that I wanted to drive home is that that,

2.2

that's going to be the case over and over again more and more as people collateral and beyond are going to get picked up and you need a lawyer to be able to have the capacity to follow that case and be able to advocate through the multiple courts that they need to, to resolve all of the different pieces to get a good resolution, a final just resolution, whatever that might be through the courts period, without a lawyer you're, you're... [cross-talk]

can't do it without a lawyer and you know and in addition to the problem of, of courthouse arrests in particular yet another issue I think is like in the past two years we've... or our clients have lost the ability to seek Lara Bond hearings from the immigration court which just means that if somebody is subject to mandatory detention and not eligible for a bond if you want to even try to get a bond hearing you have to go into federal court and file a habeas corpus petition which at the volume that we're... we need to do that is... it's, it's just... it is a huge challenge and those cases take months to adjudicate, hours and hours of time, it takes a specialization that is... really needs to be keenly

developed in particular staff so that's another area

I think that we're under a lot of pressure with. And,
and... [cross-talk]

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you… [cross-talk]

SARAH DERI OSHIRO: ...and just you know thank you to the Council for supporting this program, we... as Andrea said we are... we are tired but we're not giving up.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you, thank you for that and, and just stay strong and NYIFUP is, is a jewel... is a jewel of a... of a... not just a program initiative but a life changing, game changing operation and that's not a council thing this is a community driven... community concept that had a lot of support so we're, we're happy to do that, thank you.

TERRY LAWSON: Good afternoon, my name is

Terry Lawson, I'm the Director of the Family and

Immigration Unit of Bronx Legal Services, the Bronx

Office of Legal Services NYC. I also Co-Lead the

Bronx Immigration Partnership which is a

collaboration of community organizations providing

legal and social services throughout the Bronx. Thank

you for the opportunity to testify. Legal Services
NYC is grateful for the vital immigration funding it
receives through the New York City's IOI, DoVE, CSBG
and in addition to the generous discretionary grants
that we receive from Council Members. Through these
programs and other funding, we provided legal
assistance in 5,485 immigration cases benefiting over
12,000 immigrants and their family members last year
and so far, this year we've opened over 1,200 case
cases new cases for over 1,200 new clients and are
currently representing 71 immigrant youth in removal.
City funding allows staff in our borough offices and
outreach sites to meet with hard to reach community
members, enabling them to come out of the shadows.
Allow me to illustrate the importance of City
Council City Council funding for immigration court
representation through the story of one Garifuna
woman I'll call Ana. Through the Bronx Immigration
Partnership, Bronx Legal Services works closely with
Garifuna Community Services and its leader Gregoria
Flores. As the Council knows and as you hear from a
young man today working with Safe Passage, there is a
large Garifuna population, with many recent Honduran
arrivals, in the Bronx. This summer Ana and her 16-

year-old daughter were connected with Garifuna
Community Services after they arrived from the
border. Gregoria reached out to Bronx Legal Services
for help reuniting Ana and her 19-year-old daughter
who was detained at the border. At, at an event this
fall with Council Member Salamanca, Gibson, Ayala,
Torres, and other Bronx delegation members, Ana spoke
in heartbreaking detail about the pain of being
separated from her 19-year-old daughter and their
efforts to reunite. With support from our social
worker, Ana, a Far Rockaway resident, was connected
with Queens Legal Services, our Queens office. In the
two weeks between Ana's impassioned speech and her
intake appointment with Queens Legal Services, her
19-year-old daughter was deported and in absentia
removal order was issued against her because the
immigration court didn't give her notice of her
hearing. A disturbing trend in an overloaded New York
immigration court is to label arrivals of parents
with children as FAMU and to require these families
to appear for their first master calendar hearing
within 30 days of being served with an NTA,
permitting only one continuance of 30 to 45 days to
find legal representation and requiring that their

merits hearing be completed within five to six
months. On top of this accelerated timeline, the
immigration court frequently changes court dates,
providing individuals and their counsel little to no
warning subjecting them to the very high risk of in
absentia removal orders. When our social worker
notified Queens Legal Services of the removal orders,
Queens Legal Services immigration director Cristina
Velez quickly filed a motion to reopen. That motion
was granted last month, and Queens Legal Services
will be representing Ana and her younger daughter in
immigration court on their asylum applications.
Without city funding, our representation of Ana and
her daughter and the hundreds of other immigrants we
stand with in immigration court would not be
possible. At the same time that we applaud the city
for the vital funding, we feel the pain of all that
we cannot do, wondering whether more funding could
have helped us to stop the deportation of Ana's older
daughter from in Texas. We ask the City Council to
continue to fund immigration court representation as
well as critical social work services for, for New
York's nonprofit community. we are stronger together,
and with the City Council's support, we will fill the

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

halls of New York's immigration court with talented, bright, fearless advocates and social workers who will do everything possible to protect immigrant New Yorkers, regardless of when they arrived. Thank you.

Thank you Chairman RICH LEIMSIDER: Menchaca and the other members of the Committee for convening this very important hearing today and thank you also for such a warm welcome for Axel earlier this afternoon. He was pretty excited, he was delighted on his way out so thank you for giving him that opportunity to tell a very important story. My name is Rich Leimsider, I'm the Executive Director of the Safe Passage Project and we're a nonprofit organization based here in New York that does only one thing, we provide free lawyers to refugee children who are being deported. Safe Passage was founded in 2013 with a halt time staff person, a small budget working alongside many of the organizations in this room in response to what was called the surge of unaccompanied minors arriving in New York and we will end 2018 with 28 staff working with more than 400 pro-bono attorneys, supported by a 2.4 million dollar budget and having the privilege of representing more than 800 children in removal

proceedings at New York's immigration court. Today I
want to talk about three things; one I want to give a
little bit more context and data and chime in with
the very able and thoughtful testimony you've already
heard. I want to share a little bit of good news
about what's been possible because of the support of
the Council and the city over the past few years and
I want to add my voice to the encouragement, thanks
for the support so far, encouragement to continue
that support and especially to chime in excitedly
about this conversation on universal representation
and how we can work together to move towards that
very important goal. So, data from the track program
at Syracuse, which has been referenced earlier today,
says that without an attorney unaccompanied minors at
New York's immigration court will win their case only
17 percent of the time and that's data that goes back
almost 15 years based on their monthly FOIAs. So,
they're unable to argue for the protections that they
actually qualify for and more than 80 percent of
children are issued removal orders. The federal
government is increasingly sophisticated in its
administrative and procedural obstacles to this work
and there's a whole alphabet soup that's going on

these days; RFEs, NOIDs, NOIRs, Request for Evidence,
Notice of Intent to Deny, Notice of Intent to Revoke
to status that's previously been granted. In one
recent example with a Passage Project we had been
pursuing relief for one of our clients based a law
that that offers protection for children who'd been
abandoned by their parents and in this case the
government rejected our the federal government
rejected our claim because the children's parents had
died and the government wanted to argue that that
didn't constitute abandonment. So, this is the sort
of administrative obstacle that we're now facing. We
are still generally winning most of these cases. When
we get to the end of the case, we often see a
positive outcome, but it takes longer than it ever
did before. And so, when the child does have an
attorney the statistics are exactly the opposite, we
see that 80 percent of children who do have an
attorney by their side will win their case. And I'll
just finish up by saying that, you know we know that
together we can do more, the support of the Council
for the ICARE program bringing together a coalition
of providers has made a tremendous difference, we
oncourage the the full support and full funding of

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

that program, we agree that the Council should continue to advocate to oppose the criminal carve out and we'd love to work together with the Council and the Administration to figure out how to make universal representation a reality. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Well there's really only one person that needs to get convinced and his, his name is Bill De Blasio and he happens to be the Mayor of this great city and, and so I think he's the only one that's really blocking this and so we'll, we'll figure out a way to create that pressure point and as we build that narrative I want to ask a little bit about how... and, and Rich maybe I'll start with you, you really make it clear that there's a mission to get to 2020 and have no child in NYC face deportation in immigration court and so how do we ... how do we get there, what's the plan for Safe Passage, what, what does that look like? We talked a lot about the mechanism of ... or the different kind of components of mechanism for universal representation, one of them is the actual apparatus itself, you all as providers and then there's the funding gap, clearly we saw a year where there wasn't enough spend down and there was money left over thank goodness but

2.2

help me understand as a team here one for, for Safe Passage, Passage 2020 and then for the whole... really for the whole panel what can we help you with in determining the things that are most critical to getting you there, capacity wise, funding wise, the contract, I know... I know we're engaging in open communication on a negotiation that's a back and forth, I get that, but we're partners, we're, we're, we're with... we're with you and, and in tandem with the city itself, we have the opportunity to advocate and so tell us what do we need to do?

RICH LEIMSIDER: I'll just very briefly say that the flexibility that many of my colleagues have spoken about is really important. I think we can continue to work together, we can build data models and we can talk about exactly how many immigrants we're, we're speaking of, Safe Passage is more able to talk to unaccompanied minors to children but who are not in detention, not in the detained setting but we can build that, that understanding but the flexibility to understand that each of the providers brings different strengths and different models. For example, some providers come with a direct representation model, all the clients are served by

2.2

staff attorneys, others work more broadly with probono's. There are different strengths that different
models can bring and it's, it's helpful when the city
can understand and appreciate that we may bring
different levels of... numbers of supervising
attorneys, different sort of approaches to how we do
the work but as long as we're getting the job done
together if there's that flexibility in that funding
we can get to those numbers a lot faster.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And the flexibility has changed for the better, question mark and I guess I want to get a sense about... let's just stick on that topic on flexibility and the contracts as they moved through time, we... and, and Commissioner Banks did reference a moment where there was real conversation and I remember those conversations where we wanted to build something that was both robust in the number of dollars but really thinking about flexibility and, and, and then there was conversations about staff or, or kind of pay rates and contracts or multiyear... so there was a lot of different pieces to it, so tell us a little bit about where we are on flexibility, where we need to go on flexibility?

2	AMY TAYLOR: I'll say a few words on
3	that. Specifically on IOI, I think you know IOI has
4	been absolutely critical, it's allowed many, many
5	organizations to vastly expand services for immigrant
6	New Yorkers and I think the administration has had
7	some increasing flexibility around some really
8	important pieces of that contract to allow us to
9	adjust to new challenges, address, you know new
10	patterns that we're seeing in immigration court. A
11	couple of things where there's been less flexibility
12	that I think are really critical one is the cap on
13	matters per participant so there you know they have
14	imposed a restriction on the number of cases quote,
15	unquote that each person can have and we heard, you
16	know in Commissioner Bank's testimony today he, he
17	you know I was delighted to hear that he understands
18	that someone in removal proceedings can have multiple
19	other cases at the same time. We also that contract
20	a lot of people forget that it also covers employment
21	cases so many of our organizations have a holistic
22	model where if someone comes in the door because they
23	may, you know be eligible for some form of
24	immigration relief which in itself could be two,
25	three, four, five cases and then they also have wage

theft and they're facing discrimination by their
employer and we can only enroll two of those cases on
that contract. So, that, that is crucial and we've
raised it more in contract negotiations as they
mentioned and we're talking about it but I mean I
think that's a huge priority for many of the
providers and then the other piece is we're doing a
lot of things these days all of us that we haven't
normally done because we're there are new things
happening, you know coming out of Washington so for
example, we are all doing a ton of habeas litigation
in federal court or we're bringing like massive
federal actions on behalf of our clients who are
facing newfangled fraud schemes and other types of
things. There's been very little flexibility to count
those cases on the IOI contract so for example, we
represent 33 New Yorkers who were defrauded by an
immigration attorney and have been placed in the
deportation pipeline and we have like a massive team
of attorneys on that case and it counts as one case
on IOI and we're you know it's like huge. So, that
type of flexibility has, has been difficult and then
on the on the contract itself like the mechanism, I
think one challenge in terms of capacity and this

2.2

came up earlier is that the, the money... the funding is a case rate funding so the more money you get the more cases you do and as we all expand our programs we need space, we need to hire supervisors, we need overhead, we need to buy a copier if we have five new lawyers, you know all these things there's nowhere to charge those expenses and so, you know I think really looking at what it takes to build capacity at organizations beyond how many more cases can we do for this funding is important.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Is there a cap to the, the supervisory attorneys?

AMY TAYLOR: There's not a... there's not a cap, it's just that you don't... the... all of the money comes with cases so if you want to hire a supervisor to supervise five attorneys, they're not going to be able to have a full caseload and so I think we all struggle with that.

TERRY LAWSON: Can I just add two things quickly on... while we're on IOI and then I'm sure there's more to be said about NYIFUP. Two quick things, we agree wholeheartedly about the stack in cap and its limitation on what we can report but also another piece of that is what we can reenroll each

2.2

year so there's a limitation on how many cases we can
reenroll each year and as the cases get longer and
longer, as the dockets get longer and longer and the
cases get put out two and three and four years for a
hearing we're still doing work on those cases but
when there starts to be limitations on what we can
reenroll when we our, our caseloads will just keep
getting larger but the what we can report and get
credit for gets smaller so that's a big issue for us
that will come up in, in contract negotiations. The
other thing sorry

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Be, before you go to the second thing, so how do we solve that?

TERRY LAWSON: I mean we... our position has been as providers that we should get paid for the work that we do regardless of... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Amen, yes... [cross-talk]

TERRY LAWSON: Regardless of some calculation that was created about what we... what we should be reporting, if we're doing the work no matter how many cases, we're doing for a client we're, we're putting in the hours and we should get paid for that. The same thing with supervision, so...

2.2

you know as we are supervising these cases, we should get paid for that and it shouldn't always be a per case rate. So, that... and that... I just... the last sort of thing, Amy alluded to this but in terms of putting in... something into the contract for space, you know trying to find the money for the rent and for paralegal support and social work support these are all things especially when we're representing more and more kids, if you don't have really a robust team of social workers it becomes really hard to work with children and to be able to get the information that you need to be successful in their cases.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And, and, and for organizations do you feel like you have a plan that you can propose that says as we grow there's a, a formula that says as, as the number of clients grows the space need will be X as we move... is that something that can be developed and if it can I'd like to have that as we move into negotiations for the budget and then... and I think that there's, there's... and I like categories, there's a category of kind of capital investment that's a onetime buy, I think the, the kind of maintenance, copiers is one thing... like... well actually I don't even know how

2.2

copiers are, are bought these days, maybe it's a lease, I don't know. I guess what I'm saying is, is there... is there something right now that can bring relief to you as you expand and then what's the... what's the kind of year to year need that we can build into the contract?

it hasn't been brought up yet but our fee waiver applications are all getting denied and so we're going to start... we're going to need a fund to help pay people... pay, pay people's fees to USCIS and these are huge fees and USCIS has just been denying our fee waiver applications left and right so if the council can help us with... develop a fund for that that would help us to, to pay those application fees.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it, yeah now those are the kind of things we need to, to hear and... that are, are barrier for, for representation.

SARAH DERI OSHIRO: So, I would echo what Amy and Terry had said and also just going back to the point about flexibility in the middle of a contract year, I would be remiss not to mention that like this minute as we speak this week NYIFUP is undergoing a huge crisis of how our clients or our

future clients are being calendared all of a sudden
at 26 Federal Plaza instead of at Varick Street, we
have, you know systems in place that are now five
years old of how each providers staff the Varick
Street courtrooms every week, we have systems, we
have staff ready to go who are there present. Today
is Wednesday today is to you know today there was
one NYIFUP client picked up at Varick and why is
that, everybody is currently at 26 Federal Plaza
essentially getting funneled through rocket dockets
that we are not staffing because we don't have the
capacity to just all of a sudden send eight attorneys
to 26 Federal Plaza when we have another eight
attorneys scheduled for Varick today. The immigration
court is telling us they just want people to have the
opportunity to go home for Christmas to have the
opportunity to have a bond hearing before Christmas,
nobody is having bond hearing, in fact we have pro-
bonos volunteering there as we speak asking those
judges at 26 Federal Plaza to please reset them over
for Varick Street intake days. So, I mean this is an
issue that's going to be ongoing as we see the
immigration court trying to address the backlog, it
is in fact valuable to address the backlog, Bronx

1

24

25

2	Defenders just sued about the delay in how long you
3	have to wait between when you're arrested by ICE and
4	when you first see an immigration judge but just
5	opening up courts from one day to the next with no
6	advance notice, no ability to have the providers
7	prepare accordingly so that we can get the money to
8	hire the people to staff these, these dockets that's
9	a… it's a problem of epic proportions and we need the
10	flexibility to have emergency infusions of cash into
11	our services in the middle of a contract year and
12	yeah
13	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Have you asked for
14	resources to address this problem from the
15	administration?
16	ANDREA SAENZ: So, this, this kind of
17	just happened so we'd love to follow up with you
18	about that ASAP… [cross-talk]
19	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, yes [cross-
20	talk]
21	ANDREA SAENZ: And so… [cross-talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: This is this is
23	incredibly concerning

ANDREA SAENZ: Yes, so we had learned literally weeks ago that EOIR is, you know nearing

completion on, on construction of new courtrooms at
the Varick Street building and that they're planning
to open those as of February and that at least two of
those courtrooms will be detained courtrooms so we
just learned that information and had just started to
talk within ourselves, we need to talk to the
administration, we need to talk to our city you know
our directors to figure out how, how many new cases
would that be, how many dollars would that be, how
many staff would that be so we're literally putting
that together now and then we had kind of this drama
this week which we think we're going to mostly
overcome through like sheer teamwork and volunteer
power but the bigger the bigger thing that's coming
down the road is that EOIR is about to increase the
detained docket and they're going to do that not on
July 1 <sup>st</sup> but in February and so, you know as you
know [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: When essentially, it's kind of happening now.

ANDREA SAENZ: Right but... [cross-talk]
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: So... and not...

24 [cross-talk]

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 2 ANDREA SAENZ: ...we, we think... [cross-3 talk 4 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...just... [cross-5 talk] ANDREA SAENZ: ...we think that what's 6 7 happening this week is not going to happen every week until February, we think, we're in communication with 8 them but we do... we do know that they are planning to 9 more permanently staff more judges on the detained 10 docket and... [cross-talk] 11 12 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And help clarify 13 the, the video conferencing move... [cross-talk] 14 ANDREA SAENZ: Yeah... [cross-talk] 15 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...from, from ICE 16 and whether or not the video conferencing will 17 continue with these two... with these two court... the 18 two courts... courtrooms that are opening up. ANDREA SAENZ: I, I assume so, I mean we 19 20 continue to, you know try to figure out everything we 21 can do to bring our clients back but my understanding 2.2 is that both ICE and the EOIR are seeing video 23 conferencing as sort of the wave of the future, we all have to get with the program and so that... they 24

would I assume run video hearings with all, all of

2.2

their new courtrooms assuming they have the technology to do so which has been a problem for the last five months, they haven't had the actual lines to run enough hearings and that's caused immense delay on the detained docket.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Hence the lawsuit that is really pushing for, for a decrease in the... in the, the time of detention and so they're response is great, we'll put more courtrooms... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: We'll put them on when...

put... we'll put the cases on when you're not there,

we'll put them on without telling people, I mean this

effect the private bar as well, there are court, you

know hearings... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: ...happening this week that no one knew were happening, so we are trying very hard to get it under control and you know I think with the full court press we're going to, you know hopefully be able to plan far enough ahead of time that we can get more lawyers there.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And what can the city do to provide a resource for you or is this

2.2

something that just the, the providers, they're kind
of embedded into the system, you need funding, I hear
that very clear and we got a sense about exactly what
kind of funding you need for this emergency [cross-
talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Right... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...response but is there anything and a role that we can play at a city municipal level in this court that's federal and immigration and civil but not in our jurisdiction, what can we do, what can I do to support this, and you don't need to have an answer now but... [crosstalk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Sure... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...I'm just

offering... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Absolutely... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...everything we can

do... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: I mean the, the, the smallest and easiest thing to do which has already started because we let HRA know about some of these docketing issues we were having because they were affecting intake is that is to reach out to ICE and

EOIR in New York to let them know that you are
monitoring the situation and that you're concerned
about the way that, you know due process is, is
happening, you know or not happening in New York and
even if even if you don't have the power to direct
them I think it's very powerful in the same way when
you bring observers and you bring, you know people
who are accompanying people to watch this court,
which I know you've been there that that's powerful
and that puts people sometimes on better behavior so
I think if I think we want to continue to have the
city partner with us in talking to the agencies and
saying like, you know we all need to have meetings,
we need to talk to each other, you need to hear when
is the courtroom opening, how you know we need to
plan so that we can get some more information.
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it and I know
that both I as Chair and the Mayor's Office sent a
letter… [cross-talk]
ANDREA SAENZ: Yes, thank you [cross-
talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...when the first cases be... when it became clear that the cases being heard were going to be teleconferenced through

2.2

television and so… here's a… here's… the, the
next question I have is really about, about this
world if we can't change the teleconferencing and
what happens to the need for more lawyers that are
traveling now and now you're essentially paying for
their travel time and like what happens in an
ecosystem where, where that doesn't change, I, I
don't see that changing, we're going we're going to
move towards incredible pressure to change that
[cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Right... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...but in the meantime how, how does that change the need for more lawyers that are able to kind of be present in, in a world where the docket can be determined the morning of... while in detention, how does that... you're, you're closer to it, what does that do to the need for lawyers?

SARAH DERI OSHIRO: I mean it... there's an increased need for staff attorneys that are doing the work because there's only so many hours in the work week and you know to your point, yes it does take more time to make those trips to do an initial screening even just to tell somebody that they don't

have relief, alright, that can take a half day of an
attorney's time whereas it used to take an hour in
the morning on the day of so there's definitely a
need for just, you know having a, a larger pool of
money to hire the attorneys to do the work then going
back to Amy's point before about funding work that's
not just the direct legal services in immigration
court but the, the litigation efforts to stew the
federal agencies who's policies are having such a
detrimental impact on our client population like it's
harder to fund impact litigation services but, you
know somebody might need to sue over VTC in the near
future because we don't you know because that policy
hasn't stopped despite our attempt to meet with ICE
and to, you know explain to them what we think is so
legally problematic about this about these policies
so, you know currently the, the lawsuit that the
Bronx Defenders brought about the initial
presentment, the you know unlawful practices of
detaining people on average 80 days before they see
an immigration judge that's not funded under the
NYIFUP budget but it's impacting all of our NYIFUP
clients so I think taking a broader view of what
funding immigration legal services might entail given

2	how	neces	ssar	y it	is	to	bri	ng t	these	fec	dera	11 la	awsui	Lts
3	it	could	be a	a wa	, to	o, 1	to m	nove	forwa	ard	as	well	L.	

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it... [cross-talk]

TERRY LAWSON: Including litigation on ICE in courts, litigation on fee waivers, I mean it's, it's... the list is endless... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Right, right, right.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And that's another request too, what's, what's, what's the price tag on suing the federal government on all the... on all the cases that have yet to kind of go and do we have the capacity to do that? I think... I think part of the larger conversation that we're having here is how do we... how do we bring lawyers in front of people so that we can have that representation but the system itself is changing and we got, got to figure out how to constrain it so that it doesn't change for the worse and when it does we can sue them and win and, and that's our prerogative, that's, that's the municipal government role... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Right... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...and, and I, I dare anyone to say different and so how do we... how do

we make that case but we, we're going to need a budget request...

2.2

ANDREA SAENZ: Right...

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And that's coming up soon, so it'd be great to kind of figure out where... how, how you're prioritizing what, what lawsuits we, we can focus on and, and what kind of resources we can bring from our own council as well and join you in these lawsuits... [cross-talk]

ANDREA SAENZ: Exactly... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...through, through, through time and that's another kind of visibility, we're watching you and we're also suing you and, and that's, that's the power that we can... that we can bring and I'll have to talk to the lawyers to see how, how that works internally but I think that's the... that's initiative that I want to... I want to make clear that we want to do and support you, but we got to understand the plan that you're leading and how we can support that. Any other items that you want to point to, to kind of give, give us a sense about need, I know there are a lot of other service providers that want to... want to talk but I want to make sure any other last minute things and thanks for

alerting us of the... of the court... the courtrooms at Varick and even just this week clients being moved to 26 Federal Plaza and, and how ridiculous that is and, and contrary to due process and they're going to do everything they can. Thank you.

SARAH DERI OSHIRO: Thank you...

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thanks to this
panel. Okay, we're going to get through the next
panels. We have a few more panels to go and... two more
panels... two more panels and we have here Hasan
Shafiqullah Legal Aid Society; from NYLAG Lauren
Reiff; Camille Mackler, New York Immigration
Coalition; Franco Torres, Catholic Charities
Community Services and Marc Valinoti, Northern
Manhattan Improvement Corporation please. This is
going to be a fun panel, don't hold anything back.
Hasan do you want to... do you want to start?

HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: Sure. So, good afternoon, I'm Husan Shafiqullah, the Attorney in Charge of the Immigration Unit at the Legal Aid Society. The previous panel covered a lot of the things I was going to say and so I don't want to repeat a lot of it, but I may... [cross-talk]

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Give us the fiery... give us the, the... what do we need to do?

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

HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: Just alert about the 170, the, the criminal carve out and so... the... my understanding of the administration's position on the 170 is that they will honor an ICE detainer for somebody who has one of 170 convictions which means that if I'm in New York custody and I'm about to be released they'll give ICE a 48 hour heads up or give them an, an opportunity to lodge a detainer so I can be held for 48 hours and they will honor that detainer request if one is lodged, so I get that that the, the city is cooperating to that extent so... but I have two points that I want to make about that. One is most of the clients that we're seeing in ILU and in IFUP and in ICARE and all the other funding streams that are... that have been infected by the 170 carve out are not folks that are coming directly out of New York custody and so the detainer law shouldn't actually apply. The way that the administrative code is written it's just for people who are in custody who are about to be released and so if they want to go by the strict reading of the admin code, fine but it doesn't apply but it's actually not fine because

even if it were to apply and if I'm going directly
into ICE custody if Congress in the Immigration
Nationality Act provided forms of relief that might
allow me to get status notwithstanding my conviction
don't tie the providers hands, you might not like
that immigrant if we're going to go into a bad
immigrant narrative but if, if we have tools and
immigration laws to fight for those people who'll let
us do it. A couple of points I want to say on other
things, the city bar association's task force on the
civil right to counsel just passed a or issued a
statement yesterday about the right to counsel for
children in removal proceedings, these are some of
the most vulnerable folks facing deportation and I
encourage the city to really consider is, you know
this should be the moment that we say kids should not
be facing deportation by themselves and we really
need to make sure that there's an attorney for
everybody, for any child. In the in the NYIFUP
context with video conferencing and with the, the
crazy dockets that are going on we are going to be
coming to the city for, for more resources to meet
that need because it's going to be incredibly
challenging, there's no way for us to provide

universal representation which is what the City
Council has allowed us to do for the last several
years without, without additional resources, we just
can't do so much more with just the number of people
that we have already and so just as we get to budget
season that'll be the one of the big asks that are
out there. We're doing a lot of habeas' to get people
out of prolonged detention or to stop deportations at
the last minute, we're doing a lot of class actions,
we're doing affirmative litigation, federal work is
expensive and that's another thing that we'll be
asking for and I know you're you had flagged that
and like what does that cost and we'll be telling you
what that costs and, and we hope to have your support
in things like IOI [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Well let's go back with habeas really quick... [cross-talk]

HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...so tell, tell us a little bit about any data that you have on spikes and, and that, that'll be a question to... for everyone else, what is that spike, are we talking about an exponential spike in habeas cases and what, what does that do to the caseload, how does that change...

2 HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: So, I mean it...

3 [cross-talk]

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...the apparatus?

HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: Yeah, there's so many more clients for whom we're seeking to do it and it's because of a range of factors, the changing enforcement parties you don't get prosecutorial discretion, ICE isn't going to consent to release people, they're going to fight even on cases that we've won so we had a client where the judge terminated proceedings because they couldn't establish removability but ICE was appealing and they... and they fought us tooth and nail and we had to like go and do a habeas to get this person out of ... out of detention. We've had a citizen client where we showed with convincing evidence that he had derived citizenship through one of his parents and they still wouldn't release him we had to do a habeas even for that, for someone over whom the immigration court has no jurisdiction so they're fighting us tooth and nail on cases that should be straightforward and on the, the tougher ones they're certainly fighting us and so we're having to go into the federal courts in ways that we... at, at a volume that we never had to do

before with no new resources. And so with IOI the,
the stacking cap which Terry talked about where if
I'm doing multiple forms of relief for a client like
family removal proceedings and seeking asylum that
this person was also abused by her partner so we're
seeking a UV asylum and a waiver of inadmissibility
grounds so there's multiple things that we're doing,
we can only bill two of those and so the stacking
limitation makes no sense. If we're doing complex
work and doing multiple forms of relief to try to
maximize this person's chance of success pay us for
that work and also the, the reenrollment limitations
that these cases their the city is I think properly
really emphasizing removal defense which is great but
these cases we all know don't end in two years, they
don't end in three years, they might last several
years in the normal course and with the IA appeals
and all that its going to get even longer and so to
have a limit on the number of times we can reenroll
it if we're still doing the work doesn't make any
sense, again just pay us for the work that we're
doing. And just to echo what others have said,
building social work support in, in these grants,
building space and money for fees. We did a go fund

me campaign to try to raise some money for filing
fees, we're getting denials on fee waiver requests
and on certain things you have the luxury of trying
and maybe the client can like just scrounge money
together but if it's an appeal and you only have a
certain amount of time you don't have the luxury of
trying and so we're, we're paying for these clients
but its our funds are limited, we're nonprofit and
so, so we're looking for help from the city on that
as well and with that I'll [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: What's the cost of a... of a fee?

HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: So, it can be as, as little as like 400 or it could be as high as almost 1,900 if I'm trying to prove citizenship... [crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And that's a judge... the discretion of the judge?

HASAN SHAFIQULLAH: Certain things cannot be waived at all, other things can be waived at the discretion of usually USCIS, some of them are at the discretion of an immigration judge. Okay, I'll stop there, thanks.

2	LAUREN REIFF: Good afternoon Chair
3	Menchaca and thank you for having me. My name is
4	Lauren Reiff, I'm the Supervising Attorney at the New
5	York Legal Assistance Group. I would like to keep my
6	remarks to things that have not already been
7	discussed but I do want to emphasize that NYLAG also
8	agrees with many of the comments that have been made
9	and many of the concerns that have been raised by
10	other providers. In particular regarding the case
11	stacking limitation and the limitations on
12	reenrollment and as well as the fees that we need
13	help paying fees. One particular issue that's, that's
14	come up is that not only are all cases affirmative
15	and defensive becoming significantly more complex as
16	a result of changes in policy and changes at the
17	level of effort that is put into trying to prosecute
18	people or scrutinize their applications, we now have
19	to assume that any case we undertake, take is going
20	to require extremely increased time and preparation
21	and may in almost any case now ultimately lead to
22	removal if an application is denied. In particular
23	the administration has issued guidance that
24	humanitarian cases like U visas, FALA, T visas, if ar

application is denied in the absence of some reason

they see to exercise their discretion they will be
putting all people who are not in authorized status
and who's application has been denied in immigration
courts so now pretty much any case we take on
affirmative or defensive we have to see it as
potentially a defensive case which is a lot to
undertake. In addition, changes in policy for example
the special immigrant juvenile status issue we've
seen recently where the… suddenly the government has
reversed course on whether you can qualify that if
you're over 18 but under 21. We're now looking at
these people if they're not already in removal being
put in removal and their case is denied and because
the policy was changed so abruptly we're looking at a
need to do appeals in order to try and protect these
people and that is expensive to do those appeals
which are not based on anything that we could have
predicted at the time we first accepted the case. So,
we are asking that the Council consider the increased
demands on our services, the increased time and
resources that we need to put in each and every case
in, in its budgeting. I do know that you wanted me to
mention that representatives from, from our legal
health division which works with Health and Hospitals

testified recently at a, a hearing on Public Charge and they had certainly seen some impact, there's fear and misunderstandings in immigrant communities and people are making choices contrary to their own interest in terms of their health and in terms of their ability to feed their families out of fear that they might no longer be eligible for benefits so in terms of the impact that might have on, on people's vulnerability to bad actors as well as the need for information to the spread that the true information about what impacts might exist we'd ask for the Council's help in that as well.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And one quick follow up question, the, the, the denials for something like SIJ that you're seeing and then the appeal process you said is really expensive, is that able to be renegotiated in the current contract, Hasan talked a little bit about, about the fact that you can only kind of go back a couple times for... or maybe it was in the large... the previous panel where you can only... a case becomes limited or capped in the case of a SIJ case denial and then is that part of... can you... can you attach that to IOI contract today?

2.2

LAUREN REIFF: Sure, so if you had taken...
sort of two separate issues I want to address...
[cross-talk]

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

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yeah, can unpack that for, for us... [cross-talk]

LAUREN REIFF: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...for me?

LAUREN REIFF: Absolutely. So, for SIJ clients generally speaking there's two or three steps to the process, right, there's the family court process of, of having a quardian or a custodial parent recognized and the special findings order entered then there's the process of applying for the status on the basis of what the family court found with immigration and there may be a removal component to that as well where you need to go into immigration court and say this is what we're applying for and advocate to not have the removal order issued pending a determination on eligibility for that relief so the case cap means that we... if we then also had to do an appeal for that same client we would be limited out on the number of cases we can bill so that would not be done under IOI, we would not be able to, to get payment for, for that extra work but the other issue

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

is the fee attached that you have to submit, you have to... there's a filing fee that you... in order to file an appeal in many cases that immigration won't even consider your appeal, they won't take it unless you pay them and when the appeal comes as a result of change in policy it doesn't matter you still have to pay the fees so we have minor clients who are needing, you know they're between the ages of 18 and 21, they may be working, they may be in school and in order to try to advocate for them further and say this policy change is the problem and just preserve any further line of defense for them that filing fee becomes an option, it's 675 dollars for each client who wishes to make an appeal and that's just for the government to even look at it.

editorial note that I want to make here is we heard from the administration that they're okay giving us screening, they're not okay with following up with a full case for X reason... X or Y reason and then here we get to a point where we're, we're saying that... administration is saying yes, we'll give you a case but as complicated as it can get there's a limit and once someone gets connected to the city of New York

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
2	they should have the entire process not only paid for
3	but cared for and, and holistically approached, it
4	just the idea of, of someone kind of walking onto a
5	cliff and we're kind of saying sorry, bureaucratic
6	issues, budget issues, we're not committed to the to
7	the, the full length of case and the multiple courts
8	that we have to go to support one New Yorker, it
9	just… anyway, thank you for… [cross-talk]
10	LAUREN REIFF: Absolutely and if I
11	[cross-talk]
12	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:for walking me
13	[cross-talk]
14	LAUREN REIFF:if I may comment on that
15	we as lawyers cannot in good conscience say that well
16	we can only bill two cases so we're only going to do
17	two cases even though you qualify [cross-talk]
18	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yeah, of course
19	not… [cross-talk]
20	LAUREN REIFF:for five with you know
21	ethically that's a problem for us so basically what
22	that means is that in, in a case where someone might
23	have five individual cases and they're only one
24	participant… [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yeah... [cross-talk]

LAUREN REIFF: ...much of our work is unfunded which impacts their ability to meet our deliverables.

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

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And ethically nor should the city of New York, next.

FRANCO TORRES: Good afternoon, my name is Franco Torres and I'm the Special Projects Attorney at Catholic Charities. I just want to also start by reiterating a lot of the similar concerns that have already been expressed in terms of needing support for federal litigation. They're making us work a lot more, harder and on every single front and as they... as they have, have said over and over again it's hard to account for that in, in the current contracts. We have people with multiple matters and like we said ethically we're going to ... we're going to take that work on but thank you for allowing me to testify today about the needs and gaps in services for New York's immigrants. Catholic Charities has been committed to welcoming New York... New York's immigrants and this commitment is rooted in our respect for human dignity of each person and the value he or she brings to our community. catholic Charities serves individuals in all five boroughs, 50

percent of our clients are New York City residents,
20 percent of those are minors. Our goal our goal is
to basically take some of the existing networks that
we have and strengthen those and then add to those in
the next cycle. We'd like to encourage ongoing
developing initiatives basically to build pro-active
and nuance response and referral systems through the
existing collaborative models that we have so
ActionNYC, ICARE, IOI, ICH and IARC. We also want to
look at enhancing the direct oral presentation
structures that already exist, increasing pro-bono
and pro se services for rapid response efforts and
also addressing emergent legal needs. As been
discussed earlier today for the past two years,
immigrant communities have faced countless shifts in
policy effecting basically pretty much every form of
relief and attacks on the main pillars of the
immigration system, family unity, safety for
survivors of violence, stability for communities in
crisis and New York City has strived to meet this
immigrant need through holistic responses marrying
local communities with respective providers. We're
encouraging refining and nuancing these networks to
increase efficacy, reduce duplicate services and grow

a holistic connectivity across the different facets
of service delivery to meet immigrant needs.
Specifically, we're looking at using the ActionNYC
hotline as a referral conduit and as a means to
coordinate capacity updates between the different
legal service providers, so we can mitigate wait
times for people who are trying to come into the
system and seek consultations. We'd like to
incorporate New York City's support for the
immigration help desk to coordinate consultations and
referrals, that right now is a federally funded
program but basically its, it's a huge source of
intakes, it's through the immigration court, it
services ten months ten days a month basically doing
intakes and screening people at the immigration court
before or after their hearings and giving them
information [cross-talk]
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: But the

teleconferencing has kind of stopped that or are we talking about detained and non... you're talking about...

[cross-talk]

FRANCO TORRES: No, I'm talking about...

24 [cross-talk]

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 2 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...non-detained... 3 [cross-talk] FRANCO TORRES: ...non... I'm, I'm talking 4 about non-detained because... [cross-talk] 5 6 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right... [cross-7 talk FRANCO TORRES: ...because NYIFUP, NYIFUP 8 takes care of the detained... [cross-talk] 9 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it ... [cross-10 talk] 11 12 FRANCO TORRES: ...so, this is... [cross-13 talk] 14 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right, so non-15 detained... [cross-talk] 16 FRANCO TORRES: ...the non-detained 17 although we've had our own challenges in them 18 creating the courtrooms they took away the space that we were using for that so we were literally in... doing 19 20 it in the hallway with like three make shift desks but in the end this in depth coordination it's going 21 2.2 to take experience, time, thought and effort and 23 we're looking for funding for coordination roles that allow a heightened awareness of on the ground needs, 24

finding greater efficacy in delivering services and

so in terms of broadening the legal responses we're
looking for help in terms of recruiting, training and
deploying volunteers to supplement our services,
address the logistical support needs for legal case
work so that can be anything like finding
psychological evaluations or assistance for survivor
victims, people who are in asylum, asylum proceedings
who can use that to support and strengthen their case
and basically connect and collaborate with other
organizations to identify community needs. And just
to wind down you can read in more detail in the
written testimony but we're looking at expanding the
immigration court help desk as you guys have talked,
it's not criminal court, you don't get you don't get
a free lawyer assigned and so as a result many people
are navigating this process without counsel and so
the immigration court help desk provides an
orientation, it provides a tutorial and pro se
services and we'd also like to get into the federal
litigation.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it and before

Camille goes I want to ask this last question about

Catholic Charities and Rich kind of said this

earlier, organizations have very specific strengths

2	about their kind of entry into this world of, of
3	legal service… legal services and I'm thinking about
4	the jails, the detention centers, where they are
5	right now and different parts of the state and across
6	the river in the other state and whether Catholic
7	Charities I mean I'm like I'm brainstorming out
8	loud here and maybe we should do it off, off line but
9	I'm thinking about what you do already for non-
10	detained and the kind of need for a kind of detained
11	service like NYIFUP and, and working with non a
12	nonprofit that has you're everywhere [cross-talk]
13	FRANCO TORRES: Yeah [cross-talk]
14	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:Catholic
15	Charities is everywhere to provide that service for,
16	for folks who are who are detained and getting
17	access to them at their jails and working with you to
18	think about how we can we can do that.
19	FRANCO TORRES: Yeah, our organization is
20	already thinking about entering into [cross-talk]
21	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Sweet [cross-
22	talk]
23	FRANCO TORRES:entering into that

24

because we… [cross-talk]

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 2 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay, just want 3 to... [cross-talk] FRANCO TORRES: ...get... we get a lot of 4 calls actually from local parishes, we'll get 5 something from Father John out in Middle Town about a 6 7 local family that has had this happen where somebody is taken to detention and... [cross-talk] 8 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right... [cross-9 10 talkl FRANCO TORRES: ...we now route those, we, 11 12 we route those through NYIFUP but that's, that's... 13 [cross-talk] 14 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right... [cross-15 talkl 16 FRANCO TORRES: ...something that we have... 17 we have already... [cross-talk] 18 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: It could be robust, it could be funded, it could be... [cross-talk] 19 20 FRANCO TORRES: Yeah... [cross-talk] 21 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...even connected... 2.2 [cross-talk] 23 FRANCO TORRES: And unfortunately, I 24 think this is going to continue to be a... [cross-talk]

2 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Oh yeah, I, I
3 don't... it's going to get worse.

2.2

FRANCO TORRES: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And on that note, Camille.

CAMILLE MACKLER: I can speak fast if you... that was a joke...

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Don't... give, give us everything we need to hear.

CAMILLE MACKLER: I have... I... obviously
first of all thank you for the opportunity and I
obviously echo and could never say better than what
these providers have said today but I do want to
actually piggy back on some of the, the things that
you have mentioned and I want... New York City has to
my knowledge made the largest municipal investment in
immigration legal services anywhere in the country
and New York State has one of the largest state fund...
if you include what the city has invested has one of
the largest if not the largest state investment. So,
I think now it's time for us to start pushing
ourselves and think about more, how do we get to
universal representation, how do we think outside of
the box, how do we use the phenomenal energy and

power and knowledge that we have here in New York
City and here in New York State and how do we start
moving the conversation on universal representation,
the needle on that because it's going to start those
conversations, things are changing in D.C., right,
starting in two weeks we're going to start having
more oversight, we're going to start having more
questions being asked, there are rumblings of
independent immigration courts, there are rumblings
of access to counsel issues going on down there and
we want to make sure that when those start happening
they point the finger right here at New York City and
they say that's how you do, that's how we do it. We
you know about our immigration lawyer army, you know
we get together once a month and we talk about these
issues, they talk about it all the time in between,
we're, we're constantly channeling the energy, these
are some of the most passionate dedicated people and
I think Lauren you know that it's true, we have
ethical obligations to see our cases through but I
have never seen a lawyer in this room or outside this
room walk away from a case and to you point about so
how do we do this around the state, in Albany county
jail this summer when they brought 300 migrants from

the border it was New York City lawyers who showed up
and who helped and who got those individuals out, who
got them talking to their kids again who had been
ripped from their necks, it was it, it all starts
here. So, let's start thinking about how do we
allocate our resources properly, let's make sure that
we're not having arbitrary lines as to who gets
services and who doesn't but let's make sure that the
ones who get the free services truly can't afford it,
let's make sure that the ones who can afford it go to
private bar qualified as a goal, you know vetted
private bar and let's make sure and but more
importantly we have a whole category of individuals
who fall in the middle more than the 200 percent of
the poverty guidelines but not enough to afford a
private lawyer, we've never had those conversations
yet in a real public setting of how do we get to low-
bono models, how do we get to models that don't only
rely on public funds but do tap into the expertise
and the knowledge and the energy of this field. Let's
talk about how we help the people who never get
services, the appeals, that's where you change case
law, look at what NYIFUP did when they went to
federal court and they got a decision on how long the

government can actually detain individuals that was
Seminole, every single time that you file an appeal,
every single time that you challenge a federal action
in, in federal court you're changing the law but
providers can't do that right now, they can't help
all of the hundreds if not thousands of New Yorkers
who have unjust deportation orders because they went
to court and they didn't have good legal
representation and now they live with that over
hanging over their head, let's make sure that we're
funding that, let's be using technology, let's look
to our neighbors to the north in Canada, the federal
government gives provinces money for legal services
and in some provinces they use a voucher system so
that private bar can be brought in through a vetted
mechanism to enhance representation and in Canada 95
percent of refugees or asylum seekers are represented
through that mechanism so who where else can we
learn from, let's have those conversations, let's
figure out how we can network the state so that
everything that's happening down here can also impact
out of state because when one of our New York City
residents gets arrested at the Canadian border we
need somebody out there to help us too. I obviously

have already started thinking about a lot of these
issues and I look forward to thinking about them more
to using the energy to, to, to talking with the
providers as to how we can really become an
innovative city where we don't not only have the
largest investment but we have the best investment in
legal services and the last thing I want to say and I
have so much more to say about this but I know these
conversations are only beginning but I want to
commend you Chairman for how much you have done for
this and I really think that in three years, three
and a half years when, when you step off this
chairmanship we should give you a JD and make you an
honorary immigration lawyer for all the work you've
done with us in the ranks.
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: I don't think any
lawyer in here would approve that.
CAMILLE MACKLER: You've got my [cross-
talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: But I like... maybe
I'll go to law school.

CAMILLE MACKLER: Don't, don't do that.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay...

1	COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
2	CAMILLE MACKLER: We'll use you better
3	elsewhere.
4	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Oh, there you go.
5	This is the partnership.
6	CAMILLE MACKLER: Absolutely [cross-
7	talk]
8	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you and

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you and before, before we leave you Camille, I want to ask a little bit about the appeals, I think... I think that's, that's incredibly a bold envision about calling out that space, the appeals is where we change the law... [cross-talk]

2.2

CAMILLE MACKLER: Uh-huh... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...and NYIFUP did it

and I think we, we go back to that often and so

that's connected to the previous conversation about

funding lawsuits and appeals could be another piece

and so if, if, if the, the New York Immigration

Coalition in partnership with everyone else could

come up with what, what does that look like in terms

of funding to, to think about that flexibility

because what we're asking the administration to do is

be more flexible but also be more direct and focus

where we need to do that and this could be an area

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

where we can focus some money. Every year we're going to take on three or four cases that are going to be helpful to change the law and, and that's not something that we constructed our programs around and so if you can help us think about that as a coalition that would be great both on the... on the lawsuits but also on the appeals.

CAMILLE MACKLER: So, one thing that we're working on is collecting better data and actually... Hasan and I earlier in the back were talking about how we need our New York City track and just start doing, you know that sort of systematic fora but beyond that we're thinking through IARC and other mechanisms how to start collecting data so we can really start identifying the needs... the gaps and the needs and so that we can make that, that case for that investment and I think that that falls really particularly well into that, one thing we want to do is start trying to figure out how to engage pro-bono and volunteers into filing appeals that push back on all the terrible policy that you heard about today, right, the dock... the rapid docketing, the, the inability of judges to make discretionary decisions and all of that and then how do we start tracking

those outcomes and bringing them to federal court so definitely I'm, I'm way ahead of you already but...

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Looking forward to sitting down with them...

CAMILLE MACKLER: Yeah...

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you.

MARC VALINOTI: Thank you very much, my name is Marc Valinoti and I'm the Managing Immigration Attorney at Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation. I sincerely apologize for any overlap in... on topics that my colleagues have spoken about. For a very brief intro, Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation is a communitybased organization founded in 1979, its grown into a multi service agency with a staff of over 120 serving New York City with a focus in upper Manhattan and the Bronx where each of our offices are located. Our programs include immigration, housing, financial counseling, help care services, education and career services. Our immigration unit provides consultations and representation primarily on USCIS applications including humanitarian forms of relief for undocumented clients such as U visas, VAWAs and SIJS cases. Although we screen and advise clients on a

wide range of immigration issues, our ability to
provide robust representation before the EOIR is very
limited. There are two key aspects of how the lack of
funding for nonprofit EOIR representation impacts our
own ability to assist our community. The first is
when a screened client has an upcoming hearing,
lacking the capacity to place one of our own
attorneys on a court case that can take years to
complete, our current practice is to directly refer
the client to a partner organization. However, as has
been mentioned several times, other organizations
have similar constraints on their capacity which can
prevent the client from having their, their case
represented, this can result in the client having to
appear at least for a hearing or two pro se before
immigration judges and increasingly hostile attorney,
attorneys from the Department of Homeland Security.
Another issue arises in the decision of whether to
file certain affirmative cases with USCIS. Up until
recently a relatively narrow set of the USCIS
application denials would result in a notice to
appear at removal proceedings. This June DHS issued a
memo vowing to greatly expand instances where the
applicant for immigration benefit will be issued an

NTA, this includes but isn't limited to applications
for adjustment of status, applications to extend
their changed temporary status, U visa applications
for crime victims and domestic violence victims,
applications for the abused spouse of a permanent
resident or US citizen and also special immigrant
juvenile status applications. This new policy
mandates an extra layer of analysis and risk
assessment before even deciding to file a case with
USCIS for a client who isn't already in removal
proceedings. The likelihood of a positive outcome for
an application which can depend on the officer's
individual evaluation is now weighed against the rish
of being issued an NTA upon denial and having to
fight against deportation and as with new clients who
are already in proceedings we will have to refer out
to other organizations those summoned to immigration
court after the USCIS case is denied. Regardless of
the strength of the person's removal defense without
an attorney the client's chances of success are very
limited. As a direct services provider, it is
especially disheartening to have to tell a retained
client that we must now refer them in the hope that
another organization has the capacity to defend them

2.2

before a judge. The lack of adequate funding to take
on more EOIR cases is deeply frustrating and prevents
clients even with viable removal defense cases from
getting the representation they desperately need.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you so much

Marc and everything that you're doing at NMIC and I

think one question I just want to ask, are you... are

you lauding that... the disheartening part where you're

telling a retained client we can't serve you any

more, we're going to move you to another

organization, is that something that you're

capturing?

MARC VALINOTI: Well that last issue regarding the expanded list of denials resulting in NTAs that hasn't hit us yet thankfully... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: But you're anticipating... [cross-talk]

MARC VALINOTI: ...but we will keep track of it... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Great, that's, that's an important part because again that's, that's where we're, we're trying to figure out what, what happens when a New Yorker interacts with the city of

2.2

New York through our service providers and we carry them through the process and, and I think that's going to be the... one of the textures that we want to present to the administration saying once, once they're in our care we want that continuum to be... to be fair, just and fueled with resources, that's, that's the work, that's the... so, it would be good to kind of figure out what, what that looks like for you and other organizations.

MARC VALINOTI: Oh, we will definitely be keeping track of it.

to this panel and we have one more panel and that panel is Jojo Annobil, Annobil Immigrant Justice

Corps; Anne Pilsbury; Carol... Carlyn Cohen; Persephone

Tan and then Bridget Crawford if we can get you up,

up here and thank you for your patience on this. I'm

really happy that we're... that we're talking together,

and this is... this is a known family, all of us having

this conversation so I'm really happy that we're

doing that together here. And just make sure that you

press the button and it turns red.

ANNE PILSBURY: There we go. I'm Anne
Pilsbury, I'm the Director of Central American Legal

Assistance. I started this work over 35 years ago
when there were seven judges on the immigration court
and now there are, I think 34 and I didn't even count
the ones at Varick Street so there's been a huge
increase obviously and its continuing. The Trump
Administration obviously wants to put as many judges
on the court as possible, so they can have cases as
fast as possible. So, we're, we're encountering this
kind of dual reality where I was in court this
morning with two people and their final hearings are
set for 2022. One of my colleagues was in court this
morning with, with three-year-old twins and their
hearing is in two months. So, the new judges have
been told to accelerate what they call these FAMU
cases, FAMU, which we think stands for Family Unit
and because most of the newly arrived people fleeing
out of Central America are for better or for worse
coming with children that's a huge segment of the
cases that are now going through the immigration
courts and the administration has decided to force
these people to have their cases litigated as fast as
possible, their goal seems to be within six months.
Now the law allows people a year to apply for asylum,
but the courts are actually shortening that and

2.2

requiring us to do it even faster. So, we're pushing back, it's hard, the new judges are on probation, they're... you know they're being told by the AG that they have to do this, they're being told by us that it violates due process and some of them are a little... you know having trouble dealing with this as are we. So... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: But, but it's their discretion I'm assuming... [cross-talk]

ANNE PILSBURY: Well technically it's their discretion, I mean they, I think have been told not to exercise discretion so it's, it's very hard so anyway that's, that's what we're up against. Just to give you an idea of the numbers, this week our office had 22 hearings scheduled and we're, we're a staff of about six attorneys although I think we may have the biggest… one of the biggest removal defense caseloads in the city; four final hearings, 19 preliminary hearings. Now this is not normal, normally we have eight to 12 hearings a week and so we can see the trend is, is obviously shocking. We already are committed to appearing for 193 final hearings representing over 250 people in 2019, nevertheless the new judges are scheduling on top of those cases.

We have large caseloads for final hearings in 2020,
2021, and 2022 years for which we haven't a clue what
our funding will be. So, obviously we worry about
that but we don't turn down cases because we don't
have funding and when we take cases we take them all
the way up to federal court if, if the case the
facts of the case and the law the case warrant it
and we get no extra or special dedicated funding for
doing appeals but we just consider it a normal part
of representing somebody. So, we're very grateful of
the Council as everybody is. I'm a little bit of a
minority view on the issue of, of universal
representation because when people come across the
border, the people from the northern triangle who we
are the ones we mostly represent it's asylum or
voluntary departure, there really aren't no room for
negotiations and so it's important we think to be
able to fully staff the cases that are legitimate
asylum cases.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And, and let me just follow up with that really quick and say... and ask how... I guess I'm not following the... how universal representation hinders the opportunity for the asylum cases that need to get... [cross-talk]

2	ANNE PILSBURY: Well because there's
3	only, you know 40 or 50 hours in the week and if, if
4	you're going down to court with someone who has no
5	relief except voluntary departure, you're spending
6	hours sitting in court waiting to be called to do
7	something that a person could do without a lawyer.
8	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Got it
9	ANNE PILSBURY: And so, I think we have
10	to be realistic about how we marshal our resources.
11	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yeah, agreed
12	[cross-talk]
13	ANNE PILSBURY: I, I think it's great to
14	have universal screening, to have everyone talk to a
15	lawyer
16	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Uh-huh
17	ANNE PILSBURY: But representation to me
18	implies you put in your notice of representation and
19	you go to court.
20	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right
21	ANNE PILSBURY: And I don't think that
22	that would be a good use of public money.
23	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay. Thank you
24	for that and now I want to I want to follow up with

you later on, on the… I think what, what I'm calling

like continuum and so, so I think your, your comment
and feedback can actually fit within a universal
model that allows for us to, to focus but allow
everyone to have some sense of understanding about
what their case is and options and but you'll still
need that the screen will still be a legal a legal.
ANNE PILSBURY: Activity

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Activity and again
I'm thinking like contracts, some of the contracts...
define it but a legal screening is, is something that
a legal person will have to do... [cross-talk]

ANNE PILSBURY: Yeah, absolutely and we're committed to doing that and we do it now... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yep, right... [cross-talk]

ANNE PILSBURY: ...way beyond our contract.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Right, so I think

we might not be too far away, but I think I, I really

hear you when you say how do we... how do we marshal

our resources and really focus the intensity of an

asylum case which is going to be intense and a long

process. So, thank you, thank you Anne.

2.2

2	PERSEPHONE TAN: Hi, thank you Chair
3	Menchaca and the Committee on Immigration for
4	convening this hearing today. I am Persephone Tan,
5	Associate Director of Immigration and Policy at Asian
6	American Federation. We are an umbrella nonprofit and
7	we have 60-member organizations that are Asian led
8	and Asian serving in New York City and as you may
9	know 70 percent of Asian New Yorkers are immigrants,
10	so immigration is a very important issue to us.
11	Currently the federation receives state funding for
12	serve… several immigration programs that we manage
13	and work on with some of our member organizations and
14	this includes the navigator program, opportunity
15	centers and delivery defense project which all fall
16	under the purview of the New York State Office for
17	New Americans or ONA and we are very thankful for all
18	the immigration attorneys and organizations that are
19	here today to testify about the importance of their
20	very crucial work that's needed for the immigrant
21	community living in New York and without them to
22	fight against the President's, xenophobic laws and
23	policies would be very hard to overcome. And my main
24	point in testifying today on behalf of the Federation
25	is to emphasize… when we talk about the need for

legal representation we really need to think about
the role of community based organizations because
they are the link between the immigrant communities
and to legal service organizations especially when
the legal service organizations do not have the
language capacity to speak to the immigrants
directly. And specifically, for the Asian immigrant
community, our CBOs are the vital connections there
on the ground and they're trusted organizations where
clients go to when they have an issue and so we are
asking for investments in both CBOs and legal service
organizations when you're considering funding for
immigrant legal services. A lot of the work that our
member organizations do is unrecognize labor that
they have to deal with so, you know when a client's
seeking legal immigration services it's much easier
to find an attorney who speaks Spanish for example,
it is much, much harder to find Nepalese or Arabic
speaking attorney so the reliance on these CBOs, very
local CBOs who speak multiple dialects of Asian
languages is very crucial in that formula to make
sure that the client gets access to legal immigration
services. So, when we think about the capacity
building for these CBOs. we really need to make sure

2.2

that there is a partnership between legal service
organizations and the CBOs who have direct access to
these immigrants, can't really provide legal
immigration services if you don't even have that
connection, right, where you I've heard stories of
making a referral to a legal service organization but
that legal service organization still has to rely on
that CBO for translation services, for
interpretation, for them telling the clients, you
know you need to bring these certain documents,
making those appointments so it's a lot of free work
that they're doing, case management work that they're
doing that is very critical to immigrant legal
services.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you and I want to ask HRA, is HRA in the room, can you raise your hand? Thank you. MOIA, Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs? Thank you, awesome. So, they're here and they heard that. I heard... I hope that you feel confident both Council Member Dromm and I are really going to focus on this concept of the, the kind of wrap around resources that really think about English language learners as they access services. The legal services are probably the more critical

ones because they're difficult to understand period
and, and so it's not just about having translation
and I think your to your point people who understand
the law in a way to be able to communicate it
correctly and, and that's, that's a robust need that
requires people and that's a whole other budget line
that, that we have yet to find common ground with the
administration right now on and, and so we want to
work with you to figure out how, how we how we
address that and whether it's, it's, it's building
robust nonprofit language services and translation
services or, or it's a whole other team that is just
dedicated to, to language services and the last this
last election the three different proposals they a
few of them really spoke to bringing those language
services within the community boards and so we're
going to be pulling that out in the budget
negotiations about how we how we make sure that
every service has, has no barriers to, to access
related to language period. So, thank you, thank you
for that, for that voice.

CARLYN COHEN: Good afternoon, my name is Carlyn Cohen, I'm the Chief Policy and Public Affairs Officer of the Chinese American Planning Council. We

are a proud member of Asian American Federation and
one of the CBOs that Persephone was describing so I
would really like to uplift the recommendations that
she shared but also describe a little bit of what we
see on the ground at CPC in our three community
centers where we work with over 60,000 Asian American
immigrant and low income New Yorkers on a variety of
services every year. We see community members that
speak 25 different languages and the need for legal
services has exploded over the past couple of years.
Because we don't have a robust in house legal service
or legal partnerships what happens is we really end
up piecing together legal services from a variety of
partners like NYLAG and like IJC and what happens is
sometimes there are linguistically appropriate legal
services but because we're talking 25 different
languages a lot of times what happens is that our
staff end up doing the translating especially when
services are then being referred out after initial
screenings and our staff members are already
overloaded with their other work but are also not
experts and so that goes to what you were talking
about, about the nuances of translation when it comes
to these really detailed issues so not only are our

staff taking on extra labor that is unfunded but
they're not necessarily the best people to do it, it
would be best if we could provide legal services
directly in the language. Another thing that we see
that's a huge issue is because there's such a lack of
legal services in the Asian American community is
that a lot of our community members turn to less
reputable sources similar to Nothadeos [sp?] in the
in the Latino community for legal services and then
they're actually coming to our community centers for
second opinions when they've already been told to for
example, apply for asylum in a case where they
weren't actually eligible for asylum or their broker
has somehow frauded them and when they get to us at
that point because they have already gone through
that there's actually very little that our legal
services can do to support them and it puts them in a
set of proceedings unnecessarily that could have been
avoided if we'd had more robust legal services that
were linguistically and culturally appropriate to
begin with. So, just in conclusion I'd really like to
share the recommendations that Persephone shared
making sure that we have good integration between
community-based organizations that have the language

and cultural understanding as well as trust with community members and the legal services that have been sharing so many important points about the work that they do today. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Can I ask that ... we want to be creative right now and think about whether or not there's an, an API initiative that can be focused and I'm not saying this is the only community that needs it but your, your need is very specific and if you can build an initiative that allows us to kind of look at, at building out what, what you need and I... what I don't want to do is, is create that for you and with your partners whether that's building out a legal arm for CPC or other organizations or, or kind of building a relationship that's singular and again I'm... actually I'm not ... I'm, I'm doing what I said I wasn't going to do, figure out what you need and, and then let us know and I think that's where we need to start from, from your... from your experience on the ground with your organizations to address the language barrier and the unfunded labor that's currently going on right now, that's not... there's no efficacy at the end of the day and it's... that's

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2 unacceptable so let's figure out how we can really 3 address that from your perspective.

2.2

more.

CARLYN COHEN: Absolutely, I think that's a huge... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Okay... [cross-talk]

CARLYN COHEN: ...need for us and other

organizations that work with Asian American

communities and we'd be happy to talk about that

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Good.

CARLYN COHEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you.

afternoon and thank you so much for inviting me to speak today. You've asked a lot of thought-provoking questions this afternoon and it's interesting that I have answers to some of them. I think that what you heard today is how legal service providers and activists are drinking out of the fire hose because of what is happening here. The only thing that keeps us all going are the stories of resiliency and the stories from our clients who have seen so much, keeps us going but to answer some of the questions that you, you answered... so, four years ago we made the

largest infusion of immigration talent into this,
this into the city, 25 recent law graduates very
committed to social justice who came in and infused
legal service provider organizations with energy and
took on so many cases. I'm proud to say that 96
percent of them have stayed in the immigration field
since they graduated. We currently, we've graduated
another 25 in August, 96 percent have stayed in the
immigration field, you're talking about capacity, we
are graduating folks who want to do this, folks that
are coming from California because there's no
immigration justice corps, there's no way to get
there for through the door coming to New York to
learn and going back. If you're talking about
capacity, we are building a pipeline, our footprints
are all over the legal service providers in this
city, they have they take on our staff sometimes 18
months into the fellowship, we are hiring them which
means that we are doing something good, we are we
are bringing real talent into the city. We are also
trying different delivery models, we are capacity
building, we are not only dealing with the reputable
organizations, we're building capacity, we build
capacity at Arab American Association in New York

City, we've built capacity at Min Quan, we've built
capacity at which works with African women, we've
provided them with lawyers. The fellows we are
bringing in are immigrants or first-generation
immigrants, they speak multi languages, we are not
bringing in folks in where organizations also need to
hire translators for them, we can do a lot. The model
we have especially with our college graduates who are
embedded in all five boroughs, we are all we, we, we
working out of libraries, these are folks who we have
first years and second years, we've paired them, you
talk about supervision, after a year our second year
community fellow is able to supervise the first year
with little supervision from an attorney, right, even
though we need that oversight. We built enough that
our fellows who started this program are currently
supervisors at organizations all because of the staff
development we put in. We have a lot to offer, we
our numbers have remained stagnant but we are ready
to add more people, I have 60 recent law graduates or
law, law students who are about to graduate who are
vying for 25 spots, I wish I could give all of them
those spots but we are at the precipice of being able
to do this, we want to work with you to make sure

# COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION 1 2 this can happen, we could build a pipeline for you if you give us a chance and... [cross-talk] 3 4 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And by chance we 5 mean... do we mean money? JOJO ANNOBIL: Well money is a factor, 6 7 right, because... [cross-talk] 8 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Yeah... [cross-talk] JOJO ANNOBIL: ...most of the work... [cross-9 10 talkl CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: That's what I want 11 12 to understand what, what... [cross-talk] 13 JOJO ANNOBIL: Yes... [cross-talk] 14 CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...what is that, 15 that pipeline because you're right I think you're, 16 you're answering a lot of the questions actually of 17 the kind of need for lawyers that speak multiple 18 languages and you know I love the, the justice courts, incredible and an idea that, that lawyers are 19 20 coming from states to, to do the work here through the fellowship is really exciting and, and figuring 21 2.2 out how we take it to the next level for the pipeline 23 to be larger, how do we do that? 24 JOJO ANNOBIL: So, we, we do that ... so, a

lot of our funding, 70 percent to 80 percent of, of

our funding is from foundations and individuals,
right and we can continue to rely, rely on
foundations, right and so we have diversify our
funding streams, yes, thank you so much you give us
some money to do U visas, you give us some monies to
do other things but all we're saying is that if we're
talking about capacity and we are bringing these
folks these fellow young lawyers in and training
them we can train them to build that, build them at
the community base level, we are talking about
Chinese Planning Council, we have two fellows there,
we've had fellows there for the past three years, is
it a matter of adding a lawyer, we could do that if
we are going to get funding to, to be able to place
someone there, right but I think [cross-talk]
CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And, and the
funding right now relationship is funding is funding
for case load

JOJO ANNOBIL: Uh-huh...

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: ...and that's...

you're saying that's good and that's okay and the

diversification is more about expanding caseload,

paying for caseload through the justice corps?

2	JOJO ANNOBIL: Yes, because I, I think
3	you're investing I, I think when you talk about
4	money you should look at it in terms of investment,
5	mean investment in the career of a young lawyer and
6	investment in the lives of immigrants that you're
7	going to work with, that's two… [cross-talk]
8	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: And I wonder, you
9	know De Blasio wants to create 100,000 jobs [cross-
10	talk]
11	JOJO ANNOBIL: Uh-huh [cross-talk]
12	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:in the city of
13	New York and I wonder if he's capturing this number
14	and whether or not we can redefine that 100,000 jobs
15	with lawyers that we can help… [cross-talk]
16	JOJO ANNOBIL: And, and [cross-talk]
17	CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA:bring into, into
18	the field.
19	JOJO ANNOBIL: Exactly and my last my,
20	my last my last point also is that we're also
21	looking and I think we should all look at this
22	because you've talked about invest on representation,
23	right, invest on representation is on different
24	levels, we should really look at how college

graduates who come in and be basically accredited

2.2

reps, partial can become full accredited reps at some point and be able to do some of the work that is in... being done in court, we should look at that. We've talked about low-bono, we've just started, opened a low-bono practice in Jersey City, we are trying that model, we are bringing in fellows who are interested in going into the private sector about who want to be able to do that charging low fees, we just started this in October so we are trying different delivery models and we really want to talk to you... the city about some of these things because we've tried them, we've seen that they've been successful and we can build on it. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you, really helpful Jojo and keep doing the good work, let's, let's keep doing it together.

BRIDGET CRAWFORD: Thank you so much.

Last but hopefully not least. Thank you so much for the opportunity to testify. My name is Bridget

Crawford and I'm the Legal Director for Immigration

Equality. Immigration Equality is one of the leading

LGBTQ immigrant rights organizations in the country and since 1993 we have advocated for and represented thousands of LGBTQ and HIV positive immigrants. I

will try not to be too repetitive, I'll say	that we
echo many of the sentiments of the other	
organizations that have already testified but	t in
nearly 80 countries it's a crime to be LGBTQ	. Many
more countries are fundamentally unsafe for (	our
population, many of our clients have faced the	he most
horrific persecution imaginable and our clie	nts flood
to New York City in search of a life that the	ey cannot
have anywhere else but when they reach the Ui	nited
States as many of the other organizations have	ve
pointed out they're often met with near	
unsurmountable obstacles when interacting with	th our
immigration system. I won't repeat some of the	he issues
that have come up as of late under the Trump	
Administration. I think in particular the quo	ota
systems and the lack of access to due process	s for our
clients and immigration proceedings are probi	lematic.
I think the that the situation is particula:	rly dire
for LGBTQ and HIV positive immigrants in imm:	igration
court. We regularly find that judges require	
additional briefing and education in order to	o make
fair decisions on an LGBTQ person's case. For	r
example, judges are often unfamiliar with tra	_
identity, they conflate it with a person being	na aav.

wrongly finding that for example a transgender woman
does not qualify for asylum because it is relatively
safe for a gay man in her country of origin. This is
simply wrong, and it puts our client at grave risk.
The Obama Administration had planned to address such
issues with LGBTQ competencies trainings for
immigration judges similar to what our organization
does for asylum and refugee officers. However, no
such trainings have taken place and we don't see that
happening in the near future and I think it's
extremely challenging for experienced counsel to be
able to convey these important concepts to judges
under time constraints. It is nearly impossible for a
lot of pro se litigants especially English language
learners who do not know the law, may not have the
vocabulary to explain these nuances especially in an
adversarial proceeding. For those LGBTQ and HIV
positive immigrants in detention justice is regularly
denied, involuntary transfers to open beds rip New
Yorkers away from their communities, their families
and their attorneys. For LGBTQ and HIV positive
immigrants' detention is exceptionally dangerous. A
recent a recent study by the Center for American
Progress found that LGBTQ people in immigration

detention are 97 percent more likely to experience
sexual assault in detention than non-LGBTQ people.
And in our experience, this bears out roughly half of
our transgender clients who have been in immigration
detention report physical and sexual and or sexual
violence. In short, legal representation is more
critical than ever now and asylum seekers five times
more likely to win her case if she's represented by
an attorney. Having an attorney raises the asylum
seekers odds by a thousand percent and we know this
is true, we regularly win cases, we have a 99 percent
success rate but unfortunately, we cannot meet the
need. We have seen a significant uptick in the number
of LGBTQ and HIV positive immigrants that are calling
our hotline that are reaching out to us through web
inquiries and we just cannot meet the need right now.
With additional support and funding, we're hoping
that we can expand the services that we provide and
meet more of the need, but I think as everyone else
has voiced the floodgates have opened and, and
everybody is, is desperately trying to help the most
vulnerable population.

CHAIRPERSON MENCHACA: Thank you Bridget for your, your testimony and the work that you do at

Immigration Equality and the people that you serve
are important too not just me but the Speaker as well
and so this is how this is how we get there by
understanding the need and so it's really important
to understand the, the kind of impact that a LGBTQ,
gender nonconforming person is going through the
court system and detention, it's important to, to
hear these, these voices and it, it just accelerates
the need for us to work together to figure out what
you need as an organization and what the whole system
needs and so what, what I want to do and end and end
here is say that, you know we started we started
this hearing with, with some big topic items and the,
the topic here was how do we get to a place where
everyone who needs a lawyer, who needs a lawyer,
you're right, who needs a lawyer get a lawyer and,
and live with dignity and respect the system that due
process is the, the goal that a court system can
offer justice to the person that's going to a judge
and it is getting plagued with so much political
forces, negative, evil policies that support white
supremacy and a, a whitening of America and that is
what we are we are dealing with and the deportation
machine is an is an active tool to remove people

from our counties and you all represent people that
deserve to be here and deserve the dignity of an
immigration reform plan that allows them to create
status to stay here, to work here, to be here, to
live here, to love here and that is that is our
goal. Now the federal government refuses to
acknowledge this ability to have legal representation
and we're not there yet but we got to create it first
and that's, that's the that's the goal here because
we can't we can create it and there's nothing
removing us from that except for political leadership
and you all hold us to that fire and we and we feel
it and so we're going to keep pushing for that and
while we do that we're going to get the state to do
it and then we're found we're, we're soon going to
get the federal government because congress will
turn, it's already turning, all the women who have
been elected from communities that represent the kind
of values that we're talking about here will continue
to grow and so that's the vision that we hear that
we see already and that's what we're, we're feeling
right now and the burden on us is to get it right
here in the city of New York because that is our
world and that's what we can do and impact the rest

of the nation and so thank you for your work, your
diligent work, your thoughtful work and your feedback
to us and so all these initiatives I'm hoping we can
really follow through and come back with a real
robust budget request and some legislation that
really defines our actual commitment to
representation that, that is universal in terms of
getting lawyers to people who need it and, and that
is that is that is our work and, and I think what,
what's really beautiful too is and what I'm hearing
is all these different pieces like a justice corps
that's training the next generation look like the
people that they're serving and that that's the
that's the, the beauty of a system when the
government can represent be represented by the
people that they're serving, that, that is that is
the gold here and that's what we're going to get to
and whether I go to, to law school or not, that'll be
something else we can talk about Camille you're
saying no… you're saying no but this might be my
next my next avenue for, for work but I want to
thank you from the bottom of my heart and this is
just the beginning, it's the end of 2018 but next
vear we're going to come out fighting for the things

that we need in this next budget and you're going to be there to support us. Thank you, thank you. And now this meeting is adjourned, and I want to say thank you to the HRA team and MOIA for being here as well, thank you.

[gavel]

# 

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

January 21, 2019