	JOINT HEARING BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND
	INTERNAL GOVERNANCE;
	SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON WOMEN'S ISSUES; SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS;
	ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE ON LABOR; and
	JOINT PUBLIC HEARING:
LACE	TO EXAMINE SEXUAL HARASSMENT ISSUES IN THE WORL
	Assembly Hearing Roo 250 Broadway, 19th 1
	New York, New York
	Date: May 24, 2019 Time: 10:00 a.m.
	PRESIDING:
	Senator Alessandra Biaggi, Chair Senate Standing Committee on
	Ethics and Internal Governance
	Assemblyman Marcos Crespo, Chair Assembly Standing Committee on Labor
	Senator Julia Salazar, Chair
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues Senator James Skoufis, Chair
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues  Senator James Skoufis, Chair Senate Standing Committee on Investigations and Government Operations  Assemblywoman Latrice Walker, Chair
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues  Senator James Skoufis, Chair  Senate Standing Committee on  Investigations and Government Operations
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues  Senator James Skoufis, Chair Senate Standing Committee on Investigations and Government Operations  Assemblywoman Latrice Walker, Chair
	Senate Standing Committee on Women's Issues  Senator James Skoufis, Chair Senate Standing Committee on Investigations and Government Operations  Assemblywoman Latrice Walker, Chair
 n 1923	ASSEMBLY TASK FORCE ON WOMEN'S ISSUES  JOINT PUBLIC HEARING:  TO EXAMINE SEXUAL HARASSMENT ISSUES IN THE WORK  Assembly Hearing Rod 250 Broadway, 19th I New York, New York  Date: May 24, 2019 Time: 10:00 a.m.  PRESIDING: Senator Alessandra Biaggi, Chair

1	SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	
3	Senator Jamaal Bailey
4	Senator David Carlucci
5	Senator Andrew Gounardes
6	Senator Brad Hoylman
7	Senator Liz Krueger
8	Senator John Liu
9	Senator Shelley Mayer
10	Senator Zelnor Myrie
11	ASSEMBLY MEMBERS PRESENT:
12	Assemblyman David Buchwald
13	Assemblywoman Catalina Cruz
14	Assemblywoman Natalia Fernandez
15	Assemblyman Dick Gottfried
16	Assemblyman Michael Montesano
17	Assemblywoman Yuh-Line Niou
18	Assemblymember Felix Ortiz
19	Assemblyman Dan Quart
20	Assemblyman Edward P. Ra
21	Assemblywoman Linda B. Rosenthal
22	Assemblywoman Rebecca Seawright
23	Assemblywoman Jo Anne Simon
24	Assemblywoman Aravella Simotas
25	

			3
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Melissa Franco	15	34
3	Deputy Commissioner of Enforcement Gina Martinez	15	34
4	Deputy Commissioner, Regional Affairs and Federal Programs		
5	Dana Sussman Deputy Commissioner, Intergovernmental	15	34
6	Affairs and Policy New York City Commission on Human Right	s	
7	Michael Volforte	206	214
8	Director NYS Governor's Office of		
9	Employee Relations		
10	Noelle Damico Senior Fellow	261	270
11	National Economic and Social Rights Initiative		
12	Sara Ziff	304	309
13	Founder, and Executive Director Model Alliance		
14	Marissa Hoechstetter	320	333
15	Personal Story		
16	Andrea Johnson Senior Counsel	379	408
17	National Women's Law Center		
18	Miriam Clark President	379	408
19	National Employment Lawyers' Association/NY Affiliate		
20		270	400
21	Laurie Morrison Employee Advocate	379	408
22	Member, National Employment Lawyers' Association/NY Affiliate		
23			

	,	ı	
,	1	ı	

			4
1	SPEAKERS (continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2			
3	Ashley Sawyer Director of Policy & Government Relations	463	487
4	Kylynn Grier Policy Manager	463	487
5	Neillah Petit Frere Member, Sisters in Strength	463	487
6	Rose Antoine Member, Sisters in Strength	463	487
7	Stacey King Member, Sisters in Strength	463	487
8	Marie St. Fort Member, Sisters in Strength	463	487
9	Girls for Gender Equity		
10	Marissa Senteno	509	531
11	Enforcement Program Manager Daniela Contreras New York Organizer	509	531
12	National Domestic Workers Alliance		
13	Cynthia Lowney Attorney	560	609
14	Personal Story Marie Guerrera Tooker	560	609
15	Personal Story Christine Reardon	560	609
16	Personal Story Dennis Reardon	560	609
17	Personal Story		
18	Helen Rosenthal Council Member	620	626
19	New York City		
20	Leeja Carter, Ph.D. Development and Management Manager	634	658
21	Black Women's Blueprint		
22	Dr. Red Washburn Director, Women's and Gender Studies,	634	658
23	and Associate Professor of English Kingsborough Community College		
24			
25			

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Okay, we're going to begin our hearing this morning, our joint hearing between the New York State Senate and the New York State Assembly, on Sexual Harassment in the Workplace.

Today is May 24, 2019.

I am State Senator Alessandra Biaggi. I will be one of the co-chairs on the State Senate side.

And I'm joined by my co-chair on the Assembly side, Assemblymember Marcus Crespo.

I'm going to begin with some opening remarks, and then I'm going hand it over to the Assembly to also have some opening remarks, and remind us of our time constraints in terms of our testimony that we have here today.

I'm also joined by my co-chair, Senator Salazar on my right.

And later in the afternoon I'll be joined by Senator James Skoufis.

For the first time in 27 years, on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, joint public hearings of the New York State Legislature were held on the subject of sexual harassment in the workplace.

February's hearing was convened in response to a troubling pattern of high rates of persistent

and continuing behavior of harassment over the past quarter century.

More currently, and specifically, the hearing was an outgrowth of, and in response to, the courageous efforts of seven former New York State legislative employees who witnessed, reported, or experienced sexual harassment during their time working in state government.

They formed the Sexual Harassment Working

Group, and have played an essential role in ensuring
that there will be action to deal with the issue.

At the urging of these brave women and other tireless advocates, and men, the goal of the hearing was to gather information that would reveal opportunities to create stronger and clearer policies and procedures that will endure in public and private sectors throughout the state.

We hope that the hearing might aid in the strengthening of proposed legislation, and spur the development of new legislation, that will make

New York State a leader in workplace safety and anti-harassment law.

We heard from the federal, state, and city agencies that play roles in policy development and enforcement of workplace safety.

Representative experts from advocacy organizations testified about the shocking nature of harassing behaviors, and recommended pathways for strengthening policy and enacting new legislation.

Finally, and most powerfully, individual witnesses delivered searing testimony about their lived experiences of being subjected to sexual harassment while working in government.

It was universally found that there is a lack of reliable policy and standard reporting structures that address victims in a trauma-informed manner.

Critical gaps and obstructions impede timely and complete reporting of harassing behaviors.

Throughout the hearing, witnesses exposed the grossly inadequate avenues of recourse available to them, and widespread institutional failure to resolve matters without subjecting survivors to further harm.

Clearly, one hearing on this subject, after 27 years of silence, is insufficient to address the scope and stubbornness of this problem, and to help us fully understand how to best refurbish policies and develop appropriate and enduring legislation that protects all workers in the state of New York.

Absent from the February hearing were key

state governmental agencies, such as the New York

State Human Rights Division, who is joining us here
today, and the New York State Governor's Office of

Employee Relations, that provide oversight, and
exist as repositories for reporting.

Without the opportunity to hear from these critical agencies and evaluate how policies were developed and how complaints are fielded, an entire dataset germane to making improvements in the system has not been captured.

Despite the 11-hour marathon of February's hearing, blue-collar and service workers who were scheduled to testify were not able to. Some did not have access to sufficient child care to remain with us into the night.

As a result, their voices remain unheard.

Professional white-collar governmental workers were the only individual victims of sexual harassment available to testify.

We did not hear from any women or men of color.

We know that when the target of harassment is both a woman and a member of a racial minority group, the risk of experiencing harassing behaviors is greatly increased because that if -- because,

beyond that, if the individual belonged to only one of those groups.

Many service workers earn minimum wage or rely on tips, and have less than optimal control over their schedules, especially if they have dependent children.

Taking this all into account, and reflecting on the importance of hearing from as many voices across all employment sectors as possible, we are conducting today's hearing.

Finally, we need further testimony from those governmental leaders and agencies responsible for the laws and internal guidelines in places so we can closely examine the disparity between their intentions and the willful outcomes.

Developing policy that is rigorous enough to produce better results requires a complete exploration.

Through examination of past practice will enable us to determine how we have failed to achieve desired outcomes.

It is not enough to have strong laws. We must also have enforcement systems that function with equal strength.

We laid the groundwork in February that

demands additional hearings in order to have a clear survey of the landscape before we begin to build a truly strong framework as a foundation for new structures.

Survivors need to be heard so that oversight and enforcement bodies can develop informed policies and procedures.

Our work is off to a good start, but it has only just begun.

I'd like to address those who have chosen to testify with a moment of gratitude.

It is because of your courage and your willingness to share your experiences today that

New York can move one step closer towards building a society and culture that is harassment-free.

And I before I hand it over to my Assembly co-chair, I would like to acknowledge all of my Senate colleagues who are here today.

On my right we have Senator Liz Krueger,
Senator Andrew Gounardes, Senator David Carlucci,
Senator Jessica Ramos.

In the first row in front of us, we have Senator John Liu, Senator Brad Hoylman, Senator Shelley Mayer, and Senator Zelnor Myrie.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you, Senator.

Appreciate your leadership on these issues, and to work with you.

It's a great experience to be able to work with you on these issues, and to talk about ways to improve the workplace throughout the state of New York, and all industries.

I am joined by a number of my colleagues in the New York State Assembly:

Assemblywoman Aravella Simotas;

Assemblywoman Rebecca Seawright;

Assemblywoman Catalina Cruz;

Assemblymember Dan Quart;

Assemblymember Dick Gottfried;

Assemblywoman Jo Anne Simon;

Assemblymembers Ra, Montesano;

Assemblymember David Buchwald;

And Assemblywoman Yuh-Line Niou.

And we are -- many of us were in the first hearing that lasted those 11 1/2 hours, but it wasn't enough.

And as the Senator mentioned, too many presenters were not able to give their testimony and there are still too many voices to be heard.

We know that this issue continues to prevail in the workplace, to occur in all industries.

Discrimination and sexual harassment need to be eradicated from our workplace, and we have work to do.

Despite our efforts in last year's budget, and there were significant measures included in our budget, more work needs to be done.

And that remains clear from the powerful testimony of those that came forward, the victims, that spoke to us in the first hearing, and those that we'll hear from today.

There is still room for improvement, and room -- and ways for us to strengthen, not only the protections, but the enforcement mechanisms, as was mentioned by the Senator.

I think about this from a personal perspective. My 19-year-old daughter who's a sophomore in Queens College, or my 5- and 6-year-olds who are first-graders in the Bronx.

I want to make sure that they are able to enter a workplace where they are given every opportunity in a harassment-free space.

And that's what we should aspire to, and we have to challenge ourselves; to not rest on our laurels, to not assume that things are okay, to not think that what we have already done is sufficient,

when we continue to hear horror stories, and -and -- and -- and abuse, taking place across the
board; and, again, it's important to note, in all
industries, affecting all communities, affecting all
racial demographics, affecting all genders.

We need to make sure that we strengthen our policies.

You're seeing already significant pieces of legislation introduced by many of my colleagues who are here today, and others.

And we want to make sure that, through your voices, we can strengthen those bills, and make sure that we move forward with a strong legislative package.

We will probably never eradicate this from ever happening again, but we need to make sure that we make it a rare occurrence, and not the norm, in the workplace.

That is our goal, and we will work hard to make sure that, together, we accomplish that in terms of our policies in the state of New York.

So I'm grateful for this opportunity to hear your testimony.

I will remind my colleagues, again, that we want to provide as much time to those presenters.

After 5:30, in this building, security leaves.

So we can remain; however, if you leave the building after 5:30 p.m., they will -- you will not be able to re-enter.

So, keep that in mind, and we'll keep reminding you as the day goes on.

But we want to ask our colleagues as well, to keep your questions direct and succinct, so we can ensure that the presenters have as much time as they need.

And, again, thank you, all, for being a part of this important conversation.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

Our first witnesses who will be testifying, is the New York State Division of Human Rights, are Melissa Franco, the deputy commissioner for enforcement, and, Gina Martinez, the deputy commissioner for regional affairs and federal programs.

And they will be joined by the New York City Commission on Human Rights, who is represented by Dana Sussman, the deputy commissioner of intergovernmental affairs and policy.

Thank you for being with us today.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Good morning, everyone.

Distinguished members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the important issue of sexual harassment in the workplace on behalf of the New York State Division of Human Rights.

My name is Melissa Franco, and I am the deputy commissioner of enforcement.

I am joined here by my colleague,
Gina Martinez, who is the deputy commissioner of
regional affairs and federal programs.

The New York State Human Rights Law prohibits discrimination on a wide range of protected classes, including prohibited sex discrimination and sexual harassment in employment, housing, credit, and places of public accommodation, volunteer firefighting, and educational institutions.

The Human Rights Law also provides separate protections against retaliation.

Last year Governor Cuomo signed a ground-breaking package of legislation that strengthened protections against sexual harassment.

Now employers can be held liable under the Human Rights Law to non-employees performing work in the workplace; for example, independent contractors,

consultants, service providers, and delivery persons who were sexually harassed.

This applies to all employers of any size, public or private.

Today, any individual in a workplace, of any size, public or private, is entitled to protections against sexual harassment under the law.

If an employer is found liable under the Human Rights Law for sexual harassment, they may be ordered to provide injunctive or appropriate affirmative relief, back and front pay, and compensatory damages for emotional distress.

Civil fines and penalties and attorney fees may also be awarded in sexual-harassment cases.

The division of human rights was created in 1945 to enforce the Human Rights Law, to ensure that all New Yorkers have an opportunity to participate fully in the economic, cultural, and intellectual life of the state.

DHR investigates, hears, and adjudicates complaints filed by individuals, as well as those brought by the division itself, to address systemic discrimination.

DHR also engages in outreach and education campaigns, designed to inform the public of the

effects of discrimination, and their rights and obligations under the law, and issues, policies, regulations, and guidance, implementing the Human Rights Law, and addressing issues of discrimination and harassment.

DHR has approximately 164 full-time employees, including 63 investigators at 12 regional offices across the state.

The agency receives over 6,000 individual complaints annually, of which, approximately, 80 percent relate to employment.

For any claim of discrimination or harassment, individuals may file a complaint with DHR within one year of the last act of the alleged discrimination.

Complaints with DHR can be filed in person at any office, or can be sent in via e-mail, fax, or mail.

If individuals need assistance filing a complaint, they can call our hotline, or call or visit any of our regional offices.

An individual does not need an attorney to file a complaint or utilize our process.

DHR provides free translation and interpretation assistance at all offices.

Once a complaint is filed with our agency, it is reviewed to determine if DHR has jurisdiction over the conduct alleged.

Next, the investigators conduct an investigation into whether there is probable cause. As part of this process, investigators may issue written requests for information, visit the site of the alleged incident, and meet with the parties and/or witnesses.

Once DHR receives and files a complaint, it is served upon the respondent, who is asked to respond to it in writing.

Any responses received are sent to the complainant, who is given an opportunity to provide a rebuttal.

Once a final determination is made, both parties will receive a written determination in the mail.

Currently, 97 percent of all claims investigated by DHR are completed and determinations are made within 180 days.

During 2008, the average processing time to investigate a sexual-harassment case at the division was 172 days.

If the investigator finds no probable cause

or lacks -- or a lack of jurisdiction, the complaint is dismissed.

A complainant may appeal this dismissal within 60 days to the State Supreme Court.

If a determination of probable cause is found, the claim will then proceed to a public hearing.

If a complainant doesn't have a private counsel, the division will assign an attorney to the claim.

If a settlement is not reached, the case will be calendared for a public hearing before an administrative law judge.

If the complainant does not have a private attorney, the assigned division attorney will interview the complainant, review the evidence in the file, formulate a hearing strategy, and put forth the evidence at the hearing.

The division attorney may also conduct cross-examination of the respondent's witnesses, and rebut any other evidence entered by the respondent.

A division administrative law judge reviews all of the evidence, and then drafts a recommended order for the commissioner's consideration.

The parties then have 21 days to file

objections to the recommended order.

The commissioner makes the final determination as to whether the Human Rights Law has been violated, and may award any available remedy under the law.

Either party may appeal an order directly to the State Supreme Court in the county where the discrimination is alleged to have occurred.

DHR attorneys will appear in any of these cases on appeal to support our findings of discrimination in these matters.

DHR is also empowered by the New York State
Legislature to oppose systemic patterns of
discrimination through division-initiated
investigations and complaints.

The division-initiated investigation unit is responsible for identifying, investigating, and bringing complaints to remedy large-scale systemic discrimination in New York State.

The unit identifies potential targets through various means, including referrals from other state agencies, anonymous tips, newspaper articles, and meetings with various advocacy groups.

Once a potential target is identified, the unit uses various investigative tools to gather

evidence to determine if a potential target has violated the law.

If the evidence gathered shows a violation of the law has occurred, the unit will file a complaint on behalf of the State of New York.

It will then be investigated by a separate regional office to determine whether there is probable cause to believe that discrimination has occurred.

If there is a determination of probable cause, the complaint will proceed to a public hearing before an administrative law judge.

The division is committed to the efficient and effective investigation and adjudication of all individual complaints of sexual harassment.

In light of the powerful organizing that is laid bare the society-wide harm caused by sexual assault, DHR is seeing a dramatic rise in complaints coming forward.

Since 2016, there has been a 62 percent increase in individual complaints of sexual harassment filed with the division.

By taking effective action, DHR is able to bring justice on behalf of complainants who have faced such harassment.

For example, in 2017, DHR issued an order in favor of three women from Western New York who faced sexual harassment at the dental office where they worked. The complainants were subjected to being called derogatory names, persistent invites to dates, inappropriate touching, and other offensive behavior.

When one of the complainants notified her manager of the unwanted sexual advances, the employer countered by saying "the aggressor plays like that."

The complainants were collectively awarded over \$152,000 in damages for emotional pain and suffering, unlawful retaliation and discrimination against them. And DHR issued a civil fine of \$60,000, payable to the State, for violating the law, and required that the respondents to -- provide additional training.

DHR order -- DHR's order was affirmed by the Fourth Department, Appellate Division, this past summer.

The division is also committed to ending sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination via outreach and education.

In 2018, and early 2019, the division

participated in approximately 40 education and outreach presentations across the state, that included discussions of preventing and addressing sexual harassment.

Additionally, the division held six outreach events that specifically focused on sexual harassment, in Seneca Falls, Rochester, Cheektowaga, Newburgh, Buffalo, and Long Island.

DHR is currently planning a robust outreach and education campaign, which will include public events and an active social-media presence, focusing on all elements of the law, including protections against sexual harassment.

As part of last year's harassment package, the New York State Labor Law now requires all employers in New York State to establish a sexual-harassment policy, and provide annual sexual-harassment training.

DHR was proud to work closely with the department of labor in developing a model policy, model complaint form, and model training for employers to adopt in the workplaces, as well as an easy, accessible website, with guidance and resources for workers and employers on New York State's laws against workplace sexual harassment.

Prior to being finalized, the models were presented to stakeholders and the public for public comments. And the department of labor and DHR held meetings with employee and survivor groups, as well as business leaders and employers across the state.

Hundreds of comments and suggestions were reviewed and taken into account before the final documents were released.

The model policies and trainings are available online in readily accessible formats, translated into eight languages.

Both the department of labor and DHR continue to engage in outreach and education on the state requirements, and we look forward to continuing those efforts as part of our upcoming outreach and education campaign.

Thank you all for the opportunity to discuss the great work we do at DHR in our efforts to protect all New Yorkers from harassment and discrimination.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Good morning, Senators and Assemblymembers.

Thank you for convening today's joint hearing on the critical issue of combating sexual harassment in the workplace.

I am Dana Sussman, deputy commissioner for intergovernmental affairs and policy at the New York City Commission on Human Rights.

I'm pleased to be back with you again after the first hearing on this topic in February.

And I want to thank you, and the tireless advocates in the room today, who have brought us together to continue this vital and overdue conversation.

In February, my testimony focused primarily on the ways in which the State Human Rights Law could be amended to align itself more closely with the New York City Human Rights Law, giving this state law more teeth to hold harassers and those that enable them accountable, and to afford more victims the legal protections they need to pursue justice.

My testimony identified four areas to strengthen the law.

- 1. Correcting the decades of case law establishing the unnecessarily high, severe, or pervasive standard as the New York State legal standard for sexual harassment.
- 2. Explicitly rejecting the Faragher-Ellerth affirmative defense.

3. Making it possible for managers and supervisors, even if they do not have an ownership interest in the employer, to be held personally liable for sexual harassment; and,

4. Ensuring that punitive-damage awards are available with respect to State Human Rights Law claims, as they are under other civil rights laws.

Today I'm here to briefly discuss the work of the commission's gender-based harassment unit, and several recent developments in the commission's efforts to combat sexual harassment in the workplace.

The gender-based harassment unit at the commission was launched in January of this year, with the budget of \$300,000. It has personal lines for four dedicated staff members, one supervisor, two attorneys, and one non-attorney investigator.

As soon as an individual with a workplace sexual-harassment claim contacts the commission through our general intake line or our web form, the unit supervisor is alerted, and will make a quick assessment as to whether there should be any immediate action taken.

While most individuals who report workplace sexual-harassment cases to the commission come to us

after they have left their place of employment, there are certain situations in which the unit may be able to intervene early and quickly to de-escalate a situation or to prevent retaliation.

In some circumstances, the unit has been able to intervene immediately to ensure that evidence is preserved, either through surveillance video footage or documentary evidence, or, to obtain an immediate transfer of a victim of harassment to ensure the victim is not interacting with the alleged harasser.

Not all circumstances warrant immediate intervention, so, for most cases, attorneys in the unit will meet with the complainant within several weeks after the initial call or e-mail, unless there is an urgent need to bring them in earlier, for example, where a statute of limitations may be running.

The unit's attorneys primarily focus on workers in low-wage industries. And while the commission has cases of workplace sexual harassment spanning all industries, in both high-paying and low-wage work, the unit has identified the private security and building-management industry and the hospital industry, particularly the restaurant industry, where -- which represent a

disproportionate amount of the unit's cases.

Those industries highlight the vulnerabilities of workers who experience harassment in isolated and disconnected workplaces, and the lack of a clear or centralized management or reporting structure.

The gender-based harassment unit also reports that, while most of the victims of cases at the commission are women, they're seeing a significant number of men who are now reporting sexual harassment.

The vast majority of the alleged sexual harassers, although not all, are men, including in the cases in which men are the victim.

While the unit's work is focused on investigating and prosecuting workplace sexual-harassment claims, other attorneys in the agency's law enforcement bureau also handle sexual-harassment cases.

There are simply too many for the unit to handle alone.

The commission's caseload of workplace
gender-discrimination cases that include a
harassment claim doubled in a single year after
Tarana Burke's #MeToo movement relaunched in late

2017, from 56 in 2017, to 115 in 2018.

And I note that this number is slightly higher than the number I reported in February, because it didn't account for some very late 2018 filings.

For the first four months of 2019, the commission filed an additional 42 complaints of workplace gender discrimination that included a harassment claim.

And as of April 30, 2019, the commission is investigating 207 total cases. That includes

13 matters in a pre-complaint posture, in which the commission is seeking to resolve matters before a complaint is filed.

I also want to highlight a significant recent development since the hearing in February.

In March of this year, the State Supreme

Court, in Automatic Meter Reading Corporation versus

The NYC Commission on Human Rights, upheld the 2015

commission decision and order in a workplace

sexual-harassment case.

The commissioner's decision and order was issued in late 2015 before the #MeToo reawakening, which demonstrates the leadership and the commitment of the commission to recognize the seriousness of

these claims.

The commission ordered the highest-ever civil penalty in commission history, the only time we've ordered this amount, and the highest available under the City Human Rights Law, at \$250,000, for willful, wanton, or malicious conduct; in addition to over \$420,00 in total damages to the complainant, including back pay, front pay, interest, and \$200,00 in emotional-distress damages.

The case involved a business owner who sexually harassed a female employee over a three-year period, repeatedly engaging in unwanted touching, regularly using lewd and sexually-inappropriate language to and about her, and posting a sexually-explicit cartoon in the workplace identified as the complainant.

The State Supreme Court's decision in March, upholding the commission's order, is significant, in that it had -- it upheld one of the highest damages' awards and the highest civil penalty in commission history in a sexual-harassment case, reaffirming that sexual harassment causes real emotional and mental trauma, and devastating economic consequences, to those who experience it.

It also affirmed the commission's finding

that the complainant was constructively discharged from her employment; meaning, that the sexual harassment made the workplace so unbearable, that she had no other option but to leave.

The State Supreme -- the State Court decision further reinforces that administrative agencies tasked with enforcing local anti-discrimination laws are entitled to deference in their decision-making, and it sets a precedent for the issuance of the high penalties and damages where the evidence supports it.

My last update is that, on April 1, the commission launched its online, interactive, and free anti-sexual-harassment training. The training can be used to meet both the new City- and State-mandated annual anti-sexual-harassment training requirement.

It is fully accessible to people with hearing and vision disabilities and mobility disabilities.

It is available in Spanish, with nine additional languages on its way, and it is optimized for smart use -- for smartphone use as well.

The training uses a story-based learning model; features scenarios drawn from real cases, and highlights the ways in which sexual harassment

commonly intersects with other protected categories, including race, immigration status, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, and pregnancy and lactation.

It educates the user on the complainant -- on the commission's encompassing definition of "gender," which includes gender identity and gender expression, and of its broad and protective sexual-harassment standard.

It also provides tools and strategies for bystanders to disrupt patterns of sexual harassment.

The training was developed with, and incorporates feedback, from over two dozen external stakeholders, including some of the stakeholders and advocates in this room today.

Several government partners from our sister agencies on the state level, and several dozen internal city-agency administration partners, representing interests and expertise across city government.

The training includes content that fulfills both the State and City requirements for anti-sexual-harassment training, and can be used by employers both within the city and outside the city, across the state, to meet the training requirement.

And, as of May 23, earlier this week, the training has now been completed over 25,000 times since we launched a month and a half ago.

That's an undercount, because it does not reflect how many people view the training together at once, because multiple people or entire workforces can watch and participate in the training together. And that would only account for one completion.

We are grateful to be here today for the second hearing on workplace sexual harassment convened by the New York State Assembly and the Senate this year.

To the women, men, and non-binary people who have organized, spoken out, and demanded action, accountability, and system change, we, as government, are in your debt.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you,

Deputy Commissioners, for your presentation, and for agreeing to do this jointly. It's an interesting approach you both have.

Let me try this.

For the City of New York, you -- for the last 10 years, you have applied a different standard.

You do not apply (indiscernible) gives a -- more opportunities for cases to be considered, heard, or determinations to be made.

I'm curious, in those 10 years, has there -- has the sky fallen on the employer community?

Has -- have you seen a detrimental impact to the city's economy because of this policy?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Well, I'm no economist, but I will say that, we understand our standard in a way -- we've heard that most employers or most employees expect workplace conduct to align with the standard that the City law sets out; that people are typically surprised that other standards across the country and the state standard is what it is, because I think expectations of workplace conduct in 2019, or at least for the past few decades, have comported more closely with the being treated less well because of your gender standard than the "severe/pervasive" standard.

So I think what's interesting is that, it seems like the law needs to catch up to what the current expectations of conduct are in the workplace.

So I -- and I can say, I have not seen the sky fall, but, again, I'm no economist. I wouldn't

be able to reflect on -- on the impact to the New York City economy, but it's not something I've seen.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And with the increase in case, you mentioned also in your testimony, that there's been an increase in reports.

Have you -- has the city council been helpful in increasing your budget significantly in order to address these issues?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: We are always in constant communication with the council, with the administration, about resources, and about how we can be flexible and responsive to the need, which is one of the reasons why I think our -- the gender-based harassment unit is particularly important, because we can get cases, particularly urgent ones, where someone may be in the situation and needs an immediate transfer or needs to negotiate a way out, they can come to us quickly.

So we're trying to be -- the litigation and administrative process is long, we recognize that, and not everyone is situated to go through that full process.

So, we try to work with the resources we have to provide the appropriate response.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And then, speaking of litigation, so if someone files a complaint with -- a City employee files a complaint with your agency, do they have the option to also go to court?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: You can come to the commission at a certain point in the process, before we issue a decision, a determination, whether it's probable cause or no probable cause, you can remove your case from our agency and take it to court.

After it crosses a threshold into a determination at the City level, you've, essentially, chosen your venue, and you would not be able to go to court.

But you preserve your right with respect to federal claims, if you file with the City commission, it's cross-filed with the EEOC. So that preserves your federal claims as well.

And you could, again, remove your complaint from our agency and choose to go court at a certain point in the process.

But if you sort of choose to proceed to completion, then the venue has been chosen, and that would be the commission.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Then, for the State, so, first of all, I've got to preface whatever I ask

with this:

I appreciate the work you all do. And I'm sure that everyone in your agency is fully committed to doing the best they can with limited resources.

And I'm sure your experience had -- we do in the Legislature, I'm sure you have the same challenge, given, particularly, the increase in caseloads that you've seen.

I'm very bad at math, but, 6,000 cases, and you have 63 officers --

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Investigators?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Investigators, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So, 164 full-time, but 63 investigators; so, 95 cases each, more or less?

Is that --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It depends.

We have an office that is completely dedicated to sexual harassment. It's the office of sexual-harassment issues.

If you want to do an average, I would say the regional offices around the state --

We also have an office dedicated to housing discrimination, so that's a totally different office.

-- if I think of the numbers, I would say 1 there's probably -- taking out housing, I would say 2 50 to 60 cases. It fluctuates. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So it's -- but it's fair 4 5 to say that the investigators have their fair share 6 of work? 7 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: A heavy caseload, absolutely, yes. 8 9 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And, anecdotally, do you hear them often, maybe, express a sentiment that, 10 11 somebody got away with one; that they just -- you 12 know, there was something wrong, but, they just 13 could not meet the standard, they just couldn't 14 prove it? 15 Do you hear that? 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I haven't heard that. 17 It's hard to say "somebody got away with 18 one." 19 We construe our law with a liberal 20 interpretation. 21 I wouldn't be able to say, I mean --22 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I know it's a tough one. 23 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- it is (indiscernible cross-talking) --24 25 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I'm not trying to put

you on the spot. 1 2 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- (indiscernible) 3 tough --(Indiscernible cross-talking.) 4 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: The reason -- I guess 5 6 what I'm really trying to get at is this: 7 We know the City has done away with this "severe and pervasive" standard, and it has created 8 a better road map for cases to be brought forward 9 and/or investigated and/or, you know, decisions to 10 11 have been made. 12 We seem to keep hearing that we are applying 13 a standard that makes it too difficult, often cases, 14 to find justice. 15 And, I -- I mean, and that's a policy 16 decision that I guess we would have to make. But, how do you feel, do you -- would you 17 welcome a -- the City standard at the state level? 18 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Well, I -- I -- I'd have 19 20 to say that, you know, we enforce the laws as 21 currently written. 22 If you believe that, you know, a change to 23 the law should be made, we'd certainly enforce it, as you feel the need to strengthen it. 24

I do want to point out, for our cases, for

25

sexual-harassment cases in particular, we have a probable-cause rate of about 25 percent. That's -- that's a pretty high rate, that's a good rate, and that's above the average for all cases.

So, we -- we -- going back to your prior question, there's not too many of those that got away.

And in terms of filing, you know, we have a pretty easy process, as Deputy Commissioner Franco stated earlier in her testimony.

People can come to our -- any of our regional offices and file anywhere in the state. And they can file, you know, via mail, e-mail. They can call us and we will send them a complaint form, and we will route it to the appropriate office.

And like I said, we take this very seriously. We have an entire office that's dedicated to this issue.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I don't doubt that.

I mean, if it was completely up to me, I'd give you more resources so you can do even more.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: And I would welcome that with open arms.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: But -- so, and one last thing, so I asked this question of the City as well:

But, again, if somebody files -- if an employee 1 outside the city of New York files a complaint with 2 your office, do they have the option to go to court? 3 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: They do have the option 4 to go to court. We -- they can remove it to state 5 6 court even after a determination is made of probable 7 cause. ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Even after the 8 determination is made? 9 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Yes. 10 11 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: And they can also file a 12 claim within three years of the alleged act of discrimination. 13 14 So they have one year to file with us, and three years to file in state court. 15 16 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: How many applications do 17 you get of someone who is past that one-year deadline and has to be turn down, turned away? 18 19 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I don't readily have 20 those numbers available, but I -- if you'd like, I 21 can find those out --ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I'm curious to know. 22 23 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- and forward them to 24 you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And in that process, do

25

you notify, do you explain, to the person who brought the complaint about their options to go to court, and the timeline of when and how they should proceed with that?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I just want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Senator Jamaal Bailey.

And we will hear now from Senator Salazar.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

Thank you all for your testimony.

My -- I have a few questions for Dana.

First, I want to ask about, you mentioned that the gender-based harassment unit's budget is \$300,000, and that there have been 207 cases, that are both gender-based harassment and -- or, that are gender-based harassment.

Is this enough, in your opinion -- and

I realize you said you're not an economist -- in

your opinion, or your experience, do you think that
this is adequate funding to handle that many cases?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Well, like I said, the -you know, the unit has folks that are dedicated to
these cases. But, because there are quite a number
of them, and they are challenging cases to work on

and to collect the evidence around, attorneys in our general, sort of, pool of investigating attorneys handle these cases as well.

So it's not -- it's -- the unit is very useful, especially when there's a quick response that's needed.

But we also have attorneys who take on all sorts of cases; also take on gender-based harassment cases as well.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Excellent.

And then, also, regarding, you mentioned in your testimony, that when the unit supervisor is alerted to a claim, they'll make a quick assessment as to whether there should be any immediate action taken.

Could you possibly elaborate on what that assessment -- what is factored in in that assessment?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Sure.

So our typical process is that, someone will either send in -- complete our form on our website, or will call our info line, and, either way, it gets routed to our gender-based harassment unit supervisor.

They will then look at the report, and will

often speak with the potential complainant directly.

And in the cases that they've highlighted for me, they are -- there are situations in which someone was actually harassed on the job interview; was misgendered repeatedly, was harassed based on gender identity and stereotyping.

And the unit was able to intervene quickly, to ensure that the person was not discriminated against in getting the job. And then once on the job, would be, you know, not misgendered, not harassed, not work with the person who interviewed them.

So that was a unique situation in which the person really was adamant about not filing a complaint; wanted the job, didn't want to create a huge fuss, but wanted to be treated with dignity and respect, and not misgendered.

So -- so that's a unique situation.

But there have been others, where, it's -video surveillance was captured pretty quickly.

They would send out sort of a non-spoilation letter,
a preservation request, to say, We're initiating an
investigation. You must preserve this evidence and
deliver it to us;

Or, in other circumstances of immediate

transfer to a different location;

Or, a schedule change to avoid interaction with the harasser.

So we can't -- you know, we have limited ability to sort of prosecute cases without a complaint filed. But what we can do is help, sort of, navigate some of those complicated issues before someone initiates the whole process.

SENATOR SALAZAR: And this is somewhat related to my last question.

You also mentioned that, in the matters that the commission is investigating, this includes some -- in pre-complaint posture, where the commission is seeking to resolve them before a complaint is filed.

Could you maybe elaborate on what the motivation has been, or might be, to resolve before a complaint is filed?

Maybe this is obvious, but is -- is it just for efficiency? Is it to minimize the process that both parties have to go through?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I think it's -- some of those things.

I think there are people who call us, who say, This is happening. I don't want to file a

complaint.

So there are a few options.

We can initiate our own investigation.

There have been a few instances, that I'm aware of, where it's a restaurant. There's just pervasive hostile work environment for every -- you know, for many people. And we'd get reports of that.

And so we'll initiate sort of a pre-complaint intervention. We'll alert the respondent that we're investigating.

And some respondents, before they're actually respondents, will come to the table and say, Okay, we know there's a problem. We want to fix it. How can we work with you?

So we've negotiated mandated training, policy development, and then ongoing monitoring, so that they have to report back to the commission on the steps that they've taken.

And if they don't, we can file a complaint;

Or, if we are notified that they're not

complying, we can file a complaint.

So it's a mix of efficiencies, what the people coming forward want.

And -- and if a respondent is willing to come

to the table pretty early on, then we don't need to go through, like, sort of extended investigation and litigation.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Before I go to

Assemblywoman Simotas, I want to acknowledge we've

been joined by Assemblywoman Latrice Walker, the

Chair of the Assembly Task Force on Women's Issues.

We have -- we'll be rotating back and forth on the questions.

Assemblywoman Simotas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you.

I'm sure we all can appreciate how difficult it is to come to terms when somebody is being sexually harassed in the workplace.

My question is for DHR.

Do you believe that one year is enough to -- time to bring an action with your agency?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: If you're -- I believe you're talking about the statute of limitations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Yes.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: May I begin by saying that, when we do our education and outreach, one of the first things that we do is, we make potential --we make individuals aware in the public that it is a one-year from the last date of discrimination.

As to any changes in the statute of limitations, of course it's up to you; and if you changed it, we would abide by it.

However, in the administrative process, you know, the idea is that a complaint be addressed and adjudicated within a quicker manner than it would be in court.

So we have found that, if witnesses come closer in time to the last identified act, their memories are better, the documents haven't been destroyed, the respondents haven't gone out of business.

So there is -- that's what we have seen.

However, if you choose to change the statute of limitations, we welcome it, and we will abide by it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: I have another question, follow-up to that.

You know, normally, you would think that, if somebody is going through an administrative process, they might not need an attorney, or they can maybe file the complaint themselves.

If you're going to go through the court system, oftentimes people feel intimidated, and they believe that they need -- they need attorneys.

If they decide to go through the administrative process with DHR, do you think we should toll the statute of limitations, that they can then file claims in state court, to actually give them an opportunity to really have their grievances heard?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Should we toll the stat -- let me make sure I understand it.

Would you mind repeating that?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Yes.

Should we -- if somebody decides to go through the administrative process with DHR, should the time frame that it takes to go through that process be looped on to the amount of time they can file a claim in state court?

In other words, if it takes 180 days, ideally, or if it takes two years, because sometimes, you know, as we know from the testimony that you submitted, it takes longer, should their time not run out to actually go to state court and file a claim if they're actually able to secure an attorney?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: That's a tough one.

They have three years to go to court. That's a good amount of time.

I think -- I think it's an issue of, you have 1 2 to pick your forum. But, again, the way the law is currently 3 written, they have a year for us, and they have 4 three years to go to court. 5 The way it is currently written, we enforce 6 7 it. If changes are to be made, then we will -- we 8 will enforce them. 9 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you. 10 11 SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Gounardes. SENATOR GOUNARDES: Thank you very much. 12 13 I have --14 SENATOR BIAGGI: Excuse me, I'm so sorry. 15 Pardon my interruption. 16 We have been joined by Senator James Skoufis, 17 my other co-chair. 18 Sorry, Senator Gounardes. SENATOR GOUNARDES: Okay. Anything for 19 20 Senator Skoufis. 21 [Laughter.] 22 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Thank you very much for 23 your testimony this morning. 24 I want to start with some questions for DHR. 25 You said that, of all the cases you received,

that you invest -- you received, and then you closed 1 out, 25 percent of them in sexual-harassment cases, 2 3 complaints filed, had probable cause to move on to a hearing. Is that right? 4 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Correct. 5 6 SENATOR GOUNARDES: The non-sexual harassment 7 cases, what's the percentage of cases that you've investigated that result in the probable cause --8 9 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: For the past -- since 2016, they have been hovering around 10 to 12 10 11 percent. 12 SENATOR GOUNARDES: So the sexual-harassment 13 complaints have a higher rate of probable-cause 14 findings? 15 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Correct. 16 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Okay. Thank you. 17 What is the -- after a cause of probable -after a finding of probable cause is made, what's 18 19 the time window for a hearing in which a complainant 20 gets the hearing at that point? 21 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Okay. 22 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Can you walk us through 23 that? 24 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Absolutely. 25 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Average time?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: So -- just so you know the process:

In all cases but for housing cases, once there is a determination of probable cause, again, all cases but housing cases will be scheduled for a prehearing settlement conference.

During that time, the complainant, if they have a private attorney, they will be on there. If not, a division attorney is assigned.

An administrative law judge is on the call. She run -- she or he runs the call, as well as the respondent and the respondent's attorney.

That usually is scheduled about four weeks after a probable-cause determination.

If there is a settlement, the case will come off the calendar, and the attorneys will reduce it into writing.

And once the parties sign off on it, the division attorney will send it to the administrative law judge, who will review it, okay it, and then it's sent to the commissioner to sign off on an order.

However, if there isn't a settlement, the case will then be scheduled for a public hearing, and that's, usually, anywhere between two to

three months after the prehearing settlement conference.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: And in those cases, if it gets to the hearing, is the preliminary finding of probable cause given any additional weight to the -- to the judge, or is it a -- is it basically like starting from scratch again, to (indiscernible cross-talking --)

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: It's a de novo hearing.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: It's a de novo hearing?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Yes.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: So it's kind of like another bite at the apple, you know, to kind of have a fresh start, for both the complainant and the alleged harasser?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: They put on their evidence anew, yes.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: Okay.

In what percentage of cases that you receive, that you make a determination on, can you kind of walk us through how many of the cases you're able to make a probable-cause determination on without doing any additional fact finding?

In other words, how many cases do you just get a complaint, you talk to the alleged harasser,

give the complainant a chance to rebut, and then make a closing?

Or, how much time -- in what cases do you actually go beyond the back-and-forth, to come to a conclusion?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: So I can't give you an actual number for that.

There are cases where they're pretty straightforward and we can just move forward pretty quickly.

However, each investigation is obviously done on a case-by-case basis. All of the cases are fact-specific.

And our investigations are done using tools at the discretion of the regional director.

So some cases require one- and two-party conferences; some don't.

Some cases require additional requests for information; some don't.

Site visits as well.

I don't have exact numbers for which ones kind of go through the process because, they're so good, that we have that, you know, piece of evidence, where the alleged harasser is saying, you know, X, Y, Z, and we're good to go within, you

1 know, two or three weeks. 2 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Got you. 3 Okay, thank you. And I guess this question is -- sorry, one 4 more question for DHR, and then a question for both. 5 6 You said that you have a 62 percent increase 7 in the number of complaints that have been received? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: 62 percent increase in 8 9 sexual-harassment filings since 2016. So that's, from 2016 to 2018, the filings for sexual-harassment 10 11 complaints have increased by 62 percent. 12 Correct. 13 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Has your budget increased 14 by any reasonable amount in that time window as well 15 to process those? 16 I know there was a similar question raised on 17 the Assembly side about more resources. 18 But if you have -- that seems like a pretty dramatic increase. 19 20 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It definitely is a 21 pretty dramatic --22 SENATOR GOUNARDES: Have you received any 23 additional support -- budgetary support to kind of 24 help accommodate?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I'd have to speak to my

25

finance director about that.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: Okay. Thank you.

I guess for both DHR and the city commission, what -- are the investigators that you have, are they trained in, you know, kind of, dealing with trauma victims, when they are interviewing and taking complaints, and interviewing complainants, about these cases?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: So we've have partnered with the Mayor's office to end gender-based discrim -- gender-based violence -- domestic and gender-based violence, to train our staff. They provide a pretty comprehensive victim-centered and trauma-informed training to City employees.

And so we partner with them to get our staff trained.

I think the next upcoming training is this summer.

And one of the benefits of having the gender-based harassment unit, is we have individuals who are regularly working with people who are coming out of or are currently in very stressful, emotionally-charged, and, in many cases, devastating situations.

And so they are particularly well positioned

to handle those cases.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: All of our investigators are trained thoroughly in conducting confidential investigations.

And our regional director has been trained specifically in conducting sexual-harassment investigations, so she does train her staff.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: When we held our last hearing in February, we heard from a different agency, JCOPE, in which they said that it's, you know, common for them to ask complainants about their prior sexual history at the invest -- at the complaint state, as a potential rebuttal for defenses raised later on.

Is that a practice that either of your agencies engage in when you are taking complaints or doing preliminary investigations or interviews.

- D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I am not aware of that practice.
- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I am not aware of that practice either.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: We've also been joined by Assemblywoman Linda Rosenthal.

For the next question,

Assemblywoman Rebecca Seawright.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SEAWRIGHT: That you for your testimony.

I replaced a legislator that was a harasser.

And as a young staff member, I was sexually harassed by a state legislator.

I have a question.

Do you have recommendations for legislation that would assist you in your enforcement actions?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I -- from the City's position, we are -- you know, we are in the process of implementing a package of bills from last year, including the extension of the statute of limitations for gender-based harassment claims, from one year, to three years.

And so I think the work that we're doing to implement that bill package has been informative, and I think we're seeing the benefits of those new laws, and increased awareness around the commission, through that bill package.

So, I don't have any specific recommendations to share, other than to share the experience that we've had at the city level.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I would say, as to DHR, you know, we're neutral, we're impartial, and we're

1 an enforcement agency. We're not an advisory 2 agency. 3 However you decide as legislators to change the law, we will definitely enforce it. 4 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SEAWRIGHT: Thank you. 5 6 SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Liu? 7 SENATOR LIU: Thank you, Madam Chair. I -- I appreciate these wonderful individuals 8 9 for attending our hearing and answering questions. You know when -- when your superiors put you 10 11 in this position, it's potentially unpleasant. 12 And so let me ask you not to take anything 13 personally. Okay? 14 But I'm listening to this back-and-forth. 15 I'm listening to the testimony from the State 16 Division of Human Rights. And I will say that I really appreciate the 17 18 City's Division of Human Rights testimony. 19 But the testimony that the State is giving 20 here, it's all about how proud you are, how happy 21 you are about the work that you do, how efficient 22 you do things. 23 It's as if there are no problems whatsoever. 24 And then you answer the questions from my

fellow legislators here. They're asking you

25

specific things, and sometimes you just sound defensive.

So my -- and your testimony, towards the end, at least I'm kind of happy that you at least say, your -- "the division is also committed to ending sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination via outreach and education."

So, are you committed to enforcing the law as it currently is written, or are you truly enfor -- are you truly committed to ending sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination?

See, the City's testimony specifically says that they think the law should be changed, and cites a specific example, such has, "correcting the decades of case law establishing unnecessarily high, severe, or pervasive standard, and explicitly rejecting the Faragher-Ellerth affirmative defense."

They give examples of how the City thinks they should -- the state law should change.

You don't cite any examples. You just talk about how well the division has been doing.

Even though it is clearly a new day, the laws haven't changed very much.

We haven't had a hearing until our co-chairs here put together something a few months ago.

1 And it's like the division of -- the State Division of Human Rights is, like, everything is 2 fine and dandy. 3 Am I mischaracterizing you? 4 5 I certainly hope I am. Maybe you can clarify some of your testimony 6 7 and the responses that you've given to questions from these legislators? 8 9 Or maybe I can be specific. Is there one law, or, maybe one of our 10 11 proposed bills, about a dozen proposed bills, that 12 the State Division of Human Rights would like to see 13 enacted? 14 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Well, I would say, 15 I don't take it personal. 16 SENATOR LIU: Okay. 17 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: That is --SENATOR LIU: Good. And it is --18 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- that is -- we'll 19 20 start from there. 21 SENATOR LIU: -- not meant personally. 22 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Right, we'll start from 23 there. 24 But, again, if we're to remain neutral, and

enforce the laws as we are, if any opinion that we

25

gave would be inappropriate, right, because it takes away from that.

So, again, while you would like us to say any recommendations I'd have to stand by, in order to remain neutral, we can't.

SENATOR LIU: Well, you know what? I've heard much testimony from police commissioners, from commissioners of other agencies, that are sworn to uphold the laws as it -- laws as they currently are, but have no hesitation to suggest changes or improvements to current law.

And if you truly are committed to ending sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination, as per your testimony, there's got to be some kind of change.

I mean -- either everything is fine and dandy, or there's got to be some kind change that you think would make sense.

So once again, the question is: Is there at least one of these bills that you think would make sense?

We've had -- we've got about a dozen bills on the docket. Is there at least one that make sense?

The City cites four specific areas.

I have named two of the four specific areas

that they've mentioned.

2 Is there one?

Are you -- even in response to

Chairman Crespo's question about pervas -- pervas -"severe and pervasive," you kind of said that, oh,
it's not really -- to me, it sounded like you didn't
think it was necessary for the State to adopt that
kind of standard.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Well, it's definitely not our position, and I hope you don't take this personally, but I'm going to stand by my answer.

It is my belief that if any recommendation on potential changes to the law, or pending legislation, would be inappropriate.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Can I -- I'm sorry.

SENATOR LIU: (Nods head) Yeah.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Can I just add, without -- again, I have to agree, and say, again, what Deputy Commissioner Franco says, we can't say anything specific. We enforce the law; we don't make the law.

But I also want to respond to the assertion that we think everything is fine and dandy.

We don't.

We enforce the oldest human rights law in the

1 country, and we aggressively enforce it. But we know that discrimination exists, and that an 2 aggressive approach is required. 3 And it has taken a long time for us to get 4 5 here. And we want to work with all of you to 6 7 strengthen the protections that exist, and that's why we're here. 8 But it's a multi-prong approach that we need. 9 There's a culture shift going on right now. 10 11 But -- but we're -- we're getting there, but 12 we're not there. 13 And that just doesn't go for sexual 14 harassment. 15 You know, the discrimination, in and of 16 itself, is still existing. 17 Black people are still getting fired from jobs. People on public assistance are still losing 18 19 their homes. People in wheelchairs still can't get 20 into restaurants. 21 We don't think that things are fine and dandy 22 by any stretch of the imagination. SENATOR LIU: Those forms of discrimination 23

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Absolutely.

24

25

are -- are terrible --

SENATOR LIU: -- and you should continue the enforcement actions against those kinds of discrimination.

But there is a heightened awareness of sexual harassment.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes.

SENATOR LIU: And you can't be doing the same things as usual. It's not business as usual. You have to change some of the approaches.

And working with the legislative body, I think is fine.

Maybe, as deputy commissioners, I will allow this. Maybe as deputy commissioners you're not empowered to go beyond this testimony.

But I would encourage you to go back to your commissioner, and send us some kind of feedback as to:

Do you absolutely oppose all the bills that we've proposed?

Or might there be one, two, perhaps a few bills, that you think would make sense and would help you do your job better?

The mission that you specifically cite in your testimony, of ending -- of your commitment to "ending sexual harassment and other forms

1 discrimination via outreach and education." 2 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Noted. Thank you. Wе will. 3 SENATOR LIU: Thank you. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I want to acknowledge 5 6 we've been joined by Assemblyman Harvey Epstein, who's off to the side beyond the column where I 7 can't see him. 8 9 [Laughter.] 10 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: But he's there, he's there. 11 12 Assemblymember Quart. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Good morning. 14 My questions are for Ms. Franco. 15 In your comments to Senator Liu's questions, 16 you said it is your job or your agency's job to 17 enforce the law, not write the law. So let me ask you a couple questions about 18 19 enforcement. 20 If you can turn to page 3 of your testimony, 21 you talked about 172-day time period. 22 That's about a six-month time period, from a 23 complaint being registered, to a final determination. 24

Is that correct?

25

1 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I'm Franco, and it was 2 my testimony. Yes, it's about six months. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: About six months. 4 5 Where in that timeline, generally, is the probable-cause determination? 6 7 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: At about the end of it, that's it's when -- the determination is made, the 8 9 172 days. 10 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: So somewhere, month five, 11 month six, is that fair to say? 12 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: What happens to the 13 complainant for the first five months while he or 14 15 she waits for adjudication? 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Well, we keep in touch 17 with the complainant, generally. They can contact 18 They know who's assigned to their case; the 19 investigator that's assigned to their case. 20 They can --21 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: You keep in touch with 22 the complainant? 23 That's -- let me ask it a different way. 24 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Okay. 25 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: What regulations exist,

what statutory -- what regulations exist under your statutory mandate that allow you to prevent irreparable harm from the complainant during that five or six months while you wait to make -- while you investigate, and then make a determination on probable cause?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: The only statutory protection that exists is the anti-retaliation protection that we have --

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: So there's no --

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- where the respondent is informed that, if they do retaliate against the complainant for filing a complaint, an additional action may be brought against them.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: So other than laws against retaliate -- retaliatate (ph.) --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Retaliation.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: -- retaliatory laws --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: -- statutes --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: -- do any regulations exist that allow you, as an agency, to take preventive action within that 150-day time period to prevent that complainant from a worsening condition,

an exacerbation, of why they came to you in the first place?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Not that I'm aware of, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Do you think that would be a welcomed area that we should legislate in, to give you greater tools to prevent irreparable harm, from someone who comes forth and complains, while you investigate and make a determination on probable cause?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: That is something to be considered.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Before I hand the microphone over to Senator Krueger, I just want to make one comment about what Senator Liu had said.

You had made a comment about being neutral on the cases.

But it is your job to not to be neutral on the law.

In fact, as a former counsel and staffer in Governor Cuomo's counsel's office, one of the things I did, in fact, when the legislators ended their session and the bills came to our desk, was I called the agencies right away, and they weighed in on all

of the bills.

And, in fact, as a non-subject-matter expert on many of the bills, the agencies were my allies and my strongest supporters on those topics.

And without them, the bills wouldn't have been able to have been passed.

And so I would actually disagree that you can't be neutral. In fact, I would implore you to not to be neutral, because you can't fully effectuate your roles.

And we, as the Legislature, need your opinions because, if not you, then who; who should we go to?

Senator Krueger?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you, Senator.

Oh, I think this is working.

Thank you.

So it's -- mine is follow-up on a whole series of the questions.

So given the problem we're hearing -- two parts of a problem:

One: Some employers saying, well, there are good policies now. There's no reason anyone ever have to go sue, because they report to someone and it gets taken care of.

And then you have the reality that, because we have the Faragher-Ellerth defense as a viable employer stance regarding sexual harassment, if the employee is just completely confused about what harassment policy is, and where they're supposed to go, and how they're supposed to report, that the burden of proof falls on them, and they failed to meet their responsibilities to report and complain harassment.

So I want to ask the three of you: If you were victims of sexual harassment, and you've already answered that it's the person's determination whether they go to courts or whether they go to one of your agencies, if it was one of you, would you go to your agency or would you go to the courts?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Well, it's hard to be unbiased.

You know, I think that there -- there's strengths to either -- or, there's reasons to choose your venue.

I think what's important here, too, to recognize is that, while the agencies enforce their -- our own anti-discrimination laws, courts are also interpreting these same laws.

So while the state division is committed to interpreting the law quite broadly and protectively, as is the commission, we have no say or influence over state court judges or federal judges in how they interpret the standards.

So these standards that you're debating today will not just impact our work, or the state division's work, but how judges interpret the laws.

And that's where we see the real stark case law in which a City Human Rights Law claim survives a motion to dismiss or a summary judgment, and a State Human Rights Law claim does not, for the same behavior, because one standard is so much -- is higher than the other.

So I think that's an important thing to recognize, that when you go to state court, you can bring a City Human Rights Law claim, you can bring a State Human Rights Law claim, but you may not prevail on your State Human Rights Law claim as it currently is interpreted by case law because the standard is quite different.

I think it's about -- it's all -- it's very much about resources, and I think it's also very much about -- about how public the process is.

At the city commission, there's no public

filing. There is no online, you know, database where you could search for someone's complaint.

That may happen some day, and, certainly, we are subject to FOIL when the case is closed.

But, if you want to -- if -- when you file with the commission, it's, essentially, a document that you sign on that -- that an attorney drafts, and it's served on the responding party.

So it's not -- you can make it public. It's not as though anyone is prevented from making it public. And the respondent will know. But it is not, sort of, going to court and having it be in a public forum in the same way.

So I think it's both about resources and it's about how public you wish to be, and many other factors.

But, I'll leave it at that.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Other lady?

- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sure -- you want to go ahead? Go on.
- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Well, I would file with my agency, given the timing of the investigations, how quickly they are investigated; and the probable-cause rate at 25 percent; and the fact that I know that my staff is very well equipped to handle

these cases, and trained.

I believe that my agency is the best to handle my claim.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: For myself, speaking from personal experience, I was the victim of discrim -- of sexual harassment. I chose to file with my employer first. Then I consulted with an attorney, and took it from there.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So you're, all three, in a situation also where you work for the agency that's supposed to being overseeing these cases, but that doesn't necessarily make you that different than people I've heard from who work for -- who have worked for the executive, agencies, or the Legislature.

Or even, today, we had more exposures about the Harvey Weinstein case, where you had people working for very powerful people.

And we've already learned that you can't necessarily do anything to protect them for five, six months, even if you're taking the case.

I guess I don't understand why I wouldn't try to go to a court to get resolution, rather than face the problems inherent of going to an agency that is overseen, or agencies that are overseen, by people

1 who may be the ones committing the crimes. So I -- again, I do -- I don't want to have 2 3 not multiple options for people. But I think, particularly because of the 4 failure to eliminate the Faragher-Ellerth defense, 5 we are putting victims between a rock and hard 6 place, where one or the other decision might be the 7 right one or the wrong one at that moment, but they 8 9 can just get caught in -- what's that sci-fi movie loop, where you just --10 11 I don't -- I'm not good at sci-fi, so I'm 12 sorry I made the reference. 13 [Laughter.] 14 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- but you're just caught 15 in this loop. 16 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Inception? 17 SENATOR KRUEGER: John Liu, do you --OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: I think you're right. 18 SENATOR LIU: "Liu." It's not "Loop." 19 20 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- that loop -- okay, no, I wasn't attacking you, John Liu. 21 22 "Loop." 23 [Laughter.] 24 SENATOR KRUEGER: My colleagues, it's very

25

hard to work with them.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR KRUEGER: Well, you get caught in a loop, and you've got time frames, and you're not allowed to do both.

And so I really think this is a critical part of our assignment as a legislator, to figure out and make sure that we aren't leaving victims in different scenarios where neither option is really the right option, and they're left hanging out there, and they, potentially, can lose all their rights and protections, because we didn't make the law clear enough about what path is the correct path to take to be protected, and to ensure that you have rights, and that you don't end up losing your job when someone else was at fault.

So I think that's what I'm struggling to try to get an understanding of today from you all.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Walker.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Thank you to our Co-Chairs, and to the witnesses here today for your testimony.

One of the -- I guess, one of the major concerns that I have with respect to these issues are regarding nondisclosure agreements.

And I understand now that these are instruments that are frowned upon.

And, you know, we hope, that when litigants are coming to their settlement arrangements, that they are instruments that are no longer being utilized.

When parties are settling, do you have an opportunity to review their settlement agreements in order to ensure that NDAs are not used either affirmatively or in a -- or in a nondescript manner?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: When cases are resolved through the commission process and a conciliation agreement is negotiated, that's an agreement between the complainant, the respondent, and commission. There is no nondisclosure provision. It's against the public interest.

The commission is not prevented from talking about the case, the complainant or the respondent are not prevented from talking about the case.

Parties can negotiate -- request to remove their case from our office and negotiate their own settlement.

And, currently, that could involve, from what I understand, nondisclosure agreements in a sort of private settlement posture.

The commission still retains the ability to continue the investigation of the workplace.

If we understand that this is not an isolated situation, we can continue to work to ensure training; monitoring; potentially, civil penalties.

We can reach out to see if there are other victims.

But if the parties -- if the two parties specifically remove the case to negotiate their own resolution, there may be an NDA in there.

But cases that are resolved through the commission, there is no nondisclosure provisions in those agreements.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: With the State, where there is a settlement agreement done at the regional level, which is during the investigative stage, the division is a party to that agreement, so we review all the provisions. And the NDA is only a part or a separate agreement at the -- if it's the complainant's preference.

As with the city commission, if the complainant and the respondent wish to enter into a private agreement, we are not a party to that, and that is a separate issue.

And we let them know that we cannot enforce that.

So if the respondent agrees to do something, and then they fail to do it, we cannot enforce that.

So with agreements where the case is settled before a determination is made, you know, before the investigation is completed, yes, we make sure that there are no NDAs in there, unless the complainant wants it.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: It's the same for post determination as well, it really is the complainant's preference.

The assigned division attorney explains to them the ramifications of having one in or not having one in.

But, again, it is the complainant's preference that dictates it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: So even in -- even in an instant, because I believe I read that if a complainant does not have an attorney, then the agency provides them an attorney? Is that --

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: That is correct, and that's after there is a post determination.

So for the settlement conferences, post determination, as well as the hearing, an attorney is assigned to the case.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: So, ultimately, the

attorney that's assigned has an ability to have a conversation with the complainant about NDAs, or encourage them or discourage them, or whatever; but, either way, they still have the ability to enter into these types of agreements on behalf of a complainant?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Again, the attorneys do -- when they do reach a settlement in principle, and, let's say, and they reduce it to writing, we do send the documents to the complainant. We go through each -- all the terms of the settlement, explain each term to them, including a potential confidentiality agreement, and explain what would happen if they agree to it, and what they don't if they didn't agree to it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Have there been instances where perhaps someone agreed to a nondisclosure agreement, and then came back again to the agency, to say, you know, I made a mistake; or, you know, I want to -- you know, I want say something, I want to tell someone something?

Have you seen them sort of, you know, recant, I guess, their feelings with respect to entering into such an agreements?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Not that I am aware of.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I have not been made 1 aware of any, any of those instances. 2 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Do you believe that we, as a state, should allow liquidated damages if a 4 victim decides to speak about their experiences? 5 6 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I'm sorry, can you 7 repeat that one more time? ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Do you believe, as a 8 9 state, that we should allow liquidated damages if a victim decides to speak about their experiences with 10 11 re -- when there is an NDA agreement established? 12 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I've never had to deal 13 with that, so I'm thinking about it a second. 14 never had that issue brought to me. 15 So, if you could just give me a moment. 16 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Perhaps because 17 there's an NDA? 18 [Laughter.] 19 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Not right now. 20 I mean, it's something to be considered, but, 21 I take no position on that. 22 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Say that again? 23 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I said, it's something 24 to be considered, but, you know, having not thought

about that, I can't really, like, give an informed

25

opinion about it, not knowing the pros and the cons, and having had time to think about it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: I guess it's just sort in the era of, you know, time's up, and, you know, and -- and encouraging individuals who have gone through these experiences to -- to come out, and utilize their story to help other people who are going through them.

Or, in many instances, it's therapeutic just for themselves, to be able to have a forum by which they are able to engage about their experiences, not just with the sexual assault or harassment that they've gone through, but, also, as -- you know, to speak about their experiences through the process, even with your agencies.

So -- so it's just -- you know, I guess my concern is, is that we are, as a state, sort of allowing for, I don't know, the victimization of an individual to be muted.

And so I'm just trying to figure out, like, how, or what is it that we can do, in order to encourage more individuals to come forward, as opposed to saying, that there's this forum that's available to you to adjudicate your claims, but once you go through the process, don't ever talk about

this again.

And, I mean, it's something that happens in families.

And I just don't think that it's something that should -- it happens in church, it happens in schools, it happens in communities.

And I just don't think that it's something that we should be allowing, condoning, and, also, as in the case of the attorneys, really encouraging someone in their professional lives and in their careers to be supportive of.

So those are just my thoughts.

And, thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Carlucci.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you.

I want to thank the Co-Chairs, and thank you Commissioner Sussman, and Commissioners Franco and Martinez, for testifying here today.

And I share my colleagues' sentiment, and the frustration, that we want to work together to pass important legislation. And we're -- we're excited about a package of legislation put forth by Senator Biaggi, that we believe will truly make an impact in helping and protect survivors.

And to that effort, I'll ask a few questions,

just to see what guidance we could get.

You know, some of the alarming things that stand out, of many, but one I'll focus in on, in terms of statute of limitations, when we talk about the "one year," and I know it was asked by some of my colleagues this morning, what would be some of the unforeseen consequences of extending the statute of limitations?

And I know it was said that, as time passes, memories become foggy, not as clear, and that's understandable; or, that documents might not exist anymore.

What I'm thinking about is where the memory is clear three years later, or 12 -- 13 months later, the documents still are intact, and we've totally shut the door.

That concerns me, and I think it concerns many members here today, and looking to extend that statute of limitations.

Could you give us any type of guidance in that direction, or things that we should be concerned about?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Well, if the statute of limitations were to be extended, I think, assuming we could actually find the respondent, and other

witnesses, then more complaints would be filed.

Obviously, you know, you'd be opening the door to additional complaints.

But I think, as Commissioner Franco said before, the concern, and this is a concern in litigation as well, is that, right, memories do go stale; respondents go out of business, people die.

It's not that, you know, we're looking to limit the amount of complaints that we get. That's not the case at all, we're not doing that.

It's just that this is -- this is the amount of time that we've been given.

But, by giving, you know, the additional time, you're right, we would be getting more complaints. The numbers wouldn't necessarily go up with probable-cause rates. We would just be getting more complaints.

But, again, I can't take a position on that.

But if you were to do that, we would absolutely be open to more investigations.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So I'm just trying to understand that --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Sure.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- some of the concerns would be, yes, you would be dealing with a bigger

1 caseload. 2 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Absolutely bigger 3 caseload. SENATOR CARLUCCI: That --4 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Resources. 5 6 SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- but any of these 7 issues, like, a business going out of business --8 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 9 SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- or someone passing away, I mean, that could happen at any time. 10 11 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: At any time, yes. 12 But, then, how do we redress the complainant 13 when that happens --14 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Well, how do you do it 15 now? 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- if the respondent 17 dies --18 We can't, unfortunately. 19 So the three years doesn't --20 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Just to give that 21 opportunity. 22 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- sure, absolutely, the 23 person is able to file the complaint, at least. 24 But it's the same thing, right, with the 25 "one year," if --

1	SENATOR CARLUCCI: You know
2	D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: go ahead, please.
3	SENATOR CARLUCCI: well, I was just moving
4	on, unless you had any other
5	D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: No, no, no. Please.
6	SENATOR CARLUCCI: When we talk about the
7	average determination, with 180 days, and or
8	172 days, and we've seen the increase in the past
9	year, has that number increased in the past year, or
10	has that been the standard for the past few years?
11	D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I'm sorry, has what
12	number increased?
13	SENATOR CARLUCCI: You it says,
14	"Currently, 97 percent of claims investigated by DHR
15	are completed and determinations are made within
16	180 days."
17	D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Correct.
18	SENATOR CARLUCCI: And we know that, as was
19	stated earlier, since 2016
20	D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes.
21	SENATOR CARLUCCI: the amount of
22	complaints have increased by over 60 percent.
23	D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes.
24	SENATOR CARLUCCI: And so I'm just trying to
25	understand that has that completion time of

180 days, has that increased since 2016, or has that 1 2 stayed about the same? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: No, the -- the 172 days 3 you're asking, has it increased? 4 I think that's been -- that's been pretty 5 6 steady. We've been holding -- we've been doing very well with our investigation times --7 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. 8 9 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- (indiscernible 10 cross-talking). 11 SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then, in there, "We take into consideration that, if the investigator 12 13 finds no probable cause, or lack of jurisdiction, that the complaint is dismissed." 14 15 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 16 SENATOR CARLUCCI: And, obviously, that's 17 understandable. Probable cause would take some time to 18 19 investigate, and 180 days sounds appropriate. 20 When we talk about lack of jurisdiction --21 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 22 SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- how long does that, 23 usually, typically take? 24 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It depends on the 25 circumstances. It could take a lot less time.

1 I don't have the actual average number for LOJs, but we can safely say it takes less time 2 (inaudible). 3 SENATOR CARLUCCI: What would be an example 4 of a lack of jurisdiction? 5 6 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: What's an easy one. The respondent is outside of the state. 7 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. And I'm just trying 8 9 to figure out, because I think that would be simple 10 to figure out --11 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes, yes. 12 SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- and it wouldn't take 13 180 days. D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 14 15 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yeah. 17 Or we are outside of the statute of limitations. 18 SENATOR CARLUCCI: And that's, jurisdiction 19 20 includes the statute of limitations? 21 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 22 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Do you have any ideas of 23 how many reports are filed each year that are 24 actually outside the statute of limitations, or are 25 you trying to deny those from even being filed in

the first place?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: No, we take all complaints. We never turn anyone away.

But I don't have the number regarding how many cases come in --

SENATOR CARLUCCI: If it's possible to get --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- over the one year.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- that information, that would be helpful.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Sure.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then when there is the lack of jurisdiction, and let's say it's not because of statute of limitations, but it's because it's actual jurisdiction, but there might possibly be a claim that is eligible to be filed, are you able to walk that person through the process of what they do if it's not within your jurisdiction?

Is there any mechanism to help them file the appropriate complaint, maybe with another jurisdiction?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes.

So we have, when a complainant comes in to file the complaint, or even when they call in to inquire about the process, we will let them know -- we'll ask them about the facts of their case, and

we'll let them know, if they don't -- if they can't 1 file a complaint, or, if they don't want to pursue 2 3 our process, these are the other available avenues for them. And then we can give them their phone 4 number as well. 5 We do give them their information. 6 7 SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then just one last question: When there is a determination of probable 8 9 cause and the case is moving forward, do you have an idea of what percentage of people are represented by 10 11 private counsel as opposed to you providing counsel? 12 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I don't -- when they 13 file the complaint? 14 SENATOR CARLUCCI: No, actual -- after 15 probable cause. 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Post probable cause? 17 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Yeah. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: I don't have that number 19 with us, but we can get that to you. 20 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. 21 Okay, thank you. 22 Thank you, Chairman. 23 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simon. 24 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Yes, thank you.

Okay, thank you very much.

25

1 I have a couple of quick questions for you. 2 Now, the State has already commented about the -- when the statute of limitations begins to 3 run; it's the last discriminatory act. 4 5 I just wanted to ask the City, is that also 6 the case? 7 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: That's correct, the last discriminatory act. 8 And we can reach back further in time if it's 9 a continuing violation, a pattern or practice of 10 11 behavior. 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: And you're taking a 13 liberal view of a "continuing violation"? 14 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: We do, yes. 15 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Okay. 16 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: We do as well at the 17 State. 18 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Okay. Well, that's good to know. 19 20 It would be nice if the feds did the same 21 thing. The other -- another question I have is: Do 22 23 you have any data with regard to the industries from 24 which these complaints emanate? 25 So, for example, higher education, there are

a lot of employment cases, but also other forms of 1 harassment cases, within institutions of higher 2 education, which are, actually, fairly major 3 employers in a whole host of fields. 4 So I'm particularly curious about higher 5 education, for some other reasons. 6 7 And I'm curious whether you have that data? D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Do not have that data 8 9 with us. ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Do you collect that 10 11 type of data? 12 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Well, we just actually 13 got back jurisdiction for the public schools. 14 So when you say "higher education," are you 15 talking about the colleges? 16 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Colleges and 17 universities. D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: It may be possible for 18 19 us to pull that kind of data. 20 So when I go back, I will find out if it can 21 be. 22 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Wonderful; if you do 23 have the data, I would like to see that. 24 And then the other question I have for the

25

State:

1 We've talked a little bit about matters 2 relating to the budget. 3 And last year I know, in the budget, we provided funding for three additional attorneys, 4 5 I believe, because we were expanding the policies 6 and requiring the training, and anticipated that 7 there would be more complaints. My question is: What about investigators? 8 9 Do you need investigators? 10 How many more investigators? 11 I've heard various reports from colleagues 12 who are practicing in the field, that they believe 13 more investigators are needed. 14 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Do you want my wish 15 list? 16 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Yes. 17 [Laughter.] D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Well, to start with, 18 19 I would love an additional investigator in every 20 regional office, absolutely. 21

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: There's 13 regional offices? Is that --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: There's 12 regional offices around the state, yeah.

22

23

24

25

I think that would be highly beneficial for

our staff, to kind ease the caseload for everyone.

Ultimately, my wish list is to open additional regional offices as well.

But I -- I think that, you know, the more -- and I'm sure we'll talk about the outreach in education that we do.

The more that we do outreach and education, and we do -- we have a new commissioner, who has big plans for outreach and education in the future.

And the more outreach and education that we do, I have a feeling that our 6,000 is going to skyrocket.

So, I might be better off asking for two or three additional investigators in every office right now, if I could predict the future.

We are planning robust outreach and education all over the state, in hard-to-reach areas, hard-to-reach populations, that -- where there are individuals that maybe, necessarily, haven't been made aware of our process, and who should be made aware.

So, you know, with this 6,000 complaints that we get every year, and this 62 percent increase,

I absolutely expect that that will continue to go

up.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: I just, yesterday, was speaking with a group of -- who represents merchants, for example, in a business-improvement district. And many of them are small employers, some of them are larger employers. And they're all very confused about the sexual-harassment provisions.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: And were -- they have, in fact, engaged someone to do training, and so they've been through training.

But it's very difficult, often, to get shop owners, for example, to participate in these programs because they can't leave their businesses to do that.

And they expressed an interest to have more robust communications from the State and the City with regard to these requirements, so that they could better help their members comply with the law.

So I just wanted to throw that out there for your consideration.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Thank you.

And that's exactly the kind of information that we want to know, so that we can actually go out there and engage those different organizations.

That's very helpful.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: And just from the City side, we will be sending out mailers to all department of finance-identified businesses, with a focus on small businesses, in English and Spanish, which lays out all of the new City requirements, including providing the English and Spanish poster that must go up in all businesses, and links to the online training that we have, which I mentioned is optimized for smartphone use.

We anticipate people will take it on phones, crowd around one screen together, take it together, which is totally compliant.

And so we're trying to make -- we understand and recognize that laws are changing rapidly. Very few small businesses have access to legal counsel to guide them.

And that we want to work with small businesses, and provide as much information as we can, given the resources, to get them up to speed.

and this will be my last point, one of the concerns that was expressed to me yesterday in this meeting, was that the department of finance's records for the addresses of owners, for example, that they would

send this information to, are hopelessly out of date. And that the bids are getting a lot of returned address -- returned mail, and have no idea how to reach out to the owners.

And so perhaps you might encourage the department of finance to step up some efforts to clarify their records.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: That's helpful. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Mayer.

SENATOR MAYER: Thank you.

I have a question for the division of human right's staff.

Within your practice, if you get a complaint that -- while the person may come to you, thinking it belongs in your bailiwick, upon review, it is a potential criminal action, or, potentially, a criminal action, by the accused, do you ever refer matters to the district attorney of the county in which this occurs?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: It's our practice, if we do come across that -- it's not often that I have come across it -- but we do, depending on what the facts are, it could be that I will call the district

attorney's office and let them know, or, I will 1 refer it to -- I will inform the complainant that 2 they should call the district attorney's office. 3 SENATOR MAYER: Do you know how many times 4 the division has referred matters to the district 5 6 attorney's office in the past year? 7 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: In my own experience, just once. 8 SENATOR MAYER: Would you support legislation 9 10 that explicitly directed the division to report 11 potential criminal acts to the district attorney? 12 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: It's our practice to do 13 that. SENATOR MAYER: Yeah, but not -- I'm sorry. 14 15 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Whether or not 16 legislation is warranted --17 SENATOR MAYER: I'm asking you --D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- I don't know, but it 18 19 is our practice. 20 SENATOR MAYER: -- as someone who gets these 21 complaints. 22 This is important. 23 Someone might come to me and say, This happened. I'm going to call the division of human 24 25 rights.

That's all they know. They don't really know it may be criminal.

You are the experts in the field.

I'm asking if it would be helpful.

I understand your reluctance to talk about any legislation, which I would acknowledge with my colleague Senator Liu, that Executive Law 290, subdivision 3, and, Article 15 of the Human Rights Law, makes clear the division is not a neutral player. It has a function and a mission.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Poor choice of words
I guess I used earlier today. So I apologize.

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

But that being said, this agency, and I've been around long enough to know, was established with the mission of addressing discrimination in New York State.

So I would respectfully suggest that your reluctance to talk about how to improve the law is not consistent with the mission of the agency.

The second thing is: Do you ever refer cases to the attorney general's office when you see a pattern and practice?

Well, let's say someone calls and they say,
Oh, no, three other people in my shop have the same

problem with this guy. 1 You have the authority to have them 2 individually hire -- file a complaint. 3 But the attorney general's office can bring 4 an injunctive action immediately if there's a 5 pattern and practice. 6 7 Do you ever refer matters to the civil rights bureau? 8 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: We have not. 9 We have our division-initiated investigation 10 11 unit, where we look for systemic cases, and 12 investigate them, and bring them on behalf of the 13 State. So we handle those cases that way. 14 Uhm --15 SENATOR MAYER: But you --16 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- I'm sorry, go ahead. 17 SENATOR MAYER: -- can't go directly into 18 court? D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Unless it's a housing 19 20 case and we filed a complaint. 21 SENATOR MAYER: No, no, on these sexual harassment cases. 22 23 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Cannot, no. 24 SENATOR MAYER: So would it be helpful, and 25 strengthen the mission of the agency, to have

1 direction, that when there is two or more individuals with a similar complaint, that you be 2 directed to file with the attorney general's office, 3 a notice, so that they can go to court immediately, 4 to Mr. Quart's issue, and address some systemic 5 6 problem that is at -- potentially could impact them? 7 Would that legislation be helpful? D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Just give me one 8 9 second, please? 10 SENATOR MAYER: Sure. 11 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I just want to make sure 12 I understand what you're saying. Would a directive to the division of human 13 14 rights, where two or more cases --15 SENATOR MAYER: A legislative change. 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Right. 17 -- two or more cases filed against a 18 respondent be sent to the attorney general? 19 SENATOR MAYER: Could be referred to the 20 attorney general. 21 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Could be? 22 SENATOR MAYER: Yes. 23 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Could be? 24 My hesitation in saying absolutely yes is the 25 "two or more cases."

Two or more cases doesn't nec -- it's -- you 1 2 know, all of the cases, and -- all of the cases that we look at are fact- and circumstance-specific. 3 And I don't necessarily know that we don't 4 5 have the capacity to handle those cases. And I don't necessarily know that the 6 attorney general would deem those cases something 7 that they want to handle. 8 So I don't know that we need a directive. 9 I think that we have the discretion, and we 10 11 use the discretion properly to handle cases the way 12 we deem fit. 13 And if we have to refer cases out, I think we 14 do so appropriately. 15 SENATOR MAYER: But you dodge -- you can't 16 bring an action for immediate injunctive relief, 17 civilly? 18 Correct? Right? 19 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yeah, that is correct. 20 SENATOR MAYER: Okay. 21 And you mentioned you have your own 22 sexual-harassment unit. 23 Is that a physical --24 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes, it's a physical

office.

25

SENATOR MAYER: Where is it? 1 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It's 55 Hanson Place in 2 3 Brooklyn. SENATOR MAYER: And how would --4 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: (Indiscernible) 5 6 government building. 7 SENATOR MAYER: And how would someone know about it, a complainant? 8 9 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It's on our website. 10 It's on our literature. We let people know that it exists when we do outreach and education. 11 12 They can call. And if they let us know what 13 the nature of their complaint is, we let them know 14 that they can file directly at the office of 15 sexual-harassment issues. Or, they can file at any 16 office, and it will be forwarded to that office for 17 investigation. SENATOR MAYER: Okay. Thank you. 18 19 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: You're welcome. 20 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblyman Buckwald. 21 ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Thank you, 22 Mr. Chairman, to you and your fellow co-chairs, for 23 convening this hearing. 24 And my thanks to all of the deputy

commissioners for being here.

25

I'll be direct in my questions, primarily at our state deputy commissioners, not being myself a representative from New York City.

I'll admit to being a little bit confused, first, on a point of basic math, which is, as earlier stated, and Chairman Crespo accurately calculated, that, with 6,000 individual complaints -- or, over 6,000 individual complaints, the 63 investigators, that works out to, approximately, 95 per investigator.

And the response back was that, if you exclude housing, it would be about 50 to 60.

But in the written testimony it says that, approximately, 80 percent of complaints relate to employment.

So by my math, at least 76 complaints per investigator are those that exclude housing.

So I just want to note that.

Though my question, which also I'm at a point of confusion, relates to the questioning earlier from Senator Liu, and the observations made by a number of legislative colleagues, about the role the division plays with regards to recommendations for legislation.

I'm aware that the division of human rights

1 itself puts out departmental bills, recommendations for legislation. 2 My -- I guess my first question is: Are 3 either of you aware of how many bills, in total, the 4 division has put forward this year to the 5 6 Legislature? And secondary to that: How many of those 7 bills relate to sexual harassment? 8 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I do not. I don't 9 10 participate in that. I don't. 11 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I am not aware of that 12 either. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Just based on public information, as far as I can tell, the division's 14

put out at least four bills, in total.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The only two bills that are published are -relate to housing discrimination, not the topic of
this hearing directly.

I guess what I don't understand, as a general matter, is how the response of the department, with regards to legislators' proposals, or public proposals, is, "we don't get involved in legislation."

But, the division feels appropriate, and I think it is indeed appropriate, to put forward

legislation, another guise.

I totally get that there might not be a total syncing, and any particular piece of legislation has to go through a review process.

But there is a process, is there not, for the division to opine on legislation, and to come up with its own legislation?

Are either of you aware of any discussions whatsoever in the division on putting forward legislation on this topic?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I am not aware.

I don't participate in that. That would be our general counsel's office.

So I don't have -- I'm not privy to it, so I don't know.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: We're not involved in those discussions.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: How is it possible that any part of the division could put forward legislation related to sexual-harassment enforcement, as is done, in general, through one of your offices, deputy commissioner, or through the regional offices, for the other deputy commissioner, without consulting either of you?

Is it conceivable that some other part of the

division has put forward proposals, or is 1 considering putting forward proposals, without 2 consulting either of you on this topic? 3 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: We are -- I oversee the 4 attorneys and I do the DII. 5 So, you know, we enforce it. You know, here 6 7 is our statutes, this is what we have to enforce, this is our process. 8 It is conceivable that it happens. 9 Again, I'm not a part of it. 10 In the past, may -- I'm trying to think if 11 12 I've participated in it, and I can't recall that, 13 but I won't speak for Miss Martinez. I don't know. 14 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Unfortunately, no, we're 15 not involved in that process. 16 We are involved in, respectively, overseeing 17 our units. 18 ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Would either of you 19 plan, after today, to go to the able counsel, and 20 others, maybe under the commissioner's direction, 21 and inquire whether it's appropriate that, when 22 proposals are put forward by the division to the 23 Legislature, that some consultation be made with the

folks out in the field that you help oversee?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sure, I'll let them

24

know.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I believe that will take place after today.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: I suspect it might.

On the other proposals that are -- have been put forward by the division, say, related to housing discrimination, which both your offices deal with as well, is there any consultation with your office?

Some of these proposals have existed for a number of years.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I was not consulted.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Might then your inquiry already pending of supervisors and colleagues, with regards to consultation on sexual-harassment legislation, also extend to making sure the consultation extends on these other topics?

Because, frankly, as a legislator, it is disheartening to learn that the imprimatur of the department, on the rare occasions when the department -- excuse me, the division -- on rare occasions when the division wants to get involved, it turns out, it is not based on the broad expertise of the division.

Is that fair to say?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I believe that we will

extend that discussion as well.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: And what -- what -I would, then, maybe, through the collective
legislative Chairs, you know, request that, if at
any point, the Assembly and Senate are informed of
new proposals from the division, or updated
proposals on the ones even outside the realm of
sexual harassment that come from the division, that
we learn whether those proposals are, in part,
informed by the broader expertise.

Which, in general, I commend. The division has an office in my district in White Plains. I'm, you know, very pleased that that's available to my constituents.

Nonetheless, I'd like there to be some greater, you know, consultation between the handful of legislative proposals and what folks are experiencing out in the field.

And, obviously, the broader point that colleagues have already made, which is, the division has the capacity to chime in on legislation.

Maybe that's to create its own, and to leave legislators and the public to create their own, and so forth.

I understand a lot of deference, certainly,

to our state's Chief Executive.

And I'm not saying there shouldn't be consultation in that regard too, and shouldn't necessarily be divisions and departments going off on their own.

But, nonetheless, I think the process has not been as robust, is could be to say the least.

And unless there is any further comment,

I yield back, and thank the Chairs for their time

for these questions.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

I'm going to actually ask a few questions now, after hearing from several of my colleagues.

So, I think I would like to begin with the State.

In your testimony you mentioned that you spoke with survivor groups.

Which survivor groups did you speak with?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: And that's the -- that was, I believe, when they were doing the drafting and the policymaking for the DOL. We weren't

SENATOR BIAGGI: Who was involved?

involved in that part of the process.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: That would be our general counsel's office, and perhaps our outreach

1 office.

SENATOR BIAGGI: How often do you communicate with your general counsel's office?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Quite frequently on cases, and the stuff that we deal with, in terms of whether it's a matter of a particular case or a particular clause, but, for what we do.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So would it be common practice for your general counsel to ask you -- either of you, what approach to take on a specific initiative, as this kind of laid out, so that he or she would be able to know what questions to ask or what issues have come up, probably because, I'm assuming, the general counsel is not in the field, but in an office?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It would probably be more appropriate for the general counsel to consult with the outreach and education individuals.

SENATOR BIAGGI: And who -- who do the outreach and education individuals report to?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: The first deputy commissioner and the commissioner.

SENATOR BIAGGI: And who do both of you report to?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I report to the first

deputy commissioner.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: And I report to the commissioner.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So, presumably, there is an opportunity in your communication structure where you are able to have these dialogues back and forth, right, to make recommendations of things that you see in the field, where you would be having these conversations.

And the reason I highlight this is because one of the frustrations that the public often has with government, is that information is in silos.

And I would recommend -- it would be my recommendation, that any findings that you have or make or things that you see, especially on a topic as important as sexual harassment, especially as timely as it is, that there -- the conversations are transparent, that they are open, that they are inclusive, and that no walls are erected to prevent any type of progress from moving forward.

You also mentioned that anyone can file in the state. And I heard several times you discussed the different offices throughout the state. And I believe you said that there are 12 regional offices, and I'm happy to learn about this

55 Hanson Place office as well.

And you mentioned also that you do outreach and you do mailings.

Do you use social media; and if so, how?

Because I -- the reason I ask is because

I haven't heard of this outreach, and I haven't seen
this outreach. And I'm on the -- at least I would
like to think I'm on the pulse of this issue. I'm
not an expert yet, but I'm on my way, hopefully.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes, we have a Twitter account, we have a Facebook account, we have an Instagram account. And I believe, if I'm not mistaken, we have a LinkedIn account, or we are in the process of creating a LinkedIn account.

I'm not really good with social media, but I think those are the main ones.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, thank you.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: You're welcome.

SENATOR BIAGGI: In -- with relation to communication, again, going back to that point, at any point in time, does New York State communicate with New York City?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: We definitely interacted on drafting the model policies and the model training under the new deal -- DOL law.

1 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Yes, I'm regularly in touch with, unfortunately, not my two colleagues up 2 3 here today, but the general counsel and first deputy commissioner. 4 5 On our side, we're regularly in touch. SENATOR BIAGGI: So just to be clear, so 6 7 you're in touch with the general counsel at the State --8 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Yes. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- on these issues? 10 11 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: That's right. 12 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 13 And, then, does the general counsel often communicate to the State the information that is 14 15 learned from the City? 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It depends on what it 17 is. 18 I don't get regular briefings from the 19 general counsel about that. 20 And to answer your question, I do communicate 21 with other members of the New York City commission, 22 other deputy commissioners. And, also, we see each 23 other quite a bit when we attend the EEOC 24 conferences.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, if you wanted to make

1 a recommendation, let's say, perhaps to make it so that it's regular communication between the City and 2 3 the State, how would you go about doing that? This question is directed to the State. 4 5 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: There actually is a 6 regular communication. If I'm not mistaken, there is something called "The Civil Rights Roundtable." 7 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Uh-huh, that's right. 8 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I believe that you --9 our first deputy commissioner attends that. 10 11 I'm not really sure how often that is, but, 12 members from the EEOC, HUD, our agency, and the 13 New York City Commission attend. 14 Have you attended those meetings? 15 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I have not, but my 16 colleagues regularly do, yes. 17 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I haven't attended. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: And any information from 19 those meetings, how is that disseminated to all --20 to the State or the City? D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: In my office, it's 21 22 typically our law enforcement leadership that 23 attends, because it's quite law enforcement-focused, 24 as opposed to my side, which is policy.

And we're regularly briefed on the topics

that will be discussed, and the conversation that's 1 had there, in our executive team meetings. 2 SENATOR BIAGGI: And for the State? 3 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: And I get occasional 4 information when I meet with my supervisor as to 5 what occurred during those meetings. 6 7 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: If there's relevant case law that they may have discussed, she may bring 8 it back to us. 9 If there's an outreach event, she would talk 10 to the outreach people. 11 12 Things like that. 13 SENATOR BIAGGI: So you could see where there 14 could be some type of issues if there's not a clear 15 communication or a report after every meeting. 16 And I think that one of the most important 17 things that we can do, especially --And this is with no disrespect to the State, 18 19 I am obviously a representative of the State. 20 -- that we could do better as a state, by 21 taking the lead from New York City, who has led in 22 so many ways. 23 And, of course, you know, smaller area, but 24 lots of people, still, and has been a real

trailblazer, I think, in so many ways.

And the State can definitely learn from that 1 2 type of bravery. So going back to the data that DHR collects, 3 in terms of collecting sexual-harassment reporting 4 5 data, and I won't go -- I won't belabor you through all the statistics and the numbers that you do, but, 6 7 at the end of each year, where does that data go? So, does it go to the general counsel, and 8 then does the general counsel report that to the 9 commissioner? 10 11 And then who does the commissioner, perhaps, 12 report that to? 13 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: So we have database on 14 our fiscal year, calendar year. We have what we 15 call an "annual report," and that is actually posted 16 on our website, but it has to be reviewed by our 17 general counsel. All of our --SENATOR BIAGGI: Who else is it reviewed by? 18 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: The commissioner. 19 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: I'm sorry? 21 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: The commissioner. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: The commissioner? 23 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 24 SENATOR BIAGGI: And who else? 25 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I'm not really aware if

1 there are other people. I submit my own report from my units. 2 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I submit from my units, 3 we review them. We give them to -- they combine 4 them all, and reviewed by the commissioner and 5 general counsel. After that, I'm not aware. 6 7 SENATOR BIAGGI: Is it probable that the annual report, before being made public, would be 8 9 reviewed by the Executive? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I can't answer that 10 11 because I don't know the process. 12 I know my process. 13 SENATOR BIAGGI: Has anything that you have created or done been reviewed by the Executive in 14 your normal course of business? 15 16 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: No. 17 SENATOR BIAGGI: Nothing that you have 18 done --19 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Not that I'm aware of. 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- in the course of your 21 business has been --22 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Not that I'm aware of. 23 I mean --24 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- discussed with the 25 Executive, ever?

1 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I don't know what happens after it goes from me to my boss. 2 It's possible. 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 4 Going back to the point, I don't want to 5 belabor this too much, but I think this is -- are --6 very important to be very succinct on these issues: 7 Are you familiar with Executive Law 294? 8 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I'm not -- if you tell 9 10 me what the law is. 11 SENATOR BIAGGI: So the law is, The Statutory 12 Mandated Powers and Duties of DHR, your agency, and 13 Executive Law 294, says: The division shall 14 formulate policies to effectuate the purposes of 15 this article, and may make recommendations to 16 agencies and officers of the state or local 17 subdivisions of government in aid of such policies 18 and purposes. 19 Are you familiar with Executive Law 295? 20 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Would you mind reading 21 it, please? 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure. 23 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Thank you. SENATOR BIAGGI: So, Executive Law 295, there 24

are two relevant provisions, Section 8 and

Section 9.

In Section 8 it discusses advisory councils, and it empowers the division to go through all kinds of different issues, but to discuss and study problems, such as the ones that we're discussing today, and then make recommendations accordingly.

In Section 9 it says, that you have the power to develop human rights plans and policies for the state, and to assist in your execution, and to make investigations and studies appropriate to effectuate this article, to issue such publications and such results of investigations and research, as, in its judgment, will tend to inform persons of the rights assured and remedies provided under this article to promote good will, and minimize or eliminate discrimination because of age, race, creed, color, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, military status, sex, disability, or marital status.

And are you familiar with the submission of program bills?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I know that they get submitted, but I don't participate in them, so I can't really speak them.

SENATOR BIAGGI: But are you familiar with

1 them?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sure.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So Senator Liu's not in the room at the moment, but, this year, DHR actually submitted a program bill for Senator Liu and Senator Martinez.

And so I will double down on what

Assemblymember Buchwald had asked you, and I would

really encourage you, because we would like to be

your partners in this fight, it's an incredibly

important effort, to please weigh in on the package

of legislation that we've put forward because, we

cannot wait any longer, and we need your input, it's

valuable to us; your opinions are valuable to us,

your expertise is valuable to us. And we want to be

your partners in the state.

And I as a legislator am going to break down that wall that is oftentimes put between us, and I'm inviting you in.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: We're happy to work with you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Cruz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: Thank you.

I have a couple of questions related to the

process.

The first one: What percentage of the complaints that actually get to you represent folks who have been fired by the time that they actually file a complaint?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I don't have those numbers for you, but I can try to get them from the regional office.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: Thank you.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: And, unfortunately, I don't have those numbers either.

But, anecdotally, most people do come to us after they've left the situation involving the harassment, whether it's, as I mentioned earlier, a constructive discharge, where the circumstances were so unpleasant and so degrading that people were, essentially, forced to resign or forced to quit, versus being fired, versus, you know, some other kind of separation.

I don't have those numbers, but, anecdotally, I can say that it's the majority of cases, that people come to us after they've left.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: And now I want to talk about what happens to the cases that actually make it to the end portion.

For a brief stint, I was an ALJ, so I can tell you that there is a lot of latitude with what happens inside a room when there's a settlement process.

My concern, and what I often hear from advocates, and when we worked together on the task force, was, I can't afford to hire a lawyer to go with me to one of these agency meetings, settlement meetings, unofficial hearings, or, actually, official hearings.

And so one of these proposals that had been discussed, as -- actually as a departmental, was legal fees for the plaintiffs, for the folks who are coming forward, and being able to file the claim.

Did that ever go anywhere with the State; can someone get legal fees for representation to come in front of your agency?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: In housing cases, yes.

And now in sexual-harassment cases as well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: In sexual-harassment

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Yes.

cases you can?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: And for the City?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Yes, it's a recent change. All cases brought to the commission on

human rights, the complainant's attorney may be able to recover attorney's fees.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: And what is the -- is there a procedure to connect folks/complainants with an attorney, be it low bono, where there are fees that are getting -- get back; pro bono; or any other way?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: In terms of assigning an attorney to a case prior to probable cause, the State doesn't assign an attorney. But once there is a probable-cause determination, we do handle it.

If a complainant is interested in hiring a private attorney, I've never dealt with it, we usually don't make recom -- I would say we don't make a recommendation as to it.

But if they went to legal aid, or if they went to someone like that, they could use those attorneys at our agency.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: I mean, my concern with an answer like that, is that, when you have someone who doesn't understand the system, expecting them to go out on their own and actually find a lawyer on their own is nearly impossible.

And the power dynamics of what happens inside a settlement room, when you have someone who has an

attorney versus someone who doesn't, especially if
they're not familiar with the system, it's going to
be skewed in favor of the employer who can actually
afford to have a lawyer there representing them.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sure, if I may, I'm

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sure, if I may, I'm sorry, I didn't necessarily understand the whole thing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: (Indiscernible) -- yeah.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: So we would definitely appoint an attorney post PC. And if they said that, you know, they -- they, you know, want a private attorney, when I say we wouldn't recommend somebody, I mean, like an individual law firm. We could refer them to the bar, you can call, or you can call legal aid.

That's what I meant.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: And once you get to the settlement conference, what's the procedure for a settlement conference?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: On the prehearing settlement conference, it's set up ahead of time. Notices are sent out to all the parties, including the complainant, as well as well as the respondents.

It's scheduled, we have Wednesdays and Thursdays.

We assign an attorney.

They -- conferences are for one hour. The administrative law judge begins the call.

The attorney would have spoken to the complainant beforehand, reviewed the facts of the case, determined what kind of damages they are interested in.

Once everybody calls in, and the ALJ leads that call, then discussions are held about whether or not, you know, they can come to terms on an agreement or not.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: And, you know, one of the things that quite never happened during my brief stint as an ALJ, was some sort of training about trauma-informed decision-making.

Is that happening in either one of the agencies?

Because, when you sit there and you have to hear some of the -- some of what's coming in front of you, some cases may be very non-controversial; others can tug at your heartstrings.

And we want to make sure, not only that the judgment isn't clouded, but that the ALJ is understanding that who is in front of them is a survivor. And they need to have that knowledge.

Are you providing any sort of trauma-informed 1 2 decision-making training? D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Are you talking to the 3 ALJ --4 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: Yes, for the ALJs. 6 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- or the attorneys? 7 So we do do our yearly training. The ALJs that we've had have been there for 8 several years. They have been dealing with all of 9 our cases where the victims are of discrimination. 10 11 Not only sexual harassment, but any kind of 12 discrimination is really personal. 13 But they do receive training. 14 Whether or not it's specific to trauma, I'm 15 not sure. 16 ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: Okay. 17 I would encourage you to do that, and not just do it yearly. A yearly training for 18 19 three hours, it's not gonna to cut it. 20 I mean, I am assuming it's a short training, 21 but it's not going to cut it for a topic that's this 22 important to our community, and that truly is that 23 traumatic for all of the parties involved. 24 Does the City do anything like that? 25 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: We are in touch with our

counterparts at OATH -- it's the office of administrative trials and hearings -- for the city.

But we, as far as I'm aware, are not providing them with training.

But I will take this recommendation back.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CRUZ: Thank you.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Senator Bailey.

SENATOR BAILEY: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to the Co-Chairs.

And thank you for coming before us today.

I have a couple of questions.

One is a brief comment and follow-up to Senator Mayer's position.

I know you said you don't make recommendation or legislation, but I would implore you to look at Senate Print 24 -- 2874A, which establishes the crime of sexual harassment.

That relates specifically to what

Senator Mayer was indicating about referrals or indications to the district attorneys. It's something that advanced with the Codes Committee just a couple of weeks ago.

And I would ask that you take a serious look into that, and how it would affect your roles and

what you're doing there. 1 That is by Senator Biaggi. 2 My main question is about demographics. 3 For the State: Do you aggregate data via 4 democrat -- via demographics? 5 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: You speak so fast. 6 7 What? SENATOR BAILEY: I'm sorry. 8 9 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: When you say "demographics," are you talking about the types of 10 cases we have? locations? 11 12 We have the ability to pull the data. 13 If you're talking demographics in terms of 14 locations, we can pull them from what our regional 15 office sees. 16 If you're talking about, we want to pull the 17 types of cases, like sexual harassment, or housing, we can pull those kind of data as well. 18 SENATOR BAILEY: Let me be a little more 19 20 specific. I apologize. 21 Demographics related to race, gen -- not 22 gen -- race, gender, age, along those lines, do you 23 have -- do you aggregate data along those lines? 24 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Do we have any data

25

with us today? No.

But we do have the ability to pull that data. 1 2 SENATOR BAILEY: That would be very helpful. And my final question is related to language 3 4 access. 5 Language access is huge in any context, but 6 especially in the context where people who are a 7 victim of sexual harassments, are -- they're already scared, they're already fearful. 8 If English is not your first language, 9 I believe that would create another barrier to an 10 11 individual coming forth. Is there any, like -- what is your agency --12 13 are your agencies doing? I heard it from the City in context about 14 15 having signs in English and Spanish. 16 But, in a city of 8 million people, in a state of 19 million people, we are so diverse. 17 And as our workforce diversifies, we should 18 19 make sure that we are more in touch with the number 20 of languages that are -- that -- that are spoken in 21 the state. 22 Is -- what is being done in either agency 23 about that?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN:

Spanish and English posters.

Sure, I can address the

24

The legislation that was passed last year mandates that all employers, even if you have one employee, must post a notice of rights in English and Spanish. That's the mandate.

And so we are sending those posters.

We've actually done business, walk-throughs, where we're physically handing business owners the posters in English and Spanish.

We've additionally translated that document into the local law, 30 languages. So additional languages are available on our website.

Just for the cost associated with mailing it in so many languages, we couldn't do it by mail, but we have them available on our website in upwards of 10 or 11 languages at this point.

In addition, at the commission, we speak about 35 languages. That's up from six languages when our commissioner started in 2015. For a relatively small agency, that was a massive priority, that we ensure we have as many languages covered. It's not all.

And our commissioner is constantly trying to up that number.

And, also, to reflect, not only linguistic competency, but cultural competency, to ensure that

we are bringing in people to work at the commission that reflect the communities that we serve.

So we've built positions around Muslim, Arab,
South Asian, lead advisor; an African communities'
lead advisor; a Jewish communities' liaison.

The list goes on.

A trans communities' leader.

So we take that mandate very seriously. We could always do better.

If someone comes in that does not speak a language of a staff member that's available to meet with them in that moment, we obviously will use LanguageLine, and we have contemporaneous telephonic interpretation.

We know that that's not always the best, but, again, we try to match people with someone on our staff who speaks the language they speak.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Certainly.

And to the State?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: With the State, we have a language-access policy. That is our mandate. It comes in at least eight different languages.

My understand -- I know that, when someone comes into our office, the first thing they try to do is figure out what language they are speaking.

If we don't have someone available, we do use the language access line.

We do have available to us, any important documents. Or, documents, if a complainant needs something translated, we get that translated for them as well.

In addition, our front-line staff, attorneys, are trained in sensitivity, yearly. And we do have discussions with our individual groups about it as well.

about, again, individuals who are already speaking about a very sensitive issue. And if they have to wait any time further than that moment of urgency, that moment of crisis, that they're facing.

In the event there is not a language that you have in either a speaker in your office or an individual that you can access via the language line, how long would that process take to be able to translate that document, and be able to at least put that person who is complaining of sexual harassment at a little bit of ease?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I don't have an exact date, but from experience, what we try to do, if it's a language that's not so common, such as

Fukienese, and we had to find someone, we would work around the complainant's schedule, and so, this way, they're not sitting there; or perhaps the next day.

But we would work with an urgency because we do realize this is a sensitive topic. They do want to say what they want to, you know, express, and file complaints.

So we try to work with a sense of urgency, but an exact time frame, I can't give you.

I would hope that it's at least within a week, if not shorter.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Sure.

I would hope that it would be within 24 hours, which would be my hope.

Would an individual who has language issues, would they be precluded or permitted to bring an individual who was -- would be able to translate in their native language?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: No, it would be helpful.

But if it is a matter of an interpretation of official document, or the signing under a jurat, we would have an official interpreter.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: I guess I would have just one more comment concerning the -- your -- the

demographic data that, hopefully, we'll be obtaining soon.

I would implore you once again to -- as the City has mentioned, going to certain communities that may be at higher risk for harassment, that may be -- that may have reported these incidences in -- in -- in more -- in greater frequency, and maybe increase your outreach.

Because as Senator Biaggi questioned, the outreach is appreciated, but it seems rather nebulous as to what the nature of the outreach actually is.

So, again, I would implore you to -- to -continue to -- and I understand the cost
constraints, we all work in state government, I get
it. But we have to make sure that we are
communicating effectively to those individuals who
we want to make sure that we hear them.

So, I appreciate your time.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: If I may just follow up, the demographics that you want, is that for race, age, sexual-harassment cases?

Just so I -- or, how do you want that?

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: I would appreciate sexual-harassment data, yes.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: And I just -- thank you.

I just wanted to add, in terms of our outreach, we do partner with other agencies and community organizations.

For example, we've done outreach with the Office of New Americans, for people that have newly come to New York, just to make sure that they understand their rights.

As I stated earlier, for individuals that may not feel comfortable, because we are a state agency, we do go work with the Office of New Americans to let them know, when someone comes to their agency, here, this is what you can do if you feel afraid, you can call us, if you feel like you've been discriminated against. If not, here are your rights in case it does come up.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Thank you very much.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: You're welcome.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Niou, patiently waiting.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I know (indiscernible). Hello.

So I  $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$  -- I mean, I just wanted to say a couple things before I start my questions.

But, I want to echo my colleagues, because

every single agency that comes before us to testify, we hear from so many across different issues, right, housing, finance, economic development, et cetera, but they all give us recommendations on the legislation that we have put forth, or speak to them.

And so I just want to, you know, also echo their shock.

I also want to address a couple of words that you guys used.

I know you guys had that, you know, with the statute of limitations, you know, one year, people might have worse memories, or things might go stale, or things aren't as fresh.

And I -- I -- I just wanted to address that really quick, because, as a sexual-assault survivor myself, I will say that it was over 20 years before I could even speak up about it.

And there has not been a single moment that

I haven't lived with it. And, there's -- the

memories of it are -- are very fresh, and they won't
go stale.

I remember what he smells like. I remember what he looked like. I remember the desk, and the color that -- the color of the desk that I was

grabbing onto.

And -- and -- I -- I just want to -- I just want to put that out there for you before we continue.

And using that kind of language is hurtful for the folks in the room.

Uhm -- so -- so, for some questions:

I also wanted to kind of touch base a little bit on the doubling of the cases.

You know, you guys said that it was due to a culture shift.

I mean, I personally use different language.

I call it the "end of systemic silence."

But I just -- I have -- I have a question on why, then, the agencies are not proactive, instead of just reactive, knowing that there are so many folks who are silenced for so long?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I think -- first of all, thank you for centering us back to, really, the heart of the issue, and for sharing.

I think, you know, the -- our commission has taken this issue seriously from the very start of our commissioner's leadership.

The case I cited in my testimony earlier was the first order that our commissioner issued,

I worked with her on that order, where we issued the highest civil penalties in the history of the commission; the only time the commission has issued civil penalties of \$250,000, which is the maximum allowable.

And we were not sure if the State -- it was appealed to state court. We were not sure if the state court would affirm it.

And we waited three-plus years for that decision -- not we -- the complainant had to wait three-plus years for that decision.

But from that 2015 moment, to 2019 when that decision was issued, #MeToo relaunched.

And it has not -- this is not a new issue, as we know. This is not an issue that -- that sort of reemerged as a problem. It's simply that people are talk -- like you, and so many others, people are talking about it.

And, you know, judges are humans too; government folks are humans too.

And I don't know if #MeToo had an impact on that judge's decision, but I'd like to think, in maybe my naive way, that -- that -- the movement has made an impact on the judiciary.

So, I guess to go back to your question, this

has been an issue, regardless of whether it's in the public, it's the story of the day, or not.

And what I'm grateful for is that it continues to be the story of the day, day after day. This movement has not stopped.

It's -- and, so, you know, we have been committed to this issue. It's one that we take incredibly seriously, and have since the commissioner's very start at our agency; and it will continue to remain a focus.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I would say, as for the State, of course, more can always be done.

As I previously stated, what we have done with the outreach, our new commissioner, she's now with us for a month and a day, and she's made it clear, our mandate is going to be, we're gonna get out there into the public; we're going to educate, we're going to let them know that we're here, and how we could help.

But -- our position -- not our position -- but, you will be seeing more of the division under this commissioner; she's going to make it her point.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay, so I guess, just to follow up, three-plus years is a long time.

And then, also, with the numbers of the

three years that the statute of limitations for going to court comes up, it brings me to another question of: How -- how do you guys present all the options to folks?

Like, how do you -- I mean, I kind of wonder more, because I heard a little bit about how you present, you know, the options to folks, but -- on the City side.

But on the State side, how do folks even know what their options are, and how do you guys present them to them?

Because you're saying that you do when you're are talking to folks.

But, is there an encouragement to do things within the agency, or is there encouragement to go to court?

Like, how does that -- how does that work?

Like, you guys can role-play if you want.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I think -- well, when we do -- or -- when we do an outreach, an education event, we let people know what their rights are.

And then we let them know what the complaint process is.

And, many times, we have an investigator at the event, so that if someone actually wishes to

file a complaint on-site, they can.

We also have other additional staff there as well.

And we listen to them right then and there.

And, depending on what they tell us, we give them their options.

If they say, "Yeah, I want to talk to you right now. I'm not ready to file right now," we'll give them a complaint form, we'll give them our literature, and we'll say, Take your time.

We ask them --

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: But when that happens, do you -- do you tell them, Well, this is the statute of limitations?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Absolutely. And that's actually what I was just going to say.

We ask them what the dates are, and we say, Okay, well, this is what you're dealing with in terms of your time frames. If you don't want to file with us, this -- you know, this is the date that you have. If it's ongoing, that's fine. If it's something that --

Not that it's fine. I didn't mean it's fine.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: (Indiscernible

25 cross-talking.)

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It's never fine.

But if it's a finite event, that someone was discharged -- that's a finite event -- then we need to use that date, for purposes of the statute of limitations and purposes of filing.

And we let them know that they can also go to court, and, you know, we have to use that date for the three-year mark.

We give them the information up front so that they're armed with the knowledge.

If they need to go home and think about it or talk to someone else, they can do that.

We give them our contact information as well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Can you tell me what kind of language you guys use, though?

That's -- I want -- I want specifics.

I mean, I wasn't kidding about the role-play.

Like, can you just let me know, like, how -what kind of language you would use at one of those
events, if somebody -- if I was to say, you know,
Something's happening with me at work. I want to
see if I could file a complaint. I want to know
what my rights are. Can you let me know?

- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Go ahead.
- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Oh, I thought you were

going to play the -- okay. I was at work. Uhm, you know, I just came from work. Several things are happening to me that I'm not necessarily comfortable about talking. But I need to speak to somebody about it. D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Okay. It's very brave of you to come to us today. I'm glad you came. Let's talk about it. Do you want to tell me a little bit more about what happened? Did this happen today? 

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: No, it's been ongoing for a while, and it's been, my colleagues, my male colleagues, have been making me feel uncomfortable

by doing certain acts.

- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Okay. Are you interested in filing a complaint, taking formal action? Have you spoken to someone else about this yet?
- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: No, I haven't spoken to anyone else about it, but I'd like to speak to you, and here's what happened.

Just, I'll -- just assume that I told her everything that happens, please.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Okay. What I can do is,

I can talk to you about your options.

So you can file a formal complaint with the division of human rights, and we can actually conduct a formal investigation, and we can talk to witnesses if you have witnesses. We can help to stop the bad actor and the uncomfortable harassment.

- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Do I have any other options?
- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: You can also file a formal complaint in state court. You have three years to do that as well.
- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Will that cost money, do I need an attorney?
- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: With the division of human rights, you don't need an attorney to file a complaint with us. You don't need an attorney in state court. But we can also put you in touch with agencies where you can find an attorney.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay. Thank you for that, and thank you for taking the time to do that.

Potentially, I mean, this is for the City and the State, can the process, internally, delay, and the -- and the use of the process, internally, can that potentially delay or be used against victims, you know, when they -- if they want to go to court,

in the end?

Could it potentially be used against them to meet that statute of limitations of three years?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I'll have to get back to you specifically.

But it's my understanding that, as

I mentioned earlier, if you file with the

commission, you still have the opportunity to go to

state or federal court, because we, essentially,

(indiscernible) jurisdictional can cross-file with

the EEOC. So we're preserving your federal claims

as well, up to a certain point in the process.

So if we make a determination on your case, you've, essentially, chosen your venue with the commission.

The time that it stays with the commission during that process I think may count against that three-year period.

And I just want to clarify that, at the commission, for gender-based harassment claims, you have three years to come to the commission, just like you would if you were going to state court.

And what we found, again -- this is anecdotal from our law enforcement bureau -- that the three-year extension has been useful. People have

been coming forward in that sort of 1-year to 2 1/2, 3-year period.

Recog -- and this was one of the legis -pieces of legislation that we were supportive of at
the City level, in recognition of how long it takes
people to leave that situation, understand their
options, come to terms with it, decide what they
want to do.

And so that's been a successful amendment to our law, from our perspective.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I'm not sure of the answer, but I can get that for you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Could you?

Because I kind of -- I kind of wonder, because of the fact that, you know, just -- as we're hearing, that some of the cases take so long.

And -- I mean, when -- when -- sometimes it should take longer, and that's why I think a lot of my colleagues are asking about the statutes, and what we should be looking at, because I know that you guys used, in your testimony, the words were, I believe, "efficient and effective investigation."

And I just -- I sometimes I just -- I worry that -- that -- that it means something else; that

it means that it's quick and they want to stop them. 1 And so I -- I -- I wonder, you know, same as 2 3 my colleagues on that. And I also wonder, you know, is it DHR's job 4 to also train all of the other state agencies on how 5 to deal with these issues within their agencies? 6 7 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I know that DHR, in the training that is given to all state agencies, I know 8 9 that, on sexual harassment, DHR took the lead in drafting that training. 10 11 Perhaps the witness who comes after me could 12 tell you more about it, but I know that DHR has 13 participated. 14 And if any other -- we have worked with DHCR 15 in the cross-training. 16 So if any other agency asked us to come in 17 and help, DHR would. 18 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So when something 19 happens, say, for example, at the MTA, do they --20 do -- should people be filing with you, or should 21 they be filing with the MTA? 22 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: They could file with

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: But do they usually file with the MTA?

23

24

25

us.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: What they usually do, I don't know.

I know that we do get cases from the MTA, by employees.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So do you think that maybe there should be some research, or, could you guys get me that answer on how many people file with the MTA rather than file with you, and if they have an internal process, et cetera?

Like, I mean, with all the state agencies,
I kind of wonder because, we've heard, I've
personally heard, a lot of different stories with
different state agencies, where the internal process
within an agency, there's promises made, obviously,
or, like, people are, like, saying, Oh, you don't
have to go and report to this place or that place,
or you don't have to go to court. We can handle it
here. We promise it will be taken care of.

And, instead, it takes years and years and years, statute of limitations runs out, and, on top of that, they get nothing, and they get no closure, no resolutions. And people end up being take -- you know, fired, et cetera.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Okay, we'll do our best to get that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Yeah, and I also want to know the percentage of complainants that have already been fired when they come to you, and what percentage are current employees, unless you guys have that?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: No, I believe that was the same questions as Ms. Simon, as to the percentage that come to us already fired.

That, I'm going to -- we're going to try and get the answer for that as well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And is there a difference in how you guys handle certain cases when an employee is a member of more than one protected class?

Like, a transgender, older, African-American woman?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: We -- so we assess the facts of the case. And at the complaint-filing stage, we will -- you know, again, we interpret our law quite broadly and protections broadly.

So we will, in an effort to ensure that we are as inclusive as possible of the potential violations of the law, we will likely add as many protected categories as we think appropriate, based on the experience of that person.

So it could be race and gender and age and disability.

And, in fact, we do see a lot of cases where we've got multiple intersecting violations.

So, you know, women of color are particularly vulnerable. Undocumented people are particularly vulnerable. Young -- younger employees. LGBTQ employees.

So we -- we will "charge," is what the language is, we will charge multiple protected categories in the complaint to ensure that we're capturing the behavior.

And if, as we -- as we do the violation, some of those may drop out because it might -- you know, the claim may not be as broad or as all-encompassing as we had originally understood, and that's okay. But we want to make sure that we capture it all at the outset.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: The same -- the same for the State.

In terms of the way we conduct the investigation, it's the same across all bases in filings. We do a thorough investigation, despite how many bases, protected classes, we include.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay, I appreciate that.

Thank you. 1 And one last question, and I know I'm taking 2 up so much time, and I have a lot more, but I'm 3 going to defer to my colleagues. 4 But -- so on -- on the state level, I mean, 5 6 I was a staffer. I also, you know, have a lot of 7 friends across the board on -- you know, who are lobbyists or advocates, et cetera. 8 9 And I just kind of wonder, you know, you had mentioned that employers can be held liable for --10 11 under the Human Rights Law, to non-employees 12 performing work in the workplace, et cetera, on the 13 State side. 14 In -- in our -- in our workplace, can members 15 of the LCA also report to DHR? 16 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I'm sorry, "LCA"? 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Yeah, that's the -that's the -- the legislative correspondents. 18 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Yes. We have 19 20 jurisdiction over legislative members, yes. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: No, no.

correspondents, like, news -
D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Oh, (indiscernible cross-talking) -
ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: -- news folks, yeah, the

22

23

24

1 press? D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Yes, they can file. 2 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So they're supposed to file with you, or they're supposed to file somewhere 4 else? 5 6 Because they have their own bosses, 7 et cetera, in their newspaper (indiscernible). D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: If you could just give 8 me an example of what you're saying, maybe I'll 9 understand better. 10 11 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So, uhm -- so, you know, 12 there's a couple of young people in the pressroom 13 that have told me that certain things have happened 14 with certain people. 15 Like, how do -- where do they go to file, and 16 do they file with you? 17 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: We have jurisdiction over public- and private-sector employees, so they 18 19 can file with us. 20 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So should they be filing 21 with you? 22 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes, absolutely. 23 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So they should be? 24 That's like the -- what they're -- where they

25

should go?

1 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 2 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay. D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 3 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Just to clarify, is the 4 5 question around, they're experiencing harassment by 6 their supervisors, or by other -- in -- with -- with 7 respect to different, sort of like, organizational 8 relationships? ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: It could be 9 10 organizational, it could be within the pressroom, it 11 could be within the Legislature, it could be within 12 staff. 13 I don't. 14 But I'm just saying, like, for example, within -- we have a lot of different roles in the 15 Legislature, for example. There's a lot of 16 17 different folks working around each other. 18 You know, so what happens when there's 19 somebody from organizations or from corporations 20 that are not within our body, like, there's 21 something that happens to them, where should they 22 file? 23 That was the question. 24 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yeah, I would -- I would

advise them to file with us. Like I said, we don't

1 turn anyone away. And if it's not something under our 2 jurisdiction, we would advise them where to go. 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Would that be under your 4 5 jurisdiction, I guess? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I'd have to hear the 6 7 facts of the case first, yeah. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So, for -- I mean, 8 9 (indiscernible) -- so, for example, a person who is in the pressroom, and, something happened to them 10 11 with, say, you know, another press person within the 12 LCA. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Different employer. 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Different employers, different newspapers. 15 16 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: When did this happen? 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I don't know. [Laughter.] 18 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I don't know. 19 20 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: So, if I can jump in, if 21 this happened within New York City --22 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Yeah, within New York 23 (indiscernible). 24 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: -- uhm -- the -- uhm --25 so employers are responsible to protect their

employees from discrimination or harassment,

based -- even when it's conducted by non-employees,

when they're aware of the conduct, and, essentially,

have acquiesced in the conduct.

So that would -- that would happen in the context of, a customer at a restaurant, who regularly harasses a server, or, you know, one press outlet and another press outlet, and the employer of the person who is being harassed knows that this is happening and doesn't do anything about it.

So we interpret our law, and the standards of liability require, that, if you are aware that your employee is experiencing harassment or discrimination, based on any of our protected categories, by a non-employee; by a client, a customer, a vendor, an independent contractor, you are obligated to intervene, and, if you don't, you could be liable.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: And that's the same for us.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Uhm -- so, I mean,
I just wondered if it would be helpful, since we go
through orientation, our staff go through
orientation, like, people who work around us, should
they go through orientation? Should there be some

1 kind of training? We have ethics training, but... 2 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I think the more that a 3 person is trained and knows their rights, and the 4 law, the better off everyone is. 5 6 Yes, absolutely. 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Is there any suggestions on that? 8 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Well, I mean, I think I'm 9 outside of my purview, geographically. 10 11 But, you know, the commission does free 12 in-person trainings. We have our online training 13 now as well. 14 Anywhere within the five boroughs we will go, 15 and we will train people on their rights or their 16 obligations under the City Human Rights Law. 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Thank you. D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Thank you. 18 19 SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Skoufis. 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks very much, 21 Madam Chair, and thanks for your leadership on this, 22 and my fellow Co-Chairs. 23 I thank you for your testimony today, and 24 your willingness to answer questions.

I have a number of questions about, building

off of some of my colleagues, sort of the 1 legislative role of the division, and these 2 3 questions are for the State, pardon me. But first I want to ask a parochial question, 4 5 if I may. 6 So I pulled up your website when you 7 mentioned the regional offices that you have in the division, to see where they are. 8 9 It was news to me that you had regional offices. 10 11 So, correct me if I'm wrong, but it looks 12 like you have three in New York City, two in 13 Long Island, one in White Plains, one in Albany. 14 And then there are two, sort of, enormous 15 swaths of the state where you do not have any 16 physical presence: 17 One, which I don't represent, so I'm not 18 going to speak about, is in the North Country, where 19 there is no presence at all in the entire 20 north-of-Albany area. 21 And there's zero presence in the Mid-Hudson 22 Valley, you know, which I think is larger than the size of Connecticut. 23

So that's concerning to me.

And I don't know if I have a question

24

associated with this, but feel free to respond if you'd like.

But, you know, I do encourage you to please consider that fact, that, you know, you have this enormous Hudson Valley Region, basically, north of White Plains, in between White Plains and Albany, that has no presence.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Thank you for that.

I had mentioned earlier that, you know, part of my wish list was additional regional offices.

We do have memorandum of understanding with other local human-resources commissions -- sorry, local human rights commissions, and relationships with local human rights commissions around the state.

We are actually going to be conducting an outreach event with the Orange County Human Rights Commission very soon.

So we do, despite us not having actual offices, DHR offices, in those areas, we do work with the local offices, to make our presence known. And we also do receive complaints from the local offices around the country.

But I do appreciate that.

And as I stated, I would love additional

resources to open more offices.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, thank you.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: You know, you made it clear that you two, as deputy commissioners, don't have the authority, by the sounds of it, to weigh in on the legislative proposals that we're all discussing here, that we're certainly discussing, the Legislature.

Do you believe the acting commissioner would have the authority, if she were here, to weigh in on the division's position?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I don't know if she'd have the authority; but, more so, I don't know if she'd have the knowledge yet, since she just -- she just started a month ago.

And, she's incredibly bright and smart -- SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yeah, no, I'm not speaking specific to the individual.

I'm speaking specific to the position in the division.

Does the commissioner, by virtue of the position, you know, have the wherewithal and the authority to, you know, answer us in a way that you can't vis-a-vis these bills?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I can say that she would probably have more authority than we do to speak on certain questions that you haven't gotten an answer from us on, yes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

You've made it clear -- similarly, you've made it clear that, while you're aware, you're not familiar with the program-bill process within the division.

Is the commissioner typically familiar with that process?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I can't say with certainty if she's familiar with that process because I'm not involved in the process.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

It's commonplace, when we in the Legislature pass bills that touch on either agency operations or an agency's purview, that, while the bill is pending, and the governor has yet to sign or veto a bill, the executive chamber will reach out to that agency for a recommendation as to whether to sign or veto that particular bill.

Does that -- do you know if that happens with the division, when there are bills that pass the Legislature, does the executive chamber reach out to

the division for a recommendation?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: (Indiscernible)
Senator Biaggi today, that there is communications.

However, as to anything particular to DHR on that, I don't know. I'm not privy to those conversations.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you suspect that if any or all of the bills in the package that have been proposed here, pass, do you expect, or suspect, that the executive chamber would reach out to the division for a recommendation as to whether to sign or veto those bills?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Again, not being not familiar with the procedures, I really can't give an answer, but it sounds like they will be reaching out.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

So it sound -- if, indeed, that is what happens, the division will have a position on these bills.

But it just so happens, at least till now, the position won't be helpful to us in the Legislature as we consider whether to pass the bills. It will exclusively be helpful to the Governor as to whether to sign or veto the bills.

1 So it doesn't seem like it's a matter of whether the division is comfortable taking a 2 position; it's a matter of timing. 3 And I would encourage you to go back to the 4 5 commissioner and your higher-ups, and accelerate 6 that timing. 7 Now, if I may ask, in light of these questions, can I ask where the commissioner is 8 9 today, the acting commissioner? 10 And, no, I understand, if there was a family 11 emergency, or something came up. Is there a reason she is not here? 12 13 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I am not aware of where 14 she is today. 15 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I came straight from 16 home, so I don't know. She may be at the office. 17 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Where's the office? D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: It's in The Bronx. 18 And 19 I come from Brooklyn. 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 21 All right. That's all I have. 22 I look forward to taking up, as Chair of the 23 Government Operations Committee, the acting commissioner's nomination. 24

Thanks.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblyman Epstein.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: Thank you all for being here for so long. I really do appreciate all your time.

I wanted to go back to the conversation about nondisclosure agreements, and the usefulness of them for complainants.

I'm wondering what, both, on the City and State level, how you feel about them, and whether they've exceeded their useful life, in regards to ongoing issues of harassment, and NDAs really covering that up as a strategy?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I think -- you know, from my perspective, I'm a former employment lawyer, representing plaintiffs, and I think that it's a real -- there's a real challenge here.

I think some people really do want to resolve cases quietly, and move on.

And, in some circumstances, there are workers who have leverage in that, and they will bargain that. And that is something that happens in negotiations; that is, I'm talking outside of the commission process.

On the other side, the systemic silencing of victims is something -- and survivors, is something

that I think we are all, you know, coming to terms with, and thinking about whether this is sort of, we need to really shift the paradigm around how these -- how we have these conversations, how these settlements are negotiated.

And so I think, whenever proposals are made around monitoring of nondisclosures or eliminating them, I think there is a balancing, or at least a recognition, that, in some -- in some context, people -- it -- it -- it could potentially remove some -- some leverage, for lack of a better word, for plaintiffs when they're seeking to resolve cases more expeditiously or quietly.

I'm not taking any position one way or the other.

I'm just acknowledging that that is a consideration as we think about nondisclosures.

From the City perspective, it is not -- it is our position that it is not in the public interest to ever include nondisclosure agreements in conciliations that the City is a party to, for that exact reason; that public disclosure and information is vital.

But -- so I'm just putting out there, that I think that this is quite a complex issue, and I'm glad that we're having this conversation.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I have to agree with that.

And I'm also very satisfied that, you know, with the new law from last year, that it's the complainant's preference; they're given that power to decide if they want it. You know, it's not something where the respondent can say, you have to put it in.

You know, they're using that as some kind of leverage.

So, I'm glad that the complainants are given that option, and it's only the complainant's preference.

The respondent can bring it up, but it's only up to the complainant to make that decision.

So that makes me happy.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: But don't you think sometimes respondents have bargaining power in that conversation, and want to use the NDA as a leverage tool to get to that agreement?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I think they, yeah, respondents definitely do.

But, when we're a party to those agreements, we have to make sure that the complainants want to

be, or are satisfied with all of the provisions of the settlement agreement.

Absolutely, they try with the bargaining power.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: And have you seen situations where that's the reason that a settlement agreement falls apart, is the failure for a complainant to want to sign an NDA?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I have not.

I could find out from the attorneys who handle the case, where they do.

But, personally, I have not.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: Yeah, it would be good to know how often this comes up where a complainant doesn't want to sign the NDA, and it's in a situation where the settlement will fall apart without the signing of an NDA.

So this issue about, going back to statute of limitations as well, you know, obviously, we've heard a lot, especially around abuse situations in -- you know, in faith-based institutions, a lot around people becoming much aware of the abuse, and really come to terms with it, especially with someone who is a leader, like a faith leader or a mentor. And, really, it takes a long time for

people to get to that space where they can really process it. Lots of people, you know, we know are in therapy.

I'm wondering if, based on more information we have right now, we really need to relook at the statute of limitations, based on a whole host of information, realizing that the victim, who is really likely to be in a, you know, powerless position against the victimizer, really suppresses the information, and it does takes extended periods of time?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: So as the agency that's now implementing a longer statute of limitations, specifically for gender-based harassment claims and employment, I think that that was the recognition, that this -- while -- you know, that is not to minimize the trauma of all the other forms of discrimination, so I want to be clear about that.

And -- and -- we are thinking about this as sort of a first-in-time process, so that, you know, we're -- we've now implemented extended statute of limitations in this area.

And I think it's a continuing conversation around maybe moving up every other protected category to that same extension, or that same new

reality.

But I think that, again, because of the bravery and the courage of so many people here today, we have a renewed recognition that one year to file with the commission was just insufficient for these kinds of claims.

And I think a broader conversation around bringing in other kinds of claims into that extension is well worth having.

But, you know, as my colleagues mentioned, the truth of the matter is, the broader you make the statute of limitations, the more cases we will get.

We are getting more cases, just as we -- as we brought in the categories of protected categories.

And so we really want to ensure that there are resources; that it's met with these broadened -- our broadened powers and jurisdiction mean more cases, and that could mean longer processing times.

That's just the reality, and a challenge that we face.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: And that -- and, again, that will be our job, to ensure there are additional resources.

But just to hear from the State on that

issue.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sorry, in terms of the statute of limitations, could you repeat that question?

I got caught up (indiscernible cross-talking).

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: Yeah, I just -- just -- we -- you know, we were just talking a lot about abuse and, you know, sexual assaults, in the context of religious institutions, we've seen extending of the statute of limitations because it takes a long time to -- especially with someone who's in a position of power or a mentor or a religious leader, for people to be able to process that abuse.

And in some -- you know, multiple years, in some situations, we've seen people take decades, especially when they're younger and dealing with someone who's in that position of power.

Is it really a time to really look at these statute of limitations and think about this in that context, knowing all the trauma that people are experiencing?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I mean, it's awful.

I know people who have been subjected to it.

And to hear that your claim can't brought is

1 heartbreaking. That being said, if it's changed, we'll 2 enforce it. That's what I can say on it. 3 I mean, it's awful. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: Thank you. 5 Just one more question, if I can, 6 I appreciate that. 7 So, I know we've talked about, that statute 8 of limitation runs from the last, you know... 9 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Date of 10 discrimination --11 12 ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: ...the day of 13 discrimination. 14 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- alleged 15 (indiscernible cross-talking). 16 ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: But people in power 17 positions have ongoing power against people. You know, someone who's a former employer can be a 18 19 reference for years, and that -- hold that, or, 20 reputational interests. 21 I mean, how do you view that, someone who can 22 use their power and privilege against someone to --23 you know, is that an ongoing abuse? 24 Because you can say, well, if you disclose

this, I'm going to tarnish your name. I'm not

provide good reference.

And, how does that play out in that conversation?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: So, unfortunately, the stand -- or, the statutory framework under the City law is, employee or applicant, essentially. So it does require that relationship.

I think, when that relationship ends, it's likely that that would be the last adverse action in the employment context.

There may be other torts, potentially, around reputational harm or intentional infliction of emotional distress, or other causes of action.

But, from my understanding, and maybe there is area for case law to develop, or other, you know, ways to get at this issue, that the statute assumes, essentially, that employee-employer relationship or applicant-employer relationship.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It's basically the same, when the employer-employee relationship terminates, I think the ability to file terminates.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: Thank you, all.

And thank you both, for the Assembly and the Senate Chairs, for your leadership here.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Rosenthal. 1 2 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: (Microphone off.) 3 Okay, can you hear me? Sort of? 4 5 Okay. 6 Thanks for being here. 7 I just have a couple of questions. Do you record the interviews you conduct with 8 people who come forward? 9 (Microphone on.) 10 11 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Oh, thank you. 12 Do you record interviews? 13 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: No, we do not. 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: (Microphone off.) Do you think you -- what is your view on that 15 16 policy? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It's not our policy to 17 record interviews. 18 19 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Right, do you think 20 that's the right policy, or not? 21 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I mean, it's -- if I 22 take it from -- back to my litigation days, you 23 know, the issue with recording any statement is, is, 24 perhaps, you know, you really are locking your 25 witness in to the statement. And if they are to

take the stand, it becomes a matter of 1 cross-examination, not only if they're different, 2 3 but about things they didn't say. So I, potentially, could see an issue, as a 4 former litigator, being that way. But it's just not 5 6 our policy to record the witnesses. 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: And the City as well? 8 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I will have to confirm 9 the practices with our deputy commissioner for law 10 11 enforcement. I can get back to you on that. 12 13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay, great. 14 You mentioned 8 languages, and 45 languages. What -- what do you -- how do you treat 15 16 people who are hearing- and visually-impaired? 17 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: So we have systems in place where we can do video conferencing, bring in 18 19 ASL interpreters. 20 We have looped rooms, with a hearing loop. 21 And we do have, I believe, on staff at least 22 one staff person who is ASL-fluent. 23 So we have accommodations that we make, so that, in real time, people are able to file with us. 24

And, again, if we -- we will call -- we will

screen folks on the phone, or however they reach us, either via e-mail or on the phone or in person, and make those accommodations available for that initial interview so that there's no delay.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay. And sometimes ASL is not enough.

So do you -- how do you treat people who -- for whom that is not enough?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: What we will do on the call, on the intake call, which is, typically, about a 5- to 15-minute screening call, before they will, either, come in to meet with an attorney, or, set up a call -- a subsequent call to speak with an attorney if they are unable to come to the office, we will identify any accommodations that they need.

And we have contracts with providers of accommodations, whether it -- whatever -- whether it's CART services, an interpreter, or any other need for that person, we will make that available to them for their -- for whatever they are meeting with our attorneys.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay

And did you mention, visually-impaired, what you do for them?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: So we have trained staff

who can work with people who -- if they are -- if
they choose, or are unable to come into the office,
for an interview, which is our typical practice,
they -- we will -- we can do it over the phone. We
can do it by video conference if that's a
preference.

And then, you know, if they do come to meet

And then, you know, if they do come to meet with us one-on-one, we can work with them. And we have disability-rights specialists who we work with.

Whether the claim relates to the disability or not, we ensure that they are given the same access to resources and to attorney time and everything else as any other person.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: (Microphone on.)
Have you had such cases?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I can say with almost certain confidence that we have.

I don't have the numbers with me today, but I'm happy to check back in.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay. Thank you.

What about the State, same question?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Very similar.

If it's a hearing-impaired, we make sure we have the translators.

Our website is also accessible for both.

If they're visually-impaired, we have video 1 conferencing. We have the telephonic conferences. 2 3 We can go visit them. Very similar to the City as well. 4 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay. And have you 5 had cases? 6 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I'm trying to think, in 7 particular, it would be the hearing side of it. 8 9 I believe we have had the hearing-impaired, and we have brought in a tran -- a sign-language 10 interpreter. I'm sorry. 11 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: And --13 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I can find out if --14 more data, if you'd like. 15 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: -- okay, that would 16 be great. 17 I apologize if this was addressed earlier. Do you have interns from various legislators, 18 agencies, do they file with you? Do they know to 19 20 file with you? Have they filed with you? 21 On both levels. 22 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: We do have 23 jurisdictions over interns. 24 In our education, and whenever we go out to

our conferences, where we're actually meeting

interns and, potentially, bringing them on, we bring all our literature to all the different places we go.

When we hold events at the different schools, such as New York Law School, or Touro Law School, or different colleges, we bring all of that out to try and make the interns aware.

But we do have jurisdiction over interns.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: But -- because -- and I have legislation on this:

If there's a college student, and he or she goes to work at a private corporation, they are usually not trained.

How would they even know to come to speak with you?

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I guess it would be a matter of looking at our website, but we have to do more education and outreach to let the colleges know.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: But -- but -- right. And that's my -- my legislation would require training of interns.

But, actually, there should be training of -of everyone in every setting, whether they're
not-for-profit, corporate, university.

But in terms of, do you know if any universities undertake training of people who will go on to be interns?

- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: I am not aware, but maybe Dana knows.
- D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: We partner pretty closely with the CUNY system and with other educational institutions.

But, I'm not aware of internal practices at those institutions around sort of a "know your rights" component when they go out into the workforce or into summer internships.

What we do every year, and I'm just making a note to myself to make sure that this is teed up for -- for our agency, is a social-media campaign. You know, not -- not -- we don't have the resources to sort of place ads, but to at least to promote the rights of interns to be protected from discrimination and harassment in the workplace, which we usually do around this time every year, in advance of, sort of, the summer-work and internship season.

And we also partner with our city agencies that place young people in with internships and work experiences, like the department of youth and

community development, to make -- to get trained and understand what their rights are.

And for the employers who sign up to receive interns and students, that they understand what their obligations are.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: So there's no requirement to, for example, have a poster that says, you are protected, or, here are the rules that your emp -- your -- maybe not employer, because many are not paid, but, the people who work for you, you know, for a period of time, have to -- are protected by, or have to follow, this is what you have to follow?

I mean, there's no such provision in City or State law; right?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: There is a notice requirement in City law, specifically around sexual harassment, and that is, a notice you receive upon employment, and a poster that goes up in English and Spanish, and we have languages, but the mandate is English and Spanish, that has your rights, your resources, some common scenarios of sexual harassment.

And that should -- that is supposed to be up in all places of employment, regardless of whether

you have unpaid staff or paid staff or interns. 1 That is a requirement as of last year, 2018. 2 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: And the State? 3 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: We do have 4 5 jurisdiction, whether they are paid or unpaid. 6 As to the requirement, I would have to get 7 back to you on that, unless my colleague knows. D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: I'm not aware of the 8 9 requirement. ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay, I'd be 10 11 interested, because interns often feel they have no 12 leverage, they have no rights. They're dependent on 13 their boss's, you know, attitude toward them, if 14 they want to build a career, or, examine that 15 business to see if they want to proceed with that 16 kind of a job. 17 And they might even be more hesitant than a 18 paid employee because they really don't have rights. 19 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Well, I would just 20 clarify, they do have rights. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Well, I'm saying 22 it, in their mind. 23 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Understood. 24 I just want to make clear. 25 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Yes, you're right,

1 you are correct. 2 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Yes. 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: But, you know, they can just be --4 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Understood. 5 6 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: -- fired. 7 And if a person is an employee, they might have rights that an intern may not think that they 8 do. 9 D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Understood. 10 11 ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROSENTHAL: Okay. 12 Thank you. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Walker. 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Wow, I guess that 15 means we've gone around the world, and we're back 16 again. 17 So, I wanted to thank you for your time here today, and I understand it's been long. 18 But I did just want to ask a couple of 19 20 questions, now that I feel like -- I feel a little 21 bit better now, I'm in my mojo. 22 #MeToo -- the #MeToo movement sort of was 23 brought about by Tarana Burke, in reference to Black 24 women and girls being able, and being comfortable,

with coming forward with our stories, because, in

25

many instances, we're left out of the conversation.

We've seen in imagery, and in many societal norms, that Black women and girls are in -- we're unable to be violated, sexually. We are, you know, portrayed as natural sexual beings and/or oversexed.

We're categorized in those sort of languages as well.

And, so, one of the most pervasive locations where I've been able to hear stories of sexual violence taking place against Black women and girls are in the criminal justice system.

So -- so I have two questions.

One: When you're doing your outreach, are there any particular organizations that you work with in terms of promoting your policy directives?

And I'll say, with the State, now that, you know, you guys are going to be recalibrating,

I would imagine, what the outreach and coordination is amongst groups, are there any organizations that you've worked with in order to address the particular instances of women of color?

And, in addition to that, with respect to instances where they're reported, do you keep -- do you keep records with respect to tracking -- race-based tracking of your complaints, and

throughout different agencies?

And, lastly, with respect to the criminal justice system, are we going into the correctional facilities, juvenile detention facilities, and providing training therein to, both, the individuals who are incarcerated there, as well as to the employees -- employ -- yes, employees of the institution?

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I can start, and try to answer as much as I can.

So the organizations that we've worked with,

I was just kind of doing a mental list of the

organizations that we've worked with specifically on

sexual harassment, and I can list them if that -- if

that's is useful.

And many of them are here, or will be speaking shortly, I hope.

You know, Girls for Gender Equity, The Sexual Harassment Working Group, National Domestic Workers Alliance, Make the Road a Better Balance, and other initiatives. We're working with LDF.

We work with -- with respect to going into spaces where there are young people incarcerated, we do a lot of work in the correctional facilities in New York City, specifically focused on the

Fair Chance Act, you know, the "Ban the Box"

protections in New York City. So once you leave -once you have -- well, in many circumstances it's,
once you've been incarcerated, you have employment
protections in the workplace. You can't be asked
about your criminal history.

So we focus much of our education on that in -- in facilities.

But, I recognize that we should be doing more, and it's not that -- you are not only your criminal record, and so we should be recognizing.

And I think we do speak to more protective categories in that outreach.

But, certainly, I take your direction here, that we can be doing far more -- more, sort of, comprehensive education outreach in corrections facilities.

And then, tracking, so one of the complicated factors for us in tracking is that, we don't ask for demographic information. We -- people will self-identify, and that's recorded as part of their case, essentially.

So it's, really, protections under our law are actual or perceived race, gender, disability, and everything else.

And so -- and especially, you know,

particularly with respect to something like

immigration status, we do not keep any records of

that. And a claim, because you are being

discriminated against based on your immigration

status, we would charge as actual or perceived in -
very intentionally, to make sure that we are not

highlighting anyone's actual or perceived

immigration status.

So, you know, the -- I think we can look at cases alleging race discrimination, and then look at those individual case files and see sort of what the facts are.

But, from a 1,000-foot view, or 10,000-foot view, the demographic information is not something that we are tracking, both for privacy reasons, and also because it's not -- it's not vital to -- to the case across the board.

It may -- certain aspects of your -- of your personal identity are, but not all of it. And so we aren't keeping that information, as far as --

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: So I guess what makes me think, you know, whether or not -- you know, tracking, whether it's important or it's not important I guess is yet to be seen.

But, in many instances, I would imagine, not all, that the sexual harassment of Black women can also be coupled as, you know, race-based discrimination as well.

And so, I guess, to the extent that, you know, they may or may not be mutually exclusive, it's important to be -- to know this information.

And -- and I'll -- and I'll say that, you know, a lot of -- in a lot of instances, we like to say, you know, we don't see color. Right?

So that's almost what I hear, like, the agency is representing.

But the fact of the matter remains, is that -- that we are a community of many hues.

And a part of the conversation is being sort of left out of a very important conversation, and that -- and that community are Black -- is -- represents Black women. Right?

And, so, I just want to, I guess, you know,

put -- put a -- a -- I don't, a star, or a

point, or something, to be able to say that, you

know, I appreciate the space; like, I appreciate the

fact that #MeToo has arisen, Time's Up is here.

But also the National Black Women's Justice
Institute released a very good report about -- it

was called "Expanding Our Frame: Deepening Our

Demands for Safety and Sexual in" -- "Safety and

Healing for Black Survivors of Sexual Violence."

And so I guess this is the one place where I would appreciate, you know, for the agency to see color, and to recognize that this may be a coupling of maybe some race-based discrimination as well sexual violence in the workplace.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: And I would just like to put an extra exclamation point, or a checkmark, or a star, that, you know, I think the -- again, speaking anecdotally, and speaking with, and being very -- in very close touch with the supervisor for our gender-based harassment unit, highlights exactly that point: that most of the cases we see, gender-based harassment intersects with race, or immigration status, or national origin, or a multiple of those things.

That it is more -- and -- and the statistics bear out, as we've seen, that women of color are more vulnerable to and experience sexual harassment at higher rates than White women.

And that is what we see at the commission, and we recognize that, and -- and find -- and that is central to the work that we do.

191 And so I just want to reiterate that that is 1 very much at the center of our work. 2 SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Liu. 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Hi -- oh. 4 5 SENATOR LIU: Thank you, Madam Chair. 6 I apologize. I --7 SENATOR BIAGGI: Sorry, Senator Liu, one 8 moment. D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: As to whether, and 9 where, we've done the outreach, whether -- and to 10 11 the particular group, I would have to get back to 12 you on that. 13 In terms of tracking, we -- I wouldn't call 14 it tracking, but, our data, we should be able to 15 pull based on race or based on sexual harassment. 16 We likely could pull that data if you'd like 17 us to get back to you with it. I don't have it 18 today. D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: We do have that data. 19 20 But I believe the commissioner's assessment 21 indicated, we also have individuals that file on 22 multiple bases; so, people will file based on race

> So it's hard to take apart specific cases because, oftentimes, people are discriminated on

and sexual harassment.

23

24

25

1 multiple bases. But we do have the data. 2 As for us going into juvenile and 3 correctional agencies to train, not since -- not 4 that I'm aware of. 5 6 But I can bring that suggestion back under 7 advisement. SENATOR BIAGGI: My apologies to 8 9 Assemblywoman Walker. Senator Liu. 10 11 SENATOR LIU: Thank you, Madam Chair. 12 I just have one more question to follow up, 13 and that is: On more than one occasion, 14 15 Commissioner Martinez, you had mentioned that --16 once again, you're proud that you have a relatively 17 high rate of cases with probable cause at 18 25 percent? 19 Did I hear you correctly? 20 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. SENATOR LIU: All right. 21 22 So does that mean 75 percent of complaints 23 are unfounded; have no probable cause? 24 What does that mean? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Well, basically, for all 25

1 of the cases that we do investigate, that go through 2 the investigation stage, 25 percent of them we find 3 probable cause in. Some of the cases do not finish the 4 5 investigation stage; they settle. 6 Some of them are withdrawn by the 7 complainants. They decide to maybe pursue other avenues, or, they settle outside, privately. 8 9 But, yes, that's a higher rate than most 10 other cases. SENATOR LIU: Okay, so "25 percent," that 11 12 means that your division, ultimately, has to 13 adjudicate, prosecute, I don't know what the words 14 are, but, those -- it's 25 percent of the complaints 15 that come to the division that, ultimately, you take 16 action on? 17 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Sexual-harassment 18 complaints. 19 So --20 SENATOR LIU: Okay, so these are 21 specifically --22 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Correct. 23 SENATOR LIU: -- because that was my next 24 question.

These are not all complaints; these are

25

1 specifically sexual-harassment complaints? D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Correct. 2 3 So after a probable-cause determination is made, and the 25 percent is unique to 4 5 sexual-harassment complaints, then those cases move 6 along to a public hearing. So those -- those are the -- 25 percent of 7 those cases are the ones that don't settle before 8 9 the investigation ends. They could settle afterwards. 10 11 SENATOR LIU: And that's great about the 12 25 percent. 13 I'm just worried about the 75 percent. 14 And you're saying that -- it's not -- it's 15 not, as I characterize it, that they were 16 unfounded --17 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Right, right. SENATOR LIU: -- but, in fact, a lot of 18 19 them --20 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yep. 21 SENATOR LIU: -- get settled before it 22 actually gets to the public-hearing phase, which is 23 what you're talking about with the 25 percent? 24 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Yes. 25 SENATOR LIU: And so -- I mean, are most of

that 75 percent settled beforehand?

Because, you know, the -- at least the newfound wisdom, is that it's very hard for somebody to claim sexual harassment, and it's almost always true.

So that's -- I'm trying to reconcile the 75 percent that are not considered cases with probable cause, to our, you know, widely-accepted thinking that people are not going to file sexual-harassment assaults without probable cause.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Right.

Well, you know, the hard truth of the matter is, there are more cases that do get dismissed than do lead to probable cause. That is the fact of the matter.

SENATOR LIU: And is that dis -- okay.

Do you know why they get dismissed?

Is it because of a deficiency in the law?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Not necessarily.

It could be for an abundance of reasons. It's different for each case.

SENATOR LIU: But they're -- they're -
I mean, it seems like one of those reasons would be
failure to meet this "severe and pervasive"

standard.

Would that be one of the reasons?

I mean, if some -- you know, if a woman feels like they've been sexually harassed on the job, they make a complaint, but, they don't -- they don't meet the "severe or pervasive" standard, just as one example, they would fall into that 75 percent "without probable cause."

Is that correct or not correct?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: It -- it's -- it's our position that we take a very liberal interpretation of the law.

So I -- I -- I can't -- I can't -- what's the word I'm looking for?

SENATOR LIU: All right, look, I'm not trying to badger anybody, but, Madam Chair --

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: (Indiscernible cross-talking) understand.

SENATOR LIU: -- I think we need to get the commissioner here, somebody who -- you know,

I understand your -- your -- your responsibilities,
and the constraints that come with it.

But we need the commissioner to respond, if not in a hearing, directly in writing, to these kinds of questions.

And my last quick question is: How many

1 deputy commissioners are there? Because you're -- there's two of you right 2 3 now. How many deputy commissioners are there? 4 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: There's two deputy 5 commissioners --6 SENATOR LIU: That's it? 7 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: -- and one first deputy 8 commissioner. 9 10 Yes. 11 SENATOR LIU: Okay. So there's, basically --12 so there's a deputy -- a first deputy commissioner above you, below the commissioner? 13 D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: Correct. 14 15 SENATOR LIU: Okay. 16 I mean, I was hoping you would tell me that 17 there would be like 10 deputy commissioners, because, in response to some of the legislators' 18 questions earlier, you kept saying: Well, I'm not 19 20 in charge of that, or, I don't know about this. 21 This is what I focus on. That's some -- that's 22 somebody else's job. 23 And that would be a stronger defense for yourselves if there were like 10 deputy 24

25

commissioners.

But there are only two of you. 1 2 So you got the commissioner, you have the 3 first deputy commissioner, and then there's the two 4 of you. 5 So, you know, between the two of you, you actually should be aware of everything that the 6 7 division is responsible for. You may not know the exact details, but you 8 9 can't say "that's not my area," I'm sorry to say. 10 Thank you. 11 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So a couple -- couple 12 follow-ups. If a settlement is involved --13 14 Am I using the right term, "settlement"? 15 -- do those usually involve an admission of 16 some sort of wrongdoing? 17 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: No, they do not. ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: They do not. 18 D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: They do not. 19 20 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Okay. I'll have a 21 follow-up to that later, I'll ask another panel. 22 But let me switch gears a little bit on 23 something else: the data. 24 Again, when -- the 25 percent where there's 25 probable cause, you find, and you go after the

incident, whatever complaint it was.

That usually leads to a charge or a penalty or what -- what does it mean for the individual who committed the harassment and/or the employer who allowed it to happen?

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: After the probable cause is made?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Yes.

D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: So after the probable cause is made, it goes to the next stage, which is the hearing stage, or the settlement before the hearing. And that's when that is decided between the parties, or, by the judge.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And then once a decision is made there, what could it look like?

- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: When you say "decision," what do you mean, I'm sorry?
- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: You mean a hearing decision?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Yes.

- D.C. GINA MARTINEZ: By the judge. Okay.
- D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: So, a recommended order, after a review of all the evidence that was heard, any cross-examination, documentation, the ALJ will make a recommended order.

It is then sent to both parties, the respondent, as well as the complainant. They are given 21 days to object to it in writing.

Once they do, their objections, plus the record, is submitted to the commissioner's office, where two adjudication counsels review the record, and make a recommendation to the commissioner, which could be, she could adopt it as it stands; she can modify the ruling; and she could award more damages or less damages, based on that.

And then once she makes the decision, the order gets sent to the -- both sides.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So the damages could involve certain a payment to the victim and/or certain actions to be taken by the employer --

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Correct, it could -ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- either internal,
or --

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- front pay, back pay.

For mental health -- I mean, mental pain and

suffering, there could be damages for that. Order

to desist from the, or stop the, bad actions --

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Okay.

D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: -- instill a policy.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: The reason I'm asking

this line of questions, I would like to -- I would hope that we could discuss how to create an environment where we could really try to stop the pervasiveness of this when it involves individuals who may come before you more than once.

So, as Labor Chair, I would like to -- you know, we talk a lot about how to create a better environment for job applicants, how to give them an ability to know what environment they're going into, or, an employer who wants to make sure that they maintain a safe work environment, and not inadvertently bring somebody onboard who has been before your agency, you know, on multiple occasions.

So I would like to, at some point, maybe have a follow-up conversation with you about this idea, because I believe that we should provide that information.

And if the data is made available or public in some way, where, whether it's an affirmative action that takes place, a particular step that happens in an employment process, or, something that's researchable, right, that's available to folks, if I'm interested in working in a law firm:

How do I know -- how would I find out or be aware of how many instances that firm, or employees

of that firm, have been before your agency?

Or, how would I be able to verify that the supervisor that I'm going to be assigned to is someone that I may not want to work for because of his history.

That kind pressure point would really encourage employers to address these issues much more forcefully because, now, the reputation of their environment is on the line.

Vice versa, the employer should have an ability to know if the applicant that, on paper, looks like well-rounded applicant, may be somebody who has been in previous employment opportunities, on multiple occasions, accused of something.

And there's really no mechanism for us, in anything we've discussed so far, unless I'm wrong, that would allow that information to be used the right way; to prevent the wrong people to be in the wrong places before this continues to occur.

## D.C. MELISSA FRANCO: Sure.

I don't know that there is a mechanism. And it does sound like this is definitely a larger conversation that can be had here.

It's one of those issues where a lot of what you said makes sense, but I would have to think

1 about, what -- what's the flip side of what you're 2 saying. So, I don't think you're asking for a 3 question, but I definitely think it deserves a 4 greater conversation. 5 6 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I just want to put it out there. I think it's relevant to how data is 7 used, and how it's reported, when it's all settled, 8 9 or, at least for those percentages where there was probable cause. 10 11 So it's something that I would love to 12 explore as a follow-up. 13 But, you've been incredibly --14 You have a question? 15 SENATOR BIAGGI: (Nods head.) 16 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- incredibly patient on 17 our end, and we really want to thank you for the 18 time and your testimony. SENATOR BIAGGI: Just one comment. 19 20 Thank you, again. 21 I want to echo what my Assembly Co-Chair just 22 said. 23 Thank you for sitting and listening to us,

and answering all of our questions. It's incredibly important.

24

25

I encourage you to stay, to hear from all of the other individuals in this room who will be testifying, not only because it's important for you to have access to this information, but because, again, we want to be partners in this journey with you as well.

And, to anybody in the room who has a complaint, we would encourage you to please speak to these individuals in the room before the end of the day.

Or, if anybody who's watching would like to do that in the future, please, we encourage you to use the resources that we have before us, which are the State and the City.

Thank you very much.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: I'd just like to make a quick note.

I'm going to be stepping back to my office across the street to pump, and I will be returning to hear the rest of the testimony.

So, just to -- I wanted to -- I will be back.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Remember, 5:30 is the deadline.

D.C. DANA SUSSMAN: Right.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 1 2 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you for your 3 testimony. While the next presenter, who will be the 4 New York State Governor's Office of Employee 5 6 Relations, Michael Volforte, the director, comes up, 7 I want to make two quick announcements. We have been joined by Assemblymember 8 9 Felix Ortiz and Assemblywoman Natalia Fernandez. 10 I want to thank them for joining us. 11 A reminder that, 5:30, security issues, you 12 will be able to exit at any point, but after 5:30 13 not return to the building. And an acknowledgment of the fact that we 14 15 will be here for quite some time, and not all of you 16 have somebody available to go grab lunch for you. 17 I have ordered pizza for everyone. I think 18 there should be enough coming. It will be in 19 another room. We'll announce when it's available. 20 So... 21 [Applause.] 22 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: That's very nice. 23 you. 24 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: As long as my counsel

tells me it's a legitimate campaign expense, so...

25

1	[Laughter.]
2	ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Appreciate your
3	patience.
4	We're going to continue, so if we could
5	settle down.
6	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I was ambitious with my
7	lead
8	OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: You see what you did
9	with the pizza announcement?
10	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: where it said "Good
11	morning."
12	ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Too excited. It will be
13	a while.
14	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I was ambitious.
15	SENATOR BIAGGI: You can begin.
16	Thank you.
17	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Thank you.
18	Good afternoon.
19	SENATOR BIAGGI: If we could just have quiet
20	and silence in the room.
21	Thank you.
22	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Good afternoon,
23	Chair Skoufis, Chair Biaggi, Chair Salazar,
24	Chair Titus, Chair Crespo, and Chair Walker, and
25	other members of the Senate and Assembly here today.

My name is Michael Volforte, and I am the director of the Governor's Office of Employee Relations, also known as "GOER."

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing on sexual harassment in the workplace.

In these remarks I'd like to detail some of the very important steps we've taken under Governor Cuomo's leadership to tackle the issue of discrimination in the workplace.

Shortly after the Governor was elected, we created a compilation of all the rights and protections that executive-branch state employees have from employment-based discrimination called "Equal Employment Opportunity in New York State: Rights and Responsibilities," a handbook for employees of the state of New York, also called "The Handbook."

The Handbook informs state employees of their rights and responsibilities when it comes to protecting employees from discrimination.

In 2013 we implemented a standard investigation process for agencies to follow in investigation of complaints of protected-class employment discrimination.

We also created a small unit within GOER to assist agencies in completing those investigations pursuant to that process, and to provide technical guidance to both investigators and agency counsel alike.

In 2013 we revised our sexual-harassment-prevention training program, and mandated that all executive-branch employees complete that training on a yearly basis.

The next year we added two additional mandated annual training courses on all protected-class employment rights and reasonable accommodation for both disability and religious reasons.

In August of 2018 we took another step forward in the investigation of complaints of employment-related protected-class discrimination with the Governor's issuance of Executive Order 187, with the goals of achieving more independent investigations of employment-discrimination complaints, but ensuring that the investigative body has knowledge and understanding of the state workforce, employer-employee relationship.

Executive Order Number 187 transferred the responsibility for conducting investigations of all

employment-related protected-class discrimination complaints, in agencies and departments over which the Governor has executive authority, to GOER.

These investigations include discrimination complaints based upon protected-classes filed by employees, including contractors, interns, and other persons engaged in employment at these agencies and departments.

The protected classes are those set forth in the applicable federal, New York State, laws; executive orders; and other policies; including those based on age, arrest, conviction record, color, creed, disability, domestic-violence victim status, gender identity, marital and family status, military status, national origin, predisposing genetic characteristics, pregnancy-related conditions, race, retaliation, sex, sexual orientation, and sexual harassment.

Pursuant to Executive Order 187, effective

December 1, 2018, all complaints of protected-class

employment-related discrimination are being

investigated by GOER's anti-discrimination

investigations division (ADID).

This responsibility covers approximately 130,000 executive-branch employees, but does not

include employees of SUNY, CUNY, SED (the State Education Department), the Legislature, office of attorney general, or the office of state comptroller.

GOER investigates complaints executive-branch employees file internally within these -- within state agencies, and external complaints, like those filed with the division of human rights or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Complainants may include employees, interns, contractors, delivery people, consultants; anyone whose workplace involves the state agency location or interaction with state employees consistent with state law and policy.

In preparation for its new responsibility,

GOER received 41 affirmative-action administrators

called "AAOs" from state agencies, who are already

investigating -- already engaged, excuse me, in the

investigation of employment-discrimination

complaints; and hired another six employees to help

manage these employees.

We also created an independent investigation process, developed a new complaint form entitled "New York State Employee Discrimination Complaint Form," for employees to use, and revised

The Handbook, all the while making sure that our training, policy, and procedures comport with the 2018 sexual-harassment prevention laws that were enacted by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor.

Both the New York State Employee

Discrimination Complaint Form and The Handbook are posted prominently on the GOER agency web page of our -- homepage of our website, and agencies have been instructed to regularly distribute them to their employees as well.

Individuals now file complaints directly with GOER without ever going through the chain of command at their employing agency.

We've established an online fillable form that can be e-mailed directly to a dedicated e-mail box. Employees can also mail complaints to GOER.

We have AAOs located in a number of agencies, and employees are also free to speak with them and file complaints directly with them.

We also mandate that any supervisor or manager who observes, witnesses, or hears about discriminatory conduct, report the conduct by filing a discrimination complaint with GOER.

Agencies send out reminders to their

employees regularly, to remind them to whom they can complain, where the form and policy on discrimination prevention is located.

GOER investigates complaints pursuant to our established 10-step investigative process.

Agencies must cooperate with GOER, and provide access to employee's information and documentation relevant to each complaint.

When GOER receives a complaint, the complainant receives an acknowledgment of receipt of the complaint, and agency general counsel is also notified of the complaint as well.

A respondent is notified at the point in the investigation when it is necessary to inform them, or when interim administrative action is being taken.

The parties are notified of the outcome when the investigation is concluded.

Once a complaint is concluded, if it is substantiated, we work with the agency to ensure that they are implementing corrective or disciplinary action that we determine.

Confidentiality is important in our investigations. Complainants, respondents, witnesses, and administrators at agencies are

advised not to discuss complaints while the investigation is ongoing, to prevent anyone from trying to try to influence the outcome and to avoid instances of retaliation.

Of course, complainants and respondents, where represented, are free to speak with their representatives.

We are clear about prohibiting retaliation.

Every employee, whether a witness, complainant, or respondent, is advised during the investigation process that retaliation is prohibited.

Statistically, we have seen a rise in the number of complaints overall. This is not unexpected, and was anticipated, given a number of factors, not the least of which, we think is, we are providing regular reminders of where employees can complain. And, additionally, employees now have someone external to their own employing agency to report discrimination to.

This is consistent with what we are hearing anecdotally from other entities that handle complaints of discrimination: increasing awareness of what constitutes discrimination leads to more people filing complaints.

Also, we determine whether the allegations in each complaint, if substantiated, violate the policy set forth in The Handbook; not whether they actually violate the law.

GOER investigates every allegation of discrimination, whether the complainant overheard a single sexual comment or joke, to other than -- to other far more involved and complex allegations of discrimination.

We take our role in investigating and resolving complaints of discrimination extremely seriously. No employee should have to endure harassment based on their protected-class status.

And we are committed to furthering efforts to both ensure that the State's policies concerning discrimination, harassment, and discrimination in the workplace are followed, and holding individuals accountable who violate our policies.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear, and I'll answer any questions that you have.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Salazar.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

And thank you for testifying.

We missed GOER at the first hearing in February, so I really appreciate you coming here

1 today. I first wanted to ask about the complaint 2 form that was mentioned. 3 I've seen the complaint form online, and 4 I know it's two pages. It includes the division's 5 e-mail and mailing address, but there's no --6 there's no phone number on the form. 7 I also noticed that there is no disclaimer on 8 9 the form or any language that might inform an 10 employee of their rights. 11 And I'm just wondering, who exactly developed 12 the form, and -- or who was consulted by GOER in 13 creating it? 14 15 itself.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: GOER developed the form

SENATOR SALAZAR: Right. Okay.

And could you perhaps tell me, like, who within GOER, maybe not by name, but what the role is (indiscernible cross-talking) --

> MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Sure.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Myself and my anti-discrimination investigation's division leadership developed the form.

> SENATOR SALAZAR: Excellent. Thank you.

And there was one other question I wanted to

ask you.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: On the information on other rights and responsibilities, that's contained in that handbook that I referenced, which is a 44-ish-page document, which is located on our website.

And all the agencies post on their own intranets where the location of that handbook is.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Excellent. Thank you.

Another question I had was with regard to, ahead of -- of actually taking responsibility for these complaints, GOER, it says, received affirmative-action administrators from state agencies.

I'm wondering what happened to any active investigations from other agencies, after this -- after the executive order went into effect, any active investigations from other agencies, such as DHR or JCOPE.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We don't handle DHR or JCOPE investigations.

But if it was an internal complaint, the investigation was finished by the individuals doing that investigation, or one of our investigators.

And if it was an external complaint, meaning,

1 somebody filed with DHR, but before there was an 2 employer response, those same individuals would have completed that. 3 We would have no role with JCOPE. 4 SENATOR SALAZAR: I see. 5 6 So -- so then GOER has not received any, 7 like, active investigations that were transferred over from, or referred by, either by one of these 8 9 agencies or an agency that was just not equipped and not responsible for handling complaints? 10 11 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We -- if an -- if an 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We -- if an -- if an indiv -- if an agency didn't have an AAO, we will assign an AAO to investigate anything from that agency.

That was the general process before, except, they might get somebody from a different agency.

This time, as of now, they'll get somebody from GOER to do that.

And we took steps, and are taking steps, to make sure all of those open issues were closed after the transfer of the 41 individuals to GOER.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So, uhm, just want to be clear.

So, state agencies will no longer have their

1 own internal process? 2 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Every state agency has an 3 internal process, and it's the same: it's the one that GOER has dictated is the process. 4 5 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So you've given them a 6 process, they all have to follow it. 7 But if a -- if I work for an agency, I cannot go to my agency to file; I have to go to your office 8 to file? 9 10 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: You can still go to your agency to file. 11 12 So that's not an option, except that that 13 agency is mandated to report it to GOER, and GOER 14 will investigate it, so that the agency isn't 15 investigating themselves. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So they can only serve 17 as a recipient of the complaint? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Correct. 18 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: You handle it --19 20 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: They --21 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- you enforce it, you 22 investigate it? 23 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Sorry, I won't interrupt.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: No, no, just --

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes, you're absolutely

24

right, they are the recipient of it.

They either try to have the individual fill out a complaint form, or they're instructed to fill out the complaint form themselves with the information they have, and forward it to GOER.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So that -- that an employee would not have a recourse to go to the agencies we just heard from, human rights commission?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: That's different.

What my role as -- is, is the employer is investigating ourselves --

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Okay.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: -- so to speak, and they are external agencies. Think of them as law enforcement, just like the courts.

Our process does not restrict an employee from -- an employee could go to somebody in their own agency. That gets filed to GOER; an AAO there within GOER.

They could come to GOER themselves by e-mailing it, to the -- mailing or -- or e-mailing.

They could file a separate complaint with DHR or the EEOC, and follow their procedures.

Or, they could go to court in accordance with

whatever rules are applied.

Those are all options, and those are things that are highlighted also in our handbook.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So DHR and GOER could, essentially, be making the same investigation simultaneously?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: If the person, yes, goes to both of us at the same time, it -- it -- for all intents and purposes, it will be the same investigation, except that, in the internal complaint, we will be -- we will be reporting, so to speak, to ourselves, and we'll issue a report to the agency, telling them we found "X" happened, and this is how you fix it.

In the DHR context, what will happen is, is the agency will use whatever information we put together as an investigation to file their response with DHR.

We are not conversing with DHR regarding investigations. We're just investigating on behalf of the agency, to give them the facts, to answer that. And those facts will either be discrimination occurred or discrimination didn't occur, and then they'll -- then the agency themselves will follow the DHR process.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you. 1 2 Assemblywoman Simotas. 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you for joining 4 us today. How does your office track numbers and 5 6 outcomes of reports of every state agency, and will 7 any of that information become public? SENATOR CARLUCCI: We -- we keep track of it 8 internally now that we're -- we've taken over this 9 investigative process. And, we've built a system to 10 11 track that, and give data to us, so that it informs 12 future decisions we make, in terms of training and 13 efforts we have make to root out, you know, systemic 14 problems that exist maybe in an agency, in an 15 office, and things like that. 16 So we have that information. 17 We have no current mandate to publish that 18 data, but it's some -- you know, we certainly always 19 review that and plan on reviewing it in the future. 20 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Would it something 21 that's FOILable? 22 Is that -- obviously, the random public 23 couldn't get it.

> But can we as legislators get it if we asked for it?

24

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Uhm... 1 2 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Well, how about 3 this --MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I can't answer the 4 5 question totally on FOIL, 'cause it's -- there will 6 be things. Statistical information could be available. 7 Specifics won't be. 8 9 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Well, then, I make 10 the request right now for the Legislature, I can 11 speak on behalf of the Assembly, that we would like 12 that information. 13 Hopefully, we'll figure out a way to make it 14 public, because I think that society -- the public 15 should know about how many complaints are filed 16 regarding state agencies. 17 But, nonetheless, I would make that request 18 right now. 19 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Okay. 20 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: My next question is: 21 What efforts has your office made to implement best 22 practices for trauma-informed investigations? 23 We heard at our last hearing, a lot of people 24 who've been through the process, who weren't

satisfied with being kept up to date, with some of

the questions that were inappropriate.

Clearly, these investigations are asking sensitive questions.

And it would behoove your office to make sure that people who are trauma -- who are experts in this trauma are doing the investigations.

So what steps have -- has your office taken to do so?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: All of the investigators either have a background in this field.

And if they -- if they don't, they're all trained by my office now so the training is consistent.

The term, the "trauma-based" -"trauma-informed training," we don't, technically,
do that exact training. But we do train our
investigators in how to be, you know, sensitively
asking questions to be inquisitive.

Everyone realizes it's very sensitive, both in the sexual-harassment field and in other fields.

You know, I did view the last testimony.

I'm not sure that people who spoke about the process were speaking about our process, so I can't really comment on the questions about what specific questions were and were not asked.

I know I heard some earlier testimony on what JCOPE asked, but that's not what we do.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: I know, specifically, a lot of the people who testified talked about being kept up to date, being informed, of the whole process of the determinations.

What is your process in your 10 steps that you follow to make sure that complainants are kept up to date?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Sure.

They're informed at the beginning, they're consulted during it. They're often interviewed, and sometimes multiple times. And then they're informed at the end whether their complaint is substantiated or unsubstantiated. And if it's substantiated, that we're taking action.

There is not a regular updating process as part of that, other than what I've described.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Mayer.

SENATOR MAYER: Thank you.

Thank you for being here.

Question on your testimony, on page 3, and this is a question I just don't know the answer, but, you say, "We mandate that any supervisor or

manager who observes, witnesses, or hears about discriminatory conduct report the conduct by filing a discrimination complaint with GOER."

Now, is the -- so mandatory reporting, which I think is extremely critical, is that required by Executive Order 187, or is that a GOER imposition?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: It's -- it's required in our policy, and it's required by GOER.

I'd have to -- I didn't -- I don't have the executive order with me, but it may -- it may reference that in the executive order.

But it is in our policy, and it is in GOER pronouncements to the agencies.

SENATOR MAYER: And so with respect to every executive agency, and I recognize GOER doesn't go beyond that, there is a mandatory reporting requirement of -- by a supervisor or manager of any discriminatory conduct of which they are made aware?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes.

SENATOR MAYER: And when you are made aware of conduct which is, arguably, or potentially, criminal, do you -- what steps do you take with respect to that conduct?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We refer it to law enforcement, and then we wait for an a law

enforcement determination to go ahead with an administrative investigation, so as to not disturb the criminal investigation.

SENATOR MAYER: And how many times has GOER done that in the last year?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I don't have -- I don't have a statistic off the top of my head.

SENATOR MAYER: Any -- anytime?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: At least one, that I'm aware of.

SENATOR MAYER: And not withstanding the fact that this is executive agencies, again, do you ever refer -- let me rephrase that.

In the case of a pattern or practice of discrimination alleged against a supervisor or manager of a state agency, what steps do you take that are distinguishable from an individual complaint against a supervisor or manager?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: If an investigation, or investigations, led to a conclusion that an individual supervisor or manager had a pattern or practice, that individual would be brought up on administrative action. And depending on their -- their job, they could be -- they might be in a unit where we have to file notice of disciplinary

charges. Or, if they're a high-ranking individual, 1 if the conduct is of a level, they'll be 2 disciplined/terminated. 3 SENATOR MAYER: Since this policy, I think 4 it's 2018 the Governor's executive order went into 5 6 effect, do you know how many employees of state agencies have been terminated as a result of their 7 8 discriminatory conduct? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: No. 9 SENATOR MAYER: Do you have any -- any idea 10 11 that -- could we be provided with that number? 12 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I can see if we have that 13 number. I don't know that GOER has that number, 14 15 'cause the agencies themselves handle disciplines. 16 So it's not -- it's not a -- we don't have 17 prosecutors that prosecute notices of discipline for 18 the agency. SENATOR MAYER: I understand. 19 20 But you do the investigation. 21 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We do the investigation. 22 SENATOR MAYER: Do you make a recommendation with respect to what action should follow? 23 24 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes.

SENATOR MAYER: So are there cases in which

```
you have recommended termination?
1
               MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes.
 2
 3
               SENATOR MAYER: How many?
               MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I don't have that
 4
        information.
 5
 6
               SENATOR MAYER: Could you provide it?
 7
               MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Certainly.
               SENATOR MAYER: Thank you.
 8
9
               ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Fernandez.
10
               ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: Good afternoon.
               Following up with, I guess, a topic that
11
12
        Chair Crespo brought, and what we've talked about of
13
        you handling your investigation and the agency doing
14
        their own investigation, what happens if you come to
15
        a decision that is different than what the agency
16
        decides?
17
               MICHAEL VOLFORTE: The agency is not
18
        investigating.
19
               ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: They don't?
20
               MICHAEL VOLFORTE: So --
21
               ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: Okay, I thought
22
        I heard (indiscernible cross-talking) --
23
               MICHAEL VOLFORTE: -- but -- so just in case
        I was unclear:
24
25
               We get the complaint. We investigate the
```

complaint. We render a factual determination as to 1 what we think occurred. 2 3 The agency can say to us, Well, we think you should investigate, this. 4 5 Maybe there's something particular to that agency that we didn't look at in terms of that. 6 There's a final determination as to what 7 facts occurred. 8 GOER determines what those facts are. 9 The agency does not get an opportunity to 10 11 have a vote or overrule GOER. 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: Okay. 13 And Senator Mayer kind of took my question 14 with determinations, and how often those happen. 15 But, would you say that that's a successful 16 assessment to a case of sexual harassment if the 17 person gets terminated? Or, has there been instances where they don't 18 19 get terminated, but they just go through, I guess, 20 more training or policy amendments? 21 Can you give me an example of, I guess, 22 results from a complaint that does not end in 23 termination, but what do you do --24 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Oh, sure. 25 ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: -- with the

complainer and the victim?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Since the overwhelming majority of our workforce are unionized, they all -- the -- that vast majority have tenure rights and due-process rights.

So you have to bring -- in order to take the ultimate action, termination, for those employees, you have to file written charges. They have to be fairly specific. And then you have to prove them in front of an independent arbitrator, and then that arbitrator is to award termination.

Those are -- you know, in serious cases, those are things that we go for.

So if there was an -- if there was an incident where a -- you know, a man grabs a woman, we're gonna -- and that's proven, factually, to have occurred, we're going to file charges and we're going to seek termination.

There are levels below that, administratively, we can go through.

If someone is a -- and it's not to characterize the content as -- or, the action as good or bad, but, if an individual makes one sexually-explicit joke, that typically won't amount to a violation of law. We would still investigate

that, make a conclusion. And if it occurred, we would take action.

Sometimes that would be, the individual is counseled, which base -- they receive a memo, that goes in their file, that alerts them that it was improper, that they shouldn't do that. And they are retrained on that.

So that would be -- that would be the type of thing that wouldn't go to a disciplinary process, on those limited facts.

If that individual has some other history, that all gets taken into account and could change that -- that -- the compass on where we go.

But if you're talking about an employee with 28 years of service, and had never done anything incorrect or bad in their career, and made that one poor choice to tell that one joke, that might be the result in that case if it was founded.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: Say, if this person continues -- they get the first warning, go through training, counseling, they do it again -- do you have like a "three strikes, you're out" type of motto? Or, is there some type of limit or statute that you use to take a stronger --

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We try to be consistent

across lines.

It's all going to be dependent on what their history was, and what they did this time.

So if somebody did that comment, and then the next day they're doing another comment, or, you know, maybe they -- then, that's going to -- that timing, in our mind, would ratchet up how we take action on that individual.

If there's a long period of time, if we're talking years, that's going to be a factor.

The years an employee has, the type of conduct, all of that goes in.

So there's no stead answer, and there's no specific chart of, you do X, and you do Y.

We do certain things we take extremely seriously, and go to the end, such as complaints of retaliation.

If you think you've retaliated against somebody, we will seek your termination.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: I've seen how certain people working in a certain agency might move to another agency in the time of their -- you know, (indiscernible) working for the State.

If they do have a record of these type of reports and complaints, is the next employer or

supervisor made aware of them before hiring and accepting them?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I don't know what occurred in the past.

Certainly, those, that information is now centralized in my office, and it's certainly something we can look at in terms of how that -- that's handled.

Certainly, that information, now that it's within GOER, becomes relevant if there's another complaint that's in our purview, and so that we'll have that individual's history (inaudible) those make those informed decisions about how to handle that next case, so to speak.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

I have several questions, and I want to just start at the top.

So, I think that -- I'm a little bit confused, and I read a lot of the documents before to prepare for this. So, if you could just bear with me and humor me, that would be much appreciated.

So how many agencies are currently under GOER's purview?

Or, perhaps, maybe it would be easier this 1 2 way: How many agencies or entities are not under 3 GOER's purview? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I've listed them in my 4 testimony, and most authorities are not. 5 6 SENATOR BIAGGI: So from -- at least from 7 what I have found, is it accurate to say that the MTA and the judiciary are not under GOER's purview? 8 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Correct. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. So if a member of the 10 11 judiciary, or, a staffer in the judiciary, had a 12 problem or an issue, would they just go to DHR? 13 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: They could -- I -- at 14 this -- based on last year's legislation, if they hadn't done it before --15 16 SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure. 17 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: -- the judiciary should have their own policy where somebody could make an 18 internal complaint. 19 20 They could go to DHR. 21 SENATOR BIAGGI: Got it, got it. 22 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: They could go 23 (indiscernible cross-talking) --24 SENATOR BIAGGI: And the same for MTA; 25 correct?

1	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Correct.
2	SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.
3	So who oversees the MTA and the judiciary?
4	Who's going to be doing that oversight?
5	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I don't know the answer to
6	that question.
7	SENATOR BIAGGI: So there's currently no
8	entity in the state government overseeing any of the
9	complaints and investigations for the MTA and the
10	judiciary; is that correct?
11	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I know that GOER is not
12	overseeing it. I don't know if anybody else is.
13	SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.
14	How many employees currently are under your
15	purview?
16	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: In terms of, that are
17	covered by that we might investigate complaints
18	of? Or (indiscernible cross-talking)
19	SENATOR BIAGGI: No, how many individuals are
20	within GOER to be going through the investigations
21	and the complaints?
22	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: There are
23	41 investigators.
24	SENATOR BIAGGI: I saw that, yes.
25	MICHAEL VOLFORTE: And there are a staff of

nine individuals that are above those investigators, 1 performing oversight, administrative functions. 2 SENATOR BIAGGI: So about 50, and then you, 3 is 51. 4 So 51 individuals overseeing almost every 5 6 state agency in the state of New York, and all of 7 the investigations and complaints that come through; is that correct? 8 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Correct. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 10 11 What sexual-harassment policy do you have in 12 place for the executive-branch staff? 13 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: The executive-branch 14 staff, it's in our EEO handbook. 15 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. Does it go further 16 than the model policy or what's in The Handbook? 17 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: It's consistent with the model policy, but I'm not certain it goes further, 18 19 other than, we would -- a complaint of that single 20 joke that I stated before, would not, generally, be 21 a violation with DHR. But we could find it to be a 22 violation of policy and take action based on it. 23 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.

On -- so on December 1, 2018, that was when the inspector general's office switched its cases

24

from the inspector general's office to GOER? 1 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: No. 2 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: So can you tell me what the date is? 4 5 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: On December 1, all of the investigators transferred from their agencies to 6 7 GOER, a physical -- a physical paper move that made them GOER employees. 8 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: So what was the role, then, of the inspector general's office at that time? 10 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: The inspector general's 11 12 office operates pursuant to its operating statute, 13 and investigates those things that fall within its 14 purview under, I think it's Executive Order --15 excuse me, Executive Law 55. 16 They were not handling administrative 17 complaints of -- administrative investigations of 18 discrimination complaints. That was being done by 19 the agencies themselves. 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 21 So you mentioned the 41 affirmative-action 22 administrators. What is the role of the EEOs with relation to 23 those affirmative-action administrators? 24 25 Because my understanding was that the EEOs

reported each complaint to GOER. So those were the individuals within each agency, right, that would receive a complaint. And then that complaint would go from the EEO officer to, then, GOER.

So, what is the communication structure between the EEOs and the affirmative-action administrators, if any?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: For the most part, those individuals were the same.

SENATOR BIAGGI: They were the same?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: They were the same.

They're -- the term "EEO officer" and "AAO" were largely used interchangeably. There weren't distinct groups of that.

What happened with the -- so -- so what happened with the transfer of function was, those 41 AAOs became GOER employees. And, if they had existing complaints, brought the complaints with them.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.

So -- I mean, since the first sexual-harassment hearing, I'm sure you can probably make an inference that many individuals have reached out to my office about different issues that they've faced as it relates to their complaints with DHR,

and whether we can help, and what we can do; and in particular, FOIL requests.

And so you had said that GOER does not investigate DHR.

So why is it, then, that GOER had sent complaints to -- to -- or, DHR had sent complaints -- their complaints to GOER for this response to a FOIL request that was made?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I -- I think we're mixing

metaphors.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Metaphors?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: So, GOER doesn't investigate cases that are filed with DHR in terms of DHR's statutory responsibilities.

SENATOR BIAGGI: But what if the -- what if the individual had worked for the agency?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: That complaint would get referred to GOER and we would investigate that.

So if -- if it was a state employee complaining -- choosing to use the internal process, and saying, My supervisor within DHR did X and Y, GOER would investigate that employee's complaint, and investigate the supervisor, and render a determination that DHR would implement as an employer.

If that employee said, I don't want to go
through GOER. I want to -- and I don't want to file
with DHR, or, I want to file with DHR, they're
filing with DHR in that capacity, with their -DHR's statutory responsibility to investigate
complaints of discrimination, in general, or, the
EEOC.

We wouldn't investigate in that second circumstance contemporaneously with DHR. That would be them in their capacity, and maybe they have some process set up as to how they handle that.

But that would not be us.

So that's why, what you're looking at may be that there's a DHR complaint. That would be a -- what we call an "internal complaint," which is internal to the State, the employer investigating its own actions, which now GOER is doing.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So -- I mean, please excuse me, but I feel like you are speaking in tongues.

I really do not understand.

So can you just lay it out for me in a way that is like very simple, as if I had never read anything before, had no idea, and I am you, right and your relationship to DHR is...?

Go.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: If you as an employee of -- well, I'll go back to the example you gave.

I'm an employee of DHR. I feel --

SENATOR BIAGGI: For an employee of an agency, let's just say. An employee of an agency.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Take another -- take another -- whatever example you want, I'll run through.

So another agency that's covered under our purview, depending on that agen -- on what agency that employee works for, you have a number of options.

One: You can file a complaint, which we call an "internal complaint," which is a complaint not filed pursuant to law or statute, which is what we consider DHR's process, EEOC process, or court.

So those processes are not what we characterize as internal.

So you, as an employee in an agency, can file directly with GOER. You can mail it to us. You can e-mail it to us.

Depending on what agency you're located in, GOER may have an investigator on-site. You can go to that investigator, give them your form, or they will help you fill out that form, so you can

investigate that.

And then that GOER investigator will file that form with GOER, and then that gets investigated.

You also have the ability, if you so choose, you can go to your supervisor, and your manager, your general counsel, of your agency; you could file that complaint with them. They're obligated to send that to GOER.

Or, if you don't want to do any of those things, you could go to the division of human rights and they'll assign somebody, pursuant to their processes, to look at what the employer does, go through that probable-cause determination that was talked about in the previous testimony, make that determination, and go through their procedures.

Or, you can go to the EEOC.

Or, you can file with court.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.

 ${\tt MICHAEL}$  VOLFORTE: Those would be all the potential options.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Got it.

All right, that's very helpful. Thank you.

So -- so, now, going back to the -- where we started: Does GOER track the investigations and

complaints that DHR oversees?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Only if it's in that first, what I'll call, "bucket" I spoke to, before you get to a technical legal filing with DHR or with the EEOC.

So if it is -- if it's a DHR employee, and they want to file with their supervisor in the internal complaint process; if they want to file with an on-site AAO, if there is one; if they want to mail it to GOER; if they want to mail it to -- or, e-mail it to GOER; all of those would be tracked.

If DHR is getting a complaint on their form, pursuant to their procedures and the law, from an employee of any state agency, we don't track DHR in that.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.

Can you just hold on for one moment?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: While we're on a break,

I'll just mention the pizza did arrive.

Courage, everyone, not to go at once.

It's a room back in this corner direction (indicating).

But...

(Inaudible comments being made.)

[Laughter.] 1 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Only in Puerto Rico. 2 [Laughter.] 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. I will -- I'm going 4 to hand it over to Yuh-Line, to -- or, excuse me, 5 6 Line -- Assemblywoman Niou --7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: We're roomies, that's 8 okay. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- to ask the question. 10 I think that I -- I think I get it; I just 11 want to make sure that I get it. 12 And if I don't, I know where to find you. 13 So, thank you. 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Hi. 15 So I just -- just a couple of brief 16 questions. I know that you're running out of time. 17 So what did you mean -- when responding to Assemblymember Simotas's question on trauma-informed 18 training, what did you mean when you said 19 20 "a background in this field"? I just wanted to kind of get a feel. 21 22 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: A number of the people 23 that we transferred had numerous years investigating complaints of discrimination, either with the State 24

or came from other areas where they had those

backgrounds. 1 2 So --3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: There's like no certification? 4 5 Is there anything that you --MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Some of them -- I mean, 6 7 we've had people from work -- who worked with the EEOC, who've worked in private industry, who've 8 9 worked with the division of human rights, and had whatever training there was there. 10 11 So that's what I meant on the background 12 (indiscernible cross-talking) --13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Oh, okay. So it's not standardized? 14 15 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: It's not -- where we get 16 folks from is not the training we give them is. But 17 it -- I just want to make it -- it does not include, technically, what everyone is referring to in terms 18 of that "trauma-informed training." 19 20 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay. 21 How long does an investigation usually take? 22 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: There is no "usual." 23 We -- it -- it -- we have -- because of 24 the -- what's involved, it really depends on

complaints, and how -- what -- the number of

complainants, the number of respondents, the complexity.

If it's a -- if it's an issue that perhaps involves something that was a criminal matter, that got referred back to us, that might jump the line.

So all those things work into it.

Eventually, we'd like to work towards a goal of 30 days.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: 30 days, okay, goal of 30 days?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Goal of 30 days.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay.

And what's the procedure for investigation?

Do you start with the complainant?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes, the complainant gets an acknowledgment of their -- so they send us the form, and we send them a note back that we received their form, with notice that they should not receive retaliation.

The investigator, I'm going to truncate, makes a game plan to investigate. The matter gets investigated.

We are in consultation with the agency's general counsel because, since we're investigating other agencies, we need documents that are in their

possession, e-mails.

So that takes part of the process.

There is interviewing of individuals involved.

We then wind up with a report, and a recommendation as to how to bring the matter to a conclusion at the end.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And you're hoping to do all of that in 30 days?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: At least complete the initial investigative report and -- or, investigation, and start the report write-in.

When it comes to things that are going to the EEOC or DHR, because of the statutory time frames, we have to ramp those investigations up, and those also sometimes move in front of other investigations because of time limits that those agencies impose on the State to get back to them.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And since it might take a lot longer, do you provide investigations, like status updates or, anything, to those that you've interviewed, the complainant's -- with the witness or the complainant?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Formally, it's the beginning and the end.

And, informally, if the individual calls, we 1 tell them (indiscernible cross-talking) --2 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So they have to 3 instigate? 4 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes, there's no 5 6 (indiscernible cross-talking) --7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: They have to call you? You don't update them regularly if there's 8 9 any movement on their cases? 10 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: No. 11 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay. 12 Uhm -- okay. So -- I mean, I -- I'm just saying all this 13 14 because, we read recently, the "Times Union," 15 Gina Bianchi's case, GOER had claimed that the 16 investigation of the case is ongoing for more than a 17 year later. MICHAEL VOLFORTE: As I discussed with 18 19 individuals, we're not commenting on any ongoing 20 investigations -- on any litigation. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I know. 22 I'm talking about the length. 23 And that's -- is that normal? Is that --24 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I'm not going to comment 25 on anything in litigation.

1 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Okay. All right, thank you. 2 SENATOR BIAGGI: One final question for me. 3 Okay, so, you stated that GOER does not track 4 5 DHR complaints. Correct? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I said GOER doesn't track 6 7 what DHR is investigating, generally. That's what I -- that's what my intent was, 8 9 that we're not tracking what they are doing, 10 generally. If it relates --11 12 SENATOR BIAGGI: What does that mean, 13 "not doing, generally"? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: If it relates to a State 14 15 agency; so, in those examples, when an employee 16 would go to DHR, in their statutory capacity, and 17 file a complaint with them, we would have that 18 information because the agency would report that 19 they had an employee go to DHR. 20 We would investigate that, and provide information to the agency. 21 22 So we have information of when State 23 employees file stat -- what I'll call a "statutory 24 complaint."

SENATOR BIAGGI: What is a stat -- so, what

is a "statutory complaint"? 1 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: DHR and the EEOC exists 2 pursuant to law, to investigate complaints --3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 4 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: -- that come to them. 5 6 SENATOR BIAGGI: So a complaint that's under 7 their purview? 8 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: It's under their purview. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: So just a complaint? 10 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: It's a complaint --11 SENATOR BIAGGI: So can we simplify when 12 we're speaking, so that I can stay with you on this 13 page. 14 So GOER -- you had said GOER does not track 15 DHR complaints? 16 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I -- I -- we don't track 17 complaint -- we don't track all complaints to DHR. 18 If a State employee makes a complaint to DHR, we have that information. 19 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, thank you. 21 So I have a response to a FOIL Request, that 22 proves that, from 2015 to the present, GOER has been 23 tracking DHR complaints. 24 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: As I just stated, we have 25 information on --

SENATOR BIAGGI: But you -- but you -- see --1 but do you understand why this is confusing to me? 2 3 Because you first stated that you're not tracking it. And now you're stating that you do 4 track it. 5 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I think your question was, 6 7 or at least I interpret it to be, from a general 8 perspective. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: A general per -- I don't understand what that even means. 10 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: DHR --11 12 SENATOR BIAGGI: GOER -- wait, let me finish. 13 Complaints that DHR had, that are made to 14 DHR, does GOER track those complaints? 15 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Only if it's made by a 16 State employee. 17 SENATOR BIAGGI: Only if it's made by a State 18 employee? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes. 19 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: So that was not clarified 21 earlier. 22 So I would just recommend that you be precise 23 with your words, because that is -- that could 24 potentially lead to something very confusing, and

not helpful to the inquiry that we're trying to make

here. 1 2 So, thank you. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I know your time is 4 precious. 5 Senator Liu and Assemblyman Buckwald to 6 close. 7 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) SENATOR LIU: No, that's okay. 8 9 Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I want to go with what our Chairwoman has 10 talked about. 11 The testimony is really not that clear. 12 13 I know you're trying. 14 It just sounds like a lot of legalese. 15 Generally. Sometimes. Sometimes not. 16 I mean, are you crossing your fingers too? 17 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: (Holds up open hands.) SENATOR LIU: Okay. And no toes? 18 19 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: No toes. 20 SENATOR LIU: All right, good. 21 Let me ask the question that I asked the DHR 22 also, which is, that, you know, I understand you're 23 running us through your procedures, what you've 24 done, what you haven't been doing.

But what about what more you could do?

What about complaints that, for example, are probably legitimate complaints, but just don't meet the current legal standard: that's "severe and pervasive."

I mean, how does GOERS (sic) deal with that?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: As I stated earlier, we -we take our investigations at a policy level.

And to kind of go back a little bit, complaints before DHR can be for any public or private employer in New York State.

I over -- our process deals with a segment of only 130,000.

So when I talked earlier, what I meant to communicate was, those 130,000, if those people file complaints, I, certainly, we, have that information.

For a town, an authority, we probably, generally, don't have that information.

A private entity, we definitely don't have that information.

So, there is -- there -- you know, that's -- in terms of that, that is legalese, but, again, that's from our process.

But in terms of what an individual might experience in terms of discrimination, what I'm doing is -- in our agency, is, we -- we're

investigating as the employer, and we're looking at whether conduct occurred, regardless of whether it was the con -- what the conduct was, and not focusing so much on that "severe and pervasive" standard.

So, for example, if an individual comes to us and complains, and says, "Somebody told me a sexually-explicit joke, and I'm offended," they file a complaint, we'll investigate that.

If it's found to have occurred, we will make a finding that it occurred, and we will remedy it administratively, as the employer, and take appropriate action.

SENATOR LIU: So does that -- does that imply that the policy, that these 130,000 employ -- State employees are subject to, could be more rigorous or comprehensive than the law currently is?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Yes.

SENATOR LIU: Would that be -- would it be too onerous a standard to apply to private employers in this state?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I mean, I know you heard the earlier responses.

I have a similar response in terms of commenting on existing legislation.

1 But what --SENATOR LIU: No, I'm not asking you to 2 comment on existing legislation. 3 I'm just comment -- asking you to comment on 4 your policy, and whether it is feasible to extend it 5 to all employers in this state. 6 Forget about bills. 7 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: And I can't speak for all 8 9 the employers. (Indiscernible cross-talking) --10 SENATOR LIU: I'm not asking you to speak for 11 all your employers. 12 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: (Indiscernible 13 cross-talking) --SENATOR LIU: Just as somebody who is expert 14 15 in this field, who is an expert in administering it, 16 I mean, just from your own knowledge. 17 Forget the legalese. 18 Look, your fingers are all clear (holding up 19 open hand). 20

Okay?

21

22

23

24

25

Just from your conscience, what do you think? Is it unreasonable to expect a private employer to uphold these same kinds of standards that we expect our State employees -- the vast majority of our State employees to uphold?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I really can't comment on whether it's reasonable or unreasonable for a private employer to adopt what the State has adopted.

SENATOR LIU: Okay.

All right, thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Assemblymember Buckwald.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Thank you.

My question, I believe, will be very quick, and I preface it by only saying, it's a question out of curiosity, not based on any specific incident or otherwise.

Just curious, an employee of GOER, if there were to be any harassment, sexual harassment or otherwise, within the GOER workplace, where do they go for -- other -- obviously, they have the same abilities that anyone, even outside New York State does, of going to DHR and so forth.

But is there any -- just like GOER serves as an independent function within, for other state agencies, is there some arrangement that's made for GOER employees to have someone outside of GOER provide that same sort of function?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: What we would consider an

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Yes.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: -- in another agency, a GOER employee could have that investigated by a law firm we've retained -- we are retaining.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: You've retained a law firm, and you're employees have information on that, as -- as a matter of just, like, your -- the policy procedures that you provide?

Or -- or is it, they go to the internal person that's designated, and then they refer it to

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: We're in the procurement process, but they would -- they -- they would go file it with our administrative officer, and she send it to the law firm.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: So that law firm is, essentially, serving the same function, as far as you're concerned, vis-a-vis GOER -- that GOER is serving vis-a-vis other agencies that are within your purview?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: They will, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Okay.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

22

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1 SENATOR BIAGGI: Last question for me: So we've just established that GOER does 2 track the internal complaints of DHR? 3 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: 4 Yes. 5 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. And not the external 6 complaints; correct? 7 That's what you had said? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Not the external 8 9 complaints -- and I'm going to get -- not external 10 complaints that are filed by anybody else other than 11 state agencies. 12 If it's a state agency, and they go to DHR, 13 we track that. 14 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. So what is the 15 difference between internal and DHR? 16 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: An "internal complaint" is 17 somebody who files -- who -- who follows the 18 complaint process that's established by law, that 19 says that all employers have to have a complaint 20 process. 21 SENATOR BIAGGI: Uh-huh? MICHAEL VOLFORTE: If it is -- if the 22 23 document you're looking at says "DHR," that means 24 some State employee has filed directly with DHR,

pursuant to their statutory and regulatory

25

1 procedures. SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 2 Senator Liu. 3 SENATOR LIU: Thank you for your indulgence, 4 Madam Chair. 5 So, clearly, in your testimony, you have been 6 7 very clear, the policy that GOERS (sic) enforces does not apply to legislative employees? 8 9 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Correct, yes. 10 SENATOR LIU: Is there any reason why this 11 Legislature should not adopt similar kinds of 12 policies? 13 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I think even --14 SENATOR LIU: Forget about what your boss 15 might tell you. 16 Just tell us. 17 Free yourself. [Laughter.] 18 19 MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I'm even more reticent to 20 advise a coequal branch of government as to how they 21 should run their HR --SENATOR LIU: It's perfectly fine for us to 22 23 ask you advice. 24 We may -- we may to choose to take or 25 choose -- not take it.

It's perfectly fine for us to ask, and it's perfectly fine for you to answer. You're not tying -- binding us to anything.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: I would not answer it this way: I think it's incumbent upon employers to prevent discrimination, and one way you do that, is to prevent it when smaller incidents happen, before they blow up into a bigger incident.

So in that regard, I think it's in an employer's interest to do that.

SENATOR LIU: Okay, but if -- say, if there is an incident, or alleged incident, or a complaint, under your department, and the 130,000 employees that you have some kind of authority over, would there be a case where a complaint would just be in limbo, like, indefinitely, or is there always a clear time frame for things to be resolved?

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: There's -- we don't have an established end date.

But, you know, if -- and not that there are many of these, but if a complaint came in, and it was of such a nature that it was criminal, and that got -- that would get referred out, how long that criminal process would leave the internal complaint in limbo, because we wouldn't interfere with -- for

various -- for any number of reasons, with the criminal complaint by investigating at the same time the police were.

SENATOR LIU: All right.

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: So in that regard, that could be one that's out there.

SENATOR LIU: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you so much for your testimony --

MICHAEL VOLFORTE: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- and your time.

National Economic and Social Rights
Initiative, Noelle Damico, senior fellow.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Good afternoon.

I'm Noelle Damico, the senior fellow at the National Economic and Social Rights Initiative, and a member of the board of the Fair Food Standards Council.

And I wish to thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Fair Food Program that was created by the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, a farmworker-founded human rights organization that was awarded a Presidential Medal in 2015, and to share the remarkable success of this program's

Worker-driven Social Responsibility paradigm in ending and preventing gender-based violence.

In addition to my testimony, I have also submitted 20 copies of 2 additional reports that will provide quantitative and qualitative data on both WSR and the Fair Food Program.

At a moment when our society is reckoning with sexual harassment as never before, with these hearings, the New York State Senate and Assembly have stepped forward to declare our state is prepared to combat these abuses vigorously.

The #MeToo movement has exposed the chronic infection of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace.

What is now needed is an antibiotic capable of helping our body politic work together to create healthy, thriving workplaces.

The good news is, we have the cure and we know it works.

The cure of Worker-driven Social

Responsibility emerged not from the offices of a

Manhattan NGO, but from the sweltering tomato fields

of Immokalee, Florida, from an approach developed by

workers themselves, the true experts on human rights

abuses in their workplace.

In isolated, under-regulated environment of
U.S. agriculture, gender-based violence is severe

3 and ubiquitous.

As many as 80 percent of farmworker women surveyed reported being sexually harassed or assaulted. That's four out of five women.

Earning low wages, fearing retaliation, and facing barriers to filing legal complaints, many women elect to suffer abuse rather than report it and risk the consequences.

As one woman put it, "You allow it or they fire you."

But that chilling reality began to change in 2011 with the advent of the Fair Food Program.

Through the Fair Food Program, sexual assault has been virtually eliminated and sexual harassment has been dramatically reduced for 35,000 workers laboring on program farms in seven states, stretching from Florida to New Jersey.

Let me say that again: Cases of sexual harassment by supervisors with physical contact of any kind have been virtually eliminated, and workers consistently report dramatic reductions in all forms of harassment.

In U.S. agriculture, a profoundly

male-dominated industry notorious for sexual and economic exploitation, in this industry, the Fair Food Program has gotten to the point of prevention of sexual assault and harassment.

The story of the Fair Food Program begins with the Immokalee farmworkers' determination to use the market power of retailors at the top of supply chains to realize their rights.

The Coalition of Immokalee Workers united with tens of thousands of consumers of conscience to convince 14 brands, including McDonald's, Aramark, and Walmart, to sign legally-binding agreements, committing them to purchase only from growers who implement a farmworker-defined code of conduct with zero-tolerance provisions for sexual assault, and a range of other protections, including the right to work free of sexual harassment and to raise complaints without retaliation.

Growers who fall out of compliance lose the ability to sell to all 14 of these massive brands.

Participating growers, for their part, commit to implement the code and to cooperate with the program's monitoring organization.

These legally-binding agreements form the backbone of the Fair Food Program which has

generated a sea change in rights realization, leading "Harvard Business Review" to name the Fair Food Program among the 15 most-important social-impact stories of the last century.

The Fair Food Program works because it is a system-level intervention that ends the imbalance of power between employers and workers that is at the root of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and other abuses.

In short, it shifts the risk, from the worker who reports sexual harassment, to the employer who fails to address sexual harassment.

It put billions of dollars of purchasing power behind guaranteeing a workplace free of gender-based violence and other abuses.

What does this mean for workers?

One worker put it simply, "Now the fear is gone."

A transgender worker spoke at length about the respect that she and others on her crew receive.

A male worker, who observed that, at so many farms, women risk losing their job if they speak out against harassment or reject the advances of a supervisor, he remarked how different the environment is at FFP Farms. He added that, as a

man, he believes that a more respectful work environment benefits him as well, and he is very relieved to work in a place where women are not treated poorly.

Because of the Fair Food Program's phenomenal success in addressing sexual harassment and assault, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's Select Task Force singled out the Fair Food Program, calling it "a radically different accountability mechanism," and adopted many of those mechanisms as core recommendations in its landmark 2016 report.

The Fair Food Program's groundbreaking approach was distilled by the Coalition of Immokalee Workers into a new paradigm called "Worker-driven Social Responsibility," that is translating and adapting core rights mechanisms successfully in other industries.

WSR was strengthened through the design and implementation of the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh, demonstrating the paradigm's exponential potential for realizing human rights for millions of workers.

In Vermont, Migrant Justice has adopted the WSR model to the dairy industry through the Milk with Dignity program, where it has proved

singularly successful in combating sexual violence among a largely immigrant workforce on isolated dairy farms.

Construction workers in Minneapolis are poised to launch their own WSR program, as are female garment workers in the southern African country of Lesotho.

And in New York, the Model Alliance is adapting WSR to create a truly inclusive safe and fair place to work through their RESPECT Program.

You'll be hearing from them shortly.

As the magazine "Civil Eats" recently said,
"It's a template that, when you adjust it, can be
applied to almost any work situation."

And, indeed, that's just what's happening.

In response to the hearings (indiscernible)

for strategies to combat sexual harassment, here are
a few lessons from our experience that can be put to
work elsewhere:

One: Redress the imbalance of power through legally-binding agreements, with consequences.

Whether in a government office or on a factory floor, change does not come from voluntary good will, but from binding agreements with serious consequences for refusing to address sexual

harassment or assault.

Two: Provide worker-to-worker training and rights, and the ability to report without fear of retaliation.

Sexual assault and harassment are crimes of power and opportunity.

Trained in their rights and equipped with the ability to report problems through multiple channels, including a 24-by-7 confidential hotline, and protected from retaliation, thousands of farmworkers have become front-line monitors of their own rights, leaving bad actors nowhere to commit their crimes.

Workers in other workplaces can be similarly empowered and protected.

Third: Monitor conditions, swiftly investigate, require and assist compliance, report findings.

The Fair Food Standards Council, which oversees the Fair Food Program, undertakes deep-dive audits, interviewing 50 to 100 percent of workers on farms.

Fair Food Standards Council investigators also staff the 24-by-7 complaint hotline in Spanish, English, and Creole.

Upon receipt of a complaint, they immediately open an investigation, whatever of the hour of day or night.

Almost 80 percent of all complaints are resolved within one month, 50 percent within 2 weeks.

The FFSC is empowered to render judgments on compliance and design resolutions. They provide assistance to help farm employers thoroughly address problems so that they don't arise in future.

FFSC updates its website regularly to reflect current compliance by participating growers, and publishes reports, providing maximum transparency.

Finally: Such serious consequences for perpetrators and employers who fail to remedy and prevent.

Since the program's inception, 42 supervisors have been disciplined for sexual harassment, and 11 of those supervisors have been terminated, and are, therefore, no longer able to work on FFP farms in any state.

The removal of notorious supervisors who preyed on women increased worker confidence in the confidential complaint system.

The program also requires field supervisors

who witness sexual abuse to intervene and report, or else face disciplinary action themselves.

Any employer that refuses to terminate an employee confirmed by the Fair Food Standards

Council to have committed sexual harassment with physical contact of any kind, will be suspended.

People will trust compliance systems when they see them working.

As the New York Senate and Assembly consider legislation to address sexual harassment in government offices, I hope you'll consider these lessons, and that you will also consider the important role government can play in ending and preventing gender-based violence in the workplace by encouraging private-sector uptake of WSR by employers, and in corporate supply chains, as well as adopting WSR for government procurement.

With your commitment, we will surely step closer to that day when all workers will labor in respectful and dignified workplaces.

Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you so much, Reverend Damico.

This is an incredible paradigm for what we can apply to different workplaces across the state,

including state government.

I'm very much looking forward to hearing from The Model Alliance, who I know, last time, wanted to testify, and couldn't, because the day just went on so long.

I'm curious how --

And if you don't have an answer, it's not meant to put you on a spot yet.

-- but how do you think we as legislators can implement this in the state of New York?

What can we do; what type of legislation can we pass, and what would it look like?

To start this out, would it be a -- like a test program first; and, if so, where would we begin?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: That's a wonderful question, and I'd actually like to give it some additional thought --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: -- and consult with my colleagues.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: But what I would say is, one place to start is with some of the principles that I mentioned in my testimony, and think about

how they might be comprehensively applied and piloted.

Before the Fair Food Standards Program went into full operation, we did have a pilot stage, and that stage was very helpful for one year, working very closely with two growers, in order to get this underway.

And once we had it implemented, then it could be expanded very well.

So I think a pilot approach is a great way to start.

And what I will say is that, this paradigm is very adaptable in flat workspaces, in supply chains, and whatnot.

SENATOR BIAGGI: One follow-up question:

I think that one of the most significant parts of what you just shared with all of us, and I hope it wasn't lost on my colleagues, but I don't think it will be, and I don't think it was, is the effect of a legally-binding agreement, and how incredibly consequential that can be to the entity that has the deep pockets, or that is really just focused on profit.

So much of what we see, when it comes to sexual harassment in the workplace, is an imbalance

of power, and an end and abuse of power.

And having a legally-binding agreement,

I mean, as I'm sitting here, one of the thoughts
that I had, that came through my head, I -- I can
only imagine the day where this would happen, but
anything is possible -- we are here now, after
all -- is, imagine if you were running for office;
you were a candidate and you ran for office, or, you
had won, and you were then the elected official, and
you had signed an agreement with your constituents,
that you would not do any of the behaviors that are
often -- so often, tie the hands of the Legislature,
which is such an interesting place, because none of
us in the Legislature are employed by the
Legislature, if that makes sense.

Right?

We are, technically, employed by the State of New York, but, the employer is not the Legislature.

It makes it very challenging.

And, historically, at least in the New York

State Legislature, so many individuals who have -who have conducted in quite egregious behavior, have
not been able to be held to account because the
standards in our laws are so high, which is what
we're aiming to change.

But more importantly, because of the dynamic,

there's really not many mechanisms to use.

So -- and there's political implications, and

 $$\operatorname{So}\mbox{ --}$$  and there's political implications, and we all know what they are.

It's very challenging, as an environment, to enforce any policies against one another.

But it's also one of the reasons why I am proud to chair the Ethics Committee.

So I just -- I appreciate, that I would love for you to think about what that would look like, and how we can put that forward in the state of New York.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: One thing I will say is, it's important to know, this program's been in operation for eight years now.

And over the course of its implementation and operation, what we've seen is an increase in calls coming in to the hotline, and a decrease in the severity of the problems being reported.

Simultaneously, we now are operating in such a collaborative manner with growers and corporations, who have come to recognize that cleaning up human rights abuses in the field are the best form of risk management.

Right? Actually getting in there and

cleaning them up.

And every actor in the supply chain, in this instance, has been incentivized to put their shoulder to the plow of ending this; and, indeed, it's working.

And so if there is one message that I want to give to this wonderful group that is assembled, with so much power and possibility before us, this can be done.

And these mechanisms have proven themselves in one of the most inhospitable industry, as well as are being demonstrated in other industries and types of workplace configurations.

So, I also want to invite you to become -- to start thinking about this, and saying, Where would this make sense inside our government system?

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you so much.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: You're welcome.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I'll briefly just thank you for your testimony, for the work of the organization.

This really is -- it's amazing, the results you have.

Just, you mentioned there was a couple of other industries that have applied your model.

1 Have you seen any government; municipal, state, government, apply this model --2 3 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Not yet. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- anywhere in the 5 country yet? REV. NOELLE DAMICO: We've had some informal 6 7 conversations with different government officials in different settings, but it has not been applied yet. 8 9 But, we'd love to make New York the first. ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: We'll take that back. 10 11 Thank you. 12 Assemblyman Buchwald. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Thank you, 14 Mr. Chairman. 15 And I will take the privilege to ask briefly 16 of my constituent, Reverend Damico, who I'm proud to 17 call a neighbor in White Plains, about the monitoring portion of the setup here, because 18 I think that's one of the topics that, 19 20 legislatively, we tend not to just focus on, mostly 21 because we like to set policy. But the 22 implementation policy is, obviously, extremely 23 important, and monitoring is crucial for that. 24 Can you go into, so what you feel are the 25 right metrics, in general?

You reference in your -- there's metrics to monitor.

You reference in your remarks earlier, monitoring time for review of complaints.

We've had some discussion of that, obviously, in different contexts today.

But you also -- the FF -- FFSC website says "updates regularly, current compliance by participating growers."

What level of detail is provided?

Like, is it just, in compliance or not in compliance?

Or -- or is it like an ongoing, you know, tracking of how many complaints there, and what the process is, and so forth?

And, more generally, for an employer, in or out of government, of what you feel is the right level of transparency into this, given (indiscernible) also sensitivities, you know, as you referenced.

It's not just a matter of tracking numbers of complaints. In fact, you know, an increasing number of complaints could be a good sign for things.

So what would you just say, broadly, on that topic that would be informative to us?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Well, what I would say is, we have extensive data that we use.

And we -- first of all, let me talk about how we get the information, and then the kinds of data that we report, and then how we make that available.

First, you'll notice I mentioned the 24-by-7 hotline.

This is an extremely important vehicle because it, essentially, provides a real-time camera feed, if you will, to ongoing situations. It's available to all workers.

When workers, at the point of hire, are trained with "Know Your Rights" booklets, and provided a sexual-harassment video training, where they see farmworkers, like themselves, speaking in their own languages, acting out scenarios, to show how those rights need to be respected in the field, they also receive an ID badge. And on that badge is the Fair Food Standards' hotline.

Also, the growers in the program are required to establish, if they don't have one already, and I'll just say at the beginning of this process, none of them had it, a hotline to report.

And then they also have a third number to call, which is the worker organization, the

Coalition of Immokalee Workers.

In addition to those hotlines, we also have other points at which workers can have the opportunity to bring a problem forward.

One of those points is when Fair Food

Standards Council auditors go into the field to

interview, both on- and off-site, 50 to 100 percent

of a farm's workforce.

In that time, on those interviews, workers are able to bring forth any complaints they might have.

In addition, when auditors are there, they're looking at back-office processes; things that farmworkers themselves, or workers in general, are not going to have access to. They're going to look at payroll records, for example, and make sure things are in order.

So it's a very comprehensive audit that's going on.

Another place where farmworkers can bring forward complaints, is they can bring them forward through the health and safety committees that are operating on each of the farms where the Fair Food Program is in operation. These are worker-led organizations that gather to discuss conditions in

the field.

Now, you might be hearing me say workers can bring forward complaints, but how do workers know what their rights are, and how do they know how to access this?

They're trained in their rights.

We've distributed over 250 "Know Your Rights and Responsibilities" booklets, which are culturally-sensitive, in terms of their preparation, keeping in mind that a large number of our workforce is not going to necessarily be literate. There are many different pictures and symbols. They are in three languages, and they're also available through audio.

In addition to that, on the farms, at least once a season, and often twice a season, workers get worker-to-worker, face-to-face training, with leaders from the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, using popular education methodologies and other interactive ways.

That's another place where complaints or questions arise and can be addressed.

So workers are thoroughly educated on their rights, both at the point of hire, then once they hit the field.

By the way, that training, worker-to-worker training, is done on the clock on company time, so workers are paid for that time they're in there.

Crew leaders and supervisors and a farm representative are also present.

That way, the workers know that these standards are to be abided by, and they know that their supervisors know, this is the right way. And the farm supervisor, himself or herself, can step forward and say, Our farm is committed to making sure that you're working in a dignified and respectful environment.

So that's how they know, and some of the points of introduction.

In terms of metrics, we report different types of complaints. For example: Harassment.

Violence. Sexual harassment with touching. Sexual harassment without physical contact.

There are a variety of different kinds of disciplinary actions that we report on.

We will report on:

Whether a grower is in compliance.

Whether they're on probation. There's a progressive discipline process within the Fair Food Program.

We provide elaborate tables.

Now, we're not going to say, so and so at this farm; so we're not using names, and we're not using farm identifiers. But we are giving numbers, to give you a sense of how much compliance; what that looks like, and what the results are.

And so, in the annual report of the Fair Food Standards Council on the Fair Food Program, and this is an executive summary of it --

A new 2018 report is just about to be released, and I'll be sure to send it to you. It has all the latest metrics.

-- it will give you volume information: How many calls have come in? How quickly have these complaints been resolved?

When a call or a complaint gets reported, guess what? There's no delay in investigating.

People don't have to sit around. It, immediately, an investigator is on this, pursuing it.

So it's -- this is to say that it's a very, very deep audit.

In fact, it -- I almost hesitate to call it an audit because, when you think of auditing that goes on, especially in corporate- or social responsibility-type check-box monitoring, it just

doesn't even compare to that in terms of its depth.

Finally, the reporting that comes out the other end is available in the Fair Food Standards Council website. It's published. It's available for researchers as well.

So anyone can go to FairFoodStandards.org or to FairFoodProgram.org and take look at the results.

We have very high-level results that are quickly published --

What growers are in compliance, and which are not.

Who are the participating buyers?

-- so that consumers as well, who, frankly, have powered this movement, by pressuring corporations to stand up and do the right thing, and put their purchasing behind realizing human rights, consumers want to know what's going on here as well.

And so we have different ways of representing that data to them.

But I will certainly make sure that you have the 2018 update as soon as it's published, and then you can enjoy, like me, looking through all the tables, because it is a beautiful thing to see this data.

This is so beautiful; this data is showing

that it is working in a material and real way in people's lives.

For every bit of data, there is a transformation.

Workers are being protected.

Workers have a new day, where, instead of, before, when they had to trade their dignity in order to put food on the table for their families, women are walking with their heads upright, knowing that they are protected.

And this is important, because we can't keep putting workers on the front line and asking them to sacrifice.

Your questions earlier about, what happens between a report and when this finally gets processed?

That's a critical time.

In the Fair Food Program, phoom (claps hands together) it's eliminated to zero.

And we're working together with workers to protect them, and to help them through any ancillary processes with employers. Or, also, if, in cases of criminal behavior, the government.

ASSEMBLYMAN BUCHWALD: Reverend, thank you for the answer, and thanks for the work you and your

colleagues are doing.

Thank you, Chairs, for the time.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Senator Mayer.

SENATOR MAYER: Thank you, Reverend Damico.

And your energy and passion, and your faith in this program, is infectious to everyone here.

It's a welcome -- welcome after some of the things we've heard.

And two things I just want to say.

One is, this program relies on market consequences if there's a failure to comply. And that's a model that's a little bit more difficult for us to transfer, but I'm very interested in your thoughts.

But the second point, which you sort of alluded to, looking at Senator Liu, is the workers have faith that this process will work for them.

And I think that is a factor we are struggling with.

We have some establishments set up for complaints, but there's a cynicism among ordinary folks about whether these things work.

So I think it's -- we look forward to seeing the data to show, for example, you say that

50 percent of complaints are ajud -- determined in

in two weeks.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Yep.

SENATOR MAYER: Compared to what we heard earlier, about a sig -- you know, six months, you know, and sometimes longer, for equally-challenging factual complaints, I assume, with people, frankly, who have more power than I suspect a farmworker might have.

So, I think we want to learn from your model of how to do it quickly. How to give confidence to both complainants and respondents, that it's a fair process.

So I don't mean to do all the talking, but
I just -- we want to translate some of your passion
and effectiveness to ours, and we look forward to
your suggestions.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Well, I look forward to working with you on this.

I think what's so exciting is that, I had, well, the unfortunate privilege of seeing what it was like before, and I see the difference today.

And I can tell you that some of these claims,
I mean, there's one case vignette in the report that
you already have now, "The Fear is Gone," where
there was a field-level supervisor who had made

1 unwanted advances toward a woman. And then her 2 husband complained. And he said, Oh, hey, I've got a gun here and 3 I'm not afraid to use it. 4 That supervisor was terminated within days. 5 6 So as soon as that complaint came in, it was 7 investigated, verified; that guy was gone. 8 The (indiscernible) -- people have confidence 9 in processes when they see them working. 10 So part of this is, let it -- the 11 worker-to-worker education piece is important, but 12 worker's own experience will just help other workers 13 have the courage to come forward. 14 Hey, this worked for me. This is what 15 happened. 16 Getting rid of notorious actors in a given 17 industry also sends a very strong signal that this behavior will no longer be tolerated. 18 19 SENATOR MAYER: Thank you. 20 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Niou. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Hello. 22 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Hi. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I wanted to ask a couple 23 24 more practical questions, I guess.

You guys have to work so much with folks from

25

different cultures, backgrounds, languages.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: How does -- how do you implement that, and how do you do your outreach on that part?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: That's a wonderful question, and a really critical one.

We have the blessing, in the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, of having people that speak not only Spanish and Haitian Creole, but multiple indigenous languages. Kichai, Q'anjob'al, et cetera, that are -- Mam, from Guatemala, because the workforce itself is comprised of individuals who speak indigenous languages as well.

And so what we've done is, both, with the

Fair Foods Standards Council, which is an

independent third-party monitor, we have hired

investigators who are fluent in those languages, and

we have buttressed that support with the Coalition

of Immokalee Workers itself, leaders from the

workers' organization, who are also fluent in those

languages.

Further, we've really done a lot in terms of making different "Know Your Rights" materials available in those languages; again, not just in

written form, and not just in pictoral (sic) form, but also in audio form, which is very, very important.

So those are some of the ways that we've done it.

But if you're a Haitian worker who has a complaint, and you call at 2 a.m., guess what?

You're going to find someone who is capable of responding and opening an investigation right then, and you can speak in your language.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And how long did it take you guys to implement language access on that level?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Well, at that level it's been progressive.

We began with a pilot program in 2010. And then the program went into effect in the fall of 2011. And, at that point, we were fully Spanish-and English-compliant, with Haitian Creole kind of on the side.

And then, in the subsequent years, we're able to bring that forward more fully.

And now we have a full-time Haitian Creole investigator -- -speaking investigator with the Fair Food Standards Council.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: How many languages do

you guys help folks in?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Our principle ones, because the predominant majority speak, are Spanish, Haitian Creole, and English.

However, there are 12 or 13 indigenous languages to which we can reach for additional support as necessary.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: That's great.

And, you know, I was reading through your report, and your materials here, and I just kind of wanted to ask about your audits and transparency.

And, what are some of the things that you guys have implemented to make it so that there's more transparency on all levels?

And, then -- and -- and when -- when -I guess, when you're auditing, like, what are you -what are some of the things that you're looking for?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Well, one reason that we gained such access and insight into grower operations is because they have signed a legally-binding agreement, saying that they have agreed to give the Fair Food Standards Council that kind of access in order to assure their buyers that their operations are, indeed, in keeping with the Fair Food Standards' code of conduct.

So one thing is, we don't have to fight for access. That is part of what's in the agreement to begin with; so it's expected.

Of course, you know, it takes a while for employers to get used to this.

So, on day one, you know, it was, oh, really, you have this? And -- you know.

You have to work through it.

But at this point, it's a very regularized and respected operation, one reason being, that the growers have found it incredibly helpful for their own operations.

So, when we go in, we're going in in a variety of ways.

We're going in with individuals who are interviewing workers in the fields.

We're going to take a look at the back-office processes that has to do with hiring, firing, transportation. It would have to do with payroll decisions, and a number of other decisions that they would be making.

And we have different metrics by which we are assessing their operation, and they need to be able to demonstrate a very, very high level of compliance.

And if they don't, the Fair Food Standards
Council doesn't just say, All right, you're gone.
We work on compliance assistance.

Now, on the zero-tolerance offenses, if there's a situation of forced labor, oh, you're gone.

But, then, there is the opportunity for such employers to come back into the program, and regain access, by the way, to the buying from all those 14 massive brands that they will have lost by -- from being kicked out, if they are able to demonstrate that their systems have undergone a renovation.

And that's also true of supervisors or co-workers who may be fired due to sexual-harassment, for example. They can come back in after going through a retraining.

But if they have a second violation, then they're gone for the year, and, a third, they're out permanently.

And, so, having that progressive kind of discipline also underguards again the idea that it's better for us to be open and transparent as a grower-employer, because that's going to benefit us, it's going to clean up the circumstances in the

field, get rid of any bad actors, and then help us become more productive.

So in terms of some of the things that we're measuring for, those are some examples.

And, I mean, it's such a comprehensive list -- there are, like, 37 different categories -- that I think it's most easy to take a look at in the tables that I provided. You can have a quick look-see in the Fair Food Program report, and then in the subsequent report that I provide.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And I -- and I love that, you know, you were saying that more people were willing to report. And, then, that the things that were reported have been decreasing in their -- I guess -- their --

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Severity.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: -- severity.

And that means that more people are actually talking about their -- the issues that are coming up.

And I also love that your goal is for things to be "just expected."

And, also, that you're looking for trust and for faith in your system.

I think that folks also probably hope that

they have -- can have trust and faith in their government, and, also, that things should be "just expected," that they can be in a harassment-free workplace.

And, so, I  $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$  -- I wanted to say thank you for your efforts on this.

And -- and I wanted to kind of ask, also, this is my final question, because I know there's so many others, but:

When did you start to see that difference?

And how many years did it take to start

seeing that there was an increase in -- in -- in

folks who are willing to -- to speak up, but also a

decrease in the severity?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: I would say we got to point of prevention, specifically on sexual harassment and assault, in year three.

In terms of the use of the hotline, I want to emphasize, it's a hotline that is used for many different kinds of complaints, not only for sexual harassment.

It's the same one that you would call if you had some problem and felt that you were missing wages that you were owed as well.

And, so, as workers use the hotline for other

abuses that they encounter, or problems that they 1 encounter, they gain confidence that way as well. 2 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Thank you so much. REV. NOELLE DAMICO: You're very welcome. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simon. 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you very much for 6 7 your testimony. It's very joyful, and it's wonderful, to watch you and to listen to you. 8 9 Thank you so much for your work. I was not here when you started, so I don't 10 11 actually have a copy of your testimony. 12 But I wanted to ask, how many farms are 13 involved in this program? 14 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: There are about 15 35 farms, that are stretching, from Florida, all the 16 way up to New Jersey, that employ about 17 35,000 farmworkers. 18 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Okay, that was my next 19 question. 20 35,000. Okay. 21 And you said the program went into effect 22 fully in 2011? 23 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: 2011, yes. ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Okay. 24 25 And what are you doing next; like, what's

your next big move?

2 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Ah-ha.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Now that this is working, how do you plan to expand it?

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Well, it's -- it's began with the Florida tomato industry. And we began to expand, first, to tomato fields beyond Florida that were under the purview of growers who were based in Florida, already participating in the program.

So that was our first wave of expansion.

And then we went with those growers into other crops, such as strawberries and bell peppers.

And we're in the process of expanding to other states and other crops.

In our work, it's a matter of getting a combination of the growers and the buyers to do that expansion.

We also have an active consumer wing that is working to bring new corporations on board. We have 14, some of the biggest-named corporations.

You've heard of McDonald's; Burger King;
Subway; Whole Foods Market; Ahold, which owns
Stop & Shop and Giant and Martins; Walmart; Aramark;
Sodexo.

So there are a lot of companies that are in.

Unfortunately, Wendy's has refused to join the program, is an outlier. It's beyond disappointing, frankly, it's shameful, given that this is a program that is working so effectively right now.

But that's the other way the program expands.

When a new company comes in, it -- our -that supply chain then opens, and the possibility

opens anew.

And so we're really looking forward to bringing Wendy's on board and expanding there as well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Great.

And I have another question, sort of very practical, sort of "back to when you started" question --

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Sure.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: -- and that is: How did you physically get your workers to organize?

That can be very, very difficult. It's just labor-intensive. Can be expensive. And workers who have never experienced having any power in their lives are going to have, I would imagine, a much more difficult time getting their heads around how this could actually, fundamentally, change things.

I'm curious if you could talk about how that happened.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: Absolutely.

The story begins about 25 years ago, actually, back in 1993, when some individuals, who had come to the United States from Mexico,
Guatemala, and Haiti, began meeting together, to talk about violence that they were experiencing in the fields in the Immokalee region.

Now, what was interesting about these workers, is that each of them had had experienced defending their human rights in their home country.

So we had some individuals who had been popular educators from the Mouvman Peyizan Papay in Haiti. It's the Haitian small-farmer movement that was very instrumental in resisting the Duvalier regime, and is a very -- has very advanced methodology for analyzing one's political situation, and taking action to change it.

We also had workers from Chiapas, and workers from Guatemala, who had been through the civil war.

And these were all workers who had experience, not defending their individual rights, but defending their community rights.

So they had a very human rights, large-scale

model that they brought. It was a -- kind of a reverse-technology transfer, if you will, from the global self to the fields of Immokalee.

As they began to meet, they first were ignited because, a young farmworker, in his teens, was beaten within an inch of his life for asking for a drink of water in the fields.

And the worker group, the Coalition of

Immokalee Workers, had just formed, you know, a few
years prior, and was getting off the ground, and
thinking about how it would move next, when this
happened.

And that ignited the entire community.

And the worker stumbled into the office of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers in a bloody shirt. And they picked up the shirt, and they helped the worker, and they decided to march to the crew leader's house that night.

And they started off with about 25 people in front of their offices.

And by the time they got to the crew leader's house, there were several hundred workers, shouting, "An injury to one is an injury to all."

And that was the day, really, when, for the first time, the workers in Immokalee felt the power

of what it meant to act together.

And they refused to go to work any longer in that crew leader's farm who had harmed that worker so badly.

There was a change at that moment, because those crew leaders who operated like petty dictators in the fields, who had divided them between race and language and stature; there's all kinds of discrimination that was used to keep workers separate from each other.

The reason the Coalition of Immokalee Workers is named the" "coalition" is because they came together in that moment and stood together, moving forward.

That's how it began.

And they further were empowered to do several hunger strikes, a 30-day hunger strike; two massive work stoppages.

Of course, they didn't have any money, no strike funds, so they could only stay out for a week. And during that time, one of the growers was heard to say to another, "Why don't we just maybe sit down at the table with these workers?"

And the other one replied, "The tractor doesn't tell the farmer how to run the farm."

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Wow.

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: That's where things were.

Now think of where things are.

From people thought of as mere implements, actual machines, to be used, expendable, to full partners in an industry where their unique position as workers provides the critical insight necessary to making human rights real on the ground in a granular way.

Not just a lofty statement of, fair wages, but a, no overfilling of the buckets. Not a great statement as, we're against sexual harassment.

But this is what it looks like: this is how it manifests, and this is how we're going to stop it.

It's an extraordinary story.

Susan Marquis, who is the dean of the Pardee RAND Graduate School, wrote a book, "I Am Not a Tractor," which tells the most in-depth telling of this.

And so I would commend that to you, if you're interested.

And I'm happy to tell more stories and give you more insight.

1 But when those workers saw, not only that 2 they could stand together, but that consumers were 3 ready to move with them, that became important. And I think there's an analogy here with 4 5 government. 6 To think, you know, we have, as citizens and 7 residents, we care about these matters. This is about our lives, our families' lives. You're not 8 9 just out there alone. Just remember, there are so many of us that 10 11 are counting on you, and are prepared to step 12 forward and support this really important work that 13 you're doing. 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you very much. 15 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: You're welcome. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you. 17 Oh, you have a question. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: I have one final question, 19 it's just a technical question. 20 How are -- how is the organization funded?

21

22

23

24

25

REV. NOELLE DAMICO: That's a great question.

We're funded in two different ways.

We receive some foundation grants for the

Fair Food Program.

And then the other source is, we're funded at

1 the grassroots, through the Fair Food Sustainer 2 Program. So, thousands of consumers across the 3 country, people of good will, pledge to support this 4 work by making a monthly donation. 5 6 And you can read more about all of that on 7 FairFoodProgram.org. 8 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you so much, 9 Reverend Damico. We appreciate you, and your 10 testimony today. 11 REV. NOELLE DAMICO: You're very welcome. 12 Thank you for this, and, thank you, please, 13 all of the -- the work that you're doing here. 14 All of those late nights that you spend 15 pouring over the details, it matters, it matters so 16 much. 17 Thank you to all of you for the extraordinary opportunity that you're taking in this moment. 18 19 This is the time! 20 We can do it! 21 We can do it! 22 The people in this room, are ready to help 23 you! 24 Don't give up! 25 We're going forward together, we're going to

end this.

2 Thank you.

3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR BIAGGI: Next up is the Model Alliance, and, Sara Ziff, the founder and executive director of the Model Alliance, will be testifying.

SARA ZIFF: Good afternoon.

Thank you for hosting this hearing, and for giving me the opportunity to testify today.

My name is Sara Ziff, and I am a longtime model, and the founder and executive director of the Model Alliance, which is a non-profit research, policy, and advocacy organization that advances fair treatments and equal opportunity in the fashion industry.

Too often, models are treated as objects, and not as legitimate members of the workforce who deserve to be treated with the same dignity, respect, and basic legal protections that other workers enjoy under New York State's sexual harassment and employment laws.

Not withstanding the success that I've had as a model over the last 20 years, I, like many of my

peers, have experienced inappropriate demands, including routinely being put on the spot to pose nude and provide sexual favors.

In some cases, modeling agencies are sending models to known predators, and putting them in compromising situations that no person, and certainly no child, should have to deal with.

Essentially, all professional models operate under fixed-term exclusive contracts to their modeling agencies who exert a great deal of control over their working lives.

The agencies then contract with a client -- a brand, a magazine, department store, or the like -- for the model's work.

If a model is harassed in the workplace, to whom can she turn?

Is it the agency, who will blame the client for the unsafe workplace?

The client, who will say that they have no contractual relationship with the model?

For models and other independent contractors in this type of triangular relationship, there's still no clear remedy.

Moreover, most modeling agencies assert that they are not regulated by New York State laws

governing employment agencies, which would subject them to the necessary licensing and regulation.

Even though the primary purpose of modeling agencies is to obtain employment for their models, they claim that these activities are incidental to the general career guidance that they provide as management companies, and, therefore, are not subject to the State's regulation.

I believe that this is an issue, and I've been banging the drum on this for almost a decade now.

This is something that should be investigated by the New York State Department of Labor.

So two years ago, I brought these concerns to Assemblywoman Nily Rozic.

I had done a research project with the legal clinic at Fordham Law School on the working conditions of models. And when it came to sexual harassment, the law professors there were all mortified by what they found, and surprised by the very limited scope of the law.

The Model Alliance has since worked with Assemblywoman Rozic to introduce the Models Harassment Protection Act.

If enacted, it would extend certain

protections to models, putting designers, photographers, and retailors, among others, on notice that they would be liable for abuses experienced on their watch.

The bill would amend the current law to explicitly include models, explicitly forbid sexual advances and remarks or other forms of discrimination linked to their employment, and it would require clients to provide models, upon booking, with a contact and avenue for filing any complaints.

Now, models in New York State need specific provisions because they work in this very convoluted employment chain.

Agencies in New York say that the models are independent contractors, not employees.

The agencies also claim to act merely in this advisory capacity, saying that bookings are incidental to them providing advice.

When a client books a model through an agency, the model has no direct contract describing the scope of work with her client.

So, essentially, we have fallen through the holes of the existing statutory safety net, and that means that, until now, in New York, which is

regarded as the heart of the American modeling industry, it's been unclear where legal liability for job-related sexual-harassment lies.

There's been a very long history of institutional acceptance, or, at a minimum, recklessly ignoring sexual harassment by both agencies and clients.

We believe that models should have the same recourse as all employees to sue employers.

They should have a direct mechanism for making complaints, and should be assured that courts are willing and able to hold the agency and the client, their joint employers, responsible for the abuses they have suffered.

Regardless how we're classified, it's imperative that we have an enforceable right to work in a safe and fair environment.

So New York State can remedy these shortcomings by passing the Models Harassment Protection Act, and the perceived glamour of this business, and the gaps in the law, should no longer be used to deny models a safe workplace or appropriate recourse if abuse occurs.

We really deserve no less than any other member of New York's workforce.

And this wasn't part of my prepared remarks, but, I know you just heard in the last testimonial about Worker-driven Social Responsibility.

We have learned a lot from the farmworker women, from CIW and the Fair Food Program. Over the last year, we have adapted that model for the fashion industry.

That's also another initiative that we're excited about.

Our program is called the "RESPECT" program, and RESPECT is like the Fair Food Program; a legally-binding program that will provide a much-needed safety net, not just for models, but for freelance creatives working in the fashion industry, more broadly.

It includes a neutral third party to investigate and resolve claims of sexual harassment and retaliation.

And we believe that if a company is serious about protecting us, that they will be willing to commit to enforceable standards with real teeth.

We've campaigned for the last year. It's very difficult to get a company to sign on to make that -- you know, be the first one to jump.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.

So the Models Harassment Protection Act, has any other state implemented a model like this, or a policy like this?

SARA ZIFF: This is something we've been working on for the last couple of years, at least.

We did champion legislation in California, the Talent Protections Act, last year. That legislation looks a little bit different, in part, just because there isn't quite the same issue with management companies and how they're structured in California, versus here.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So, look, I'll -- I'll just say this, and -- my wife did some modeling when she was younger, and would tell me some horror stories of what she experienced, even as a minor, participating in some events.

And it is -- it's mind-boggling that an industry as relevant, where -- and particularly here in New York, to your point, right, and you made it in your testimony, with the biggest players in the market operating or based in New York, and that this issue has not been more thoroughly addressed, especially in this movement, right, with #MeToo and with Time's Up, and with everything else that's gone

on, that more hasn't been done around this industry in particular.

So I'm -- I'm -- as -- I'm new to the

Committee on Labor, but I'm going to immediately go

back and take a look at the differences, and why we

are not treating modeling agencies as employment

agencies.

And I think you've made some very good points, that we're very interested to go back and look at.

So I appreciate your testimony.

SARA ZIFF: Thanks, I appreciate it.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I just have a few quick questions, and just one -- uhm, just overall broad comment on your work that you've done for so many years, through the Fashion Law Institute, and the modeling law class that I actually took at Fordham Law, with Doreen and Ally (ph.) --

SARA ZIFF: Oh, okay.

SENATOR BIAGGI: -- in 2008, that you had come to speak at.

And I think that one of the most glaring things that was so clear to me, was that there are these known abusers in every single industry.

And with modeling, it's everywhere. It's the

photographers, it's the agents; it's all over the place.

And one of the things that seems to be so challenging, especially if you are a disruptor in that system, where you clearly know, this is the way that we can change it.

Passing this law would create a relationship -- or, a legal chain of a relationship that can hold someone to account.

And this kind of goes a little bit to what we just heard in terms of that testimony.

It's -- and I think Assemblywoman Simon had touched on this, too, in your question of: How do we get -- how do they know how to organize?

So my question is:

It's one step after that.

It's -- you know, after you organize, how do you get people who are in the system to join you?

Because there's such a culture around just letting -- like, letting it go, because, again, of the imbalance of power.

And I know that you're using this, the RESPECT model.

But it is -- it's incredibly challenging.
Right?

So if we pass -- let's say we pass the Model's Harassment Protection Act, that's -- that's a huge step in the right direction.

But before that point, and then after that point, how do we continue to make sure that people are able to feel safe when they can speak up, and still have their livelihood?

Because so many men and women in the modeling industry, and agent -- and -- and world, rely on the agencies and the photographers. And, you know, some of the best photographers are some of the worst abusers.

Just like some of the best legislators are some of the worst abusers.

Right?

It's everywhere; it's everywhere in the whole world. And I've always said this, but it's an epidemic.

And so I really would be curious to hear your point on that, because that really matters when we're thinking about laws, because we can change laws till kingdom come.

But the cult -- like -- I would argue that the culture has reached the point, but it hasn't met everybody where they're at.

SARA ZIFF: Right.

Yeah, no, that's an important point.

And I think, at the moment, people -there's -- people just feel that they can act with
impunity --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Right.

SARA ZIFF: -- because they can.

And, you know, I remember calling out a well-known photographer who shoots for -- has shot for many of the, you know, biggest brands and magazines, and even photographed the President of the United States; and, yet, was known, it was just an open secret, was sexually harassing and assaulting even minors.

And, you know, I know because I saw it firsthand.

And yet all of these, you know, big prestigious companies continued to work with this person.

And -- and it's not just about any one person. This is pervasive throughout the industry.

And it's really not until the #MeToo and Time's Up movements, through the power of publicity, that we've been able to be heard, despite pushing this forward for a very long time.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I have one just follow-up 1 2 question. Have you considered, and I think the answer 3 is yes, but I'm not sure, the unionization of 4 models? 5 6 SARA ZIFF: Uh. Before I started the Model Alliance, 7 I approached established unions and asked if they 8 would extend membership to us. 9 They said it was impossible because we're 10 11 told that we're independent contractors. And under 12 federal law, we cannot unionize. SENATOR BIAGGI: So what makes models 13 different from actors and actresses? 14 15 SARA ZIFF: That's a very good question. 16 Under -- so, legally, actors are actually 17 considered employees. SENATOR BIAGGI: Of whom? 18 19 SARA ZIFF: I would believe of the 20 production. 21 SENATOR BIAGGI: That is so remarkably 22 ridiculous because it's an analogous structure. 23 makes no sense. 24 SARA ZIFF: It makes no sense. 25 SENATOR BIAGGI: Wow.

1 SARA ZIFF: Yeah. 2 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 3 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simotas. ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Sara, thank you for 4 5 coming to tell us the truth about what happens in 6 your industry. 7 My question is very specific about, potentially, what we can do about retaliation, 8 which, in your business, would be blacklisting 9 10 somebody. 11 I could see how it could -- would be easy for 12 a photographer or for some -- for some label to say, 13 Well, you don't look the part. 14 But it could be because you're trying to complain about, you know, a predator. 15 16 SARA ZIFF: Uh-huh. 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: How would we be able 18 to structure? 19 We have strong retaliation laws in the state 20 of New York. Like, you're not supposed to retaliate 21 against people if you complain about something, that 22 you feel like you're being harassed. 23 But I think in the modeling industry it's

going to be different, because of just the way that

the business is run.

24

25

How do -- do you -- have you thought about how we can prevent blacklisting of models, and maybe create a repository, something, that could be more helpful than just claiming that you're being retaliated against, or blacklisted, and not really being able to prove it?

SARA ZIFF: Sure.

Yeah, it's a tricky question when you're talking about the gig economy, and -- where you don't have, necessarily, regular work, or one steady client.

And I think -- we do, however, have exclusive multi-year contracts with our agencies.

And I think, you know, I've seen -- I saw myself, while working as a model, and also in other cases that have come to us through our grievance reporting line, that agencies have, you know, dropped models after they have reported sexual harassment or assault. They have failed to, like, promote models' careers any longer, submit them for jobs.

So I think -- I think there are some clear indications that -- that -- you know, that would show retaliation, at least from the agency side.

But maybe that's something that the last

person who testified, and the folks at the Fair Food
Program, could speak to more, since they also deal
with contract workers.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblymember Quart.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Yeah, just a quick
question.

Thank you for your testimony.

Having just had the benefit of reviewing a modeling contract, it really shocked me how unequal, what the leverage is, almost to the extent that the young person, and it usually is a young person, is almost as if an indentured servant in some sort of way.

I think changing the labeling, from an independent contractor, to employee, is a good start.

But in other areas of the law in the state, we, the Legislature, can step in when the balances of power between two parties are imbalanced, if you will.

Has any -- have you or your organization given any thought to things that the Legislature should do, policy-wise, on the contract end of things?

Because we do legislate in that area, in

insurance law, and other places, to try and give more power to young, mostly young women, who are going to become models, because, based upon the contract, it is a desperate situation as I read those contracts.

SARA ZIFF: Yeah, no, thanks for raising that point.

The contracts tend to be entirely one-sided in favor of the agency.

Often it's, you know, 16-, 17-, 18-year-old girls who are signing these contracts. It's an aspirational industry. They don't -- they sign on the dotted line, they don't negotiate. And, frankly, they don't have any bargaining power.

And I question whether many of these contracts are even enforceable, frankly.

But that's -- you know, certainly, the contracts that these models are held to, where they are, essentially, working in debt to their agencies.

And some of these are children, who are, you know, here, sponsored by these modeling agencies to work here, from Eastern Europe, Brazil, and elsewhere.

It's -- yes, thank you for recognizing that.

I'm not quite sure what the answer is, but

```
it's certainly on our radar.
 1
 2
               ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Thank you.
               SENATOR BIAGGI: I have just one follow-up
 3
        question.
 4
               That was an excellent question, and,
 5
 6
        Assemblymember Quart, thank you for raising that.
               When -- when child models are signing
 7
        contracts, is a par -- a parent, I'm assuming, is
 8
 9
        required to be present?
10
               SARA ZIFF: Yeah, I mean, it's not -- it's
11
        not enforceable if you sign it when you're under 18.
12
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Right.
13
               SARA ZIFF: Right.
14
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Because that's 'cause child
15
        labor is illegal.
16
               That's quite interesting.
17
               I wonder if there's a mechanism in contract
        law?
18
19
               You know, we'll see.
20
               Thank you.
21
               SARA ZIFF: Thanks.
22
               ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.
23
               SARA ZIFF: Thanks so much.
24
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Next we will be hearing from
        Marissa Hoechstetter.
25
```

1 Thank you.
2 I hope I p
3 MARISSA HO
4 SENATOR BI
5 MARISSA HO
6 SENATOR BI
7 ASSEMBLYMA
8 MARISSA HO
9 Thank you
10 today about how t

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I hope I pronounced your name correctly.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Hoechstetter.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Hoechstetter?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: It's okay.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Hoechstetter. Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Hi. Yep, you can begin.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Okay.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today about how the lack of oversight of physicians and other licensed medical professionals puts employees and patients in danger.

I chose to testify because, while the hospital and clinics where I was sexually assaulted were not my workplace, they are someone's workplace.

I'm going to do the best I can today.

No hospital or doctor's office, no workplace, should ever put their reputation and profit ahead of their patient's safety.

Real improvements must be made so that workers and patients, particularly the most vulnerable among us, are not needlessly and repeatedly exposed to sexual harassment and assault.

Most doctors are well-intentioned, caring people dedicated to their field, but the minute you

walk into a doctor's office they have power over you.

It's a unique profession.

There are often legitimate reasons for a doctor's hands to be on or in your body.

Those who abuse this do not deserve protection.

I'm going to briefly share a little bit of my story, and then, in the context of this hearing, share what I've learned about sexual harassment and sexual assault in health care. And, I'm going to refer to a number of studies that I have included in the attachments.

As a patient at Columbia University and

New York Presbyterian Hospital from 2009 to 2012, my

OB/GYN performed overly-touchy exams, made

inappropriate comments about my body, examined me

without nurses in the room, and, on my last visit,

undoubtedly, sexually assaulted me.

When I realized what was happening, I never went back.

The assaults and the experience of coming forward have fundamentally changed my life.

I know now that what happened to me was allowed to transpire because of a lack of action by

his employers and a lack of oversight by regulators.

For 20 years this predator retained power over patients and staff, and used that for sexual gratification.

Despite more than 20 women reporting to the police and the Manhattan District Attorney, Hadden ultimately only pled guilty to crimes against just one victim, two minor counts called down from a long list, a list that would have been longer had the DA included me and others in the case.

Nurses who worked with him claimed to have reported his behavior to supervisors going back decades.

His employers have yet to take any responsibility, and victims continue to come forward, even as recently as last week.

There are probably hundreds, or even thousands, of others out there. It's a sickening list.

Some of us like me were pregnant. Some were minors, including one that he himself had delivered. Some had their babies in the room with them.

His own defense attorney said during the criminal trial that he -- Hadden had over 30,000 patient visits.

Okay.

A recent study found that most sexual misconduct by doctors involves a combination of important factors.

100 percent of the perpetrators were male, and 85 percent of them examined patients alone.

96 percent of known cases involved repeat offenses, And the abuse was often accompanied by a milder, more visible behavior, such as comments and touching, over 90 percent of the time.

Yet these same researchers wrote, "It's not possible to provide an accurate estimation of the frequency of sexual violations in medicine. Most patient-victims do not report."

And one study estimated that fewer than one in 10 victims come forward, which is much lower than an overall rate of cases of rape and sexual assault in the United States.

When you pair this information with reports from the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine that says up to half of medical students have experienced some form of sexual harassment, and another study published in the "Annuls of Internal Medicine," that up to 70 percent of female physicians have reported sexual

harassment, it is clear that health care has a sexual-harassment and sexual-assault problem.

In New York, the education department issues licenses to practice medicine.

Discipline is split between two offices under the department of health:

The office of professional and medical conduct (OPMC), which investigates reports of incompetent or unethical doctors;

And the board of professional medical conduct, which adjudicates those cases and decides on punishments.

This is not just a few people in a backroom somewhere, it's a whole system; staff, investigators, board members, administrative law judges reviewing cases, all using public money with a mission to protect the public.

New York is one of only six states that does not conduct a background check as a requirement of initial licensure for medical professionals.

This might make New York attractive for those with a criminal record to seek licensure here.

The National Practitioner Databank, a resource only available to state boards, established by Congress in 1986 to prevent practitioners from

moving state to state without disclosure or discovery of previous damaging performance.

A survey of databank users found that about 21 percent of matched query responses contain new information.

This means that in states that reviewed -when states reviewed a doctor's application for
licensure, they found new information that had not
been self-reported on applications about a quarter
of the time.

A quarter of the time they're not telling you the whole story.

If New York doesn't conduct background checks and doesn't sufficiently query the databank, we are letting physicians get away with lies and omissions and putting the public at risk.

In 2014 the New York Public Interest Research Group found that over 77 percent of doctors sanctioned for negligence by OPMC were allowed to continue to practice.

Think about that: 77 percent of doctors that were sanctioned were allowed to continue to practice.

Nearly 60 percent of those actions were based on sanctions by other states, the federal

government, or the courts; not the result of some action that OPMC had actually taken.

So an example of that is, the plea that my abuser made, a condition of that was him surrendering his license to the State.

OPMC had nothing to do with the loss of his license.

And because of a lack of transparency, there's no way to know if he had been previously reported or disciplined.

In New York, staff and peers are required to report to the OPMC any information that reasonably appears to show that a doctor is guilty of alleged professional misconduct within 30 days.

Hospitals are also required to report when a doctor's clinical privileges have been curtailed or have -- they've resigned to avoid discipline.

It's very common that they resign before they're actually disciplined and then there's something on their record.

But, there's no penalty for not doing so, and there's no way to know if they're following the law.

In my case, Columbia and New York

Presbyterian had plenty of notice, but it does not

appear that they ever reported Hadden to OPMC.

And, I'd ask people to think if it's realistic to imagine the hospital is going to raise its hand and self-report that they've been employing a sexual criminal.

Because I speak publicly about my assault, victims regularly contact me, seeking help, and most have never heard of the OPMC.

I've spoken with OPMC staff who do not understand or could not clearly communicate what is in their jurisdiction.

I specifically asked if sexual harassment of a hospital staff member by a doctor, for example, was reportable, and I was told, that "it depends."

People should report the harassment so that OPMC can review the complaint and determine if it's in their jurisdiction or not.

How can we expect patients or employees to know what and where to report when we're not clear about whose responsibility it is to investigate or discipline?

One thing that's unique, as I understand it, there's actually no time limit, so no statute, on being able to seek justice from the OPMC for a doctor who has abused or sexually harassed you.

They are required to investigate all complaints

regardless of when they occurred.

We encourage victims to speak up, but when they do, they are often met with a justice system that doesn't offer much relief or, as I've learned, much justice.

In addition to mustering the courage to come forward, we must overcome mountains of disbelief, inertia, and prosecutorial discretion.

Despite OPMC's flaws, the public should be aware of the office as a resource, especially when other criminal justice systems are likely to let us down.

Last year, "The Village Voice" reported on an osteopathic doctor from Great Neck who admitted to verbally harassing a patient and sending her inappropriate text messages. He was fined \$10,000, and required to be chaperoned anytime he saw a female patient.

He then broke that rule two years later, and, as of yesterday when I checked, his license is still active.

Time and again we see abuse happen even when others are present.

Think of the Nassar cases.

In addition to putting a patient in a

vulnerable position with a previously abusive doctor, the chaperon, the person assigned to follow them, who themselves has an employer-employee relationship with the doctor, has to themselves work in a potentially toxic environment.

Boards are knowingly putting criminals back in private situations with their previous victims.

Think of what we know now about the Catholic Church, where clergy, with credible allegations of abuse, were simply moved to new environments to, supposedly, perform differently under new supervision.

The public doesn't know enough about the practice of chaperons to be outraged, but they should be.

And, I'll note, that it's not public information why the chaperon is there.

So you go in, and there's just another person in the room.

And I think many of us, you go into a doctor's office and, you know, there might be other nurses, other staff.

So it's not publicly known why that person is assigned to be there.

So if you could choose between two doctors,

one with a chaperon and one without, I think most of us would choose the one who had not been disciplined, requiring a person to be there with them.

I could go on.

Patients and medical staff who visit or work with a doctor have a right to know their full disciplinary history.

California recently became the first state to require that doctors notify their patients if they are on probation by the Medical Board of California for wrongdoing, including sexual misconduct.

The Patient's Right to Know Act puts the onus to inform the public on the provider and the state board, not on the victim.

A 2016 Consumer Report survey showed that 82 percent of Americans favor the idea of doctors having to tell patients they're on probation, and why.

Doctors' offices could be required to post signage about patients' rights, promoting OPMC's website as a resource.

We know that victims turn to the Internet privately, seeking information about sex crimes, statutes, and reporting our support resources.

OPMC must also update its website.

The word "sex" only appears in one buried place. There is nothing that explicitly mentions sexual harassment or assault of -- as professional medical conduct that is within their purview.

Think about that: It's an office. I mean...

The word "sex" appears only in one buried place as an example of something.

The site does offer a link to relevant state laws which could potentially offer more clarity for those who can understand them.

Under relevant education law, which offers a definition of "professional misconduct" applicable to physicians, the word "sex" only appears in relation to a definition of "misconduct" under the field of psychiatry.

There is a statement that professional misconduct can be willfully harassing, abusing, or intimidating a patient either physically or verbally.

Again, I don't think it's explicit enough.

Under the relevant Public Health Law, which explains the penalties for misconduct and proceedings for the OPMC, neither the word "sex" or "harassment" appear anywhere.

The word "abuse" appears only in relation to drug and alcohol abuse.

The relevant laws should clearly state sexual harassment and sexual abuse as crimes that are considered professional misconduct for physicians.

I hope that my remarks today help shed light on sexual harassment and sexual assault in medicine.

Doctors are an important part of our lives, and have specialized knowledge that we rely on to be happy, healthy, and productive, but they're not gods who deserve to be protected at all costs.

There's a lot more I can say, but, for now, I'll share that it's my hope that state re -- that the state resources already set up to protect us can, at a minimum, be made more visible and accessible, and that the role in curbing these crimes can be clarified, and that we can work together to support victims.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.

Wow.

First of all, thank you for coming forward and telling your personal story. But, you've shed light on an area that I think a lot of us would easily overlook.

I assume, whenever I walk into a medical-facility, appointment, whatever, when my daughters go there, that the people there are highly, you know, regulated, they're licensed, there must be tremendous amounts of oversight.

What you've presented shatters all of those beliefs and raises significant questions.

I just want to share that.

I think we have to do a lot of follow up on -- on -- you present a lot of ideas that can lead to potential legislation.

But, simply, I just want to thank you for -for bringing forward something unique to this whole
conversation.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you for listening.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I echo my Assembly

Co-Chair's sentiment, and thank you for being so

incredibly brave, for sharing your story. It's not

ever easy, and it doesn't necessarily get easier.

But, you create a space for so many other people when you speak up, and we're very grateful for that.

And you -- that's -- I mean, you put a light in an area that I would never even think about.

I mean, I'm thinking now about all the doctors that I have gone to, dentists. I mean, if you just -- now it's just -- goes down the list of things.

How many times has somebody been in a room with me and the doctor?

That's alarming.

That's alarming, and it's negligence in so many different ways.

And the way that you laid out your testimony is so helpful to what we're trying to achieve here right now, because you do it in a way that gives us clear gaps in the law, so that we can put bills in place for these types of things.

And, you know, all of your examples go through, and then you mentioned California so many times.

And I really would be remiss if I didn't say how incessantly disappointed I am as a legislator, and as a New Yorker, that New York is constantly second to California's lead on so many things.

They are trailblazing in ways that I don't even think we know yet.

But it's great that we have --

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: California, you can

1 sign up to get text messages if there's a disciplinary action against your doctor. 2 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Oh, my goodness. I mean, that's remarkable. That's good to know. 4 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: They have challenges 5 for sure there with the medical board, but they 6 7 are -- they have some really great ideas I think that could be looked at. 8 SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure. 9 I mean, that's incredibly helpful for us. 10 11 12 it already means that we have a model. 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think the fact that California has done

So even though we can be a little envious of their leadership, we can still use them as a ally and as like a sister state for us.

One of the things I just want to ask you about, if you are comfortable --

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Sure.

SENATOR BIAGGI: -- responding to, you mentioned that -- well, first of all, I want to just say, this doctor, and the behavior of this doctor, is incredibly egregious, and it's criminal.

To have, as one of the lines in your testimony, that some of them were minors, including one that the doctor had delivered, is disgusting.

It's disgusting.

And that person should not be able to have the privilege of practicing medicine in the state of New York.

So going back to what you had mentioned in that paragraph, which was the Manhattan District Attorney's Office:

So 20 women reporting to the police and the Manhattan District Attorney.

Okay.

I have several friends who have reported these types of acts to the police.

And I think one of the things that's very clear is that police officers are not necessarily trauma-informed in this specific subject, so that's a different topic.

But when you talk about the Manhattan DA, and the application of the law to specific facts and circumstances, that is what a lawyer and an ADA should be able to do.

So I'm curious about, when the Manhattan

District Attorney had, I guess, reviewed these

cases, if you -- I don't know of the extent to which

you know, so any details surrounding that, because

that's alarming, in so many ways, seeing what's in

front of us, and knowing that it went to the Manhattan DA.

And do you know the timing of when it went there?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: There's a lot I could say about that.

SENATOR BIAGGI: You don't have to if you're not comfortable.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No, I can.

It's something I think that's worthy of a whole other hearing.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Wow.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I -- what I have learned since going forward to the DA, and subsequent litigation that I'm currently involved in, and other things, the extent to which -- and some has been made of this, you know, publicly, the extent to which political contributions, friendships, networks, and effort, I believe, really, to -- I don't think anybody cared about this doctor. I think it was an effort to protect the reputation of his employers.

And I hope that our litigation will provide an opportunity to reveal some of what we believe, this case was handled very badly.

When I went in and reported what happened to me, I was told that I was outside of the statute of limitation.

I know now that that was a lie.

And part of what spurs me on to talk about all the parts of my experience; reporting to the DA, learning about the medical board, you know, talking to people, I mean, this is all stuff that I have just learned and taught and sought out for myself, because I was not able to get justice through the criminal justice system.

I mean, we tell people to report. We have ridiculously short statutes of limitation.

And we have people that, when you come forward to report a crime, I believe that most of the people, I mean, people who are report -- you know, presenting to you earlier today, I believe that they look at someone like me as work. I'm one more person; I am somebody that now is going to require them to do more work.

And that's how I see it.

And so I think there's a real incentive for some of these people to look at the case and say, if they can win or not, or, you know, there's a lot of factors there. I mean, there's a lot to talk about.

1 But --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Can you talk a little bit about the statute of limitations, a piece of it?

So the statute of limitations you were told was expired.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: It depends on how you define what the crime against me was.

I define it as first-degree rape.

So I don't think there's a statute of limitation against that.

How the -- and, honestly, I know we're talking about statutes right now.

I think one of the reasons to get away from all these different little definitions, is that people use different things against you, and they can say, Well, I see it this way, and so, therefore, it's this crime, or, it's misconduct, or, it's forcible touching, or, all these other things.

It's all wrong.

And as a victim, I mean, I really did research. I tried to understand the law before I came forward, and, it's confusing.

It's confusing.

And that's why, I mean, I've said it here, like, the fact that the med -- the state office

1 responsible for disciplining doctors does not have the word "sex" anywhere on there. Not "sexual 2 harassment, " not "sexual abuse, " not sexual 3 misconduct." 4 5 Nothing. 6 Why would I think that they're an office that has a resource for me? 7 In my case, it is unique, he did lose his 8 9 license. 10 He -- I got to sit in court and watch him 11 plead guilty, not to crimes against me, but to 12 someone else. 13 That is extremely rare. 14 I'm, like, following a trajectory that almost 15 nobody gets. 16 And I do feel a responsibility because, I've 17 seen that, and I've learned from this process. I feel a responsibility to tell the story. 18 19 It's a -- it's almost like a privilege that 20 I can say that and do that. And I really believe

that, if I can't, you know, who can? And so I'm trying.

But -- so in this context and this opportunity, I wanted to talk about the state medical board.

21

22

23

24

25

I think there is a lot to be said and discussed about statutes, about prosecutorial discretion. Our lack of recourse is none, there's none.

If they don't pursue your accusation, you have no recourse, except, for example, this is one way you could go get justice, right, you could go to the state medical board.

But nobody knows about them.

No one -- I mean, I didn't know that they existed until I read that as a detail of the plea, and then I looked into it.

So it's not a resource that people know about.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Wow.

I think that some of the notes that you touched on, I won't go into details about them at all.

But, the criminal justice system not serving justice is a theme that I think all of us here are very much aware of, and are working on, and have worked on significantly this year.

The influence of political contributions and money in politics, the -- it's -- you know, it's not surprising that it's shown up here in this room, but

it's something that is on our radar.

And I think this is also one of the challenges -- analogous challenges in the Legislature as well, that I'm glad that you brought it up in this instance, because I think it's important to take it out of the context of politics and put it into, you know, the normal course of business.

And I just want to really thank you for sharing all of your testimony, and being so forthcoming.

And to your point of, it's a privilege, it is, but it is also not required.

So, it's really remarkable and transformative that you are using that for good.

So thank you for doing that.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simotas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Marissa, thank you for being here.

You said that you're a victim.

You're not a victim; you're a survivor. And that's really important.

I've been working in the arena of rape laws

and sexual-assault laws now for quite a while, and
I've met a lot brave individuals who've been willing
to come forward and tell their story.

And what you provide to us, and to the rest of society, is a spotlight on the problems.

And we happen to be the people who can try to fix them, but without you, we would never have been made aware of these gaping holes.

I want to ask you a little bit about the office of professional medical conduct and your experience reporting, and just ask you: How can we do a better job telling the public that this office exists, and allowing people who may have complaints to navigate the process?

I assume that it wasn't so easy for you to report or navigate the system.

How could we make it better?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: So thank you for saying that, and thank you for that question.

I have seen, and I think it was

North Carolina, that did a study, that only -- and only 10 percent of the public knew about their medical board.

So I think, at a minimum, people need to know the office exists.

There are some states that require signage to be posted, with a website.

Again, I think the website needs to be improved.

But, I mean, at a minimum, I think there's some public-relations work that needs to happen.

You know, we think a lot about health care, like, what happened to me was in a big hospital, there's people around. You imagine that there might be somebody to go to.

A lot of this -- these things happen, I mean, individual doctors have private offices. There's one staff member, or two staff members, there.

And you're putting the onus of reporting or knowing where to report on someone who themselves is an employee of that -- that physician.

So it's tricky, but I think that there's some, you know, minute -- like, public-relation stuff, having it available.

Making sure that different support groups, like, you know, birth groups, people that work with mothers. There's different -- there's -- excuse me, there's different -- there's the AMA; there's ACOG; there's different organizations that work in medicine. All of the medical schools.

I mean, I tried to keep my remarks to my

personal experience, but, I mean, Times of Health

Care just launched. There's incredible data and

stories of how pervasive -- I listed a few

statistics -- how pervasive sexual harassment is for

medical residents and students.

That's not something that I, you know, personally can speak to, but I think there's an opportunity to educate people before they are officially in the workforce.

You know, you can have mandated chaperons.

So not in the sense that I said, but you can require that, for certain types of exams, there's alway -- there always has to be a second person in the room.

I don't know that that will always curtail this. And a lot of what we see, I think it's probably almost impossible to prevent a first occurrence, but it surely should be possible to prevent repeat occurrences, especially when you see the statistics of how frequently these people are repeat offenders.

So I think informing the public, which is part of why I'm here and trying to do this.

I think making the law and the language

around OPMC more visible.

And I think, when you have it, the responsibility spread out between the department of education, and then these two offices under the department of health, it's not clear where to go.

So perhaps the department of education and the department of health could also have a responsibility, even if they're not the office responsible, to be responsible for informing the public of where to go.

Uhm... yeah.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: One more question.

Is information that's filed, or complaints filed, with OPMC, is it public? Is there any way we can go and check to see who filed the complaint against who?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No.

What you can see publicly is final actions.

Now, again, this is how I understand it, you can see a final action; so if a doctor's license was revoked, suspended, or surrendered.

You cannot see if there were files -- complaints filed that didn't result.

I mean, right, again, you might want to see a pattern of behavior.

And I think the number I shared was something 1 like 77 percent of doctors are allowed to continue 2 3 practicing. So there's a lot of people out there who 4 probably have a disciplinary history. 5 6 And I'm speaking from a sexual-assault, you 7 know, perspective. There -- this also -- a lot of what I'm 8 talking about applies to the opioid epidemic, for 9 example. There are examples of doctors prescribing 10 11 medication in exchange for sex. 12 So, like, there's an intersection of a lot of 13 things related to health care that I think could 14 be -- could benefit from some legislation here. 15 It's not just sexual assault, because they leverage 16 that power for people who are the most vulnerable. 17 But, yeah, it's -- it's not public. I mean, there's some information online, but 18 19 it's pretty limited.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Marissa, again, I can't thank you enough for being here and publicly sharing your story.

> MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Quick question, before

I go to the next.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: The chaperon component, we talked about it in terms of, if a chaperon requirement is imposed on a doctor.

But does a patient have the right at any given time to bring a chaperon with them to a test or an appointment, that you're aware of?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I believe that, yes, you can request that.

It is -- I under -- I mean, someone else here might know it.

It's my understanding that you can always request that.

I think it could be mandated, especially in certain circumstances.

What's tricky, and, again, I'm telling you my experience, there can be someone in the room, and then they leave, and you're already in a vulnerable position.

So it's not perfect, but I think if you say, you know, there has to be someone in the room for these certain types of exams, or, that you can always request it, that is the law as I understand it, but there's no signage, for example.

1 So, you know --2 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: In theory (indiscernible 3 cross-talking) --MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: -- you might not know 4 that that's available to you. 5 So I do think that that's something, again, 6 7 we need more, you know, education around. ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Appreciate that. 8 9 Assemblyman Gottfried. 10 ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Question, just sort 11 of mechanical: Do we have your testimony 12 electronically? 13 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I did submit it, yes. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Oh, okay. 15 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: But I can get it to 16 you also. And I submitted all the various 17 attachments too. 18 ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Okay. 19 Well, if -- if the Chairs have it, I can get 20 it from them. 21 Uhm -- you know, as I've chaired the 22 Health Committee in the Assembly for quite some, 23 and, from time to time, we've tried to deal with 24 legislation relating to the physician discipline

25

system.

You know, in my experience, OPMC, you know, it's kind of like, if you were talking about a sheriff in some rural county in Mississippi, if you discovered that there were some people in the town that the sheriff, you know, treated extraordinarily harshly, and other people in town, who the sheriff left them do anything they wanted, you would understand what was going on.

And in some ways, OPMC is like that.

There are people in the medical profession that they come down on very hard, and people in the medical profession who they never touch.

And the -- the secrecy of the proceedings, including, not letting the complainant know what's going on, is certainly a major problem.

So bottom line is, we'll look into this, and, I imagine, be in touch with you.

I think there's a lot here that needs to be looked at.

So I appreciate your raising these issues with us.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you.

As I understand it, you know, a number of the things I've raised have been considered for decades in the state. Some of these are not new.

But I do think, as we've seen with some of the other testimony, we're at a different moment where we need to recognize.

That's why, even just putting some of the language online.

I didn't include this here, and I don't remember the number exactly, but if I remember correctly, it's something like 260 days that it takes to do an investigation. So, that's almost a year, often -- well, I'm going to round up a little bit -- when that person is still practicing.

So another thing, as you mentioned, they come down really hard on some people, and not on others.

Most -- as I understand most of the board, it's something like two-thirds professionals and a third public.

So, you're -- you're, essentially, having peers/doctors discipline other doctors.

And even the publicly-appointed members, the public members, often have ties to the medical industry in some way.

I think that's something that, you know, I would question.

I'm not saying those people are not well intentioned, but, that's, I think, a lot of the

reason why you see people, they're saying: 1 Well, you know, it was a mistake; 2 3 Or, we're going to send this person to, you know, training, and they're gonna go back to work 4 5 with a chaperon, and it's going to be fine. 6 You know, at some point, I think we have to 7 care more about the people that they're harming than this one person's career. 8 9 And I get the doctors are an expensive investment, but, our lives are. 10 11 And I think we need to see a shift on what 12 their priority is. 13 Thank you. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Thank you. 15 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblyman Quart. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Marissa, thank you for 17 being here. 18 The State of New York has given you every 19 reason never to step foot in this state again, but, 20 here you are. 21 And thank you for your testimony. I want to talk a little bit about 22 23 Columbia University, and our large, sacred 24 institutions in this city and state.

Now, I know you have a civil lawsuit.

25

But the civil courts are a difficult place to seek justice because the end result is usually compensation. It will unlikely end with an admission or a change of policy. And we have to deal with statute of limitations in civil court, which -- beyond the army of lawyers that you and your attorneys will have to deal with.

But this Legislature is not bound by a statute of limitations to conduct its oversight responsibilities of our large institutions, which, in this very building, through the council, I'm sure has received largess and land use, and all of that, through state government as well.

What would you like to see this Legislature do with respect to holding large institutions, like Columbia University, accountable for what I'll describe as its likely failures to provide any oversight over a sexual predator that was in its midst for two decades?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: It's a hard question for me to answer.

You know, the State already has mandated reporting, so, you have that.

But because none of this is -- it's not public to see if somebody's even been reported, it's

very hard to hold anyone accountable.

Another example in California, if it's found to be that a hospital knew, and did not report, they have fines of, I think, around \$100,000. There's some different fines.

That's actually not that much money, considering how much money these nonprofits make.

And health care is -- they make a lot of money on health care.

The hospital and the university, their partnership, I mean, a lot of this is in their annual report.

And their reputation matters a lot.

And so I think when you have a system that is, essentially, asking them to self-report, especially in an environment where people bring lawsuits, again, that's one of the only tools that we often have to hold people accountable.

It's tricky.

So I think there has to be real consequences.

When you are found to have known something, to have had notice --

And, in my case, I really believe that they had notice for decades.

-- and when you have been found to have had

notice, and not reported it, you have to be held accountable.

So, I don't know if that is monetarily or through, you know, different accreditation.

Uhm... yeah.

It's a tricky thing, especially, I think, in New York City, where you have such a concentration of the money and politics and these employers, and it's all just so connected.

So, if the chair of Columbia's board is a law partner with Harvey Weinstein's lawyer, and they're all making contributions to the DA, like, it's all -- it's all the same thing, it's all a network.

So, I mean, that question is hard to answer.

Like, how do -- how do you hold people accountable? How do you infiltrate that?

You know, I -- you have to expose it, and you have to hold people accountable.

And people have to feel like coming forward matters.

I have been really fortunate over the last year since speaking publicly, that I do feel like people are listening to me.

And I'm the only non-anonymous person of dozens. I mean, I talk to a lot of these other

women.

It's crazy that I find myself and my life being the only non-anonymous person, but that's where I am.

And hearing from all these other women makes me feel -- makes me able to, you know, keep going.

But I do not feel like people have been held accountable yet.

And what I'm doing has to matter, and so I'm not going to stop talking about it.

I'm not going to stop talking about it until there are different people in certain elected offices, I'm not going to stop talking about it until the influence of money and politics is changed, and until patients are really safe, and feel like they have recourse, somewhere to go.

And that comes down to statutes, it comes down to state offices, it comes down to holding people accountable when they have notice and they don't act.

So, that's probably more of an answer than you wanted, but that's how I feel about it.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: No, it's -- I think it's important for people to know that,

Dr. Hadder (sic) -- accountability, which you talked

about, Dr. Hadder (sic) was a 63-year-old doctor. 1 Okay, so they took away his law (sic) license, but, 2 he was able to retire to his home in New Jersey. 3 And nobody sought --4 5 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I mean, is he -- is he 6 getting a pension? 7 Is he -- I mean, there's some real questions that, again, the criminal case had an opportunity, 8 9 I think, to look at that, and they didn't. And so there's a limit to what, you know, 10 11 civil litigation can do. 12 But I believe that we have yet to see the 13 worst of it, unfortunately. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: And it's my hope, under 15 the leadership our Chairs, that, in future hearings, 16 we can poss -- we can seek to explore the 17 accountability, or lack thereof, of our large-scale institutions in this city and state who have failed 18 19 you. 20 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you. 21 Thank you. 22 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblyman Epstein. 23 ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: I also want to thank

you for being here, and really bringing issues to

24

25

light.

And -- so what we're talking, like, is systemic change, and I understand the struggle about figuring how to get to it.

But do you think more ways to hold institutions accountable for the behaviors of their -- you know, their employers to figure out systems and structures?

Like insurance -- like, if you want to change how people drive, insurance companies affect how people operate their vehicles; they create rules.

And, so, do we hold hospitals and institutions accountable for the acts of their staff, maybe they would do better training, go back to medical school?

Is there -- are -- so just I'm trying to think through some of the structural things that we need to be doing to prevent people in those positions to be happening in the first place.

Have you thought through those issues, and where the structural changes has to happen to ensure that people are not put in these positions? Or people who think that --

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I have ideas about that.

I appreciate that question because I think

you bring up important points.

I don't know that I am, as an individual, you know, an expert to say enough.

I know that some of the things that I've raised have come before the Senate and the Assembly before, and have been taken out of legislation by the insurance industry, by the medical industry, themselves.

So it is, you know, medical malpractice.

I mean, there's -- there's -- we're talking about a whole area, I think, with insurance. It's expensive, and there's a lot of liability there.

So I don't know that I'm the best person to talk about that.

I think, also, my -- because I'm in litigation, I don't really want to talk about that.

But, as I understand, there is history with some of what I'm talking about.

And there have been industries that you would think are supposed to help protect the public, are themselves lobbying to keep this stuff out of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: And what role do you think the medical schools have to -- and nursing schools have, in this conversation?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I think they have a

huge role.

We saw the launch in -- I believe in

December, or just recently, of Times of Health Care.

They're working to get hospitals and medical schools
to sign, you know, pledges.

As I understand it -- and I have a family member in medical school, actually, right now -- there's no classes, there's no training, there's really nothing, about how to interact with patients.

I mean, it should be obvious that you should not abuse your patients, but, it apparently needs to be explicitly stated.

The Federation of State Medical Boards, which is an association of groups like the OPMC, they actually use a definition called "sexual misconduct."

I think, you know, we're not even really using the real words, and so some of this is like getting really basic, like, putting the word "sex" and "sexual harassment" and "sexual abuse" on the website.

Doing some basic, sort of, you know, PR work around -- around these offices.

Working with medical schools.

Yeah, it's a big challenge, and I'm sorry

I don't have all of the answers.

I've appreciated learning, and I want to continue learning, and I think work with people who are experts and maybe have more history, you know, in this than I do.

But I wanted to sort of raise some of these questions because I think they matter.

We're talking a lot about health care in a lot of other context at the moment, and this is part of it, you know, for me, and many other people.

ASSEMBLYMAN EPSTEIN: Thank you.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Niou.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Hi.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Hi.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Is it okay if I ask a couple of more personal questions?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Of course.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I don't want to -- if you're ever uncomfortable, just, please, feel like -- you know, you don't have to answer.

So going back to OPMC, how -- and the BPMC, how did you even find out that they existed?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I found out they existed because, in the plea agreement that he

signed, it said he had to surrender his license.

And I wanted to see that that had actually happened.

And so I found the office. I found -- they do -- this is something that is there. I can actually see the letter that they sent him, saying, Send in your license.

And it's really funny because it says, Don't send us the frame that it's in.

It's, like -- anyways.

It actually says: Don't mail the frame in with us. We don't store your frame. But send us the actual paper license.

That's how I realized there was an office.

And then I started, you know, looking into it.

And I'm a member now of a group called the Medical Board Roundtable, which is a national group of advocates really committed to understanding medical boards.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And -- so how did you report, since you couldn't use what they had set up?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: So I did not report to the medical board.

I reported to the district attorney's office,

and at that point I was led to believe that my reporting to them was all that I could do at that point. I mean, they never suggested, for example, that I go to the OPMC.

Uhm... yeah.

And then -- yeah.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So what -- what led -- what did they say to lead you to believe that that was all you could do?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: They said that my accusation was outside of the statute of limitation. And they appreciated me coming forward. And that perhaps I could be used in Molineux -- that my statement could be used in Molineux.

That was it.

There are other women who saw the same doctor, who did report to the state medical board.

Within a few months of -- he was arrested in 2012, and he stopped practicing within a few months.

So at that point he wasn't actually practicing, even though he was still employed by the university.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I mean, when Senator Biaggi was talking about how (indiscernible) somebody else didn't have to be in the room, I was,

like, just as stunned about learning that we didn't 1 need to conduct a background check. 2 3 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: It's kind of crazy. Right? 4 I mean, I don't know why you wouldn't do that 5 as a condition of initial licensure. 6 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Sure. MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah. 8 9 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So it's not a condition 10 of initial licensure. 11 It's not a condition of -- I mean, for law 12 school, for law students, you know, you're not 13 allowed to have committed a felony. And there's a 14 lot of different things that make it so that you 15 can't get your law license. 16 So I would think that there should be 17 something. 18 So I really appreciate you're bringing that 19 up. 20 I'm working on a bill now. 21 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you. 22 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: But I -- I also wanted 23 to ask: So when -- when you -- when you found out 24 that they -- so, that these organizations existed,

the OPMC, the BPMC, when you found that out, what --

25

what -- did -- when you -- did you talk to them?

Like, what was the -- did you go before them?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I did reach out to them because I wanted to know if other people had reported him.

So I understood that he lost his license as a condition of this plea.

And now I understand why the DA made such a big deal about that being "a win," because it is, in fact, quite common for doctors to lose licensure in one state and go seek it in another state, especially a state without background checks.

So I -- sorry, ask the question again?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Did you go to -- did -- how did you reach them? What did you say to them?

How did you --

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Oh, right.

So I reached out, I called. I've also -I called, and wanted to know, you know, could I see
anything else?

And, no, you -- you know, you're -- you can't. You can only see final actions.

I have also -- I've spoken publicly at events, and I've met members of the OPMC's board, and I've asked them questions.

1 And I've also called and spoken with other staff members since, just in sort of a personal 2 3 advocacy way. Like, for example, asking if sexual 4 harassment is covered, you know, in their 5 6 jurisdiction. 7 And them basically saying, "It depends." And maybe there's good reason for that, 8 I don't know. 9 I just think we need to be clear about what 10 11 is and what isn't covered. 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So they never asked, 13 like, to hear more about what happened to you? 14 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No, uh-uh. 15 No. 16 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Interesting. 17 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No. 18 Uhm... yeah. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And --19 20 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: In fact, in one 21 instance, and I don't want to make this personal, 22 but, there is one person who was very proud to tell 23 me that they were responsible for him losing his

And I replied by saying, that OPMC had

24

25

license.

nothing to do with it. 1 Right? 2 I mean, it was because of the plea. 3 They might have signed the paper, saying he 4 5 6 anything they did. 7 it, and that might be true. 8 9 10

had to turn it in, but they -- it was not because of

And they might say that they never knew about

But the point is, there were plenty of opportunities along the way when they should have been notified and been able to act, especially if you have mandated reporting within 30 days.

But, if no one does it, then there's no way to follow up on it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: That's right.

You gave us a lot to work on.

Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And since they never followed up with you, what would you have liked to have seen coming from them?

Like, what would you have liked to have seen coming from them?

And is there something that would have been helpful in your case? Like dream scenario.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah, I mean, I think that the information available online needs to be much more user-friendly, modern, accessible.

I think information needs to be transparent.

Or, if there's information that can't be shared, at least to say what is and is not available.

Simply linking to the relevant law puts a huge, you know, burden on the individual to be able to read and understand that law.

It's only in English -- well, I think there are parts of the website that might be in multiple languages, but it's just really not very accessible.

So I think the information needs to be more clear.

It needs to be shared and pushed out to the public in another way.

I think there's bigger questions about why the licensing and disciplining, and all this is spread across these three different, something is department of ed, something is department of health.

I mean, those are bigger conversations to have.

But, this is not a small endeavor. I mean, there are hundreds of people who do this work in

these offices.

So I feel like that's something to look at, and understand, why does it take almost a year to investigate a case?

Especially because I think we have a really unique opportunity; there isn't a statute in coming forward.

I mean, medical records could be gone. Yes, there's other things that may go over time. But this is actually, as I understand it, you know, you can come forward and seek some justice.

And so I think that's pretty unique, but not something that is promoted or readily visible.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: There were like no signs, nobody telling you, like, hey, this is available to you. Right?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And how would you hope that they are populated?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: You mean the staff people?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Well, and the -- well, the boards.

I mean, I know that Mr. Gottfried had just talked about it being the Wild, Wild West.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: It's -- as

I understand, compared to other states, it's really great, actually, the ratio of public members to -I mean, you need people with specialized knowledge.
I mean, they're also looking at cases of medical harm, right, they're looking all kinds of different kinds of behavior.

So you need people who understand the specialties of the different boards, and everything, but having public members is good.

I think we need to look at whether or not those public members have connections to the medical industry. They might not be doctors, but they have other connections.

And I think that is something that I would question.

There's also, I think, almost 100 people. It just seems like a lot.

As I understand it, part of that is because you need a certain number of people to look and review each complaint. And so -- and there's a volume.

And so there might be good reason for that, but it feels to me like it's a really big endeavor that is not having an impact. And if it is, it's

not visible.

So how can we protect people and respect privacy, but also make their work more visible, so that people see results, see them as a resource, and are willing to come forward.

And then we might start to understand the extent of the problem.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And what would have been some flag that they would could have helped to post up so that you would know that you're not alone?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I mean, I think if there was signage in doctors' offices about resources, someone might see that, you know, you might see that.

I think that the district attorney -- I mean,

I would think if you're reporting to the police and

the district attorney, perhaps they should also

direct you to that resource.

I mean, it's not exactly like a Title 9 complaint, but I think of it a little bit the same. Like, you might report to the police, but you might also might report on campus.

Right?

So I think there -- there's some value to asking law enforcement to also encourage people to

report, because they might not be able to help you 1 in a criminal way, but this is a way to get this 2 3 person, you know, away from patients. 4 So they should be promoting that to people who come forward with these complaints. 5 6 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Thank you so much. 7 I'm sorry I had to ask so many. MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: 8 That's okay. 9 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I just wanted to make --MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you for asking. 10 11 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: -- make a --MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Very few people want 12 to talk about this stuff, so I appreciate you asking 13 14 questions. Thank you. 15 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Well, I appreciate your 16 being brave enough to, you know, open up your story. 17 Thank you so much. 18 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simon. 19 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you. 20 And thank you again for your testimony. This 21 is really very powerful. And, it's also a little 22 bit different than -- from some the testimony we've 23 heard before.

And I think it raises one of the issues that

I have talked about, and that is, our institutions,

24

25

our institutions of higher education in particular, are like cities.

They have doc -- they have medical centers.

They have law clinics. They do research. They -you have co-worker problems, faculty and staff and
student; faculty-on-student discrimination,
employer-employee relationships. You have campus
security, so you have that issue of law enforcement.

And you have sports, which is another whole scene.

And so it strikes me that today's hospital systems are all linked to a university. There are almost no small community hospitals anymore that are not linked to a bigger institution.

And I'm curious whether you have a sense that, the size of the institution, the power of the institution itself, played a significant role in the perpetuation of this doctor's actions?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Sure.

Thank you for that question.

Yes, I believe it did.

I think the bigger the institution, the easier it is for people to reassign someone, move them around, look the other way, sort of bury it, leadership changes. You know, someone, that history might not be passed on. I mean, uhm... yeah.

You know, I read recently, I think Columbia has -- their insurance rate has like more than quadrupled in the last few years because of the number of sexual-assault and harassment cases they have, but from faculty and students and staff.

You know, it's so big, and each one is in a different area, and no one sort of puts it all together.

But at some point you kind of wonder, like, what is your commitment here?

And I think, especially with really big institutions --

You know, I work in higher ed, I understand some of endowments and, you know, financing, the donations. I mean, I work in fundraising.

-- when you have really big endowments and you can just sort of throw money at problems, and make things go away, make people sign NDAs, yeah, you can get away with more when you're a really big institution.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: It also strikes me that we have repeat offenders who are allowed to repeatedly offend.

And I'm curious whether, in your experience, and, certainly, talking to the women that you spoke

to, and there are likely to be other people in the environment, whether it's the nurse or another physician in the practice, who would have a sense that there was something going on that shouldn't be going on, whether there's a need for greater whistle-blower protection?

Whether you had looked at that at all in the work that you've been doing, and in the conversations you've been having?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: So I can't speak too specifically.

I will say that part of our complaint, we drafted suggestions for things that the university and the hospital system should do to have anonymous reporting, to have protection for employees who come forward.

I mean, you're putting a lot of the responsibility of reporting on the nurses in these situations, or the sort of orderlies, or people, and they're, like, often the lowest on the chain, and you're asking them to come forward.

So, again, in this context, it might not be sexual harassment of those people, but I thought it was relevant, in that they were having to work in this environment, and be afraid of reporting

something that they saw.

And so I think there needs to be a way for people to be encouraged to report. I mean, really, you need to explicitly say you have a no-tolerance policy, or, a zero, you know.

So the fact that the state board lets
77 percent of its people go back -- you know, the
physicians go back, like, you're saying "we don't
have a zero-tolerance policy."

So I think most people in any -- anywhere in the chain are not going to say it's worth it to report, because you're putting yourself at risk.

Uhm... yeah.

So there needs to be reporting mechanisms that are anonymous.

I don't know, really, how it relates, like, if you work at New York Presbyterian, you know, partnership with Columbia, are you reporting to the university? are you reporting to the hospital?

I really don't know how that works, and I think maybe that's part of the problem.

When you have these big institutions with all these partnerships, it might not be clear where you go.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: That's why they hire

1 lawyers, to figure that out. MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah. 2 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Somebody --MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Well --4 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Somebody can figure it out, and they ought to be figuring it out. 6 7 And it strikes me that a lot of what happens when they do these deals, is that they don't figure 8 9 those kinds of things out. And it's clear that there needs to be a 10 11 better intersection between the various entities, or 12 units, of these large entities, so that people 13 don't -- the institutions -- entities within the 14 institutions are in that cross-purposes, and leaving 15 people to pay the price. 16 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah. 17 I mean, Nassar was at a public institution. 18 The gynecologist at USC was in a school, you 19 know, higher ed. 20 There's something to be said about that: why 21 are they able to get away with this in those 22 institutions for so long? 23 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you very much. 24 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.

25

1 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thanks so much. 2 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Just a reminder, it's 4:53. 5:30 is the magic hour for security 3 downstairs. 4 5 SENATOR BIAGGI: Next, we're going to shuffle some of the order. 6 7 We will be hearing from the National Employment Lawyers' Association, also known as 8 "NELA"; the National Women's Law Center; and 9 A Better Balance. 10 11 MIRIAM CLARK: I don't know where A Better 12 Balance is. 13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: You could start, 14 whenever you're ready. 15 MIRIAM CLARK: I don't know where A Better 16 Balance is. 17 SENATOR BIAGGI: We're just waiting for A Better Balance. 18 19 We'll wait a moment. 20 MIRIAM CLARK: I don't know where A Better 21 Balance went, but we're here. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: That's all right, we can get 23 started. And then, when they come back to the room, that's okay, they can share their testimony. 24 25 ANDREA JOHNSON: My name is Andrea Johnson,

and I am senior counsel for state policy at the National Women's Law Center.

The law center, we're located in D.C., but we work all across the county, and we've been working for over 45 years to advance and protect women's equality and opportunity, and we've long worked to remove barriers to equal treatment of women in the workplace, including workplace harassment and discrimination.

And since January of last year, the National Women's Law Center fund has been housing and administering the Time's Up legal defense fund, which has received over 5,000 requests for assistance just since January of 2018, almost 400 of which are from workers in New York, related to workplace sex discrimination, and the vast majority involve sexual harassment and related retaliation.

And over one-third of those requests into the Time's Up legal defense fund from New York have been from workers in the arts and entertainment fields, health care, and education services.

And significant numbers of individuals working in local government, food services, finance and insurance, and information and communication, have also sought assistance, and the majority

identified as low-income.

One thing that I really want to underline is that the requests that we've received into the fund confirmed that sexual harassment does not occur in a vacuum, but it often occurs alongside or in combination with other forms of harassment and discrimination, like pay discrimination or pregnancy discrimination.

It also occurs at the intersection of identities, like race and sex, or national origin and sex, or disability and sex.

A report that the law center published recently, analyzing EEOC charge data, indicates that women of color, and Black women in particular, are disproportionately likely to experience sexual harassment at work, highlighting how race and sexual harassment can be intertwined.

I want to underline that because our #MeToo policy response cannot just focus narrowly on sexual harassment. It must be intersectional, it must cover all forms of harassment and discrimination, because legislation that would focus exclusively on sexual harassment would have the odd and impractical result of providing a worker who experiences multiple intersecting violations with only partial

protection, I think a point that was made earlier today.

New York, as you all know, passed a number of really important protections last year, and in years prior, to cover independent contractors and employees of smaller employers, those are really important protections, and, to limit the use of NDAs, but they were all focused on sexual harassment.

So we urge the Legislature to extend these protections to all forms of harassment and discrimination, and make sure the same is done of future policy reforms that you're considering, so we can truly address the inequities and harassment in the workplace.

And in addition to administering the

Time's Up legal defense fund, the law center has

also been working with federal and state legislators

and advocates all across the country to really

harness the energy of the #MeToo movement, to make

real change, and stop and prevent sexual harassment,

both in legislatures and the general workforce.

Last year alone, over 100 bills were introduced in states across the country, and by October 2018, 11 states had enacted some of those

measures into law.

And at the beginning of this year, over

300 state legislators, representing 40 states,
signed a letter of commitment, pledging to
strengthen protections against sexual harassment and
violence at work, in schools, in homes, and
communities in 20 states by 2020; a call to action,
#20Statesby2020, which is very exciting.

There's a lot of momentum in the states.

And the Congress has also introduced legislation to address the many inadequacies in our federal laws, but little has moved. So it's really fallen to the states to carry the torch of real reform.

And New York has enacted several important protections already, but for the state to be a leader in fighting for workplace equality and against harassment, many of these protections need to be strengthened, and additional protections are needed.

And I'll just touch quickly on a few that we think are particularly important.

One is that, much needs to be done to remove the barriers to survivors accessing justice, like the short statutes of limitations, which we've heard

about today.

Many workers don't come forward immediately, or even within months, to report, either due to fear of retaliation, or as a result of the trauma they're experiencing. And it's just difficult for workers to -- without resources to easily find and consult with advocates or attorneys about their rights.

That can take time.

We see with the Time's Up legal defense fund, that many people seeking assistance have run out of time and no longer have legal options.

Fortunately, we're seeing states, from Texas to Oregon, working to rectify this; working on legislation this session.

We saw New York City last year extended the statute of limitations.

In April, Maryland extended their statute of limitations for filing an administrative claim to two years.

And yesterday, you might have heard, the California Assembly passed a bill that will very likely become law, that will extend their statute of limitations to three years.

So, I know you watch what California does, they are moving ahead.

The comprehensive anti-harassment bill that was recently introduced in Congress, the Be Heard Act, which is something that we worked closely on, it would extend the statute of limitations to four years, and also has provisions dealing with federal government employees who have a much shorter statute of limitations, only 45 days, presently, to initiate a complaint. And it would ensure that they would have the same time as others.

So we really urge New York to join this movement to extend the statute of limitations.

Another important thing is, addressing the "severe/pervasive" standard, which has become unduly narrow.

And my colleagues at the table will speak more to that.

We urge the Legislature to pass legislation that rectifies the standard, and really ensures that courts' analysis of workplace harassment focuses on the impact of the conduct, and the individual's terms, conditions, or privileges of employment; that it's based on the record as a whole and the totality of the circumstances, and that recognizes that the wide -- a wide range of circumstances may alter the terms and conditions of employment, and that no

single type or frequency of conduct is required.

New York City, as we've heard, has taken a different standard.

California passed legislation last year, also addressing the "severe/pervasive" standard.

And the federal Be Heard Act is another bill that has not passed, but has been introduced, that we think provides a model for guiding courts away from the standard -- the "severe/pervasive" standard.

And we encourage you to take a look at that.

The Faragher-Ellerth defense is something we think is very important, to allowing for punitive damages, which I know will be mentioned.

But I'll end by emphasizing the need for measures that increase transparency as a mechanism to really increase employer accountability, and incentivize employers to proactively prevent harassment.

So, what we've seen around non-disclosure agreements we think is incredibly important.

And we're happy to see that New York is taking some important steps in that regard.

We are concerned that, how the law was drafted, leaves it open to -- leaves open to

employees being still coerced into signing an NDA.

So we encourage the Legislature to, for example:

Ensure that workers who breech an NDA are not subject to liquidated damages;

Ensure that the agreement to keep a settlement confidential provides independent consideration for that agreement;

And also ensure that any settlement agreement clearly includes an explanation in it, that an NDA does not prohibit the worker from filing a complaint or participating in an investigation with the state or federal agency, or in federal or state litigation, or using collective action, to address workers' rights violations.

Vermont took -- passed legislation last year that takes that approach.

So, all these things we think are some additional important procedural protections to try to address this fear that maybe this actually doesn't shift the balance of power necessarily in the negotiation, to try to give more power to the survivor.

And there are other transparency measures that we're seeing in other states, such as requiring

employers to report about the number of claims and settlements, and how claims were resolved, as a mechanism, again, for accountability.

And Maryland passed legislation to this effect last year, that would require employers of 50 or more employees to report about settlements to the Maryland Civil Rights Commission, which would then aggregate and publish those responses.

So, some interesting work going on in other states I'd be happy to talk more about.

But we do think that transparency is a really important accountability measure, and would encourage you to look more in that respect.

Thank you.

MIRIAM CLARK: I'm Miriam Clark. I'm the president of the New York affiliate of the National Employment Lawyers' Association.

I've been representing employees in New York for more than 30 years.

And so it's striking that we're hearing so much at the last hearing, and today, and in the press, this outcry against workplace sexual harassment. It's wonderful to hear.

I've been doing this work for a very long time, and I have to say that, when I first started

out as a lawyer, I thought that, eventually, I would be out of a job because sexual harassment would end.

Who knew?

But the point is, that we can't change culture without changing the law.

Outrage without meaningful legislation is just this year's noise.

So what we need to do is comprehensively change the substance of New York State's discrimination law.

And I know you're all familiar with S3817, A7083, which is our omnibus bill that we believe will do just that.

So, just to start something that I haven't said before, but I also read the quote in Politico from the business council, and, you know, I do think there's a legitimate concern about what the effect of these laws might be on businesses, especially small businesses.

Large institutions like Columbia must be held accountable, but, I think we do have a concern about small businesses that make New York vibrant.

But I think what we need to think about is that harassment and discrimination are bad for business.

Employees who are harassed and discriminated against suffer physical and psychological illness, which lowers their productivity and increases their absenteeism.

Studies show that women of color report the highest level of discrimination in the workplace, and are most likely to suffer symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder as a result of such experiences.

And these -- there are articles that talk about, really, sexual harassment as an occupational health issue, in my printed testimony.

Employees who suffer from unlawful discrimination, harassment, quit if they can afford to.

A workplace rife with unlawful harassment will suffer turnover, which experts estimate costs employers anywhere from 20 to 213 percent of salaries.

So, you have turnover of one highly-paid professional person, you're gonna spend 213 percent of their salary replacing them.

Overall, it is estimated that each person on a team affected by sexual harassment is less productive --

That makes sense because you're distracted or afraid by what's happening to your co-workers.

Right?

-- with an average cost through loss productivity of \$22,000 per person.

Common sense, and my experience, tells us that this must be the case.

My clients who suffer from sexual, racial, and other forms of harassment dread going to work every day. They suffer from physical and psychological symptoms. They're exhausted by the emotional and physical energy involved in trying to get away from their harassers, and, of course, by terror of retaliation if they complain.

Those with the ability to leave their jobs almost always do.

So who stays? The harasser, free to make the life of the next employee totally miserable.

So I'll walk through S3817 in a minute, but first I want to discuss the specific weaknesses of current New York law.

So, overall, New York's anti-discrimination law is more than 75 years old.

Yay for us for being one of the first, but not yay for us because it needs to be amended.

The worst thing right now is that New York courts have deliberately and explicitly chosen to align it with federal law.

Every single case you bring under the State

Human Rights Law, the first thing the judge says is,

"We follow Title 7." That's the federal law.

So federal law has gotten significantly less employee-friendly over the years. I can tell you about that. It's become harder to prove age discrimination, harder to prove disability discrimination, harder to prove retaliation.

The "severe or pervasive" standard has gotten crazier and crazier, and this is all just likely to become worse, since we know what's happening to the federal bench and the Supreme Court.

Okay, so, moreover, there's this procedural mechanism called "summary judgment," which, for people who didn't go to law school, means that, after discovery, but before trial, a judge looks at all the evidence and decides whether there's enough of a factual issue to go to trial.

So less than one-third of employment discrimination cases ever get to trial. The rest get knocked out on summary judgment.

And the cases that are most likely to survive

are pure sexual-harassment cases, but even they get to juries less than half the time.

So what you have are these judges deciding, without ever looking at the witnesses, without ever looking at the employee, which cases are deserving enough to go to a jury.

So why is it that so few of these cases get to trial?

And the answer is, of course, the substance of New York law.

So as we all know, discriminatory harassment is only illegal if a Court believes that it was severe or pervasive.

By the way, it's "or" -- severe or pervasive -- but many judges think it's "and."

I gave some graphic examples of outrageous conduct about "severe/pervasive" when I testified in February.

Here's some more.

Neil (ph.) in New York did an Amicus brief three years ago, in a case called Kaplan versus
The City of New York.

There was a claim under the state law and the city law.

The claim was, that a supervisor masturbated

through his clothes while sitting next to an employee.

And the lower-court judge held that not only was that not severe or pervasive, it was actually a petty slight or trivial inconvenience under the New York City law.

But see, interestingly, on appeal, the Appellate Court said, no, you do absolutely have a different standard under City law.

The employer did not prove that this was a petty slight or trivial inconvenience, and the employee's case was allowed to go to trial.

So this is an absolutely clear example of how the City law, which our bill tracks, allowed a case to get to trial that New York State law would not have.

Here's another one.

In a 2018 case involving a Black woman -this is a case -- one of Laurie's cases, a Court
held that being called "a bitch" and "a Black bitch"
numerous times, along with comments such as, "This
bitch thinks she's the shit," and, "You Black people
think you are the shit," did not constitute severe
or pervasive harassment. 2018.

Also last year, the Second Circuit Court of

Appeals affirmed a lower court who held that the following conduct suffered by an African-American public school teacher in Westchester -- this was Rye -- was not severe or pervasive.

Plaintiff's colleague forwarded a derogatory e-mail, comparing a minority teenager to a downwardly evolved human, "homo slackass-erectus."

"This species receives benefits," the cartoon said, "and full government care. Unfortunately, most are highly fertile."

Another teacher referred to African-Americans as "Alabama porch monkeys."

Another teacher complained she didn't want another "Hernandez" in her class.

The same teacher told plaintiff in front of his class that it was her right as an American to use the n-word.

And a baseball coach told an African-American student that he ran as fast as a runaway slave.

Not severe or pervasive.

We've talked about -- a little bit about the accountability of institutions.

New York employers escape liability because they're often held to be not responsible for the hostile work environments created by their low-level

and mid-level supervisors. The only exception is the rare situation where the employee can prove that the employer encouraged, condoned, or expressly or impliedly approved the supervisor's conduct.

That's really hard to do.

It is very hard for an employee to ever prove that, somehow, the employer acquiesced or approved what the supervisor was doing.

And most New York State courts follow the federal example, which gets the employer completely off the hook if the employee failed to promptly use a reasonable avenue of complaint provided by the employer.

So we talked about this in February.

If the employee calls the wrong 800 number, calls too late, calls too early, complains about the wrong thing, then, under the Faragher-Ellerth defense, the employer is off the hook.

And, of course, all available research shows that most employees who suffer from unlawful, hostile work environments don't complain, usually because they have a quite justifiable fear of retaliation.

So, in some ways, New York law tracks federal law, as I just described. In some ways it's worse.

So New York does not provide for punitive damages, which means that awards, especially to low-wage workers, tend to be low and absorbable by

the employer as a cost of doing business.

Damages in New York State cases are only measured by the worker's economic loss, which could be low if it's a low-wage worker, and emotional distress, which is highly variable.

If an employee can't afford psychotherapy, for example, her damages are considered to be "garden variety," and limited to five figures or lower.

The employer, therefore, paying very little money, is incentivized to continue to employ the harasser and allow the harassment to continue as a cost of doing business.

Under New York law, an employee who wins a case can have the employer pay legal fees only if the case was based on sex discrimination.

And small employers are allowed to commit all forms of discrimination, except for discrimination.

Employers are only responsible for the acts of independent contractors if the unlawful conduct was based on sex discrimination.

As we will describe later, these anomalies

allow many forms of discrimination, especially discrimination against women of color, to go completely unchecked.

Again, all of this outrage without legislation is meaningless. Fundamental changes need to be made in the substantive law.

So 3817 and 7083A, introduced by

Senator Biaggi and Assemblymember Simotas, has now
been supported by many co-sponsors, including many
of you in this room -- thank you -- and more than
30 organizations, including the New York City Bar

Association, the National Employment Lawyers'

Project, Legal Aid Society, Make the Road, New York

Legal Momentum, the Chinese Staff and Workers

Association, Latino Justice, and others.

It would eliminate the "severe or pervasive" standard explicitly, and replace it with an employer's ability to prove that what happened was a petty slight or trivial inconvenience.

This comes right out of New York City law.

And as we heard from Dana Sussman, New York City law works.

Our bill holds employers absolutely liable for discriminatory and harassing acts of their supervisors, and allows employees, who prove that

they have been unlawfully discriminated against or harassed, to obtain punitive damages and have their attorney fees paid by the employer.

It also protects all employees of small employers, and it protects independent contractors.

So the #MeToo movement, and even some of the press coverage that I see of these hearings, might have reasonably led people to believe that, really, what we need to do right now is just strengthen the law against sexual harassment.

Given the press coverage, this assumption might be understandable, but it's dead-wrong, as my colleague Laurie Morrison will explain.

LAURIE MORRISON: Thank you, Miriam.

Hi, I am Laurie Morrison, employee advocate.

I have been representing victims of employment harassment, discrimination, and retaliation for almost 20 years.

And I'm also a member of the National Employment Lawyers' Association, both the national and the New York affiliate.

As Miriam described, the proposed bill, S3817, seeks to include important, critical provisions that are desperately needed in New York State law.

But I want to specifically talk about how it wants to eliminate the "severe or pervasive" analysis.

Why do we need to eliminate it?

Well, because it's a barrier; it's a barrier that says, if you're harassed in the workplace, you have to prove the harassment, but you also have to prove that the harassment you suffered is sufficiently egregious to warrant recognition and to warrant protection.

Okay, so we're telling people who are brave enough to come forward, these are survivors, these are thrivers, these are people who need to be applauded for coming forward --

It is terrifying to be alone in a workplace, to be harassed, to not be able to -- these people don't necessarily have trust funds. Okay? They need to work.

-- and we're telling them, if you are brave enough to come forward and complain so it stops happening to you, and, hopefully, it will help it stop happening to others, well, you need to prove your harassment, and you need to make sure that you're worthy of legal protection.

That's not okay, and it has never been okay.

And what "severe or pervasive" also does, is it further reduces protection of people who have suffered intersectional harassment.

We've talked about it today. Right?

So "intersectional harassment" are people who have been -- who have suffered and been targeted because of more than one characteristic.

They're a Black woman.

They're a White male who is disabled, who might be called, "You're not man enough," just 'cause he's disabled.

Well, that's his disability and his gender being attacked. Okay?

We have so many different examples of this.

We have transgender people who are struggling from this, because people are saying, Oh, well, which is this?

Okay, we don't have a way yet, or at least it hasn't been exercised yet, to deal with intersectional harassment.

So then you add on to it "severe or pervasive," according to studies, half of all people who bring intersectional harassment claims have no protection under the law, just because they happen to be a Black woman who was called a "Black bitch"

at work.

We have too many people who are not getting covered under the current New York State law, and "severe or pervasive" is paving the way for them to continue to not have that kind of protection.

Let me give you the example of the case that I've been working on.

This is a Black woman, repeatedly called "bitch," "Black bitch," "These Black people think they're the shit," and other egregious slurs in the workplace.

Now, it was very clear that this woman was being targeted specifically because of her race and her gender simultaneously.

Now, how do we know that?

Well, because White women were not ever called "bitch."

White and -- White women and White men were referred to by their proper names, not by their race.

So we have a clear signal that race and gender were at -- were at the center focal point here.

But, the intersectional nature of this woman's abuse, the "Black bitch," and otherwise, was

completely overlooked.

So the "Black" was segregated from "the bitch."

And then doing so minimized the severity and effect of the abuse this woman suffered.

So "severe or pervasive" analysis was applied to the "Black" portion in isolation, and then to the "bitch" portion in isolation.

And then it was found that just "bitch," in and of itself, or just "Black," in and of itself, is not sufficiently severe or pervasive to warrant protection under the current New York State law.

It gets worse.

The person who made these slurs was a woman, but she wasn't an African-American woman. So the "bitch" portion of the slurs were completely disregarded. They were considered just "intragender sparring"; one woman calling another woman "a bitch," no big deal.

Then they took the "Black" portion, segregated that as well, and they said, well, just "Black" alone, I'm sure this person was just trying to describe skin color.

They completely -- this is what occurred in reality.

I know, Senator Biaggi, I see your face.

I know, it's the same disgust, and I deal with it every single day with my clients, unfortunately.

That's why we have to change these laws.

So, when we do not understand, or do not respect or appreciate, the intersectionality, we are all more than just gender, race; we are so many things. We are gender and race and disability and sexual orientation.

There are so many ways that we can be targeted for harassment.

And if we don't look at those ways and respect those ways, we're not going to protect people who are victims.

But if we keep "severe or pervasive," it's going to get even worse.

And it still is worse, just like I've just described.

So, intersectionality research, intersectionality experts, such as Leah Warner and others, have provided research to show, that not only are intersectional claims only half as likely to win, they are the least likely of all to get any protection under our current laws.

They've also found, intersectional researchers, that women of color are most at risk for mistreatment.

Well, our laws inform our behaviors, so we're not surprised at that, are we?

They're least protected, so they're the ones that you want to target.

If we overlook the fundamental aspects of harassment, such as the intersectional nature of abuse, then we help the harassers achieve their goal, because we reduce protection for a large portion of our population.

And this negatively affects all of us.

Like I said, there could be a gay woman in the workplace who's targeted because she's a gay woman, but a heterosexual man might be treated differently, a gay man might be treated differently.

A disabled man might be called "less than a man" in the workplace. It's because he's a disabled man, not one or the other.

So we cannot have a law that takes who we are and segregates them, and then puts an artificial, "severe or pervasive" analysis on top of that.

And by the way, the "severe or pervasive" analysis is being determined and judged by someone

who wasn't there. They didn't see what happened.

So let's go ahead and distort what happened, and then let's have a third party be blind to the intersectionality and impose an artificial standard that has not worked, and won't work.

Now, Assemblyman Crespo, earlier, when you were speaking with the HID, thank you, you asked, have they heard, "Well, this harasser just got away with it?"

Let me answer the question for you.

I have heard that daily.

I have heard it from my clients.

And, unfortunately, I have seen it in person, with these people being brave enough to come forward.

And because someone imposed a "severe or pervasive" barrier on them, the "Black bitch," all these other horrible words, not severe or pervasive.

Do you think the harasser got away with it?

Absolutely, and it happens time and time

again.

Now, I want to add as well, that some people are concerned that if we remove "severe or pervasive," well, people will just be able to claim harassment, and that's it, and employers will go

down, and small employers especially, we have to be careful.

Well, to be clear, again, without "severe or pervasive," you still have to prove harassment, and it's not an easy thing to do.

So you still have to prove your case.

And, employers, they have no interest, at least I hope, to having a workplace that's divided on these severe or pervasive, non-intersectional, artificial grounds.

No one wants a workplace where the workers are divided amongst each other, and before themselves.

And as we've said and as we've seen, people of color, intersectional people, they are suffering, we are all suffering, severe PTSD, because when we finally do stand forward and are brave enough to complain, our law takes a blind eye and says, You're not protected, you're not good enough. Who you are is who we don't want to see.

We cannot allow this to happen in our law.

We cannot allow our workers to not be protected.

Let them focus on doing a good job; not on having to avoid harassment because the law is not

1 helping them. 2 Thank you. ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: First of all, thank you 3 for your patience and for your testimony. 4 A couple of questions. 5 6 The -- have you handled cases regarding 7 violations or not following last year's implementation of the new policies? 8 9 MIRIAM CLARK: Not yet. 10 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Have you seen specific 11 cases? 12 MIRIAM CLARK: Last year's policies, 13 I haven't yet. 14 LAURIE MORRISON: Not yet. 15 MIRIAM CLARK: Although, I have had cases 16 where the additional affirmation, that the plaintiff 17 wanted the NDA, came into play. That's the only interface I've had so far 18 19 with the new policies. 20 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Okay. 21 And in Aravella's bill, 7083, you mentioned, 22 if we get rid of the "severe or pervasive" standard, 23 and we apply, instead, the petty slight or 24 inconvenience, that would -- explain one more time,

just, layman's terms, what difference does that

25

make?

So -- so the victim wouldn't have to prove that the incident was severe or pervasive; instead the employer would have to prove that what occurred amounts to a petty slight or inconvenience.

MIRIAM CLARK: Right. So back --

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So it puts the pressure off the --

MIRIAM CLARK: -- backing for one minute, though --

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- yep.

MIRIAM CLARK: -- as Laurie said, and this is important, sexual harassment is illegal because it changes the terms and conditions of the person's work environment because of gender.

Let's talk about gender.

So the employee still has to prove that there was harassment, that it was because of gender or gender and race, or whatever protected class, and that the terms and conditions of her environment were changed as a result; that something happened, and that it happened to her because she was a woman.

Under the "severe or pervasive" standard, she would then have to prove that what happened was severe or pervasive, using this line of increasingly

restrictive cases, sort of like what I described.

Under the New York City law, and under our law, the employer -- the burden of proof would shift to the employer to say, Wait a minute, that was trivial, that was petty.

And so that's why, in the Kaplan case, involving the supervisor, the employer was not able to prove on -- that, on papers, this kind of conduct was petty slight or trivial inconvenience. And that's why the case did not get dismissed.

LAURIE MORRISON: Yeah, the "petty slight and inconvenience" is the defense.

MIRIAM CLARK: Right.

LAURIE MORRISON: So first the -- right, so, first, the employee has to -- squarely has to prove the burden, the employee was harassed.

MIRIAM CLARK: Because of her membership in a protected class.

LAURIE MORRISON: Exactly. Or in the membership in several protected classes.

MIRIAM CLARK: Right.

So we're not talking about, you know, generalized workplace bullying, even though we would like to be.

We're really talking about conduct because of

membership in one or more protected classes that changes the terms and conditions of employment.

That's Employment Law 101.

But instead of the burden on the employee, the burden shifts to the employer to prove that it's petty slight or a trivial inconvenience.

LAURIE MORRISON: Exactly.

Once the employee proves harassment occurred, then the employer -- the burden shifts to the employer to say, Okay, maybe it occurred, but it was a just a petty slight or inconvenience.

And if the employer cannot prove that it was just a petty slight and inconvenience, you win --

MIRIAM CLARK: So, yeah --

LAURIE MORRISON: -- basically. You get protected.

MIRIAM CLARK: -- or in Kaplan, you get past a motion to dismissed.

LAURIE MORRISON: Correct.

MIRIAM CLARK: Most of these -- this issues come up way before a person ever gets to a jury.

They come up in either motions to dismiss, which is a motion that the employer makes right after you file the complaint; no discovery, no nothing.

That's what happened in Kaplan.

On the complaint, the employee described the masturbation in all of its glory. And the employer made a motion to dismiss the case (snaps fingers) up front, saying that what was written in that complaint was not severe or pervasive.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: We also have this underlying concern that expanding protections to all employees, and to more classes of employees, is going to hurt business.

And the first question, I guess the moral question, we have to ask ourselves is, what is more valuable: the rights and protections of every individual to be free of harassment, or the potential financial interest of an entity, corporation, or business owner or individual?

I would think that would be an easy answer.

I asked a question to the City earlier, if they're expanded -- or, their approach to these protections had hurt business?

And while there wasn't a specific issue,

I just want you to reiterate the message, and you

pointed it out in your testimony: There is

tremendous cost to businesses because of the issues

arising from harassment in the workplace; whether

it's the productivity impacts, whether it's the physical and/or emotional distress on an employee, whether it's that employee now requiring additional services that are expensive to the employer to provide, because of the ramifications of all of these things.

So, in your experience, again, looking at other jurisdictions, like the city of New York, would you say it is a highly exaggerated notion, that expanding these protections will end up costing businesses more than, say, the improvement to productivity and morale, and workforce in general, of having a high standard of protection?

MIRIAM CLARK: I would say it goes even further than that.

It's wrong thinking to think that this is going to have a negative impact economically on employers in the long run.

In the long run, a workforce where there's sexual harassment, racial harassment, is a divided, unproductive, physically- and psychologically-ill workforce with a high turnover.

And I can tell you, my clients, who are still employed, come to me, they're having such a hard time concentrating.

You know, I have a woman right now who works in a big bakery upstate. And, you know, there's derogatory terms written at her workstation. And every time she sees it, she goes into the bathroom and she cries, and she debates about whether she'd reported it, even though it doesn't really help.

And, you know, she's not herself for the rest of the day.

That's -- she could be a great worker, but she's being horribly, painfully distracted, and you know she's not the only one.

LAURIE MORRISON: If I may add dollars and cents to this as well, how this is going to affect or potentially harm business depends on how we're going to define "business." Right?

So if we're going to go ahead and have a law that says, anything other than severe or pervasive, you can go ahead and harass people, are we actually doing business, or are we just fostering harassment in the workplace?

Are we're just giving a space where we say, Harassers, go ahead, have at it?

Okay?

But also in terms of, money, just dollars and cents, it is so much more expensive to try to say,

Oh, well, no, this is not severe or pervasive.

And fighting this, because employers are trying to now get away with, because there's this whole fear of, I don't want to be caught, versus, make the law make sense and make the law be clear, so that it becomes less expensive, far less expensive, for an employer to say, Supervisor, you did that, you're out.

Okay?

That doesn't cost much.

What costs a lot of money is when they're trying to hide how severe or pervasive it is.

When you're trying to get -- work within that law and that huge gray area called the "severe or pervasive analysis," it is so confusing, no one knows what's protected and what's not protected.

That, is what costs businesses money.

MIRIAM CLARK: Just an obvious point is that

New York law, for sexual harassment only, already

covers all employers. It's an anomaly in the law

that, sexual harassment, by itself, is somehow

privileged over other forms of harassment, which is

something that has to be changed for all the reasons

that Laurie said.

And, frankly, it's hard to understand how

it's moral, ethical, or constitutional to, you know, privilege one form of harassment over another.

LAURIE MORRISON: Yeah, what kind of message is that sending, privileging one kind of harasser over the other.

MIRIAM CLARK: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Well, listen, just, last comment.

I appreciate your leadership, your voices, your ability to help us come up with a draft of good legislation.

I think there are really good bills out there that need to be seriously considered, that, hopefully, we can move forward with in the very near future.

And to what has been stated over and over again throughout all presentations: We need results. We need to take action. We need to expand those protections. We need to create real accountability, and real liability, for violations of these protections.

And for you to highlight that intersectionality of all of these issues.

Somebody, you know, in our community, the Latino community, we've it seen in our immigrant

community, and, you're right, there's always this -it's difficult to outline exactly where or what is
the thing that is causing people to treat me
differently.

Some of us have been accustomed to just accepting that that's the way it is and/or that, because of who we are, maybe there's just more to talk about.

And it's something we have to kind of, even ourselves, get out of.

I'm a legislator, I get a chance to sit here and ask these questions, and talk about this, and maybe shape some of this policy.

But, I've got to tell you, even me, I feel it every day.

I don't -- I often go into a room feeling
like I shouldn't even be in that room to begin with.

I have to work that extra hard to feel like I fit
in; let alone, how I'm talked to or treated, I often
overlook, or ignore, because I don't measure myself
in the same.

And that's something that, as a community, many of us have to grow out of.

And, yet, as a male, I have advantages that others don't, and my daughters may not have.

And so, again, I just want to thank you for your leadership, and for fighting.

And I hope that all these years of advocacy will finally see some real light of day as this committee leads into its legislative work.

MIRIAM CLARK: Thank you.

LAURIE MORRISON: May I say, you're saying that you've become accustomed to it.

I think you've had to adapt to it.

And that's, unfortunately, what a lot of us have had to do.

When the law doesn't protect you, and you still have to work, you have to adapt to it, but you still feel it every day. Right?

MIRIAM CLARK: And until the point where you can't adapt.

LAURIE MORRISON: Exactly.

Exactly.

SENATOR BIAGGI: No, I just -- I mean, I just wanted to thank you for your testimony, and for being on the record with those examples, because I think it's incredibly important for those individuals who don't really understand the behavior that doesn't reach the "severe or pervasive" standard.

This is probably where so much of the confusion lies.

You know, we have about 13 days left of session, I believe, which means that we're going to work incredibly hard to prioritize these bills.

And so I think my only question that I have for all three of you, because you know that we will be met with resistance:

For those individuals, whether they're colleagues, although I can't imagine that that would be the case, especially after today, who wouldn't want this; but, more importantly, for any type of advocacy organization or special interest that would lobby against us doing this now, or have, probably, the strongest argument against doing this now, what would be your best argument, other than what we've already heard, right, of how it is bad for business?

The fact that the business council came out with that disappointing statement today, was,

I mean, not -- it wasn't surprising.

But I'm sure that we'll hear more of that as the weeks go on.

So -- I mean, in just the last moments

I guess that we have together, if you have any
advice for myself and Assemblywoman Simotas for some

of the arguments that you think will be made that we haven't foreseen yet?

Because I find that, even if you think you're on the right side of things, there's always some -- like today, there's always some instance where something surprises you, and then you're not necessarily prepared.

And if you are not prepared also to answer this question, you know, that's all right. You know where to find us.

MIRIAM CLARK: I mean, we've give an lot of thought to this, obviously.

So, we've talked about the cost of harassment in the workplace. Right?

We've talked about New York City economy thriving.

And I think it's also true, although
I haven't researched it, although I could, that
every time that the law has moved toward greater
protection of workers, the same exact argument is
being made: That this is going to be bad for
business.

My bet is, that you could go back and look at reactions of these people all the way back to

Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or maybe

even 1945, and find these same arguments.

2 There's a real fear.

But I think that Assemblymember Crespo hit it on the head: At a certain point, you have to think about all of the employers, all of the employees, and their need to earn a livelihood, with dignity and with respect, and their ability to be productive, and they're wanting to be productive, and measure that against an inchoate, unmeasurable, and probably not real threat to somebody's profit.

Right?

And it's one thing to think about it in the context of a very small employer, like, your mother-in-law's barbershop.

But, I mean, when you think about the employer as, say, Columbia University, it's really hard to imagine that getting rid of the "severe or pervasive" standard, getting rid of Farragher-Ellerith, is going to bankrupt Columbia.

ANDREA JOHNSON: That's right.

(Indiscernible cross-talking) --

LAURIE MORRISON: (Indiscernible

23 | cross-talking) -- please.

ANDREA JOHNSON: -- so I'll just add,

I always find this question challenging because it's

kind of, like, what's the business argument for human rights?

Like, it's human rights, and we shouldn't be kind of making this into dollars and cents.

But, I also am a pragmatic person and understand how it works.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Of course.

ANDREA JOHNSON: And so -- I mean, yeah, I'll just reiterate, the productivity and health impacts for employees are significant. That leads to turnover, which is costly for employers, and that's definitely, yeah, a piece of it.

And I think -- I think we're in a moment where -- and it's not just moment -- it's a movement that is continuing strong, the #MeToo movement.

It's impacting a generation, where folks are realizing that we -- it's not -- we can't just do business as usual before. You can't just have a policy on the books about, you know, don't harass, here's the law, comply with it, check the box, and be done.

Like, that is not acceptable.

And we want to make sure that's not acceptable per the law, but I think also, culturally, it's becoming less and less acceptable.

And so employers need to change regardless, but we need the law to make sure that that is true across the board.

And -- I mean, it's -- liability is a cost.

And, already, I think employers are -- employees much more aware of their rights and feel much more empowered in this moment to speak up.

And that is an amazing aspect of the #MeToo movement.

And so that is a business-case argument to have -- you know, you need to be doing the right thing.

And the law is trying to push employers to have practices, and change structures, so that the right thing is done from the beginning so that you prevent harassment and you don't end up with lawsuits in the end.

So -- and I think, you know, recruiting talent kind of thing, I mean, New York has an interest in recruiting talent.

And I think to your point about mentioning California, you know, you want to be seen as a leader in this space, and businesses need to be there as well.

And so you need to be creating business

environments that are safe and dignified, and that 1 that's where people want to work. 2 I mean, everybody wants to work, obviously, 3 but I think that's especially, acutely, people are 4 5 aware now. LAURIE MORRISON: And if I may add, the 6 7 New York City law already doesn't have "severe or pervasive" or Faragher-Ellerth. 8 9 So if they say suddenly making the New York State law comport with New York City law is going to 10 11 cause such costs, well, really? 12 That's like saying the water is going to be 13 wetter. 14 It just doesn't really -- it doesn't work. 15 [Laughter.] 16 LAURIE MORRISON: Okay? 17 But on top of it, you know, people fear 18 change. 19 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Yep. 20 LAURIE MORRISON: So I think a lot of times 21 what they're talking about is, you need something, 22 something's going to change?

Then, okay, but that same change has created a stronger workforce.

23

24

25

Employers were terrified back in the '50s and

'60s about, you know, giving women and minority -- and racial minorities the ability to vote.

Well, we're a lot wealthier now because of it, as a nation.

So your business, I don't care who you are, small or large, is only as good as the strength of your workforce.

So let's keep our workforce strong and make our laws protect them.

SENATOR BIAGGI: That's right.

Thank you so much.

I could not agree with you more.

I think the question was more so about the individuals surrounding us who are fear -- who are afraid of the disruption that we are potentially causing their status quo.

But this was incredibly helpful.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I -- we have -- I have a couple of more colleagues to present, but I just want to take a second, first of all, thank everybody who's still in the room with us and going strong.

As you know, we've reiterated a number of times, we went on for 11 1/2 hours the last time.

I think we're going to beat that record today.

But, I'm only saying that because I just want to remind everybody, we purposely did not apply the clock to this conversation -- we didn't do it in February, we didn't do it today -- because we understand, and didn't want to rush a discussion, and we wanted to give everybody ample time to really discuss in-depth.

But I think we -- it's incumbent upon all of us to also then try to be as succinct and respectable of that time as possible.

So, we have three more -- four more members, questions for this panel, but we will ask the student group --

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: I thought we were done.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: No, no.

-- the student group that's here, we will ask them to come up next, so that -- I appreciate that you have been this patient, and with everybody in the room patient enough, with us.

So Assemblywoman Simotas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you.

I think what your testimony has highlighted is that the reforms that were passed last year were not enough.

Just training people on an insufficient,

ineffective standard is not going to change our system.

So that is why your testimony today is so very important, to establish why we need to get rid of the "severe or pervasive" standard.

Now, I'm going to get into my geeky lawyer self and ask a question that may be asked of myself and Senator Biaggi when we debate this bill.

With respect to any precedent with respect to New York City law, now, clearly, the standard that the City applies has been around since 2009.

Since then, has there been any case law that you would find did not track the correct standard?

We hear that there's -- as you testified, there's a host of federal and state decisions that are applying the state law that can, you know, make your skin crawl.

But are there any examples with respect to courts applying the City law?

MIRIAM CLARK: Well, Kaplan, I hate to keep talking about this quite disgusting case, but, that's what happened with a lower court in Kaplan.

The lower court in Kaplan tried to apply the same State law standard to the City law claim, and got reversed.

1 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: On appeal. 2 MIRIAM CLARK: On appeal. ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: So there's no other 3 district court other than that one case? 4 5 MIRIAM CLARK: There's probably others. 6 I mean, we know of the ones where the two 7 were clearly delineated in that way, but there might be some bad City law cases out there, I'm sure there 8 9 are. ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: May I ask, Miriam, as 10 11 we're going through the process, if you can provide 12 the Senator and myself (indiscernible 13 cross-talking) --14 MIRIAM CLARK: Do you want some City cases 15 under the City law where the court applied the wrong 16 standard? 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: No. 18 MIRIAM CLARK: No. 19 Go ahead. 20 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: What I want, if they 21 misinterpreted the standard, or if -- you know, if it needs to be clarified. 22 I just want to make sure what we're doing now 23 is going to be right. 24 25 LAURIE MORRISON: It's going to stick.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Exactly.

MIRIAM CLARK: Sure.

I mean, there -- especially in the early days, there were definitely decisions where the courts kept veering off towards "severe or pervasive," and had to be veered back in.

So, sure, we can get you those.

LAURIE MORRISON: I mean -- and I'd like to say, that's why we call it the "practice" of law, right, because we're really never going to make it perfect.

But I think, to your point, the City law is really -- we have a good law here. We have it -- you know, we can always make improvements, but we have some clear guidelines here that can help.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: And we can always amend our sponsors' memo, we can always do things to put things in the administrative record, that if there's ever a question, and there's actually a good law or a law clerk doing the research, they can look into the legislative history of the bill to understand what our intention is.

MIRIAM CLARK: Perfect.

LAURIE MORRISON: And the City law, by the way, I cite, and I'm sure all of our colleagues,

Miriam cites as well, the intention behind the City 1 law we cite it all the time, to make it -- and thank 2 you for that -- because it makes it clear "severe or 3 pervasive" is not appropriate. 4 MIRIAM CLARK: Remedial --5 6 LAURIE MORRISON: Any type of discrimination --7 MIRIAM CLARK: -- right. 8 Remedial purpose of the law. Don't construe 9 the same as. Should be a floor and not a ceiling. 10 11 All of that language. Some of we put it -- we put some of that into 12 13 3817, but all of that language helps courts 14 understand that they're not looking at, you know, another version of Title 7. 15 16 LAURIE MORRISON: Right. 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you. 18 LAURIE MORRISON: Thank you. 19 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simon. 20 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Technology, you know, 21 you can't live with it, can't live without it. 22 So, I'm going to ask you a question that 23 I know you know the answer to. 24 And, last night, when some of us were having

a brief -- was it last night, or the night before,

25

I don't remember -- where there was a briefing on this bill.

And I remember this case as being somewhere in the Midwest, and it was a school case, and I was wrong.

It was actually Upstate New York, and it was a school bus driver, who pleaded guilty to raping a 14-year-old. He had applied her with gifts and alcohol, and raped her, and -- a 26-year-old man.

And the Court did not give him any jail time.

MIRIAM CLARK: Yep.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: And said, in explaining the sentence, the judge said that "he had no prior arrests, and that only one victim had to be involved."

So, in other words, one rape is okay.

And this notion of "severe and pervasive" is really about, it's okay to discriminate or to harass or to rape or to assault a couple of times, right.

And, you know, sociologists, and people who do research, and also law professors do research.

And I had asked about, you know, "how many pass is enough" kind of thing.

And you were talking about the "noose" article, and I don't know if there are other

1 articles out there. But I'm curious, if you could address that 2 issue on the record? 3 MIRIAM CLARK: Sure. 4 5 So the "severe or pervasive" standard leads to discussion about what exactly is "pervasive." 6 Right? 7 So it says "or." 8 So then if something only happened once, is 9 it "severe"? 10 11 So, again, it's a federal standard. 12 And what I said on Tuesday night was, there's 13 actually a split in the circuit. So the federal courts have the lower courts, 14 15 which are the district courts, and then the circuit 16 courts, and then the Supreme Court. 17 There are nine circuit courts. There's is a split in the federal circuits 18 about whether one "noose" is sufficiently severe to 19 20 meet the standard. 21 The 9th Circuit recently held that one noose 22 is not severe.

So there's actually -- as I said, I found a "Law Review" article that essentially says, you know, is one noose enough?

23

24

25

There's still some debate, although I think it's recently been resolved, about whether one use of the n-word is severe.

Certainly, under the cases that I described at the last hearing, it was perfectly clear that having your -- one time your bra strap gets pulled, one time you get squeezed; one touching is absolutely not severe.

For a while there was a split in the circuits about whether one rape was severe, although I think that may have come down in the employee's favor since then.

So, hard to believe.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Clearly this guy.

MIRIAM CLARK: Right, right.

Well, that was a criminal case. Right?

We're talking about the workplace.

So -- right, the -- and so then you get equally idiotic results about, what's "pervasive"?

Right?

What does "pervasive" mean?

It pervades the workplace.

So that's, like, you know, Laurie's case.

Well, if it happened 5 times in 10 years,

that's once every 2 years, that's not really

pervasive, the courts have found.

I think I have one of those in my testimony about -- on the "pervasive" piece of this idiocy.
Right?

So -- yeah, here you go.

I was describing to you the case about the school teacher in Westchester. Right?

It cited a case from New York, "Seven racially-insensitive comments over three years, including one instance of using the n-word, were not pervasive."

So, yeah, this is what happens with the "severe or pervasive" standard.

And I want to say that there's a lot of federal case law, that when the courts feel like citing it, talks about, you're not supposed to take things in isolation. You're supposed to, you know, look at the totality of the circumstances.

And when a particular judge feels like doing an overall analysis, he or she will do one.

But especially New York State court judges, when they have really high caseloads, they're not accustomed to writing long opinions. What they tend to do is just, boom (snaps fingers), say, "We follow Title 7," and then apply their gut as to whether,

you know, one noose is enough, or whatever.

So it was a very thoughtful and calculated decision on our part to specifically eliminate the "severe or pervasive" language in this legislation, and then to incorporate the New York City affirmative defense of petty slights and trivial inconvenience.

LAURIE MORRISON: I think it's important to add, as well, on top of that, the "severe or pervasive" analysis keeps changing.

When it first started, it's like -- it's like trying to nail jello to a wall.

When it first started, it was clear, fairly, that one use of the n-word was enough. That's severe or pervasive.

MIRIAM CLARK: And it was.

LAURIE MORRISON: Now, you can use the n-word and the b-word a lot, "b" being either Black or bitch, whichever one it's applying to, and, you know, you have to actually count --

MIRIAM CLARK: How many times.

LAURIE MORRISON: -- yeah.

So you're caught -- and I can't tell you how many times I've had to do this, and not -- when we talk about it right now, it feels frustrating to

1 have to explain it to a client. It's demeaning. 2 Okay? Well, you were called the n-word five times, 3 and you were called the "bitch" word six times, and 4 the "Black bitch" word seven times. 5 6 So -- but there was a case where it was --7 you -- you're -- you're -- you're two less than another case. 8 It is -- what are we sending to our workers? 9 10 But also what the "severe or pervasive" 11 problem is doing now, is we're having these numbers. 12 Now, who in the world in the workplace, if 13 they're hearing in n-word a lot, is going, okay, 14 that's seven, that's eight, that's nine, I better 15 write those down. 16 I actually had some people ask me: 17 Okay, well, you're able to describe --18 through the client in a deposition: 19 You're able to describe exactly what 20 happened; that it happened repeatedly during this

You're able to describe exactly what happened; that it happened repeatedly during this period of time by this person. And you were there and they were there, and you're able to describe all of that.

21

22

23

24

25

But can you tell us the exact date and time that this occurred?

MIRIAM CLARK: And we need to know that. 1 LAURIE MORRISON: Well, that must not be 2 3 severe or pervasive, then, because you must be lying, because you have to prove the exact number of 4 times that you heard the n-word or the b-word. 5 6 MIRIAM CLARK: Because if it was only once, 7 it's not pervasive. LAURIE MORRISON: Well, yeah. 8 9 And if it was seven, but not ten. Right? So that's -- so -- I mean, it -- it -- we're 10 11 falling down a rabbit hole of -- of -- of 12 ridiculousness, that "severe or pervasive" begs. 13 So we need to get rid of this. This is 14 not -- yeah. 15 This is reality of what's happening every day 16 because of these analyses. 17 That's why we have to get rid of them. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 19 I just also want to comment on that. 20 Do you think that's also because the state 21 courts are applying the federal standard which is 22 the "and" versus the "or"? 23 LAURIE MORRISON: No, they're both -- they're 24 both "or." 25 MIRIAM CLARK: They're both "or."

```
SENATOR BIAGGI: I thought that the federal
1
        was the "and."
 2
               LAURIE MORRISON: No.
 3
               MIRIAM CLARK: No.
 4
 5
               LAURIE MORRISON: They're both "severe or."
6
               SENATOR BIAGGI: So where does the "and" come
7
        from?
8
               LAURIE MORRISON: Well, it's because --
9
               MIRIAM CLARK: Courts screw it up.
               LAURIE MORRISON: -- exactly.
10
11
               MIRIAM CLARK: People screw it up.
12
               It's "or."
13
               LAURIE MORRISON: but I want to be clear,
14
        the cases that I'm talking about, where my client
15
        has to figure out how many times it's happened --
16
               Which is, who does that?
17
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Crazy, crazy.
18
               LAURIE MORRISON: -- these are federal court
19
        cases.
20
               MIRIAM CLARK: But they're applying the state
21
        law. Right.
22
               LAURIE MORRISON: Yes, they're applying the
23
        state law, and they're applying it just like the
24
        Title 7.
25
               MIRIAM CLARK: Right, right.
```

And state courts do the same thing, only less verbosely, usually.

SENATOR BIAGGI: That's -- that's crazy.

LAURIE MORRISON: And we're seeing this happen in depositions, and everything, where, you know, well, they have to prove severe or pervasive, so let me go ahead and make sure this victim can give you a number.

And, it doesn't work.

that.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So I just want to be, like, clear on the record: So the state courts in New York are applying the wrong standard on occasion?

MIRIAM CLARK: No -- well, I have to correct

I mean, I think -- I have seen cases where a judge mistakenly writes "severe and" instead of "severe or," not only in New York, but in federal cases as well.

But everyone understands that the standard really is "or."

And as we described, the "or" standard is problematic enough.

LAURIE MORRISON: And not for nothing,

I think when there -- like, a lot of times when
they're using "severe and pervasive," it's a

```
Freudian slip --
1
               MIRIAM CLARK: Right.
 2
               I mean, everybody --
 3
               LAURIE MORRISON: -- because they're
 4
 5
        basically applying a much higher standard that needs
6
        to happen --
7
               MIRIAM CLARK: Everybody --
               LAURIE MORRISON: -- which is "severe or
 8
9
        pervasive."
10
               MIRIAM CLARK: -- everybody understands that
11
        it's "or."
12
               Right, everyone does understand that.
13
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, thank you for
14
        clarifying that.
15
               ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: (Indiscernible.)
16
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Yes.
17
               Assemblymember Gottfried.
               ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: A couple of things.
18
19
               One, if it hasn't happened yet, I'm sure, at
20
        some point, some judge is going to say, you've got
21
        such a detailed explanation with dates and times,
22
        you must have made it up.
23
               LAURIE MORRISON: Or you must have been
24
        preparing for litigation.
25
               ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Yeah.
```

1 LAURIE MORRISON: It's a catch-22. ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Yeah. 2 MIRIAM CLARK: Right. 3 LAURIE MORRISON: You better name the dates; 4 otherwise, we don't believe you. 5 6 And if you do name the dates --7 MIRIAM CLARK: You must be preparing for litigation. 8 LAURIE MORRISON: -- we don't believe you 9 10 because you must have been trying to prepare for 11 litigation. 12 Right? 13 MIRIAM CLARK: Right. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Right. 15 And the other thought is that, nobody would 16 apply this standard to petty larceny. 17 I mean, if you were accused of only two or three times grabbing a \$20 bill from her purse while 18 she was away from her desk, nobody would say, Oh, 19 20 it's only two or three times. 21 And if the thief said, Well, if she had complained, I would have given it back. 22 23 [Laughter.] 24 ASSEMBLYMAN GOTTFRIED: Nobody would say, Oh, 25 okay, case dismissed.

The main thing I wanted to say is, I just want to thank all of you, and I'm sure there are others who have contributed to this process, and, certainly, the working group is a key part of this.

You've helped put together, really, an extraordinary package.

And at least as important as putting it together, is what you've done to explain it to us in really great detail, legally, and in terms of the practicalities.

And I think the work that all of you have been doing on this, I hope we are going to be able to take advantage of the new political alignment in the Legislature to make some really extraordinary changes in the law.

And, if and when we are able to achieve that, you and your colleagues are really going to be the ones who made it happen.

So, thank you.

MIRIAM CLARK: Thank you very much.

LAURIE MORRISON: Thank you.

ANDREA JOHNSON: Thank you.

MIRIAM CLARK: You can do a lot in the next, however, 13 days.

LAURIE MORRISON: And I just have to say

thank you, to Miriam, who -- and people who work 1 2 with her, so much, to be able to help create this law, and the intersectionality scholars who have 3 really contributed so much. 4 You know --5 6

MIRIAM CLARK: It was a group effort.

LAURIE MORRISON: -- well, yeah.

MIRIAM CLARK: But we do think that 3817 is one's best, most efficient shot at getting -- of getting this right.

And we're really grateful to have the City law as a model.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Are you done?

SENATOR BIAGGI: Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Oh, okay.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Assemblymember Quart.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Thank you.

And thank you for your presentation.

I just wanted to pick up on something Ms. Morrison and Ms. Clark talked about, about the practice of law.

And, especially, something stuck with me, Ms. Clark, about summary judgment, in your testimony, because, in so many areas of the law, in civil practice, the results are just the opposite.

The tribal issue of fact goes to the moving party more often than not, except in this area.

And I suspect that has a lot to do with the exceedingly high and faulty standard, as well as the affirmative defense that lets employers walk away from their employee's conduct.

But I wanted to explore with you, and -- if there are other areas that act as obstacles to parties bringing forth their complaints in a successful way through the court system?

And I don't know the answer to this, but I would -- Article 16 is very broad, rules of discovery and disclosure.

I don't practice in this area, but I wanted to know, from your perspective, are there any changes in civil practice, or best practices, that other states follow, that we could duplicate or replicate in civil practice, that may require statutory reform?

We did so in criminal law this year.

Are there any changes in this particular area that you see that would take away some of the obstacles to an aggrieved party getting justice in this area?

MIRIAM CLARK: What a great question.

LAURIE MORRISON: Yeah, it is.

MIRIAM CLARK: You know, I think I'd like to get back to you on that.

There are things that come to mind, but, because it's sort of a CPLR question, I think I want to think about it.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Yeah.

MIRIAM CLARK: I can tell you that the mandatory mediation for employment-discrimination cases in the Southern District is a successful program, that I think I would encourage the State to implement.

Also, in the Southern District, at least, there is a pro se office that helps pro se plaintiffs.

There's not that kind of help for a pro se plaintiff in State Supreme Court, at least not in New York County.

And I do think that that would be something else that would be beneficial.

Finally, in my personal experience, many
New York State court judges don't understand the
law.

They don't understand the election of remedies that we talked about;

They don't understand that the statute of limitations is tolled while you're at the state division;

They don't -- it's a very complicated mechanism.

And, you know, sometimes we've had to go up to the Appellate Division, just to have them clarify something basis that a lower court -- basic that a lower-court judge got wrong.

So I think better training for trial-level judges about the substance of the New York State law and its procedural mechanism would be enormous.

And then I'd like to get back to you, when I talk to --

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: And that your answer -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

LAURIE MORRISON: And I'd actually also like to add, some type of enforcement with respect to acknowledging and -- and -- and -- and staying pure to the summary-judgment standard.

MIRIAM CLARK: Oh, yes.

LAURIE MORRISON: Because there are way, way too many cases, I think it was 65 percent, or something, of employment cases, nationally, don't quote me on that, but, a high, high majority of

summary judgment -- of employment cases,
discrimination, harassment, and retaliation, are out
on summary judgment.

Now  $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$  but there are very interesting issues with that.

It also depends on the race, the intersectionality, what we're arguing, and, actually, even the decision-maker who's making the decision to dismiss the case.

The race of that decision-maker affects the number, where, it could be 65 to 75 percent, but if the race of the decision-maker is a person of color, I think it goes down to about 35, 45 percent.

MIRIAM CLARK: So having a diverse judiciary is incredibly important.

LAURIE MORRISON: Very, very important.

MIRIAM CLARK: So we have to --

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Yeah, that actually, that comment, leads into my second question about other obstacles that may exist, and that's the court system.

In other areas where we want to incentivize some sort of policy goal, either through legislation or OCA, we do certain things.

We have specialized parts for medical

malpractice, or asbestos. If you're 70 years old, you receive a trial preference.

We do all sorts of things, whether through,

I won't call -- we set forth our policy preferences
in our court system because we want a more fair
system towards some aggrieved party.

It's my understanding we do not do that in this area.

So my question is: Are there obstacles we can remove, or things we can do, within the court system, within the -- that we can request of the chief judge or OCA, that will take away another obstacle towards someone who's likely been harassed, being able to set forth their proofs in a court of law?

MIRIAM CLARK: Can I take that back to Neil in New York and get back to you?

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Sure.

MIRIAM CLARK: I mean, I said the ones that sort of came to the top of my head, but I'm betting that there are more.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Sure.

LAURIE MORRISON: Yeah, and there are a lot of -- this is a conversation that can be ongoing, and I think should be ongoing.

And thank you so much for the question.

I have to also say, when judges are making these decisions, they could be well meaning, right, but employment discrimination, harassment, is -- it's a very personal, visual thing.

So when you're looking at a piece of paper and you're seeing a bunch of, you know, "Black" or, this, or - or -- or "gay," or whatever it is, it's very difficult to really see -- you're not seeing the person.

So when I stand in front of someone and I'm talking -- I just did this the other day, where I was talking in front of the judges, and I said, My client, she's mocha-colored like me, and she's a Black woman.

And I tell you -- and I told them specifically, I'm telling you that so you can look at the face of what this happened when I tell you what she was told.

And you could see that that made such a difference.

But when you're just looking at a piece of paper with some names, and you've got a thousand other cases to deal with, employment discrimination is, just, it's uncomfortable, it's a lot of work,

and -- and it's -- and it really lends itself to, sometimes, them wanting to get rid of it, even if they're good and well meaning.

I think some way to maybe also get the victims in front of their faces while they're describing it, or while they're having to make these decisions, might also help.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: I think, to your point, in -- both in this area and criminal law, diversity on the bench --

LAURIE MORRISON: Oh, huge.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: -- is so critical.

You've tried cases, you talked to jurors, you tell them, "use your own common sense, use your own experience." That recommendation is not separate and distinct from a judge.

And if there's not diversity, you hope they can sort of get out of themselves and see it through another person's lens.

But if you have both diversity and excellence amongst your judges, then I think you're farther along in achieving that.

LAURIE MORRISON: And it's also diversity of thought and ideology as well. Yeah.

MIRIAM CLARK: Another barrier, I just want

to say this is obvious, but a barrier, altogether, are mandatory arbitration clauses.

And legislation that would ban -- that would bar the State from contracting with any employer who had a mandatory arbitration clause, we talked about this, that would elim -- you know, in practice, eliminate an enormous barrier.

Many, many of my clients now are walking in with, you know, mandatory arbitration clauses they had no idea was buried in the handbook somewhere.

ANDREA JOHNSON: And I'd like to just add that, you know, so much of the harassment happening in the workplace, I mean, the rates are really severe in the low-wage workforce, and a lot of folks there will not be even going to court at any point.

So thinking about what resources are available for them.

And I mentioned the Be Heard Act before, which I think is a model that states can look at.

It is a very lengthy bill, but it has all the things in it, comprehensive solutions, related to harassment.

And there are -- part of the Be Heard is to provide funding to states to -- for independent, private, non-profit entities that can really work --

advocate for workers' rights.

And, both, maybe that is through the court, but maybe not, other mechanisms like that.

So looking at what funding is available, and what support can be given to non-profits in the communities, to represent workers, especially those that -- for -- of a wide variety of reasons might never access court system.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: And I only asked the questions because we need to pass Senator Biaggi and Assemblymember Simotas's bill.

And -- but when we do that, and we cut a ribbon, we should not -- there is much more work to be done.

MIRIAM CLARK: There certainly is.

We were looking at sort of the bedrock, because it felt like, without changing the heart of the substance of law, that things around the edges could never change.

But, absolutely, I mean, the "attorney's fees" provision, by the way, will go a long way toward making cases practical for low-wage people, which now we only have, for some reason, in sex cases.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUART: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Niou.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Everybody asked so many questions, I am so sorry.

But --

MIRIAM CLARK: It's fine. We like to talk about our bill.

LAURIE MORRISON: We actually love this stuff.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I really -- no, I really appreciate you guys, and I really appreciate the -- the issues on intersectionality that you bring up.

I guess, you know, with somebody who, you know, has a lot that's happening here, all of this, but I just -- I wanted to ask, especially about the transgender community, and the things that we can do to protect them.

So just this year, the legislative -- this legislative session, we are -- we passed GENDA, which is the first time, after 16 years of Assemblymember Gottfried reintroducing the bill, and reintroducing the bill, and reintroducing the bill, that it has passed in our Legislature.

And -- and I just -- I feel like, you know, in our transgender community, not only are we -- did we not even have them as a protected class, but,

instead, we hyper-policed them. There's like a ton of stuff that is wrong with how we treat folks, including, you know, just people walking around, transgendered, get stopped by the police, and get picked up, and get arrested for prostitution, just for walking. Just for walking.

And so -- I mean, I just -- I feel like these are different things that -- that -- you know, that are so pervasive and systemic within our laws, within our system.

Do you guys have any suggestions on how we can fix our system, systemically, within how -- you know, with what we've gotten now, knowing that there is a system that is so incredibly discriminatory towards our community, that -- is there something that we can do?

MIRIAM CLARK: That's a hard one.

I don't know that I've thought about it specifically with regard to the transgender community, but I have thought about this over the years with regard to other forms of people in protected classes, that our society is really atomized, so that I know that in the, you know, White working-class neighborhood where I grew up, nobody knew a person of color.

And I think that there are still neighborhoods in New York that are like that.

And, so, housing in New York is terribly segregated, just like it was in my childhood.

So, people go to work, and that might be the only place where they have to interact with somebody who looks different from them.

And so, the workplace, more than the neighborhood school, and more than the neighborhood itself, the workplace becomes the sort of laboratory where people learn how to deal with each other.

And so to the extent that we can have workplace laws that encourage not only non-discrimination, but also respect, then I think we are educating people to go back into their lives and deal with their children, and deal with people that they see on the street, in a somewhat different way.

So, again, I don't know how much that applies to the transgender world, but I kind of think it does.

For somebody who doesn't know any transgender people personally, their first encounter must be at work, so let it be a respectful, regulated, predictable encounter.

LAURIE MORRISON: I actually have a trans -- a client -- a trans client currently, and she's -- God, she's so brave and so fantastic.

And what she's going through, just having to deal with this case, all of the abuse.

I mean, people don't realize, they think, oh, they're just going to -- you know, you're just going to bring a case because they're trying to make money.

No, no, no, no, no one brings these cases just to make money. This is so heartbreaking and so terrible to have to tell what's happened to you over and over and over again. It's just awful.

So I would say that the first -- just like
Miriam was saying, the world is full of
discrimination and harassment. It has always been.

I -- I -- unfortunately, I think it -- I hope it won't always will be, but, it seems that way.

So we need to enact laws that say, when you're in the workplace, behave.

Not, you know, oh, this isn't sufficiently severe or pervasive, or, you didn't complain to the right person, even though it was the right person, you complained to HR. But somehow, now, when you bring a lawsuit, well, that's not good enough.

Stop giving all these wonderful hiding places, and let's protect these people.

I'd say the second thing to do for trans
people is, when they complain, believe them. You
know, just like if -- just like if a woman
complains, and she's being sexually harassed, and
raped, believe her. And when a man complains,
believe him.

It's just, you know -- and when a Black man or -- I mean, all of this, let's have respect for each other in the workplace.

And I think one of the best ways to do that is allowing our laws to inform our workplace and say, no, no, severe or pervasive, uh-uh, because that's saying, you don't have to respect them, you can get away with it.

Make the law respect these people.

Make the law say, I might not understand what you're going through, but it's not my right to make you feel like less than human because of what and who you are.

I think that's the first way to do it.

ANDREA JOHNSON: And, also, we need to make sure that they're at the table in these policy solutions.

And to that point, actually, I'm eager to hear from Girls for Gender Equity, which I know is doing a lot of work with transgender and non-binary students.

And so much of that work needs to happen in schools. You know, that's where a lot of this systemic work can take place, and making sure that our schools are inclusive and a safe place for transgender students, and that students are learning behaviors that are -- you know, good behaviors, that can go into the workplace, about dignity and respect.

And I think that's incredibly important.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Yeah, I just wanted to again, you know, addressing the intersectionality of it, you know, we see that a transgender person, even if they're White, or if they are a person of color, there's differences in how people are treated.

LAURIE MORRISON: Oh, absolutely.

MIRIAM CLARK: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: If there's something that happens to somebody who is a transgender person, who -- it's -- they -- they -- there's mistreatment in getting health care. There's mistreatment in being able to go to school safely.

There's mistreatment in just walking on the street.

There's mistreatment in our government system.

And, so, with the systemic -- with the systemic discrimination that we just now, this year, finally passed GENDA, and finally classified trans folks as a protected-class, but our laws have not caught up.

And so when we're talking about the workplace, when we're talking about, you know, schools, when we're talking about our hospitals, because the law has not caught up, you know, there's going to be loopholes, and -- and -- and cracks that people can fall through.

So how do we make up for that within the laws that we are writing now?

LAURIE MORRISON: Other than what we've already described?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Yeah.

LAURIE MORRISON: I think we should -- if we can get back to you on that as well?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: That would be great, that would great.

MIRIAM CLARK: Yeah, I mean, we've drafted this to, obviously, treat transgender people as a protected class, like any other, but, special

protection that might be needed because they're so 1 newly protected, and because what they go through --2 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Right, that -- that's what --4 MIRIAM CLARK: -- is so extreme --5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: -- exactly the wording. 6 7 Sorry. MIRIAM CLARK: -- right. 8 9 No, that's fine. So -- yeah, so, that, and the question about 10 11 state court procedure, we'll get back to you on. 12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Thank you. 13 MIRIAM CLARK: We need to circle with our 14 members, I think. 15 LAURIE MORRISON: And I think it's really 16 important also to listen to the trans community. 17 I mean, a lot of times we spend so much time 18 talking, and we have well meaning, we want to make 19 things right. But maybe we need to spend more time 20 listening, and maybe we can get the answers that we 21 need as well. 22 ANDREA JOHNSON: Yeah, and understand the 23 unique challenges faced in the workplace, and the fact that there is, you know, likely, a much higher 24

fear of reporting, and what that means in terms of

25

accessing some of these solutions that we are crafting.

Like, as I was kind of saying before, will they even get to the point of going to court and being able to use some of these standards?

Obviously, the standards impact the workplace outside of the court, and everything.

But, just kind of recognizing the challenges, in terms of fear of reporting and retaliation, and how severe those are, and what that means in terms of (indiscernible cross-talking) --

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I mean, if you can be deemed a criminal, just to walk down the street, then, you know, people are going to, of course, wonder.

But, anyways.

LAURIE MORRISON: Can I just add one thing, that I don't know if we've actually mentioned, and I'll be quick?

When we're talking about costs to business, and what we're going to do with trans and any other group, it seems to me that, when there have been people who have been harassed in the workplace, and they complained, and the employer rectified it, there were no lawsuits.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LAURIE MORRISON: Okay?

MIRIAM CLARK: The employer can always rectify the problem. They very seldom do.

Because of Faragher-Ellerth, the complaint mechanism in the workplace is set up to just defend

So it's really rare for the internal complaint to lead to getting any kind of redress, especially getting the person fired.

But if their complaint mechanisms worked, there would be no lawsuits.

LAURIE MORRISON: Right.

So I think that's back to the question, also, when you speak to the business community and they say, Well, this is going -- you know, this is really going to make us pay a lot of money on this, well, let them know, if you behave properly in the workplace, and you don't allow this to occur, then you're not going to have a cost at all.

So don't change the law to make it easier to harass; stop the harassment, if you really want to save money.

> ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.

> LAURIE MORRISON: Seems simple.

1 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you very much. 2 LAURIE MORRISON: Thank you. MIRIAM CLARK: Thank you. 3 ANDREA JOHNSON: Thank you. 4 5 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And now we have Ashley, 6 Kylynn, Neillah, Rose, Zoraida, Stacey, Marie, from 7 Girls for Gender Equity. I hope I have the names right. 8 9 NEILLAH PETIT FRERE: Ready? 10 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Yep, you can begin. 11 NEILLAH PETIT FRERE: Good afternoon, 12 everyone. 13 My name is Neilla Petit Frere, and I am 14 16 years old. I am a junior at the Brooklyn School 15 for Music and Theater in Brooklyn, where I also 16 live. 17 I am a cisgender Black girl, and I am passionate about speaking out and having my voice 18 19 heard, and taking steps to empower our future. 20 I am a member of the Young Woman's Advisory 21 Council at Girls for Gender Equity, who I am also 22 here representing today. 23 In Girls for Gender Equity, young people are engaged in the work of enacting institutional 24

change, and we work in the foreign policy, develop

25

as racial and gender experts, and also receive social and mental-health support.

I would also like to thank everyone who came here today to support and hear our testimony against sexual harassment in young people's workplace.

I will be speaking on sexual harassment occurring in school.

In my school, school safety agents sometimes make comments on the bodies of female students, and make attempts to flirt with students as well.

If a girl is walking by, school safety agents will look at her in a very inappropriate and sexual way.

I have witnessed moments where students in my school were harassed, and that led them to feeling uncomfortable and unsafe.

When I feel unsafe in my school, I tend to focus less on my work, and it creates an environment where I'm taught that what I'm wearing is more important than what I'm learning.

Schools are microcosms of society.

The same way that adults experience sexual harassment at work are the same ways that young people are experiencing sexual harassment in schools by people who are in power.

These experiences leave me to question what I wear, fear of being a target, and forces me to believe that what happens to me -- what can happen to me is my fault, because I should be able to control that man's reaction to what I'm wearing.

Stories like these are -- so many more -- are so many reasons why I'm here today, calling for the New York State Legislature to support the state expansions of Title 9, and to pass the Safer New York Act.

Title 9 and Title 9 coordinators are important to me because, in the workplace of young people, we are vulnerable without them, and they are supposed to keep us safe.

There are police officers in my school who are abusing their power and are subjecting students to sexual harassment and violence.

In particular, your support of full repeal of Civil Rights Law 50-a is important, because (indiscernible) students (indiscernible) should be made available to survivors.

New Yorkers deserve to know who New York
City, and police departments across the state, are
employing when they come into our schools and harm
us.

This should be a priority for New York, and
I hope you take this testimony into consideration to
make your decisions.

Thank you.

ROSE ANTOINE: My name is Rose Antoine.

I'm 16, and I'm from Brooklyn.

I'm currently a junior in (indiscernible)
Brooklyn High School for Music and Theater.

I identify as a first-generation Haitian-American Black girl.

I'm also a participate -- a participant in Sisters in Strength at Girls for Gender Equity, who I'm also representing today.

Sisters in Strength is a restorative justice group for girls of color, to shed light on issues that are important to them, and support each other.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my testimony today, and I hope this start a conversation which lead to change being made.

Today I'm here to talk about police brutality, and the excessive force police use in our communities to harm those around me and people I care about.

I feel our police brutality relates to everyone.

Over this past year, there has been several incidents where police used excessive force on innocent people for various reasons that we're yet determined why.

Once -- once, when me and my brother was driving, ran a red light by accident, and we were stopped and pulled over.

The cop axed -- ask us if we knew what happened?

My brother said, and he acknowledged, that he ran a red light.

The cop looked at us in a very intimidating way, and we felt very threatened.

The police officer eventually let us go because my brother have never been stopped or receive a ticket.

Afterwards, a White woman walked up to us -a White woman walked up to us and let us know that
she was -- she has been watching, and would have
been a witness for us if anything would -- went
down, happened, or escalate.

 $\mbox{\sc I}$  --  $\mbox{\sc I}$  should not feel unsafe and helpless when encounter a police officer.

This situation showed me how unjust the system is, and how skewed police officers' views can

be on people of color.

Many officers, when they have -- they use brutal force, sexual harass, or sexual assault community members, are -- who are involved of -- in the death of someone, are never held incountable (sic), or walk away from -- with no consequences.

Did you know that 43 percent of police officers agree with this sentiment?

Always following the rules is not compatible with the need to get their job done.

Those 43 percent of police officers are in the streets every day, and not afraid to use excessive force on innocent people, that just to say that their job is done.

Did you also know that people who are

African-American Blacks are twice as likely to be

killed by officer while being unarmed, in comparison
to their White counterparts?

These statistics tell me, when interacting with a police officer as a Black girl, I should be afraid.

We need to advocate and create a safe space for everyone, and this starts with the way the NYPD treats our community; being in concert for this

action, and create a transparency between the NYPD and the community it serve.

My story is not unique. There are so many young people who looks like me, from communities like me, who are in need of greater police accountabilities.

This is why I am here today testifying.

Your support of the Safer New York City Act and, in particular, a full repeal of Civil Rights
Law 50-a, is important, because survivors knowing the background of police officers will help us to know their track records and keep us safe.

When the community is aware of what police officers have done, we can build a stronger case for accountabilities, and we can become a community that prevents police violence instead of being a community that strives on harm.

Please take my testimony into consideration when making a decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

MARIE ST. FORT: Good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Marie St. Fort. My pronoun is she/her/hers, and I'm a high school student.

I'm in a program called Sisters in Strength at Girls for Gender Equity.

In our program, we learn about power,

privilege, oppression, and it's impact on

intimate-partners' sexual gender-based violence.

We also engage in healing practices, healing justice work, build community organizing, and engage in organizing work.

Before I start, I just want to say thank you to the -- thank you to the Assemblymembers and Senators for being present, supporting the cause, and amplifying the message.

I would also like to state that I will not only be speaking on the topic of sexual harassment, but also police brutality.

Sexual harassment, it can be found anywhere, any place, at any time; places like schools, homes, industry, and at work, in the morning, afternoon, and night.

It's something most of us have experienced. It could be anything, from someone cat-calling you on the street, or touching you in ways you don't feel comfortable with.

Most people who are survivors of sexual harassment never tell anyone, and it's usually at the hand of those -- of someone they know.

Survivors sometimes ask themselves questions,

like: Will they believe me? They probably think I'm lying. Or will they think I'm a snitch? Or just be embarrassed.

Sexual harassment has a huge impact on people.

I'm pretty sure most of all in here has been in situations -- in a situation where we were not comfortable; not being comfortable in your own skin, especially somewhere you go to every day, or somewhere you have no choice but to go there.

No one likes the feeling of being uncomfortable.

I know we can't put an end to sexual harassment, and that anyone is capable of sexual harassment. They might not know what they're doing is sexual harassment, but everyone is capable of it.

Like, how these two police officers harassed this girl, and they thought she was lying because -- people thought she was lying because they didn't believe two officers would do such a thing.

It's crazy because, when we do that, we just hurt the victim more, and forces them to shut down.

It takes a lot for someone to open up on something like sexual harassment. It's not something we want. It's a disgusting thing that

happens, and we can't control it most time.

Why not help prevent it?

Just like how we can't put an end to police brutality, it's crazy (indiscernible) on how we got to run, and hide from those who's supposed to be keeping us safe and protected.

Some people get blindsided by the fact that they are police officers, and that they are just looking out for us and making sure that we're safe; but yet they're the ones who are quick to kills us, beat us to death, choke us to death, and shoot on us.

And when you ask them, why? it's because they felt threatened -- threatened by, what? -- or self-defense.

But here's the crazy part: They do not get consequences. The most they will get is probably a paid suspension from work. You know, you get to stay home after killing an innocent soul, and getting paid for it.

Now please explain to me, how will they learn from their so-called "mistakes" when there's no type of consequences?

They just keep doing it over and over again. Nothing is going to change unless we treat

them how they treat criminals: prison time.

Stop justifying the things these police officers be doing, and start punishing them for what they be doing, or else they are going to keep doing it.

Let's start thinking about ways to prevent sexual harassment and ways to end police brutality.

To help prevent sexual harassment:

We could start by teaching young men ways to properly approach a lady;

Help our young people to respect each other;

Don't do things to others you wouldn't want
to be done to you;

And, finally, adults, to please listen. When someone comes to you and tell you that they have been sexually harassed from workplaces, school, home... anywhere, take it seriously.

And to help put an end to police brutality, we need to start taking actions. Let them see what they're doing will not go by like that, and that there's no consequences -- and that there's consequences to everyone's actions, and that there's no free pass, and we're not favoring nothing.

Thank you again to everyone for attending this hearing.

STACEY KING: Good afternoon.

My name is Stacey Ann (ph.). My pronouns are she, hers, and hers.

I'm a senior in high school, and I'm part
of -- I'm a part of Girls for Gender Equity and
Sisters in Strength program, or "SIS."

SIS helps young women of color become more aware of the social injustice that goes on in our schools, and -- high schools, and community.

We primarily focus on healing, and how to aid people who have experienced sexual violence, gender-based violence.

I would like to thank everyone for hearing me out today, and I hope everyone is well.

I attend a school that has a formal dress-code policy. Understand that we're required to where a uniform; however, the policy does not always seem logical.

The ways that they choose to enforce them do not make for a positive school environment.

In my junior year, I had experience with -I had experience, where I was wearing a skirt that
was above my knee, and my principal and my teacher
called me out about it in public.

This made me feel self-conscious about my

body, and enraged.

I don't think the way I dress has any impact on how I learn.

I recognize that this was not as severe as an experience as many of my friends and fellow classmates. They have been sent home because of their dresses and clothing.

Many of my friends live an hour or so away from school. This travel time takes away from their learning and time in class.

Additionally, we receive robo calls at 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. every day about the uniform. They are pre-recorded messages that tells us what to wear, in advance of coming to school.

Our uniform policy is gender-biased and culturally insensitive, so this message that we receive daily is offensive, and is how we are beginning and ending our day.

The voice recording targets

females-identified (sic) students in some cultural

or -- and/or religious dress, because it says for us

not to wear low-cut shirts, see-through clothing,

short skirts, spaghetti straps, leggings,

flip-flops, no headband, hair covering, do-rags, or

headwear.

This makes me feel like I am a distraction, and that I am responsible for my classmate learning or how they learn.

Schools frequently have gender-biased dress codes, and these dress codes infer that young women are responsible for their own experience of sexual assault because of what they are wearing.

This promotes rape culture.

This should not be the case in any situation, because we are responsible for our own action when rules are enforced, and mostly targets women of color.

New York State should increase the number of Title (indiscernible) coordinators in schools, and expand Title 9 protection.

Title 9 coordinators, coupled with comprehensive sex education, would allow everyone to feel safer and supported in schools.

Everyone deserve basic human rights, and

I would like for everyone to be aware of Title 9,

and, most importantly, be comfortable and safe

whatever environment they are in.

I believe I should feel and truly be safe in school.

Safety looks to me -- safety to me looks like

1 coming to school and not feeling targeted or being called out on how I dress, feel guilty or ashamed of 2 my body, and, more importantly, to be supported 3 mentally and emotionally to be the best version of 4 myself. 5 Thank you for the opportunity for testifying 6 7 today. ASHLEY TURNER: Thank you. 8 I don't know if this one is on. 9 It is on? Okay. 10 11 Thank you. 12 Good evening, at this point, 13 Chairperson (indiscernible), Biaggi, thank you 14 for -- Chairperson Crespo, Chairperson Walker, and 15 other members who have stayed this late in the 16 evening. 17

My name is Ashley Sawyer. I'm an attorney, and I'm the director of policy and government relations at Girls for Gender Equity.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Girls for Gender Equity obviously has a very unique position in this conversation.

We have been around for close to 20 years, but we're most known because we are the institutional home of the #MeToo movement.

The very movement that set the stage for this

hearing today and the conversation that we're having was founded by a Black woman, Tarana Burke, who was senior director at GGE when #MeToo went viral.

And the young people you just heard from are all members of Sisters in Strength, which is the only organization in the entire United States that is the #MeToo movement youth organization.

And I am grateful for you all taking the time to hear from young people who identify as survivors, and allies of sexual-assault survivors, and the issues that are coming up for them.

The broader framing is, young people want to see changes happening in their schools and in their communities.

And we're grateful for the sexual-harassment working group for opening up this conversation about sexual harassment, but we can't have a conversation about sexual harassment or sexual assault in the workplace and ignore the fact that, for many people, millions of people, who have to attend school, that is their workplace.

Every single day, by law, they're mandated to go to a place where they may experience sexual assault or sexual harassment.

We know that it's not unique to New York

City.

We know that, in Binghamton, New York, we just learned of four girls of color, Black and Latinx girls, who were forced to strip down into their underwear in front of a principal and a nurse because they were giggling too much.

That is sexual harassment.

We understand that, for young people, they're not afforded the protections that adults would have in the workplace. And even as you heard today, adults are not getting the support and protections that they need.

So you can only imagine what it means to be a student.

We also are very grateful for you,

particularly, Assemblymember Walker, for naming

earlier that the #MeToo movement was founded

specifically to name the ways that Black girls and

girls of color were impacted by sexual violence.

And we are centering cis and trans girls and gender not-conforming (sic) youth and non-binary youth because they're so often left out of the conversation around sexual violence.

We also want to name the fact that sexual violence happens at the hands of police at alarming

rates, which my colleague Kylynn will testify to, about the alarming rates of police sexual assault and misconduct, which you learned about.

And I want to name, that, earlier this year, four -- there was a complaint filed on behalf of four girls in New York; two who raped in their schools, and, two who were sexually harassed, one who was subjected to trans-phobic harassment in particular.

And this is not unique.

Young people are experiencing sexual harassment at alarming rates across this state (sic), including in New York.

Two years ago, three years ago, we did a report called "The Schools Girls Deserve," and it found that one in three students experience some form of sexual harassment in school.

So, if we're going to take the work -- take the action to address sexual assault and sexual harassment, we have to begin with schools.

We have to understand that, if we don't teach comprehensive, quality sex ed with a focus on consent education, the same people who are doing harmful acts, committing acts of sexual harassment, in their high schools and in their middle schools

will go on to do it in the workplace.

And so while the package of bills in front of you is mostly focused on changing standards that affect adults, we could not let this opportunity go by without acknowledging that the people who -- some of the people who are most marginalized and most vulnerable to sexual violence are not getting the support that they need.

And, the prevention that needs to happen must happen in the environments that young people are in.

Schools are the places where we can do some of the most radical, powerful shift -- culture-shifting work.

And so we recognize that, in addition to what we have asked for on the local level in New York

City, our Title 9 coordinators, New York City has

1.1 million students, 1 adult, 1 adult who's responsible for investigating claims of sexual assault or harassment in the entire school district.

And so we've been pushing a budget ask that we will soon -- I'm hope -- we'll hopefully win, to see if we can get at least seven Title 9 coordinators to respond to and prevent school-based sexual assault.

But on the state level, we know that there's

a lot of work to do, and we hope to partner with you all, and particularly next session, to think specifically about: How are we addressing the issue of sexual assault and harassment in schools; and how can we address this issue as it particularly affects youth of color.

And, again, I appreciate you,
Assemblymember Walker, for naming the ways it
impacts people who are incarcerated.

The national data shows that 90 percent of the young people who are put into girls' prisons have experienced some form of sexual harassment or assault. 90 percent.

There's no other institution where you're going to see such a high concentration.

And so as you all look to this package of bills, we are grateful for the time and energy that you've spent with this existing package, and just being here tonight, recognizing the hour.

But also looking to you to please not ignore the ways in which young people, cis and trans girls and non-binary youth, particularly youth of color, are impacted by sexual violence.

And we are deeply grateful for your time and your energy, your commitment, to this issue.

1 Thank you.

2 KYLYNN GRIER: Good evening.

Thank you all for still being here.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{My}}$$  name is Kylynn Grier, and I'm the policy manager at Girls for Gender Equity.

Girls for Gender Equity works to -- is an organization challenging the structural forces that work to obstruct the freedom, full expression, and rights of girls, transgender, and gender non-forming young people.

We work daily -- sorry.

We work daily with young women and TGNC youth of color who are policed at every juncture of their lives; on the way to school by NYPD officers, in school by NYPD school safety agents, and while accessing city services.

Young women and TGNC young people are criminalized for normal adolescent behavior, oftentimes, hyper-sexualized due to historically-located racialized and gender-based stereotypes. And their bodies are regularly policed because of their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and/or gender expression.

Three shocking revelations of police

misconduct have served as a tipping point for policy change that organizations have been advancing for years.

Earlier this year, BuzzFeed News exposed that hundreds of officers were allowed to keep their jobs after committing egregious, fireable offenses.

These offenses included lying under oath to grand juries and district attorneys, lying on official reports, physically attacking innocent people, engaging in excessive force, and committing sexual misconduct against members of the public.

Then, two scathing reports emerged of an 18 -- a then-18-year-old teenage girl, under the alias Anna Chambers, who was handcuffed, raped, and sexually assaulted in the back of a police van in Brooklyn, New York, and who was one of many survivors of police sexual violence against community members in and out of schools across New York State.

Shortly thereafter, there was shock and outrage as the nation heard about the treatment of Jazmine Headley, a 23-year-old mother, whose baby was ripped from her arms by the New York Police -- New York Depart -- New York City Department of Social Services and the New York Police Department.

These experiences and narratives are often unheard in mainstream media, in conversations about policing, or in conversations seeking to address gender-based violence.

This silence exists alongside a multitude of systemic barriers, purporting survivors -- supports, and often victim-blaming, and criminalization of survivors.

This is absolutely and unequivocally rooted in racialized and gender-based discrimination.

For these reasons, Girls for Gender Equity and partners call on New York State -- the New York State Legislature to pass the Safer New York Act.

Included in this package is a full repel -repeal of Civil Rights Law 50-a. It is an essential
tool for transparency about police abuses
experienced by women, gender (indiscernible) people,
and all New Yorkers.

We look to partner with you, and support your leadership, to pass a full repeal of this law.

A repeal of Civil Rights Law 50-a would follow progress made in New York City to increase transparency, an important step on the road to safer communities.

As organizations that serve and advocate on

behalf of women and girls, many of whom are survivors of gender-based violence, we know that acts of gender-based violence are often patterned, manifested by extreme power differentials, and are very rarely isolated incidents.

These power differentials expressly -- are especially exacerbated in police and community interactions, with a gun-carrying officer, and added layers of an agency that has historic culture of being unaccountable and non-transparent.

Even though sexual assault and gender-based violence is drastically underreported, a

Cato Institute study of incidents reported shows that sexual misconduct is the second-most reported form of police misconduct.

As of February 14, 2018, the New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board, a New York City police-oversight agency, adopted a policy to expand the agency's purview to include incidents of sexual harassment by NYPD officers against members of the public.

According to the CCRB, 117 complaints were received in a short 15-month period that included allegations, from cat-calls and sexual propositions, to unwanted touching and rape.

It is imperative that police personnel records be made available to survivors of police sexual violence to better understand any history of harm that has been perpetrated by an officer.

Repeal of New York State Civil Rights

Law 50-a would be a significant step in ensuring
that officers who have repeatedly harmed community
members across New York State are held accountable,
and the full repeal of the law is necessary for true
community safety.

Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you, all, so much, for staying this long to share your testimony with us.

Each one of you, and the words that you spoke, are incredibly powerful, and incredibly important; and let me tell you why.

Because you just put a massive crack in our consciousness, that I don't think that many people in this room even thought was there.

You connected a law that I don't think
I personally would have connected to sexual
harassment.

I support the repeal of 50-a, I have during my journey here. And I don't think I would have connected the two.

And that is a blind spot that you just put a light on for me, and that's a remarkable, remarkable thing that you did.

It's incredibly important that you continue to raise your voices. Do not let anybody silence you. Do not let anybody tell you that your voices don't matter, because your voices do matter, because you just created change in this room, today.

So, thank you.

First, we're going to hear from

Assemblywoman Walker -- oh, Assemblymember Crespo.

Pardon me.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Quick question:

So, thank you, all, also, for your testimony.

If you -- for all of you who are students, if you are harassed by a teacher, who do you go to?

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Guidance counselor.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Guidance counselor.

If you feel that you've been harassed by a school safety agent outside of the school building, who do you go to?

MARIE ST. FORT: I would probably go to the person I'm most comfortable with in the school, or outside of school.

KYLYNN GRIER: As it stands now, there's

actually not a process. And -- well, that's not completely true.

There is a process, but it is nontransparent.

Right now, if a young person reports to an adult in the school, at the end of the day, where that report ends up is the internal affairs bureau of the NYPD.

And so what that means, is that young people are expected to report to the very officers, uniformed, that did the harm in the first place.

We also know that the internal affairs bureau of the NYPD has been notoriously nontransparent, and, still, it's just a really tough place for anyone to report anything.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So there's no -- there's no current cooperation between DOE and school safety officers, where the student could go to the administration of their school, principals, somebody, within the school building, to make that formal complaint, and have the school then submit it in a more formal sense to the NYPD?

KYLYNN GRIER: I can't speak to exactly what is the MOU between the NYPD and the department of education.

What I can say, is that, regardless, those

reports end up on the desks of the internal affairs 1 bureau of the NYPD. 2 3 (Inaudible comment by Ashley Turner to Kylynn Grier.) 4 5 KYLYNN GRIER: Right. 6 And there's -- and to build on that, there's not someone who's in the schools or accessible. 7 Title 9 coordinators, in particular, would be 8 one key place that young people could go, if there 9 10 were enough. 11 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So all of you are part 12 of an organization that has made you -- given you a 13 platform, and encouraged you to speak out, and is 14 preparing you to be advocates; not just victims, but 15 advocates for change. 16 How many of you have experienced personally, 17 or know someone directly, who was sexually harassed by or assaulted by a school safety agent or an 18 19 officer that was assigned to your school? 20 NEILLAH PETIT FRERE: I've seen it, but, 21 like, it hasn't personally happened to me. 22 I've seen, like, police officers, like, talk 23 to students, like, in a very inappropriate way that 24 they shouldn't be speaking to a student.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: (Indiscernible)

25

teachers?

NEILLAH PETIT FRERE: Teachers? Uhm, no.

MARIE ST. FORT: Can I say something?

It had happened to me before.

It was outside of school. There's a store by my school. And a police officer that goes to my school, he was talking to me so inappropriately.

Where you going, Big Head, (indiscernible)?

Talked to me like that.

But, yeah, it's made me feel uncomfortable.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I didn't consider, until you guys made this testimony, just how susceptible those interactions are on a daily basis.

And, especially when those officers are imperative to providing safety when leaving the school building, and all the other things that we -- the relationship we want them to be able to build with students, but how susceptible that is to someone committing some sort of harassment.

And if there is no transparent process for reporting that, it's extremely problematic.

So, I appreciate the feedback on that.

And as I call on Assemblywoman Walker, I just want to also thank you for -- the organization, for what you represent. And to acknowledge that

Ms. Burke is a proud Bronxite, as we acknowledge all 1 of the Brooklyn reps that are here. 2 Ms. Walker. 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Well, I think I've 4 heard that Brooklyn is in the house. 5 6 Uhm, although, we're very grateful to 7 The Bronx for the pizza, that I didn't get a slice of. 8 So, I am inspired by your testimony here 9 today, and I guess the thing that inspires me the 10 11 most is that, we put a lot of emphasis on supporting 12 programs that are very male-centric. 13 You know, I remember, we were having a conversation about supporting a basketball program 14

You know, I remember, we were having a conversation about supporting a basketball program in our -- in my community, and I represent the neighborhoods of Brownsville, East New York, parts of Bed-Stuy, Crown Heights, and East Flatbush.

And they said, well -- I said, Well, what about the girls?

Oh, we got girl's basketball.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And it's, like, no, it's a boy's sport, but, you know, generally, and -- but you have girls playing.

I do recognize that a lot of girls play it.

But they -- you know, they -- they give us

credence with lots of programming, but through the lens of boys.

And so this is special to me because, you know, it's -- it's girly.

And -- and a lot of times our stories are not heard.

And I appreciate this, because it -- it -- you even had me tap into experiences.

When I was, you know, in high school, and I remember a teacher told me to get on the desk and do a couple of jumping jacks.

And, you know, even as a young girl growing up, I, you know, was always a big girl.

And when that happened to me, I guess it wasn't until you sitting here today, with your testimony, it sort of struck a cord, that that was sexual harassment.

And -- so -- so I thank you for -- for helping me to see myself.

One of the -- I guess, the question that

I have is with respect to the police department, and
sexual harassment and the way it's addressed.

There was a young girl in my district who was, allegedly, raped, or a sexual assault, in a park.

When the report came out, it was -- it was -- allegedly, it was done by a group of boys.

And then when the report came out, they victimized her. Said that, you know, she was having sex with her father.

I mean, it was just crazy, crazy thing.

I don't if you remember that.

But we were having conversations with the police department about it. You know, the comment that we heard was, Well, most of the people who are sexually assaulted -- who are raped are raped by somebody that knows them.

As if, you know, it makes a difference, if you're raped by someone who knows you or someone that's a complete stranger.

So hearing your testimony today with respect 50-a, and other issues, do you -- are -- do you know if the police department reports instances of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or rape, as that?

Or, when it happens, and someone knows that person, is it reported like a domestic-violence scenario?

KYLYNN GRIER: I can speak to the sexual-harassment and sexual-violence reporting.

Currently, they do not report on incidents or

allegations of sexual violence.

(Inaudible comment by Ashley Turner to Kylynn Grier.)

KYLYNN GRIER: Oh, if the assailant is a cop.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: If the assailant is a cop, they don't report any of that information?

KYLYNN GRIER: (Microphone off.)

No.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: But I'm also wondering, what about, even in instances where -- you know, where they're not?

Because, I looked at, sort of, some Compstat reports prior to coming here, not necessarily thinking about sexual violence per se, and it was sort of alarming to me that there weren't very high instances of sexual violence or sexual assault that was reported in the 73rd Precinct, particularly as the precinct that I was looking at it at.

But it doesn't take away from the fact that

I know this is happening, but what's happening with

respect to it being reported?

Is it not being reported because people aren't necessarily coming forward, or is it not being reported because it's being misconstrued as domestic violence, where we see is very high, as

1 opposed to calling it for what it is? 2 So, you don't have to answer that, but it's 3 just, I guess, another thing that your testimony today really just sort of put into my head. 4 5 So, again, where's your program located? 6 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible/microphone 7 off.) 8 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Where? 9 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible/microphone off) we're actually in Councilmember -- oh, excuse 10 11 me, in Assemblymember Simon's district, in -- on 12 Chapel Street. 13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Nice. 14 Are you in any --15 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible/microphone 16 off). 17 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Are you in any 18 schools? 19 ASHLEY TURNER: Yeah, so, historically, GGE, 20 we've been around for almost 18 years now. 21 We run two after-school programs that were 22 Brooklyn-based. And our youth-development programs, 23 including Sisters in Strength, and our Young Woman's 24 Advisory Council, both serve young people from all

25

five boroughs.

And so young people could apply regardless of where they live.

So we had young people from Staten Island, and The Bronx, all coming to Brooklyn to be a part of both of our youth-development programs.

And our after-school programs have, historically, been just in Brooklyn.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: So I guess -- well, I guess one of the other questions then, is: Do you provide transportation?

STACEY KING: For young people, when young people come to our program, and we always make sure they have MetroCards.

And I forgot to mention that, as we phase out of our after-school programming, we're providing technical assistance to schools across the five boroughs, specifically highlighting the research that came out of our "School Girls Deserve" report. That report is where we talk specifically about -- it was done alongside 100 students; talked specifically about the issue of sexual harassment, sexual violence, that girls of color and youth of color experience, as well as criminalization that they experience in school.

And so the outgrowth of that report, in our

years of running after-school programming, has been providing -- we will begin to provide technical assistance to DOE schools that take an interest in wanting to find ways to make their schools more safe, healing, and affirming for youth of color.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: So -- so you're phasing out of the after-school --

ASHLEY TURNER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: -- business, period?

ASHLEY TURNER: And shifting to providing TA for DOE schools that want to do better, in terms of sexual harassment, racial-justice issues, cultural competency, and to how to support students across the gender spectrum.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Do you -- are you perform -- are you participating in a curriculum-based scenario?

So, it's going to be, like, during the day, and will the students be able to avail themselves of the -- in -- in school-time programming?

ASHLEY TURNER: So the two youth programs that we run, existing, separate from our after-school programs, we have a curriculum for -- a curriculum that is rooted in what young people mentioned earlier today, about learning about

systems of oppression, learning about race and gender and class.

Young people get to engage in both of the curriculum -- both of the curricula, excuse me, and both of our youth programming.

And then there's another set of curricula, specifically targeting at adults and schools, and how they can be better advocates for young people, and make their schools more safe and more affirming for young people.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Okay. Well, I guess, we heard an invitation earlier today from the Senator to the division of human rights.

So I'm going to give you, also, an invitation, to say that:

I think what you're doing is spectacular.

ASHLEY TURNER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: And I'm not poaching here, but, you know, Brownsville is a beautiful community, and with some beautiful Black girls in there, and who, you know, would gain a lot from having access to a program such as yours.

So I extend to you an invitation to participate in some of the programming that's contained within our community.

And I look forward to working with you. 1 2 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I'll answer that for you 3 with some funding. They would more than happy to --[Laughter.] 4 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: Oh, I'm willing. 6 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Niou. 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN WALKER: I'll give them \$2 million if I could. 8 9 Twenty. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: First, I just wanted to 10 11 say thank you, guys, for being here, and for 12 speaking up on behalf of your peers, and for 13 yourself. 14 It is incredibly, incredibly brave. 15 For my own experience, I wasn't able to speak 16 up for over 20 years. 17 So, I just wanted to say that I commend you on your bravery, and, that -- that it matters; that 18 19 it matters -- everything that you're saying matters. 20 I know you guys work with a lot of TGNC 21 youth. 22 You heard my last questions, probably, and 23 I'm just going to reiterate them to you guys, and see if you guys have some other thoughts on policy, 24

on how we can change things in New York State,

25

1 because the discrimination is so pervasive and systemic, it makes it so that young people, just 2 3 walking out of a, you know, club, walking out of school, they could get arrested just for being 4 transgender or gender non-conforming. 5 6 So, I wanted to see if there was anything 7 that we can do. As -- you know, we -- our -- we just passed 8 GENDA this year, way long overdue. 9 And if there was anything that you guys 10 11 wanted to suggest that we can do as a state. 12 ASHLEY TURNER: Well, a couple of things, 13 really quickly, (indiscernible) time. 14 Actually, there's a rally happening right now 15 that we're missing, in support of trans folks who 16 have been murdered. 17 I think you may know --18 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I think your mic may not 19 be on. 20 ASHLEY TURNER: Oh, sorry. 21 How do I turn this on? 22 Hello? Is this better? 23 Okay. 24 As you know -- you may know that there's

actually a rally happening in the city right now.

25

The life ex -- and it's the "Keep Your Hands
Off Our Trans Bodies" Rally, and it's in
Washington Square Park.

But most people know, life expectancy for Black trans women is, like, 36. And so that's -- it's a huge issue.

GGE centers all -- centers most marginalized folks in all of our narratives and in our work.

So some of the things that we've been looking for, particularly in the context of young people in schools, have been thinking about, how do schools provide the type of -- get the type of technical assistance that they need, to understand what's happening for trans youth, and how can they do a better job of supporting them.

And we would love to partner with you, and have additional conversations with you about, what are the things that came up in the reporting that we did, or that participatory action research that we did, and what are the things that trans youth are asking for in their schools.

We try our best to make sure that trans youth and non-binary youth are included in all of our programming.

And those young people have the ideas about

what they want to see happening in their schools to 1 make them feel safer in their schools, and in their 2 3 the community. And we would love to have a conversation with 4 you about some of the feedback that we've received 5 6 from young people. 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I would love that. You know, just for the record, I mean, our 8 9 body knows that, you know, trans youth have the 10 highest suicide rates. 11 We all know that -- I've lost many friends. But I -- I would have to say that, we all 12 13 know that there's a huge systemic issue. 14 And so we really thank you for your work on 15 those issues. 16 And, please, you know, any -- any ideas that 17 you all come up with, when it comes to protecting folks, and making life just a little bit more 18 bearable, is helpful. 19 20 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simon? 21 You should join us up here. 22 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Try it again? 23 There we go.

And I want to thank all of you, first of all,

24

25

Thank you.

for your testimony, which is really incredibly 1 powerful, and, for being here all day long, and 2 3 listening to us yammer on at times. And -- so thank you for -- for -- for being 4 5 here. 6 So, Stacey Ann? Right? 7 I went to an all-girls' Catholic school and had to wear a uniform every day, so your testimony 8 really reached out to me. 9 Are you going to a parochial school, or a 10 11 charter school, or --12 STACEY KING: I go to a public school. 13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: A public school? 14 STACEY KING: Yeah, uhm -- yeah. 15 'Cause, when I first -- where I attended to 16 school, like, in ninth grade, before, it was -- it didn't have a uniform policy. 17 So me coming into freshman year, we had a 18 19 uniform policy. 20 So, it's very inconsistent. So it's like --21 yeah. 22 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: So they have an 23 inconsistent uniform policy? 24 STACEY KING: Yeah. 25 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: That's bizarre.

And -- and -- I -- I also am freaking out about the robo call at 6:00 in the morning.

What about the boys, what's their uniform policy?

STACEY KING: It's the same as ours, but, like, since -- it's more targeted towards us as girls.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Uh-huh?

STACEY KING: So, like, if I wear -- if a guy comes into school with like a tank top, he won't be called out or called home.

But if I come -- if I come to school with, like, you know, like, maybe a spaghetti-strap, I don't know, tank top, with a cardigan, or something like that, they'd be, like, Oh, what are you wearing? You know, you shouldn't be wearing that. Like, put on a shirt.

I understand that there's certain policy that I abide with the rules, and I'm, like, respect the school uniform policy.

But I feel like -- like, just the other day, they sent another robo call, saying, you know, like, oh, we're a distraction. And now what you wear will create an unsafe environment.

So it's just, like -- yeah.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Yeah, cringe. We're all cringing here about that.

ASHLEY TURNER: Can I just add?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Yes, sure, of course.

ASHLEY TURNER: I apologize.

So there's national data that backs up, that Black girls are more likely to be targeted for the clothing that they wear.

So even if there's a policy about what young people wear, Black girls and Latinx girls are more likely to be told that they're dressing inappropriately because of their body size.

And what happens is, we've heard reports from young people say, that they were told that the reason boys are distracted, the reason sexual harassment is happening, is because of the clothing that they are wearing.

And so we -- yeah, so that's the problem.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: I mean, I think that -that is, obviously, a bigger problem in communities
of color. It's certainly a problem for women and
girls, generally, I think, about clothing.

I certainly remember that being something that I was plagued by as well as a young girl.

And we were rolling up our skirts in those

days. The skirts were below your knee, and everybody was rolling up their skirts.

And -- and -- so there's a lot of messaging about -- about -- about clothing.

So I'm also curious, for the rest of you who are not in schools with a uniform policy, about that kind of -- the kinds of comments that you may get with regard to what you're wearing, and how, if at all, it has changed the way you dress for school, and has made you comfortable or uncomfortable?

NEILLAH PETIT FRERE: Yeah, I think your body is -- takes a huge part in dressing policies, because it can be like a really skinny girl wearing the same thing as you. But if you have a more, I don't know, curvey body --

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Voluptuous?

NEILLAH PETIT FRERE: -- yeah, like, you could get your house called, you could get sent home, or they give you a big shirt to wear.

And that -- it's really unfair, because it makes -- it starts making you just, like, feeling insecure about your own body, because, if I'm being pulled out of class, why can't she get pulled out of class, because we're, basically, wearing the same thing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: So, I wanted to just -- well, I'll leave it at that.

But I wanted to just tell you again how impressive your testimony has been here today, and the work that you're doing.

And thank you very much for leading this charge, and for being there for -- for these girls, and for you being there for each other, and for the other girls in -- in your schools.

And I'm really looking forward to continuing to work with you guys.

Thank you.

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you very, very much for your testimony.

I want to just end on one note, because

I think that this is an important one, not that the others were not. Every point that was made was incredibly important.

But, if there are instances that you experience after this day, that you feel you can't raise to someone in your school or your community, you have allies here in government.

And I -- you know, I think I'm going -- I'm not going on a ledge by saying, all of my colleagues

here, we are here for you.

You can pick up the phone and you can call our offices, you can e-mail us, you can tweet at us, you can even send us messages through Instagram or Twitter or Facebook; whatever is easiest for you.

You're not alone, we hear you.

And please use your government as a resource to have your voices heard.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you.

(All witnesses say "Thank you.")

SENATOR BIAGGI: Next we're going to hear from the National Domestic Workers Alliance.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you, and thank you for your patience.

MARISSA SENTENO: I want to, first of all, thank the Joint Committee on Sexual Harassment in the Workplace, Part 2. Right?

We really appreciate being able to come down here today and really tell our story.

My name is Marissa Senteno. I am with the National Domestic Workers Alliance. I am the enforcement program manager for our New York chapter.

So that means I organize domestic workers in

New York City and New York State, specifically around enforcing their labor rights, especially as addressed under the Domestic Worker Bill of Rights.

And if you don't know our organization, the National Domestic Workers Alliance is the nation's leading voice for dignity and fairness for millions of domestic workers in the United States.

We were founded in 2007, and NDWA works for the respect and recognition and inclusion of -- in labor protections for domestic workers, most of whom are women, women of color.

The alliance itself is powered by 60 affiliate organizations. And then we also have individual membership and local chapters, of which, here in New York, we have a New York local chapter of approximately 3,000-plus contacts -- not contacts -- participants, yeah, 3,000-plus participant members.

And then the organization, as a whole, has about 35,000 members nationwide.

So NDWA itself leads on several campaigns and coalitions to advance the rights of domestic workers.

We advocate for increased labor protections, racial justice, gender equity, and humane

immigration policies.

So New York State was the first state in the country to pass a Domestic Worker Bill of Rights in 2010. It sort of marked the culmination of a 6-year grassroots organizing campaign.

It was the first legislation of its kind, and the bill of rights closed gaps in labor laws that left domestic workers with fewer rights than other workers in the state, and it added new protections.

It since has inspired a national movement, and we've been able to pass protections in nine other states and one municipality.

So it's a big deal that New York State set the bar high, to be able push other domestic workers to seek labor protections for themselves in nine-plus other states.

Here in New York, the Domestic Worker Bill of Rights includes domestic workers in protections against sexual harassment and discrimination by changing the previous law, protecting workers in places of employment of four or more for domestic workers, to, if you're a domestic worker, a place of employment of one or more.

This is key, because most domestic workers themselves are the only -- are the only employees in

their household, and were previously excluded from harassment and discrimination protections.

So what we're doing now is that, in the past five years, NDWA has worked with our members and local affiliates to explore the following strategies in pursuit of a more worker-led, community-supported enforcement process:

We prioritize leadership development amongst domestic workers, that prepares and utilizes them as key actors in supporting peers throughout the enforcement process.

So what that means is, I train up worker leaders, people who are part of our membership, to understand their labor rights.

And they go specifically out into the communities; they go to the parks, the libraries, churches, they're talking to each other. And they are expertly doing so because, we have trained them about what their rights are, how to screen other workers, and how to establish the relationship and build the trust that will baring them into our domestic worker-led legal clinic.

To my knowledge, it's the only domestic worker-specific legal clinic in the state, and of its kind.

We -- we have a legal advocacy group that handles the adjudication of the cases.

And then we also work closely with the department of labor.

So these worker leaders are dubbed "groundbreakers."

That means they are breaking ground in areas that enforcement agencies have told us, time and time again, We don't know how to enforce domestic-worker rights because we actually don't know how -- where they, where to talk to them, how to get them to come forward with cases.

This is key, when thinking about very severe cases, such as harassment and trafficking, how do we build trust? And what is required in order to actually enforce the laws that we have?

Secondly, we work collaboratively with the government agencies, to share our values and vision and alignment; to explore how to leverage our collective resources and mechanisms in order to increase our capacity to bolster enforcements as a system, and not just as an instance.

So this happens through our pilot program with the department of labor, to work really closely with them on domestic-worker cases.

We also have been working really closely over the past three years with the department of consumer affairs, and now dubbed "worker protection," and the division of paid care, to help in -- increase our ability to do collective outreach and co-enforcement, and thinking about different co-enforcement models, like a mediation clinic, as a matter of fact, that they will launching shortly.

We've had success in collaborating with -with the city agencies and with the department of
labor. And it also helps us to get a better
understanding of the processes itself when it
takes -- when workers themselves need to enforce
their rights.

And then what happens is that, the agencies themselves get a better understanding of domestic workers.

When we effectively investigate domestic-worker cases, most of our cases come through our wage-theft violations. And, often, wage theft is the first indicator that there are other workplace violations, such as sexual harassment and discrimination.

Yet, because of the severe power differential between employer and employee, and the isolated

nature of domestic work, the way that the cases are investigated and adjudicated affect whether a worker will be able to divulge more serious violations, such as sexual harassment.

It's almost as if those first experiences are really valuable, and for being able -- for a worker to be able to determine if they're gonna come forward with anything that is more severe.

And it creates a huge barrier when workers, first of all, don't understand the system, but then are also met with an agency, entity, or an investigator that doesn't understand them as a worker, their work sector, the nuances of domestic work itself, and what makes them so vulnerable.

We want to make sure that we're strengthening sector-specific knowledge and protocol for domestic workers in enforcement agencies.

So it's key to -- what -- what's key for us, is to helping investigators understand and practice how they work with (indiscernible) situations, and we -- and the way that they gather evidence is fair. Right?

For a domestic worker, there is no such thing as a human-resources department. So their avenue to seek and redress is to actually come forward in a

very -- for them, a very public exposed way.

They need to actually engage with some sort of outside entity, like the department of labor.

First of all, they would have to figure out how to get to the commission on human rights, or the division of human rights.

And, oftentimes, if they're lucky, very lucky, they can find a community-based organization that would help them maneuver that process, or refer them appropriately.

And oftentimes, unfortunately, that does not happen.

We work specifically towards developing metrics, and measuring the progress in domestic-worker rights enforcement efforts.

So, we want to be able to see the patterns of, like, what are the systemic violations, and what are the barriers to making (indiscernible) -- like, enforcement itself successful?

So each of the cases that come through, we're just trying to collect as much data as we can, as to:

What it took to bring them to our clinic?

What is it taking to keep them from dropping

off their cases, or, stopping their cases?

What does it take for them to find a new job afterwards?

Right?

And so this is all data that we're collecting.

Then, how does the process work, so that we can go back to the department of labor, we can go back to, you know, the commission on human rights, and say, Hey, this is what we're seeing, and we need to be able to work together to address these issues.

So what we're seeing on the ground for domestic workers is that, even with these strategies in place, continued collaboration with city, state, and community-based organizations and advocates, we know that it still takes a very long time for workers to know whom to turn to, and whom to trust.

Domestic workers have a very hard time admitting that their workplace rights have been violated.

They have an even harder time sharing accounts of harassment, and continue living with that trauma and fear every day in their current workspaces of past experiences.

And we're committed to, like, the complete screening of potential workplace violations, which

includes sexual harassment, but it's not enough to wait for workers to come forward.

I think this is one of the biggest lessons learned around the Domestic Worker Bill of Rights.

It's 10 years since it's passed, and the kind of prevailing thought was that, you passed the law, it will get enforced, workers' lives will be better.

We actually have to go out into the communities, find the workers, and actively support them through the process and life of their case itself.

And then once we do so, we're actively engaging them back into organizing, into community-based group organizations, into our chapters, so that they themselves are able to build -- build their opportunities so that they don't have to go back into the same or similar situations.

Right?

We find that when some workers are -- have decided to come forward, they do so in relation to a different complaint of workplace violations. It might be a lesser offense. They kind of test the waters.

And they do that so they can see how well

they can trust us, and how well they can trust the support and the process itself.

So for domestic workers, it's not -- it's almost never just sexual harassment. That's sort of like added insult to the injury.

Unfortunately, while a worker itself has several years, six years, in New York to file a wage-theft complaint, the statute of limitation runs out much sooner for sexual-harassment claims.

So, oftentimes, I only counsel workers who will come forward with a claim of harassment, but that claim they cannot pursue, and we would have to figure out if they had some other type of workplace violation that they can actually pursue.

Workers themselves need to have time.

So, one year is barely enough time for workers to build the stamina and support and understanding of their rights to come forward. But we also know that they require additional time to distance themselves from a job.

So, if they are relying on a reference letter, they need to be able to secure their next job, or even the, next, next job, in order to make some kind of a complaint against their previous jobs.

So one year is not enough for them to do that.

We've had to even -- had to advocate the department of labor, that they were -- they were giving us a three-year cutoff date for when wage-theft violations were made.

And we had to push them to please give us the six years, because we knew that workers themselves weren't even able to file -- just, these are just stolen wages -- within the three-year time limit that they had -- had put forward recently.

So we know that, for domestic workers, one year itself is not nearly enough.

We know that, for domestic workers, because they work in the homes, they're highly -- they are highly surveilled. They're afraid to make a phone call to an agency, they're afraid to seek out support. Their hours are very long.

And so would need some extra access to be able to call late at night or on weekends, to figure out where could they file a claim.

Right?

It takes a long time for a worker to take a day off to come in to any of our offices.

We hold clinics very late into the night in

order to be able to accommodate their ability to work their full day, and then come in and make a file -- a claim in the evenings.

And that's almost impossible with the department of labor, unless we make a very special kind of request, which we have been able to be do, but, how could that be scalable, how could we make it more accessible, statewide, for domestic workers to be able to access the division of human rights and the department of labor?

I cite the department of labor a lot because that's probably the entity that workers would reach first. Right?

And so there also needs to be an ability for investigators to appropriately refer workers and screen workers for the different types of violations that they might have.

I think what I want to say, really, is that, because domestic workers are so isolated, they work in such intimate settings, and they have to uphold a very high standard of work. Right? These are people who take care of our children, of our elderly, and of our homes themselves, that we need to be able to understand that education itself isn't enough.

We have laid out some policy requests, and -in my testimony, and, really, those are addressed
towards, like, what is going to -- what is it going
to require to support very vulnerable workers to
come forward and file claims of harassment?

Many workers would lose their home because they are live-in. Many workers would lose their job.

And so how could we mitigate a retaliated -- retaliatory actions from an employer?

We know that worker centers themselves are the first point of contact for many workers.

So how could we bolster that, by funding worker centers as a point of contact for being able to be sort of like a hub for enforcement?

And, you know, create funding streams, so that the community centers themselves can effectively do the pre-work that is required to bring cases forward?

We would like for the agencies to really consider what it means to do co-enforcement models.

I have a lot of visions of what it would look like.

I have worker leaders who are currently really good at investigating domestic-worker cases.

They could be -- they could be actual investigators within the DOL. They could be the navigators.

And so, when I'm thinking big, what would it be to really collaborate very closely, creating vulnerable-workforce sectors, especially domestic work, to be able to navigate other workers through the system.

And then, lastly, I would ask that we think about creating a task force to explore the feasibility of establishing like a statewide sectoral standards board for domestic workers, that monitors and proactively sets standards for the domestic-worker industry, so that when we set the standards for the industry, we don't have workers that are so vulnerable to issues such as harassment.

Really, I want to leave the rest of the time for my colleague Daniela, who is a fierce organizer, mother, domestic worker, and, herself, has a powerful story.

But she inspires both myself and other workers to come forward with their stories.

Thank you.

DANIELA CONTRERAS: Buenos stades.

My name is Daniela Contreras. I am the

organizer at the National Domestic Workers Alliance.

I have worked for many years as a domestic worker, and also my family, my mother and my sister.

I am the mother of a curious, intelligent, beautiful 6-year-old girl, and I have been undocumented. I am currently a DREAMer.

Today I am here to share my story of sexual harassment in the workplace, and how this issue affects the sector in which I organize.

Domestic workers have faced a long history of exclusion for basic labor protections.

Domestic workers were a specifically excluded from federal labor protections, like minimum wage and the right to organize a union.

Many laws, such as anti-discrimination and harassment laws, have also excluded domestic workers, and domestic workers feel the consequences of that. They feel it as disrespect, a lack of dignity in their work. They experience it as wage theft, and not having enough time to take off for -- to take care for their families and their loved ones.

We feel unsafe in our jobs, unprotected by our laws.

When I was 16 years old, I got a part-time

job as a nanny, cared for a 3-year-old boy while his parents were at work. I took care of him every day after school, from three to four hours.

I was so excited because it meant helping my family financially.

My mother at that time was working as a live-in domestic worker, staying with her employer seven days a week, and earning \$125 a week.

My sister and I were living with my uncle at that time, and she had very little time to spend with us. Her situation was bad.

So bring in an additional income went a long way. I felt proud I was making a contribution. At that time, I was undocumented.

In my community, there is a lot of fear of seeking help from law enforcement when you're in trouble.

I did not know where I could go, and, at the time, had something bad had happened.

And while I understood English, I did not feel I could express myself fully in this language at that time.

The mother of the child spoke Spanish, and

I -- she interviewed me, and provided me with a work

agreement. But the husband was a monolingual

English-speaker.

My job required me to be alone with him at home often, and this made me feel very uncomfortable.

At 16, the idea of being home with this father alone was uncomfortable, but I felt I was -- it was a job that my family needed me to have.

Sorry.

The father will come home from work in the late afternoon. He will go straight to shower.

At first, he will come out of the shower and walk from the bathroom to his bedroom, wrapped in a towel.

But, over time, he started to call me from the bathroom to get a towel for him. I will bring him a towel and leave it at the door.

On some days, I would try to be proactive, and leave a towel in the bathroom before he got home, but it continued to escalate.

One day he came home from the show -- he came home -- he came out of the shower, into the bedroom, where I was playing with his child. He began to touch me and pull me into the bed, sexually assaulting me, right in front of his child.

I felt so vulnerable and defenseless;

I froze.

I was lucky enough, someone knocked on the window. He got distracted, and I was able to run away.

It was one of the most terrifying experiences of my life.

My employers never called me back; I never got paid.

And out of fear, and embarrassment, I kept silent for almost two decades. At that time, I kept wondering, why me?

And later I began to wonder about other women who did the work I did, but in houses that were significantly more isolated.

What happens to them?

This was my first experience with sexual harassment in the workplace, but it wasn't my last.

I have had also experienced sexual harassment repeatedly, working at a restaurant, and a deli.

In the restaurant, the owner required the women employees to wear super-tight clothes in the winter; and short skirts, and low shirt cut -- low-cut shirts that revealed cleavage, in the summer.

He will specifically target me when he was

around, requesting me to be the server, telling me, he'll like to take me to dinner, and then a hotel.

And there verbally abusing me when I ignore his behavior and turn him down.

My work -- my co-workers would say nothing, not even the servers who experienced some of the same behavior from him.

I was the only worker who stood up to him, and, of course, I got fired.

I remember dreading working those long hours where I felt such undignity (sic).

I did file a complaint against him in 2005.

He hired a lawyer, and working with the manager, put a (indiscernible) counter-story, accusing me of pursuing him.

My case was thrown out.

Later, I saw the same lawyer recently who worked with him in this response to my complaint, and this lawyer was running for office.

It angers me to see how unfair power dynamics work against us to so many women in our society.

I experienced similar behavior by the deli owner's son where I also work.

One day he called me into his office and told me he wanted me -- to have sex with me.

I was already older by then, and the experiences from before draw me to want to stop repeating the cycle.

I told him, no, that his behavior made me uncomfortable. And if done again, I will report it to the department of labor.

It scared him enough to stop his behavior, but that not -- but that's not always the case in our situations.

At that time, I knew that the department of labor enforced workers' protections, but I did not know how to find their number or how to access their help.

Everyone says, go and take action, but it's difficult to know where to go, and how to go about reporting, and actually changing this situation.

Now, as an organizer, every day I hear stories of working women just like me.

I moderate several online domestic-worker groups on social media.

Recently, I got a call from a house cleaner in Texas. She had gone for an interview, and after the employer drove her home, he attempted to rape her.

As she was leaving his car, he threatened

her, that if she ever mentioned anything, he will come after her, knowing where she lived, and having information about her personal life, from the fake work interview.

She call me, crying. We had a deep conversation about what was happening, and, immediately, I contact her with our -- one of our affiliates in Texas, which they give her support and legal advice.

Domestic workers have no way of knowing beforehand how safe the workplace is before they are there. They have no one around, often, to witness their experiences or offer them support and protection.

Many domestic workers are immigrant women,
American women of color. Their families and
communities are constantly targeted, separated,
(indiscernible) with violence.

Our stories can be fully of pain, fear, and violence.

When I have posted videos and articles about my firsthand experience of sexual harassment in the workplace to the online domestic workgroups, there's often little to no response, compared to other postings.

Our communities still struggle to talk about this issue openly.

And the only thing I am requesting, it's -- (indiscernible), but what I'm asking is, as Marissa said, we want more protections for domestic workers.

I don't know if my daughter's ever gonna do the domestic work. She has seen me doing it. She's very proud about me doing -- being a house cleaner sometimes.

But I want my daughter to also know that, wherever she goes, she's going to be safe.

We need those protections.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you, both, so much.

I don't think that -- I don't think that I've heard testimony as compelling as both of you have given to us tonight about domestic workers at any point throughout the entire inquiry of what we have been doing.

And, it's incredibly powerful, but that doesn't even really underscore the feeling that I have.

Daniela, when you were speaking, my heart was racing in my chest, because I understand what that's like; how normal it is to just let people, and, mainly, in these dynamics, where it's male and

female, to just allow men to say things to you, or just to touch you, or to touch -- rub your back, or to touch your face.

It has happened to me more times than I can even count in my entire life, and, it's not okay, it's unacceptable.

And, that behavior is unacceptable in every environment, no matter where we go.

And so I think that one of the things that you touched on, that is -- really underscores the beginning of this hearing today, was, you said, "It's difficult to know where to go, or how to go about reporting, and actually changing the situation."

That is not by accident. That is on purpose.

The way that our systems have been designed have been designed in such a way where only a few people can understand where to go.

And even if you understand where to go, it doesn't necessarily mean you'll be heard.

And I've seen it up close, and I just find it to be incredibly egregious.

And that is why both of you here today, to share your testimony, is important, because I'm actually incredibly impressed that you even knew to

say, not only "no," which may not be -- may not feel like a big thing, but it's a huge -- a huge statement to make.

I didn't say -- start saying no until I was in my late 20s.

So, I really -- I'm just -- what I'm really getting at here is, I want to know, how did you know where to go, or that the department of labor was even a place for you to go, at all?

How did you find that information out?

This is important because -- it's important because, one of the things I feel like that we can do, and one of the things that is a problem, is that, when we pass laws, sometimes people don't even know, or they don't know what their right -- they don't know what their rights are, or where to find their rights. And the information is tucked into a place that, only if you have access to a system can you get the access.

So I'm just wondering if you remember how you learned about this information?

And what you think we can do to make this information more readily available for everyone.

DANIELA CONTRERAS: I -- I have been very involved with my community. I -- I -- if I'm not

mistaken, I -- when I was younger, right after school, I will go and volunteer at community centers. There's one specific one in Sunset Park, it's called Mikstaka (ph.), and that's where I learn about it.

But it was -- I -- I knew there was a place to go, but like I said, where do I find it; what's the address, what's the phone number?

That's what happened back then.

And -- and now what we're trying to do here, now, differently, and that's the reasons I came on board, and -- to NDWA, is because I want domestic workers to know how to find help.

Maybe it's not the department of labor, but they can come to us.

We -- pretty much, what we do, we walk around, with these cards, all over the city, where we have our information; social media, phone number.

I call them our "domestic workers' 911 phone number."

They can call any time. Each one of us take turns on that cell phone. We answer that cell phone, weekend, night. Anytime a domestic worker calls, we answer them.

They can leave a voice message in any

language they feel they're more comfortable.

We have these cards, where they -- we tell them about their rights. We try to get their information. And we do follow-up.

And whenever we have our monthly meetings, we send home, our workers, our members, with 10 cards each, and they got to bring it back, to make sure.

And we also walk around the city with T-shirts, with our phone numbers.

Like, we're doing all the way.

And, Marissa, she has more.

MARISSA SENTENO: I -- no, it's just -- I was remembering back the earlier conversation with the division of human rights, around, like, how do people know how to get to you?

So, first of all, a "know your rights" is not an enforcement strategy. Right? Like, that is a piece of an entire broad set of strategies that need to happen in order for workers to -- all workers, and the most vulnerable workers, to be able to come forward, and then, also, you know, go through the process, up.

So the strategy is, outreach, education, engagement.

And then, when we were thinking about

"know your rights," what we were finding was that,
when I gave just "know your rights" trainings, which
were great as one-offs, our trainers were amazing,
because they are worker leaders themselves who can
engage really actively with the other workers, it
can be disempowering because, suddenly, you know how
much you have been exploited.

But, when we gave this same training embedded in a nanny training, something that they could gain a certificate in, along with other -- other skills, like, how to communicate with your employer, nutrition for children, social-emotional development, and, then, your home is a work -- someone -- your home is -- your home is someone's workplace, and knowing your rights, that was something that they could utilize later; they then knew that they could go and ask for a contract, to make sure that they weren't agreeing to signing away their overtime rights.

And then understanding, what does sexual harassment look like?

It could look like, and these are, you know, stories from our workers:

The man of the house walking around in a towel, wanting to hold, like, a meeting with them,

and making them feel, like, extremely uncomfortable, day after day.

It could look like someone trying to physically advance on somebody.

It could look like, saying no, and then also being threatened with your life, because you said "no," and because you told the wife.

It runs an entire -- you know, it's a spectrum, and this is what we needed for domestic workers to understand, and they're beginning to understand, that no one should ever be doing anything that makes you feel uncomfortable, regardless of how pervasive or egregious that is.

So I think what -- so, yeah, what we actually did was, we held sexual-harassment trainings in conjunction with the commission on human rights, so that they got to meet the people who could possibly help them, right, in a safe space.

We've held other sexual-harassment trainings with self-defense classes, so that they could go home with something that makes them feel a little bit more empowered.

We showed them the websites.

We have been in communication with, actually, the division of human rights, around the -- the new

requirements.

And, most importantly, we're in constant conversation with, and building up, worker leaders, to understand: How are these rights affecting their lives? What are the barriers?

They are the experts, so we need to build space for them to voice their expertise, and actually creating the space for them to talk to the other decision-makers directly. Right? They're -- I'm not always the conduit.

SENATOR BIAGGI: That's incredibly helpful, and very illuminating.

And I have two -- one question, and one comment, just to share information.

Do you think that it would be helpful for us to do -- and I mean, "us," in our individual capacities, 'cause, you know, one of the ways that we communicate with our constituents, is we are able to send mailings, home.

Now, you know, there's lots of information to send, but perhaps this is one of those areas where I feel like there's not much communication shared. Right?

So, it's -- it's a two-way street, so that, we know that -- and that doesn't -- that's not to

say that our constituents are not domestic workers.

But what I'm saying is that, we can have an information that's sent home, that says, Are you -- do you employ a domestic worker, or are you a domestic worker?

And have a flip-card, right, that we have -that we ask either our Senate communications or the
Assembly communications to create for us, to send
home, to say:

Here's what you need to know about this industry, and the rights that these people have.

Or, if you're a worker, this is where you need to go.

Because, one of the things I know for sure, is that, you know, one of the reasons we know, as -- as citizens, is: You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can be -- right?

We know that because it's become -- it's like pop culture, almost.

But so much of what we need to know has to be almost turned into that.

And so the fact that you're walking around with these (indiscernible) cards is so important.

And to create -- to create more communication around it from all the different areas that can

possibly be pulled on to share this information is 1 an important way to get this information out. 2 But I want to know if you think that that's a 3 helpful mechanism that we can do, separate and 4 distinct from legislation? 5 MARISSA SENTENO: Yeah, so it is a helpful 6 7 mechanism. I think, for domestic workers, we are 8 understanding that it's everyone's responsibility to 9 10 ensure enforcement of our rights: it's workers, it's 11 government, and it's employers. 12 And we are responsible for workers 13 understanding how to enforce their rights. 14 We would like help to -- for employers to 15 understand that they are also, in part --16 SENATOR BIAGGI: That's wonderful to hear. 17 So -- but -- so what I'm asking then from 18 both you is, would you help us to create what that communication would look like, so we don't get it 19 20 wrong --21 MARISSA SENTENO: Certainly. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- and we can send that into our districts? 23

MARISSA SENTENO: We have a -- you want to

24

25

tell them?

1 DANIELA CONTRERAS: No, go ahead. MARISSA SENTENO: Okay, all right. 2 Hand in Hand is our sister organization that 3 employ -- that organizes employers, specifically. 4 They have a nice kind of hub in Brooklyn, 5 6 themselves, and they've been doing some really great 7 outreach. They have some great, like, pamphlets and -- and booklets. 8 So I would love to be able to, like, connect 9 10 to you all with them. 11 And then they are also, like, all of us in 12 communication together, because, when workers 13 themselves, like, when they put their stamp of 14 approval on it, you're, like, okay, that's going to 15 fly. 16 SENATOR BIAGGI: Right, that's right. 17 That's wonderful. 18 And I'm going to take you the up on that. 19 Are you familiar with the Workplace Project? 20 MARISSA SENTENO: Yes. They are an affiliate 21 of ours. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: They are? 23 MARISSA SENTENO: Uh-huh. 24 SENATOR BIAGGI: Oh, okay. Jennifer Gordon, who their -- is the 25

professor from Fordham Law School, was my 1 2 immigration law professor. So, her work in this area has been --3 MARISSA SENTENO: Yes. 4 5 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- transformational. 6 MARISSA SENTENO: Yes, absolutely. 7 SENATOR BIAGGI: And I'm glad that you're working all together, but not surprising at all. 8 MARISSA SENTENO: Yes. 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 10 11 MARISSA SENTENO: Thank you. 12 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you both for your 13 testimony. 14 Daniela, (speaking Spanish). 15 For those of you who are 16 bilingually-challenged, I just said, she's amazing. 17 I'm really taken aback on this, on a couple of fronts. 18 19 Number one: I grew up in a household, a 20 family, where most of my aunts worked as domestic 21 workers; some of them still do. And, we've heard 22 their stories, nothing to the extent of which you 23 shared. But I could imagine, you know, how common 24

25

those stories must be.

And, what's really interesting, we've talked a lot all day about the intersectionality of all of these different categories that can impact a particular victim; so whether it's race, gender, sexual orientation... you name it.

In your cases, also, that added dilemma of status, and the fact that that can be used.

We currently have legislation on the floor, on third reading, to protect undocumented workers from being threatened with referrals to ICE by employers.

We have another bill that arises out of your efforts, I believe years ago, with the bill of rights, and working with Keith Wright, at the time was the chair of the Labor Committee.

And there's a bill on third reading now, that would also lower the threshold for eligibility for domestic workers to get disability benefits.

And we're going to continue to go down this field.

You -- on the labor front of your industry there's is a lot of work to be done.

And we -- you have my commitment to dive into these issues, and to be a partner every step of the way as we strengthen that.

But just sort of keeping a focus on sexual 1 2 harassment and complaints: So, how many domestic workers are there in 3 the state of New York, that you're aware of? 4 MARISSA SENTENO: So the last best guess, 5 which is from research in 2010, which isn't good 6 enough, it's 200,000, 250,000, domestic workers. 7 Now, we believe that to be much higher 8 9 because Hand in Hand actually did a more recent survey of how many employers of domestic workers 10 11 there are. And that number was much higher. It was around 2 million. 12 13 So, we're looking at --14 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So somewhere between 15 200,000 and 2 million. 16 MARISSA SENTENO: Yeah, 2 million, exactly. 17 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And, the vast majority of them don't have an agency intermediary? 18 In other words --19 20 MARISSA SENTENO: No. 21 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- these are individuals 22 who make direct arrangements with the owners of the household --23 24 MARISSA SENTENO: Right. 25 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- for, whatever that

service.

MARISSA SENTENO: These are direct employees of -- right, who would be like the household itself.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So for -- for legal purposes, they are considered independent contractors?

MARISSA SENTENO: No, they are -- they are employees.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Employees?

MARISSA SENTENO: Yes.

That's a very common misconception, and so many workers themselves get misclassified because of it, but they are employees.

So, child-care workers, almost all, exclusively, employees.

Caregivers, also employees.

House cleaners, mostly all of them are employees, except for the situations where they themselves are running their own, like, cleaning business. And they are also particularly vulnerable because of that sort of, like, misunderstanding and gray area, even amongst themselves.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So if you are a cleaner -- house cleaner, but you work -- you get assigned a job, and you could be assigned to

different households, on a given schedule, because 1 another individual is running an actual cleaning 2 3 business, you're an employee of the business, in that case, not the household you're cleaning? 4 MARISSA SENTENO: Right. If there is like 5 a -- sometimes they call them, like, "scheduler" --6 7 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Yes. MARISSA SENTENO: -- and of that business. 8 9 By and large, though, they're -- they're -most house cleaners are direct employees of, like --10 11 they make that arrangement with the -- with the 12 employer, with the homeowner. 13 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So --14 MARISSA SENTENO: (Indiscernible 15 cross-talking) --16 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- right now, the remedy 17 for filing a case would be the division of human 18 rights? MARISSA SENTENO: Division of human rights. 19 20 And then, currently, if you live in New York 21 City, the commission on human rights. 22 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And then, in cases 23 you've seen, we've talked a lot about this current

standard of "severe or pervasive," how does a

domestic worker, how do you, Daniela, if you would

24

25

1 have brought that case forward, prove any of what 2 happened? DANIELA CONTRERAS: I wouldn't have any 3 proof. Just my word. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: There's no co-worker to 5 6 go to the witness? There's no --7 DANIELA CONTRERAS: I had the baby, but, he was a 3-year-old. So, no one else. 8 9 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I'm just curious, did you ever confront --10 11 DANIELA CONTRERAS: No. 12 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- his wife? 13 DANIELA CONTRERAS: Never. 14 Never went back, did not care -- well, it's 15 not that I didn't care. I was afraid. My status 16 was one thing. Language was another. 17 And, what was I supposed to do? 18 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Right, right. MARISSA SENTENO: I know of two instances 19 20 where workers have confronted the other partner. 21 One was met with very severe aggression. 22 The other was met with severe retaliation, 23 like, blacklisting the worker. 24 And, yes, you're right, it is very difficult 25 to prove, because they're the only people in the

house.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Again, I'm really interested in following up, and having more conversations, and figuring out how we can work together, through the committee, to do more work around protections for -- you know, just, in general.

MARISSA SENTENO: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: But I really want to commend you, the work you are describing, and what you are doing, to empower colleagues in this field, is remarkable.

(Speaking Spanish.)

Thank you for doing that.

Assemblywoman Simotas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Marissa, Daniela, thank you for opening our eyes.

I understand that harassment, any kind of harassment, especially sexual harassment, it's about a power dynamic. It's about, an employer, or somebody who's a supervisor, who is in a position of power, who is taking advantage of an employee, because, sometimes, because they can.

And, I think your testimony today, very pointed testimony, really highlights that.

Daniela, you really established that with your example of what happened to you; that, you were taken advantage of, just because, you were somebody -- there was somebody who felt that they were in power over you.

With that, you know, I agree with you,

Marissa, that we have to take steps and provide

resources, to allow people, especially when they're

economically disadvantaged, to come forward.

So, in addition to changing our statute of limitations to extending the time, what other resources can we as a state provide to workers who may not have the economic ability to just quit their job and move on, and, you know, find a lawyer or file a complaint?

What can we do?

MARISSA SENTENO: So funding for legal-aid services, especially those that deal with the most vulnerable workplace populations.

I have been working with day laborers and domestic workers for over 15-plus years. It is the hardest thing to find legal advocates, lawyers, that specialize in worker-rights protections, and then also have experience in harassment itself.

So funding more money into those really key

legal services, service providers, and then also the community-based groups that specialize in working with the most vulnerable workplace populations, like domestic workers, is really key.

Mental-health services as well.

I know that New York City is trying to kind of expand, but we know that, you know, domestic workers are statewide. Right?

I worked in Westchester for many years.

And so we see that, New York City workers, we can at least get to the park and talk to them.

Workers in Westchester, Long Island, and then further up north, so much more isolated.

So the onus is on us to really be able to get out into a lot of different types of communities, and to be able to provide, you know, mental-health services, health services itself, to just women of color, low-wage workers.

And then emergency-housing funding for especially domestic workers who are live-in.

I don't know how many times I've had workers just result homeless because of what happened on the job.

That's a really big factor for women coming forward in the domestic workplace.

And then thinking about, really, like, how to create a framework of support, because the one avenue, enforcement, needs to do its thing. But then there also needs to be the support for workers to be able to heal and move on, as well as kind of rebuild their career opportunities, and move on from that.

And then -- so we do part of that through the organizing, but we know that we are severely lacking. Right?

For the few cases that come forward with sexual harassment, like, it breaks my -- it doesn't just break my heart, but it makes you weary, trying to provide things that, you know, I got to like pull out of thin air, or something.

And that shouldn't really be the case, at all.

And if there were like a statewide, also, like guide of resources, like, verified resources, around, like, where do people go for different types of situations.

You know, oftentimes we work in this, like, loose network of, like, who do I know, like, I can call when I have a certain type of issue?

But that really shouldn't be the case either.

Right?

It should be more formalized, so that we can have like a better connected network system for the most vulnerable workers.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: And I have one more question.

Clearly, many domestic workers may not -- English might not be their primary language.

How do we make it easier for domestic workers to report problems when they face them?

Obviously, we have to educate them about the law. But maybe putting them -- maybe the State actually advertising, or putting notices in foreign-language newspapers.

I'm just thinking outside of the box.

I mean, we really have to make them feel comfortable with reporting these incidences.

Do you have any thoughts on that?

MARISSA SENTENO: Yeah, that's why we've invested worker leaders.

I mean, Daniela was my first cohort of worker leader. Like, she came part-time, learning about her rights. Is bilingual.

I've had teams of, like, four or five who will, spoke between them, like, eight different

languages.

So when we invest in community members who are really motivated to be liaisons, navigators, within the community, they themselves have -- you know, increase the language capacity for, like, our small entity. And then you'd be surprised how many people they can talk to.

This past year I've had a team of three, between, like, four different languages. And they spoke into over 1,000 workers in this, you know, past summer.

And that's -- for us, was quite -- quite an influx of contacts. But then we're able to bring forward 100-plus -- no, 150-plus cases, when, before, it was, like, you know, five cases.

So I know that when we invest in people in the community, that can go out into the community and have like the language access themselves.

And then of the materials that we use, it's always, we have them -- we actually utilize the City a lot.

I would commend the City in being able to provide us a lot of access to different languages, in -- and they have like a really excellent, like, bill-of-rights booklet.

If you haven't seen it, track it down. 1 2 It's really good, because it starts the conversation, and then it's in -- and it's in many 3 languages. 4 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: And just so that 6 I can clarify the record, our first step has to be, to make sure that our state human rights law covers 7 domestic workers. 8 9 MARISSA SENTENO: Absolutely. ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: And places of 10 11 employment that, you know, could just be one person, 12 or two people, like, not -- it doesn't have to be 13 more than four. Correct? 14 MARISSA SENTENO: Uh-huh. Absolutely. 15 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you very much. 16 MARISSA SENTENO: Thank you. 17 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Niou. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Hi. Thank you so much 18 19 for your testimony. 20 I think that it was really, really powerful 21 to hear. 22

And I -- I -- I agree with Chair Biaggi, because there are so many incidences, that it's, like, you can't even count them.

23

24

25

You can't even count them; it happens to

women daily.

And your testimony really, I think, shined a light on that.

And I just want to clarify, I don't think that anyone meant to say anything like -- that might sound like that, but, you don't have to confront anyone. You don't -- you don't have to do anything.

You don't have to do anything that you're uncomfortable with.

I just wanted to clarify that for folks, because, I think that so many of us go through so many situations, where it's enough to just get out of a situation safely, and to walk away unscathed.

I don't -- I just want to clarify that, there's nothing wrong with how anybody reacts to any situation that is sexually violent, or, violent, in any circumstance.

I -- I -- I know that there's a lot of laws on the books.

We just also talked about taxi drivers, we talked about bus drivers, we've talked about hospital personnel, and, folks who assault or harass these folks, they have a particular protection, you know, because we all know that -- and I remember working on this with Assemblymember Ron Kim, that,

you know, taxi drivers, they're put in the specific situation, just like domestic workers are.

Taxi drivers, though, are put in specific situation where they have the drive people anywhere, and they have a roll of cash on them. So people will assault them, to get the money, or, you know, they think that they can just drive them somewhere, and then they'll put them in a dark place, or something, and do something to them.

But most of these are -- protections are -
I've just kind of realized in my head, that many of

them are regarding men, positions that -- you know,

that they deserve these special protections

because -- and -- and the higher protection, because

of the position that they're in, they're public

employees, like, if they're working for the MTA,

et cetera.

But, what if there is something that is also protecting domestic workers like that, is that something that would be helpful, to say that they're -- it's a felony to attack your -- your employee?

I don't know.

MARISSA SENTENO: That would be great. I'm like...

I would say, first of all, because we're a member organization, that's something that we would ask specifically, like, our members: What would it take for them to feel protected? What would it take?

We do know that, what it takes for them to feel a little bit more -- the power differential is so high, so, for them to feel a little bit more of a level playing field, is that, when there are contracts.

And so, you know, we would love to put forward that notice of rights, and, contracts be mandated for domestic workers and employers, because at least, that way, there is, first of all, a level of understanding between the two, and it needs to be in the language that the workers themselves speak.

This all goes to, also, agency employee -employee -- ack, sorry -- employment agencies -it's been a long day -- as well, so that people -what happens is, especially for employment agencies,
for newly-arrived immigrant communities, it's sort
of, like, where they go to first, and then are
shipped off into these far-away suburbs, where they
may not have contact with other people outside of
their specific community for, like, several years,

until they've built up enough capital for themselves, to kind of, like, move on to different jobs.

And then for -- between domestic worker-employer unit, the household, contracts help them have a better understanding.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: That's great.

I mean, I think that what you just said is so key.

Like, if you want to ask your members, like, if there's anything that you think that would be -- you know, "How would you feel safe?" I think that's a great question.

And I would love to be able to hear -- MARISSA SENTENO: Sure.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: -- the answers for that question, because I think that, you know -- I don't want to hear these testimonies again. I don't what to hear -- I don't want to hear this.

MARISSA SENTENO: We're designing a survey for New York City domestic worker, employers. We're hoping to launch it this fall, training workers this summer, to be surveyors themselves.

And, yeah, and these are the things that we asked them. Like, what will it take for you to

feel, heard, respected, and honored at your work? 1 And so, actually, I'll go back to the survey 2 3 and see if there's something of that component. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: That would be great. 4 5 I love it. 6 Thank you so much. 7 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Two more questions. Do you have an app? 8 9 DANIELA CONTRERAS: An app? MARISSA SENTENO: Okay, so we don't have --10 11 we have a Facebook. All of the "grams," right, 12 Twitters. 13 We also an app for portable benefits. It's 14 called "Alia." And that's specific to trying to 15 address how house care -- house cleaners themselves 16 are not able to gain access to certain types of benefits. 17 But, an app for, like, worker rights, the 18 19 last one I saw was like the -- has you all heard 20 about the (indiscernible) app? 21 So I'm not sure if -- like, what -- what 22 you're getting at. 23 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And do you provide, or do you also assist, domestic workers with template 24

25

contracts?

MARISSA SENTENO: Yeah, we do have template 1 2 contracts. We would love for that to be something the 3 State could help provide template contracts for the 4 5 different, like, work sectors, so that employers had 6 like a trusted place to go, some guidance. 7 And, you all would be like a trusted entity, and be, like, okay, if I have a house cleaner, this 8 9 is what a general contract should look like. Currently, our contracts are mostly geared 10 11 towards nannies. 12 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Okay. There's a lot 13 more questions, but we'll do a follow-up. 14 I appreciate your time and your testimony. 15 Thank you. 16 MARISSA SENTENO: Thank you. 17 DANIELA CONTRERAS: Thank you. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you so much. 19 Next we are going to hear from 20 Cynthia Lowney, Marie Tooker, and Christine Reardon. 21 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Thank you. You can 22 begin. 23 CYNTHIA LOWNEY, ESQ.: Okay. 24 My name is Cynthia Lowney. 25 I'd like to say thank you, good evening, and

I'm glad that you waited to hear what we had to say.

Good evening, as I said, Senators, Assemblymembers, staffers, and all.

Thank you for holding and attending this joint New York State Senate and Assembly public hearing to examine sexual harassment in the workplace.

I believe that both the definition and the venue should be extended and broadened.

"Sexual" should also include gender and racial harassment, and "workplace" should include interviews, social and/or work-related events, volunteer work, et cetera.

Hostile work environments need to be eradicated by the compliance and the enforcement of rules, regulations, and laws that are already in existence, in a timely manner, and refined by updates when necessary.

"Sexual harassment" can be defined in a myriad of ways.

The usual definitions includes unwanted or unwelcomed sexual remarks or physical advances in a workplace or other professional and social situations.

It includes:

Making offensive remarks about women in general, as well as offensive suggestions and/or photos;

Giving gifts of a sexual nature;

Repeatedly asking another to socialize when given a negative response, especially if it's a supervisor;

Verbal abuse of a sexual nature, touching, grabbing, repeatedly too close, or brushing up against a person by a superior, even from another area or unit, a co-worker, a client, a customer;

Sexual pranks, teasing, singing love songs in the workplace, telling events of jokes of a sexual nature, innuendos, in person, by e-mail, phone, or other social media.

People need to know the definition, and that is precisely why education and training are imperative, and not just in the workplace.

Unwelcomed conduct unreasonably interferes with and/or intimidates one to do work performance, and, it can create an unhealthy, hostile, or abusive work environment.

Giving promotions, awards, training, or other job benefits to another who reluctantly accepts, or, may even want unwelcomed activity if that means you

get a promotion, anything like this of a sexual nature is wrong.

And, notably, the harasser can be of the gender, race, or religion.

Education.

One needs to know the definition of "sexual harassment," which I believe needs to be expanded to the gender, racial, and harassment of people because of their religion, so that others can better understand the entire component involved.

We must the expand the definition, and acknowledge a behavior, give it a name, so that people know, understand, and accept it as egregiously wrong; not just something like, "Oh, what a nice outfit you're wearing," or, "You look great today," which a lot of people have sarcastically, or perhaps they believe, has to do with sexual harassment, when there are no added actions or motions.

False accusations are yet another problem that must be addressed.

Because of a lack of education on topics or a misunderstanding, one might file a complaint that is inappropriate or false.

The target can also have longstanding

negative effects as to his or her career.

When so few know what it is, how can businesses, organizations, and government entities instill effective policies?

Similarly, without education, how would parents, relatives, teachers, coaches, mentors, neighbors, and all, know what could and should be done, or what should be reported?

Why don't people speak out?

"Those who are aggrieved keep silent for fear of retaliation: firing, being blackballed," as
Anita Hill said in 1991, when asked why she had not come forward about the sexual harassment towards her by Clarence Thomas, when she was subpoenaed for testimony during his U.S. Supreme Court hearing.

"Was some of a kind of subliminal repercussions, being labeled as a 'rat,' 'a snitch,' failing to adhere to the 'boys' club' mantra, or being denied promotions."

For sure, Professor Anita Hill was criticized.

In her career, while successful in some limited ways, was negatively affected, while Clarence Thomas is still a U.S. Supreme Court judge.

Former New York State Governor Mario Cuomo

had an executive order issued in the early 1990s, that forbid New York State employees from acting, ignoring, encouraging, condoning, excusing, sexual harassment.

That executive order did not curtail the rampant gender and racial discrimination that persisted in the New York State Department of Labor.

My specific reason for submitting
this testimony is because, after I heard
Professor Anita Hill's testimony in 1991, I was a
New York State Department of Labor administrative
law judge in Brooklyn, New York.

I was one of 21 administrative law judges hired in '91 to '92, because the New York State Department of Labor was required to hire women and minorities, since over 90 percent of the judges were White males.

From the onset, the instances of gender, racial, and sexual harassment and discrimination were rampant.

When we attended a training session in Albany, New York, in December 1991, it was the first time, after working since March of that year, that the ALJs had a social interaction after the daytime courses.

It was then that we realized the illegal behavior was beyond outrageous, as there was a hospitality room; a bedroom converted to an opportunity to have liquor and speak with the other ALJs, including supervisors and the executive director, all of whom were White males.

Within moments, we witnessed one of only three ALJs hired prior to our hiring, kissing a few supervisory judges and posing for photos with them.

Most of us were newer ALJs, and we left quietly without saying anything to those who remained.

We then began to relay what other gender, racial, and religious harassment and discrimination had occurred to us in our isolated cubicles.

Because most of us had a 30-minute lunch period, and had to travel from under the Brooklyn Bridge, on a van, to downtown Brooklyn to obtain our lunch, our conversations were extremely limited, since we wrote appellate divisions.

I had public contact because I was one of two ALJs chosen to do special hearings, since I had been an ALJ at another New York State entity prior to going to the department of labor.

When we arrived back at work the following

workday, which was a Monday, we were somewhat shocked, but totally dismayed, to see photos of the female ALJ, and the supervisors kissing her, posted by our main mailboxes.

Subsequently, armed with knowledge that there was a serious problem, we contacted our union, the Public Employees Federation, and spoke with our representative.

All of we new hires were provisional, and the New York State Department of Labor would not give us a test; therefore, most were afraid to file a grievance or complaint.

Fear of losing a job was prominent; however, without civil-service protection, and being on probation, even if hired by a test, allowed these few White males in a powerful position to persist with their antics of harassment and/or discrimination, and what we later learned was their way to encourage us to leave our jobs.

When a few of us contacted the employee assistance program and/or the office of equal opportunity at the department of labor, an explosion of interrogations, and more retaliation, occurred.

The EAP counselor I consulted violated my privacy by reporting what I said to the OEO office

without asking for my permission, or telling me that she did so.

Another ALJ went to OEO about racial and gender discrimination against her.

When the chief ALJ got a message from OEO that a female ALJ had complained, and he wanted to talk to him, I was called into his office because he assumed that I was the one that went to OEO, and he interrogated me for over an hour, without a witness for me, while he had a witness.

When I asked for union representation, he told, that if I wanted to leave his office, he would write me up for insubordination.

I stayed.

While I filed a PEF grievance about unfair and unequal treatment, and won a \$1,000 award, the rampant treatment and retaliation I suffered was outrageous.

On one occasion, the chief ALJ and executive director insisted that I stay after work for them to review 25 of my cases at once.

The norm was, for a senior ALJ, to review one at a time, and simply send back any recommendation or changes.

Before my one-year anniversary at the job,

and, without even one formal review of my work,

I was terminated, along with the minority female who
had gone to OEO.

It was blatant retaliation, and was a message to all others that, if they dared to report anything, they too would lose their positions.

Even though I won the grievance, the DOL never investigated my complaint that violated the PEF contract.

Both the other ALJ and I filed outside complaints of harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation.

I filed my complaint with the U.S. EEOC because I did not want a New York State entity reviewing a sister-brother unit.

Unfortunately, the EEOC transferred my case to the State Division of Human Rights in New York, without consulting me or obtaining my permission, because EEOC's backlog at that time was 10 years.

That's not a typo.

And that was in 1992.

I contacted our family friend,

Senator John Markey, who was able to have our immediate termination letter revised to include two weeks' notice.

The governor's office was notified, and his governor's office of employee relations was notified as well.

However, while Senator Markey's office had intended to assist us more vigorously, he was hospitalized to undergo emergency surgery, and, we were just without work.

A New York State DOL attorney from Buffalo interviewed me in the summer of 1992, and recommended that I be reinstated; she told me so.

However, the chief judge did not make that recommendation; I was not reinstated.

After months of no job prospects as an attorney, I was hired by the PEF regional director, Bob Jackson, now a New York State Senator, to fill in as a union rep for a woman on maternity leave.

A PEF union grievance was filed on behalf of other ALJs, since none would dare sign their name on it for fear of termination.

And when the test was given, both the other ALG who was terminated the same day as me, and I, both scored 100, and we were ranked Number 1.

But Number 27, a White male, was hired.

Because I was a single mother of two, unable to obtain a position with sufficient income, I had

to cash in any pension moneys that I had in the New York State Retirement System.

I had an income execution order for child support because of non-compliance after a divorce, but it was unenforceable, since I was able to hire -- unable to hire a person to determine the whereabouts of my children's father after he left New York State.

My financial woes continued because of the State Division of Human Rights' backlog. Their move to another location, and letters not to contact them, because they were busy with other cases.

My probable-cause hearing that was supposed to occur in 90 days, according to the executive law in New York State, took 4 years.

I had the probable-cause hearing in 1996, along with the other ALJ who was terminated the same day as me in April of '92.

I won my hearing, and the DOL appealed it.

I won the appeal, which meant that it would -- I would be entitled to a public hearing, or, I could proceed in federal court.

Both the other ALJ, and many others that were subsequently fired before the test results had come out, we could not get an attorney to represent us on

any kind of a contingency. They wanted \$10,000 from each of us. And I was making way under 40,000 at the time. And like I said, I had two kids.

I could not afford that substantial retainer for a private attorney, and, therefore, I could go to federal court.

No not-for-profit would take my case because they knew backlogs meant lots of paperwork, lots of time; no money.

I had a rely on the State Division of Human Rights. They would only represent my complaint, but not me personally, whatever that meant.

I never had a public hearing for several more years. All that while I took what I called "survival jobs," and, often, that meant two or three jobs at a time, including many without medical, dental, prescription, optical benefits, or vacation, sick, personal days, and some with minimum-wage salaries.

At the same time, I had to hope for a hearing; but, instead, attended various conferences with the State Division of Human Rights, on little notice to my employers for a day off from work, often without pay, because the positions were temporary, provisional, 1099, or seasonal, and

travel to State Division of Human Rights' offices in Harlem, Hauppauge, Brooklyn, and The Bronx.

Neither the attorney for the DOL, nor the attorney for the State Division of Human Rights considered my loss of work every time they postponed, failed, agreed to adjournments, or they failed to produce documents or were unprepared.

Even presiding ALJ -- even ALJ -- I'm sorry.

Even presiding ALJ demands that the DOL be prepared and show up with files was ignored.

Most corporations, not-for-profits, and others enter into negotiations when it's a case of the State Division of Human Rights, because they want to expedite all and reduce legal fees, costs, et cetera.

Government entities do not consider costs, since attorneys who handle the cases do not suffer any consequence if they lose a case, and they don't get a raise if they win.

The incentive to work earnestly sometime lands in the laps of those who would agree to serial adjournments by their adversaries.

Accountability as to timeliness, sufficiencies, was not a priority. In fact, I never met -- in all those years, 15 years in the end, I

never met the general counsel or the commissioners that were appointed over that entire experience.

My public hearing took 38 days of testimony over 18 months.

Both the DOL and State Division of Human Rights' attorneys were required to file briefs, but neither of them ever did that.

The State Division of Human Rights' attorney failed to file a brief after several months of extensions, and work was done by me most of the time.

She notified both the ALJ, who presided over the hearing, and me, the Friday before the brief was due on that following Monday, after months of extensions, ergo, I put together a brief, without a library, on 48 hours' notice, hoping the ALJ would accept it.

The DOL attorney who was at the hearing for those 18 months left the DOL, and another attorney not familiar with the case, allegedly, filed a brief, but I never got a copy of it.

15 years later, after I filed my 1992 complaint, I received --

And by the way, there was a typo there. It should say '92, not '96.

-- I received a winning recommendation for back pay, minus what I did make, plus 9 percent interest, 50,000 in compensatory damages, and

immediate reinstatement.

That would have been almost 500,000 for those 15 years.

Both the DOA and, shockingly, the State Division of Human Rights, objected to my win.

I anticipated that the DOL would object; however, it was beyond astonishing that the State Division of Human Rights objected.

Since the attorney had not been prepared, I did almost all the questions to the various witnesses whose names I gave to her.

I had to Xerox all for her when she received papers from the DOL at a hearing, while she got her lunch.

Apparently, her boss, the general counsel,
Gina Lopez Summer, was undergoing New York State
confirmation to become a New York State Court of
Claims judge when that decision came out, and the
award, as given, would have publicly exposed the
inefficiency at the State Division of Human Rights
under her supervision, and that would have caused,
you know, major harm, stress, et cetera, to her, but

it also cost me lots of that as well.

Taxpayers would have been outraged if they saw the amounts of money that I won, based on a 9 percent interest rate for the difference in the salaries that I made and the salaries that I would have had, to say nothing about pension again.

A new commissioner was appointed, and that meant more delays.

Gina Lopez Summer was approved by the

New York State Senate, and the new commissioner

handed me a decision and order, that included

\$100,000 in compensatory damages, but only one year

of back pay, plus interest, because I was a

provisional appointee.

She did not consider that I took, passed, and scored Number 1 on the civil service exam, and was never interviewed or hired, and that an associate commissioner at the New York State Department of Labor testified at my hearing, that they skipped over the several of us, the terminated judges, because they thought they could do so.

Bottom line:

After an appeal, I got zero, because the

New York State Department of Labor hired outside

counsel and filed two affidavits:

One, that the person who accepted service from my process server, with me by his side, was not authorized to accept the papers, which was not true;

And, two, that the only place to serve legal papers was in Albany, as indicated by an internal memo, albeit not available to the public.

Suggestions and recommendations that I would give:

- 1. Expand the definition of "sexual
  harassment" to include gender, racial, and religious
  harassment and discrimination.
- 2. Mandate education, beginning in elementary and high schools, with resources and teachers who are well trained in those areas, because workplace harassment, discrimination, is the result of one's environment: their home, their family, their school, their neighborhood; religious, social, and ethnic background; plus, TV social media, et cetera.

For sure, the double check mark of hiring only those who fit two categories of underrepresented groups eliminates hiring those of certain genders, ethnic, religious, and/or racial backgrounds, who need to find others with whom they can have trust, confide in, et cetera.

3. Provide training, education, for parents, families, workers who may not be organized of their -- I'm sorry -- may not be cognizant of their own prejudices, behavior, and its effect on others.

We must go to the sources that is the root of the problem.

4. The current rules, regulations, and law must be complied with, and enforced timely, by not just corporations who often settle with non-disclosure agreements, thereby allowing the predators to remain in their jobs, while the person reporting is giving money, and may not realize that explaining why they left a position is, in essence, not true, when an employer agrees that the reason for leaving is something other than the egregious behavior, or that their career is ruined because they did report; but, also, by way of government entities, not-for-profits, per diems, household workers, store clerks, waiters, waitresses, actors, actresses, tutors, coaches, and more.

Justice delayed is justice denied.

5. Discussing the issue goes back centuries.

Professor Anita Hill; U.S. Supreme Court

Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who graduated, top of her

class; couldn't get a job as a lawyer. Go teach.

The Women's Rights movement of the '60s, and the #MeToo movement, and instilled hope in women that we would be treated equally and with dignity; not harassment and discrimination.

Women had their hopes up when they fought for the right to vote, the right to own property, to make their own medical decisions, without their husbands' decisions; to attend military, medical, law, and business schools, without prejudice against them; to enter predominantly male fields as firefighters, police, pilots, FBI agents, judges, electricians, plumbers, rabbi, minister, priest, and more, to be promoted to levels consistent with those who have been met with equal pay, for promotions given to men with equal education, experience.

The norm has been, and still is, in many areas, that women and minorities must have superior credentials to attain positions and salaries that are equal that of White males.

Neither New York State, nor New York City, has had a female governor or mayor.

No female has been elected as a U.S. President.

However, African-American men have all attained those positions.

Weekend news is headed by a plethora of women and minority hosts. Only recently have women and minorities appeared more frequently during the week.

Women have, and still do, put up with lots.

Hillary Rodham Clinton was considered too old to be president of the United States, but

Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump were older. Nobody cared about their age.

Many, even women, do not see through the eyes of harassment and discrimination.

Hearings and legislation are two initial steps.

The momentum must continue through education, training, compliance, and enforcement in a timely manner, if all serious about eradicating harassment and discrimination.

Justice delayed is justice denied.

And I'd just like to end with:

I graduated from NYU in the top 10 percent of my class. Went on to get a master's degree, with a fellowship.

Worked for a year, then went to law school, and a scholarship to Buffalo, but transferred because I was married at the time.

Went to Rutgers, where Ruth Bader Ginsberg

had set up clinics for lawyers. And I graduated with a current U.S. Senator, she was in my class.

I have to say that, all of these years, of the 15 years of waiting and hoping for justice, and then losing and saying, as a former varsity player, from elementary school through college, "suck it up and move forward," you can't suck it up and move forward.

Retaliation is there forever, especially with government contracts.

Thank god for Tisch James, changing the thing of "name your salary," because when I was a chancellor of the rep, a federal law clerk, all the different jobs I had, even if they were temporary, or any of the jobs, an ALJ for the City part-time, representing people with different things, or being a volunteer, I didn't have to list salary anymore, because she passed that for New York City.

That needs to be passed, forever, everywhere.

The other thing is, the retaliation continues on government applications, especially, "Have you ever been terminated?"

You have to tell the truth.

And then you tell the truth, and then you're out there: You're the rat, you're the

(indiscernible). Oh, we can't touch that one. 1 I'm now 70 years old, and I've been asked on 2 interviews --3 When I score 100 and I get Number 1, and 4 5 I know who to call in Albany, to say, Am I going to be interviewed if I'm Number 1? 6 7 Unless they're veterans, you don't have to interview me. 8 9 -- and so I'm getting more interviews, and what's the question? 10 11 You've got a lot of shaky background here. 12 Why do you have so many jobs? It's called "survival." 13 14 My most recent job was two years. I worked 15 two years for a president of the bus drivers' union. 16 They were doing 100th anniversary for their 17 union. I knew the president from community 18 activity. 19 I did that for two years. 20 The day he had open-heart surgery, which was 21 an emergency, one of his officers came in and said, 22 We don't need you because he's not here. 23 And then it's another gap. 24 Okay? 25 So, just so you get the picture.

I hope it helps somebody else, because 1 I could tell my family, they've lived this story. 2 3 My daughters had to make college choices based on my low income. 4 Yeah, there's financial aid. 5 My daughter got into Boston College, her 6 7 first choice. Financial aid was 3,000 of a loan. She couldn't go there. 8 She ended up going to Binghamton, ended 9 loving it. 10 11 My other daughter had national merit, she 12 could pick and choose where she went. But she 13 wanted to go to law school. 14 And she had to go to work first, but that 15 kills any financial aid, because now you worked. 16 So, it's really -- it has repercussions for 17 everybody. And, right now, my house is in foreclosure. 18 I was hit with "Sandy" storm. 19 20 It's not "Queen for a Day," an old show they 21 used to have, but, I just can't win. 22 And I said, I'm gonna just come and tell it, and it is what it is. 23 Prior to this, I wouldn't want it to go 24 25 public.

1 And when we had this problem back in '92, as a coalition, I know the union said, Come on, all of 2 3 you go together. But all we could see is, "The Daily News," 4 "15 judges, knocked out." 5 And we just thought it would ruin our 6 7 reputation. Well, mine is ruined. 8 9 And, at 17, I worked as a telephone operator. 10 Joined VISTA for a year. And from VISTA, 11 I met other people that were in college. I took a 12 year off. And they told me about financial aid. 13 I put myself through school. 14 I have a mother that was a high school 15 dropout, and pregnant at 15, married at 16, and 16 4 kids by 23. 17 And I'm telling you, I am the first female in my family that even graduated college. 18 19 And now look at me. 20 But, thank you. 21 I'm sorry, I took up more than my 10 minutes, 22 but, sorry. 23 MARIE GUERRERA TOOKER: That's okay. 24 I would say good morning, but that was

25

at 10:00 this morning.

1 But since I've been here now, very long time, 2 I --[Laughter.] 3 MARIE GUERRERA TOOKER: -- have witnessed 4 remarkable, wonderful people. 5 6 You, this Assembly, for the first time 7 ever --I have spoken at the Moreland Commission, 8 county legislation, town board meetings. Thrown out 9 10 of meetings. 11 -- I have never seen the most compassionate, 12 caring, loving, giving group of government Senators 13 and Assembly. 14 I -- you're a beacon of hope, and I am so 15 grateful, so grateful. 16 It was a pleasure to be here all that time, 17 to see yous act, and, with all this wonder, I just -- I'm in awe. 18 19 And I'm -- I know now, that New York has a 20 chance. We have a chance. 21 Even though I'm not happy with the Governor, 22 because the Governor has covered up many crimes in 23 my case, and I have caught him taking campaign 24 contributions, not doing good things, covering

things up, I know that we have a chance now, by

25

being in this room today with all of you. 1 So I am very grateful. 2 3 So thank you, with all of my heart, and God bless all of you. 4 I didn't fully write my speech about my life 5 because it said not to talk about your life. 6 But I -- I wrote that I am a victim of the 7 "Suffolk Crime Family." 8 And just last Friday, our presiding officer, 9 legislative, Duane Gregory, actually described the 10 11 "Suffolk Crime Family" as "the Sopranos," publicly. 12 And as you know, Suffolk County has an 13 indicted DA, the chief of police was convicted, the 14 Nassau County supervisor -- executive was convicted. 15 We're having all of these corrupt players, 16 bad actors, being caught. 17 So there is hope. But with women like me, who are 18 19 whistle-blowers, retaliation is out of control. 20 I'm already marked as this crazy woman, who 21 speaks out. And anything I do, I'm targeted, 22 especially law enforcement.

Whenever I go for help, I mean, I've gone from, them killing my animals, to putting me in -- falsely, in jail, to beating me up in front of my

23

24

25

children, to being undressed from a federal judge.

So I experienced a lot, and all because
I chose to build my dream that I had since I was a
little girl, to take care of orphans and
underprivileged children. And I had this beautiful
134-acre farm, that became worth \$100 million, and
I chose not to sell. I chose to follow my dream.

And the powers to be wanted this beautiful piece of land, and they came to get me.

And my father, unfortunately, was the ring man. He was the ring man that brought all the wolves to me, who paid bribes, kickbacks, favors to all these powerful people, and they took me down, and they tried to destroy my life.

But the most important that they didn't do, that they tried to steal my children.

And most women today, that are like me, they lose their children.

So God had mercy on me, I did not lose my children.

But that's why I have the strength to carry on, to help women like me, who do lose their children, which is the most horrific thing that people are not aware of.

When you talk like I do, and speak like I do,

and tell on them, your children are targeted, and they come for your children.

And, you're not -- you -- you're dysfunctional. It's a hidden disability, that you're just -- can't function.

So harassment just doesn't come on a sexual level. It comes in all forms, and it's -- could be in your own backyard.

I call it "war of the land."

134-acre farm, I had war in my own backyard.

So, I just wanted to start with that.

So I want to -- harassment comes in many forms, but the most horrific nightmare of torment is the hidden ones; the hidden sexual comments, the hidden groping, the hidden kiss, the hidden terror to shut you up when you whistle-blow on them.

Like Senator Graham said, "When they want to silence you, they kill your cat or puncture your tires."

Well, with harassment, they do more than that. They degrade you to a level where you become dysfunctional.

Men instill fear in you, belittle you, so you are so beaten down, you just want to crawl under a rock and hope it stops.

Reality is, it never stops, when you're a strong mother like me who was a threat to the establishment.

Harassment continues until you are so broken, you just cannot back -- get back up.

We are in such a state of fear to lose our children and home, we bow down to the abuser, and he gets away to abuse the next victim.

It is not always just one man harassing you or asking you for a date or making sexual moves on you. Many times it is more than one.

For instance, when the police are called to your home, and, instead of them helping you, they're making fun of you, making sexual remarks, to a level, you just give up, while the police are protecting the person you are calling for help from.

You are so beaten down, the crimes against you are diminished, and the women (sic) is usually in more danger, because it becomes known to the world that she has no protection.

Today, I am forever grateful that the tide is changing, and this new administration is finally putting their foot down and protecting women.

Let's face it, God made women beautiful, and men sometimes just cannot help themselves.

I would have to say, by experience, most women in their lifetime have been harassed more than once, and they usually just deal with it at that moment in time.

The word "harassment" is not strong enough to describe the hidden terror that everyday women, single mommies, drug-addicted women, and women who are at their lowest, who are abused by the system, especially by law enforcement and judges.

It's men out there that have a political agenda, to degrade you, to gain power, and to get benefits from harassing women, like stealing your children, or stealing your home, or allowing to continue to sell drugs and traffic women.

These men who are protected by the corruption that has plagued our country are out of control, need be prosecuted to the fullest, to send a message that women must be protected from the bully.

Local police would solicit prostitution, and make a drug-addict woman in the streets give him a, and I -- I'll say it, but it's a little crude, blowjob to get off an arrest.

The police would then take the drugs from the prostitute and sell them.

The cops got sexually aroused, and then made

money.

This is one example of hidden evil that women suffer in the hands of silent harassment.

In today's world, sexuality is exploited, unbridled, seductive, and considered glamorous in the media, more and more predominant than ever in history.

In the olden days, women did not have fake nails or cosmetic surgery. Women were just natural, working hard to survive, milking a cow or planting corn.

Women are so discriminated against throughout history, and are still not fully protected today.

Although women have come a long way, there are categories of women under the new laws who are still not protected.

"Workplace" needs to be changed to "anywhere women are harassed."

"Sexual harassment" needs to be changed to

"any form of degrading a woman," especially when it

happens from law enforcement or judges.

Without hesitation, judges, if they harass a woman, need to be impeached.

So you ask, what we should do?

The first step is to take a good look at the

judiciary. Enough is enough with the corrupt judge.

I want to speak on behalf of what I witnessed with women, especially the ones who cannot speak for themselves, because they died.

Her name was Danielle (ph.), who I met in the dark, in my driveway, on property I own, that was under siege by drug deals and prostitution, fully protected by law enforcement.

I asked her what she was doing in my driveway, and she started crying. She told me she had two sons, and had to leave them and her home because her husband was abusing her and had protection by someone powerful.

She became a drug addict and lived in the streets, and serviced the police to survive.

How does a mommy lose her two sons, walk the streets, homeless, in today's world?

Why?

Because law enforcement and the court system protected the abusive man.

I believe Danielle was killed in the streets with a hotshot because -- because the police -- by the police, because she was giving me evidence and telling on powerful people.

I spent my life as a philanthropist, helping

the poor. I probably saved over 1,000 people.

Many people have come to me to tell me their stories. That's why I'm such a threat to the establishment.

Other women who came to me, like Bianca, who overdosed and died.

She was giving me evidence of law enforcement selling drugs and running the prostitution ring on the east end of Long Island.

Five days before she died, she reached out to me and was afraid for her life.

I could not save her, because the men were too powerful, and I had nowhere to go to help her, because it was the local authorities that were involved.

The workplace is not always in a building.

It could be in a hay field, on a farm, or in the police station, or right in a courtroom filled with men before a sadistic judge, a theatrical play, where the script has been written way before you got to the podium.

These judges and attorneys already colluded and marked you to be a target of their sick, sadistic actions of terrorizing women, so they can steal your children and home.

Our God-given rights have been plagued with corruption on every level of government, and completely ignored by society.

Congratulations to all who were elected during the 100-year anniversary of women's rights.

I pray to God that you protect all women, and bring hope to the women who are still suffering, oppressed, and change the laws to add the hidden harassment to the target of women that are abused in their own backyard, in the police department, or in the courtroom.

In my experience, when a sick, sadistic judge wants to punish you, and steal a 134-acre farm that was slated for a philanthropic endeavor to protect children and veterans, they abuse you and degrade you, instill fear in you, to shut you up, so you cannot defend yourself in a court of law.

When the act is so horrific, the average person cannot believe that a federal judge, like Judge Grossman, can be so sadistic, and say in a room filled with men --

And I was going to do this, but, you guys are just so wonderful.

-- "Take your sweater off for a second, and hang out."

"Take your sweater off for a second and hang out (demonstrating)."

We all know what a "second" is, and "hanging out" means to protrude, to stick out.

No woman should ever experience this kind of harassment by a judge, leaving her no protection as he degrades you as a woman, using his powerful position to instill fear in you, and to shut you up so you cannot defend yourself.

I would never go back in his courtroom after what he did to me.

Women need to be protected from men in power, and Judge Grossman needs to be impeached, immediately.

I was lucky, this abuse is on audio.

Many women like me will never get protected, because it is covered up by other judges and law enforcement.

So my question to this Committee is: Who will sponsor a petition of remonstrance to have judges impeached if they sexually harass a woman in a court of law, and to change the laws to protect women from men with powerful positions who have immunity?

Immunity needs to be taken out of the

equation.

Thank you so much for allowing me to speak today on behalf of all women who suffer in the hands of powerful men who are protected by our corrupt system.

And I hope and pray the laws are changed to protect us, and the future of women's rights, so men, like Judge Grossman, lose their powerful position, and never hurt mommies like me again.

Thank you.

CHRISTINE REARDON: Good evening, and thank you, everybody, Assemblymembers, for allowing me to speak.

My name is Christine Reardon.

 $$\operatorname{My}$$  issue has to do with my former employer, the  ${\operatorname{MTA}}.$ 

I began my career at the MTA, Long Island
Railroad, in 1983, and worked there for 27-plus
years in various positions, including the manager of
benefits administration.

In 2005 I opted to exercise my seniority, passed qualified -- qualification exams over a one-year period, and became a crew dispatcher.

I opted to make this career move due to the pressure I was under as a manager; the inflexibility

of my managerial schedule, and to better facilitate the IVF process my husband, Dennis, (motioning) and I were involved in.

After four years, struggling to achieve pregnancy, I gave birth to our beautiful daughter, Chavon (ph.) Faith (indicating), on April 8, 2010.

I remained on maternity leave until August, when I returned as crew dispatcher. I was assigned a male trainee, who made a verbal threat against me on October 8, 2010.

I immediately reported this threat.

But due to the manager's inappropriate handling of the harassment, I went over their heads, to their supervisor, in an attempt to have the threat appropriately addressed.

My manager's retaliation for doing so included harassment, bullying, and filing false charges against me.

My research, with the assistance of my shift supervisor, to challenge those charges prompted my managers to collude in misrepresenting my job performance.

And when I chose to go to trial to refute those charges, those same managers sandbagged me with unspecified accusations.

They refused to reveal to me the details of those charges, and they threatened me with loss of pension, loss of my husband's pension, and physical arrest, if I did not sign a scrolled one-sentence resignation that very day.

I was terrified.

And under such unexpected and unwarranted threats, I resigned under the most mental duress I have ever experienced.

The writing was on the wall.

I had seen how the managers operated in the past, and I feared further retaliation.

Despite a verbal assurance that my resignation that very day would not impact my receiving my pension and other benefits, I was later threatened with pension loss, and illegally denied payment of accrued vacation time.

My husband and I were devastated, and fearful to challenge the juggernaut of collusion and retaliation.

This is the typical bureaucratic bullying endemic at the MTA.

Three months later I was contacted by the MTA

Office of the Inspector General, asked if I would

serve as a witness to colleagues' complaints about

the misogynistic work culture, replete with sexism, racism, threats, pornography, and retaliation.

The MTA OIG was given my name as someone who experienced the same treatment that they were bringing to the OIG's attention.

I didn't call the MTA OIG; they called me.

We were elated to have an opportunity to reveal what happened to me to a State entity, and that could provide me with a fair and full investigation, and offer protection from further retaliation from the railroad.

The MTA Office of Inspector General did nothing of the kind.

This 8-year runaround by that agency includes:

An initial promise-of-protection agreement, which they reneged on only two days later;

An initial investigation, with as many as 12 other witnesses, that the MTA OIG decided to forgo.

A re-engagement with the MTA OIG, only after we reached out to numerous elected officials and an MTA board member, to request a review by the MTA OIG.

That initial re-engagement and interview was

also discounted, until we garnered the support of Congressman Pete King.

Suddenly, the MTA OIG expressed an interest, prompted by the Congressman's advocacy.

Finally, the MTA OIG agreed to interview witnesses we had proposed, and we were again once hopeful. But another year went by, with little or no movement, and with us doing all the heavy lifting, and continuing to seek out elected officials to highlight the injustice of what was done to me.

More than four years after targeting me for exposing the harassment that I and my colleagues were subjected to, the MTA OIG was still stalling, and ineffectively investigating my case.

We decided to reach to our witnesses, to compile statements of what they had told the MTA OIG, which included their assertion that I did nothing wrong, and did not deserve the treatment I received, which, in essence, was constructive termination, as well as their testifying to the type of harassment and abuse of women that this forum is addressing.

We deemed this outreach to our witnesses necessary, since none of our witnesses were asked to

sign statements at the time of the interviews.

Can you see the plot thickening?

Does it sound familiar?

This was years before the #MeToo movement served as a catalyst for where we now find ourselves.

Time is up.

Only one week after the last testimony was received by Congressman King and sent to the OIG, suddenly, there was movement.

Coincidence?

After four years of being discounted, lied to, and misled, the lead investigator at the inspector general's office, in a series of phone conversations, all of which are documented, discussed the investigation, his findings, reiterated the demands we were seeking, and told us that the railroad was willing to negotiate a settlement in close accordance with all items of compensation that I had been seeking since I was bullied out of my job.

Well, here I am, still waiting all these years later.

All I have received has been denial of any compensation, reversal of what I was told, and a

fallacious formal report, which I was told would not be necessary, which we (indicating) had to push for when the railroad reneged on what the MTA assured us would occur.

That formal report was compiled after the MTA OIG met with the railroad, and colluded to produce a false, biased, and misleading tome, which did not, by any interpretation, represent what I had been told.

Despite the MTA OIG assuring us that we would be part of the process of investigation, and that we would be permitted to review and comment on the report before it was finalized, that never occurred.

Once again, I was silenced and misled.

All parties involved know that what they did, in collusion to continue this attack on me, this could have been resolved eight years ago when the MTA OIG contacted me to be a witness to what was done to me and my colleagues.

When the MTA OIG and the railroad colluded to circle the trains, they derailed justice, and many representatives of the state government, who promised us an unbiased venue, were at the controls.

On February 19, 2015, a 14-minute conversation with the special counsel for the OIG,

assuring us that the railroad was willing to end this debacle with a fair settlement, well, that should be evidence enough.

In that conversation, he assured us that the settlement would be swift; that we would not have to re-present our case; that entities don't settle unless there was good cause to do so; that the settlement would be close, if not exactly, in line with all my demands for appropriate compensation to be made whole, all of which were discussed in detail.

When my husband, Dennis, asked the special counsel what his report stated that would induce the railroad to offer a settlement, he kindly told us that a formal settlement was not necessary, because I didn't need to be mentioned in such a document, and didn't need my name dragged through the mud.

What a guy, what compassion, to spare me any more emotional pain.

What a crock.

His only desire was to stall us until we went away, and to spare the MTA OIG and the railroad from any further scandal.

What are they waiting for?

For my story to be on the evening news?

Can they hear me now?

Additionally, we started to engage with the Governor's representatives in October 2014 when we began to see the writing on the wall.

Our novice experience and our naïveté in this theater of the absurd led us to believe that, with the spotlight of Governor Cuomo's purview, we would be treated fairly.

As the outspoken defender of women rights in New York, and as he was approaching his second run for governor, we thought someone would be interested, and they were, but only in leading us along, and then dropping any involvement, as we pursued each representative.

There initial cordial engagement morphed into no return phone calls, e-mails, or any other type of response, despite their assurances of their concern.

Now, four years later, and after working our way up from the basement of Governor Cuomo's hierarchy, to the penthouse offices of Lieutenant Governor Hochul, and a number of well-known and outspoken administrative officials, all supposed women's advocates and cheerleaders, they have continued to delay and deny me a venue to be fairly heard.

Fortunately, we have copious files of all our e-mail conversations, and irrefutable documentation of all our phone conversations, conferences, and refusals to follow up on their assurances of the Governor's concern.

Conversely, our recent contact, one of the Governor's counsels and spokesperson, has referred my case to a third entity.

In fairness, we are respecting the integrity and confidentiality of that process until it is completed.

We will comply with our recent engagement with this investigative agency, as we have done with agencies and individuals; all those agencies, often to our detriment, who are mandated to adhere to a code of ethics, that have fallen woefully short throughout this nine-year attack on me.

Our faith has often been misplaced, but we will go through this process with the hope that they have spiritual awakening, and finally provide fair treatment and long-delayed justice.

As the former U.S. attorney general for the Southern District of New York, Preet Bharara, is fond of saying, "Stay tuned."

We may have been naive, but we were

persistent, consistent, and, although jaded, have steadfastly advocated to be heard treated -- and to be heard and treated fairly.

And this summary is my short version.

Thank you for this opportunity for review.

And the bottom line is:

This is not an employment issue as the MTA would like to spin it.

This is an issue of a state agency colluding with another state entity to silence a woman who was harassed and threatened, and robbed of her 27-year career.

The shell game is over.

They keep shifting responsibility back and forth between the MTA OIG, the Long Island Railroad, the MTA board, and the Governor's representatives, and they should all be held accountable for this miscarriage of justice by our governor, the champion of women's rights.

The support of my family, and our belief that God is always watching, are the only things that have sustained me these last eight years.

I very much appreciate your time and concern, and look forward to a continuing dialogue with concerned individuals.

Thank you.

DENNIS REARDON: She has some suggestions.

CHRISTINE REARDON: I also do have some suggestions, if I may.

Transparency, and allowing individuals who are the victims of harassment, to be privy to the investigation, and the statements made by those who are covering up their egregious behaviors to protect themselves, in real-time.

Victims should not be forced to wait several years, and never hear the rebuttal and fallacious rhetoric during the process of investigation, and not after the case is closed.

Victims should be informed about anyone and everyone participating in the investigation, and should be given the opportunity to have their witnesses accompany them to those meetings.

Also, remove the protection that the MTA

Inspector General's Office has in running their own
investigation, when they are so, so incredibly
devoid of integrity.

The New York State Inspector General does not have legal authority over the MTA Office of Inspector General.

And, obviously, to increase the number of

women in lead positions on these boards.

We are buoyed by the fact that, presently, our attorney general, as well as the New York State Inspector General, are women with extensive experience in investigations.

Any individual given the authority to protect the victims of the kind of abuses we are here to discuss, should be independent from influence by any elected official or lobbiest with deep pockets, or connected to the deeply entrenched "old boys' club" culture, and needs to be thoroughly vetted prior to their appointments.

The standard excuse of confidentiality, and ongoing investigation, is an often-used ploy to avoid accountability and transparency.

"Confidential" is a euphonism for clandestine, covert, cunning, calculated collusion to cover up rather than expose.

Harassment and abuse of women grows like bacteria when kept in the dark.

And as you cast a spotlight on the deeply entrenched agency and bureaucratic shell game, prepare yourself for finger-pointing and denial.

Don't give up out of frustration and exhaustion.

That is what the railroad and the MTA OIG hoped we would do, but we have not.

Thank you so much for this opportunity to bring to light my story of the abuse that I was subjected to for confronting the harassment of women in my office.

Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you all for sharing your stories with us this evening, and thank you for staying here until such a late hour, and being so patient to do so.

DENNIS REARDON: May I interject something?

SENATOR BIAGGI: Oh, you may.

DENNIS REARDON: You know, when I walked in here, I was told by friends of mine, "You're walking in with a pork-chop suit into the lion's den."

But I didn't experience that.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

DENNIS REARDON: I experienced warmth, courtesy.

I've had some phone calls with some of the people here, and they couldn't have been any more engaging or gracious.

And to get M&Ms and popcorn, on top of it, for my daughter, you're a winner, and I appreciate

it.

But I came in, and I can't really identify, obviously, with the perilousness that these ladies have felt in their lives, but I've witnessed it, I've stood on the outside.

And as a man, unable to protect my family,

I feel a different sense of powerlessness.

I respect this gentleman on the panel.

I wish that there were more men in the room.

I guess it was kind of perceived that this was woman's issue, and it certainly is. But the men in their lives who watch them suffer, for 8 years, and how it prevented us from moving on with our childhood-planning plans.

Without going into details, Christine mentioned the IVF process, we had more plans to continue.

But with harassment, and a constant threat of losing your livelihood, and being attacked in the media, which is what they did, where are we to go?

I worked in the field as a substance-abuse counselor, among other jobs, and I saw the powerlessness of women who were abused by men who were out of control. Borderline personalities, sociopaths; "anti-social personalities" as they call

them now, because we can't call them "sociopaths," because that's what they are.

 $\label{eq:And I saw women suffer for years and years $$ and years.$ 

And then come to the rooms to get help, and be victimized by men in the rooms, who still weren't really turning their lives around, but were using that center of safety to victimize women.

It is atrocious, it is obnoxious.

What's going to change?

Severe punishment, censure.

40 years ago, in an early social-work course I took, the professor who was a disabled gentleman, who could barely talk, gave the most amazing lectures, and people stood in awe.

We still need to stand in awe of everybody who's been disabled or disempowered or beaten up, and clear up the lens. The lens of this misogynistic culture is unbelievable.

Men have to clear it up as much as the women who confront it.

It's not their responsibility; it's our responsibility, as fathers and brothers.

I'm the father of four girls, I'm the brother of three young women, and I would never accept this

in my life.

I'm six-foot-four. You're not going to abuse me, you're not going to harass me, you're not going to threaten me, but you can do that to the women in this room, until men in the workplace, who are courageous enough to stand up and say, Stop it.

Those sex-counter groups, the harassment groups, who runs it?

Guys who are really not very aggressive and don't confront people.

Don't confront anybody.

I'm sorry, if you feel guilty, there's a room -- they say in the rooms of AA, "If it doesn't apply, let it fly. And if it does, you better duck."

Duck, but come back and get healthy.

If you're not going to get healthy, and the men aren't doing it, it's our responsibility as men.

I'm so glad to be here.

I'm so honored to be the husband of a wife who is proud and courageous, but was intimidated and threatened in a place, there were all men in that office.

And when I suggested I would go in and perhaps address it in a slightly inappropriate way,

I was suggested that they would fire me, and I would be taken out in handcuffs.

I deferred to what everyone said.

I've been in recovery, by the grace of God, for 38 years, and I've learned how to control my behaviors, and know I can only change what I do.

That's why we're here.

We fought this for 8 years, all the way up to the Governor's people.

And now we're here with you.

Thank God you gave us this opportunity.

CHRISTINE REARDON: Thank you.

DENNIS REARDON: And I pray for you and the men in your lives that could maybe start to step to the plate for a change.

Thank you.

CHRISTINE REARDON: Thank you.

CYNTHIA LOWNEY, ESQ.: And I would also like to add that I have been to many, many meetings, public meetings. And I know that they usually go on long and long, and usually there's nobody left at the end.

So I want to thank all of you for staying, because it's been long, and it's been very hard for all of us to listen to things that we can't change.

We're sitting there, it's like reliving our problem through other people.

It's really been torture in a way, but thank you for being so compassionate without being patronistic, maternalistic, or some -- you know, giving some kind of phoney responses, because that's what they do a lot.

And by the way, that's the thing they really do at transportation: they're gonna you this and give you that, but they're just yessing people, and nothing gets done.

I really get the sense you're going to take it all in and do something.

So thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you so much.

And it's important that society clears the lens; not men, not women, but our entire society.

Thank you so very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: A couple of quick comments.

Appreciate the mention on the "salary history ban" practice, the legislation that then-public advocate Tisch James forwarded to city counsel.

It's a piece of legislation that I carry in the state, and we are looking forward to passing

that bill this year again, and seeing it law.

And I appreciate all of your comments in regards to the work of all of my colleagues here.

And I must say, I appreciate your candor, as a husband, as a man, willing to say that we all need to do better.

I will say that many of our colleagues in the State Legislature, many of the men that were here earlier, chairs of committees, that have been a part of these conversations for years, advocating for change and for these issues to be addressed.

It's been stated over and over, these hearings have taken too long, but, we're here to do the best we can.

And we poured, not only our political and/or our legislative time towards addressing these issues the right way, but I think, in a moral sense, how could we not want to hear these stories, and care deeply about the impacts.

Again, we're all family members; we all have daughters, we all have sisters, moms, and other women in our lives, that matter.

And, we need to make sure that we create an environment, and as many of you have stated, not just in the workplace, but around the workplace,

where sexual harassment is just not accepted, and not occurring. And where it does, that we have policies to address it.

So we really appreciate your testimony, and also the fact that you've made recommendations that we can review, and take a look at.

And it's not lost on us, that we have to also go back to other agencies that are not maybe governed by some of our legislation.

But the judiciary is one that we also need to take a deeper dive into, what the practice is within.

So, really appreciate all your testimony.

DENNIS REARDON: Can I just share one more piece that was glossed over, because we were both so nervous?

Journalists are one of the most powerful advocates in our country, the media.

Unfortunately, when people who are doing this do not have the super-ego with a conscience to look what they've done, they only understand, unfortunately, severe censure and punishment that's effective and carried through.

There are a number of journalists, in all the newspapers, male and female, all ethnicities, who

are starting to really address and put people's feet the fire.

That's, unfortunately, what many of them need, but thank God we have it, because, with that spotlight on things, they squirm. It's like putting a magnifying glass, when you were a kid, on the poor ant, which we shouldn't do anymore, but I did as a kid.

When that spotlight is put on these people, they squirm, they point fingers, and they throw each other under the bus.

We need more buses, and we need more magnifying glasses, and I'm glad you're here to do that for us.

Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

So as I began to say before, I hear you, and I understand, when you discuss and say, and really underscore, the abusive system that our government has created, and has a resistance to dismantling.

One of the reasons we're here is to do that.

And one of the reasons why I ran for this seat was exactly the reason that you're describing, because, for too many years, the people in my district were not put first.

And the entire point of public service is to serve people, not to serve ourselves.

And similarly situated, when I ran for the seat that I ran for, I was threatened, and I was told that my life would be over, and my career would be over, and I was crazy, and I would never win.

And, oh, my goodness, what are you doing?

And, along the journey, to this very moment, was attempted to be silenced.

And I think that one of the most interesting, and really spectacular characteristics of human beings, is resilience.

And each and every one of you demonstrates that.

And, it's important to not stay silent, and that when you see something that doesn't seem right or doesn't look right, you speak up and you speak out, no matter who tells you not to.

And I'm grateful that we have your testimony today.

I think that it's not lost on me that we started this day with one of my questions being:

Well, who does the MTA and the judiciary report to? Who's overseeing those two bodies?

It seems curious that they're not under the

purview of GOER.

But I think that these are the exact types of opportunities that couldn't have happened before.

And, because we are in a transformational moment of government and leadership, and because we are moving away from silencing people, even if there's still a strong attempt to silence people who speak up, this space that we've created, this space that our leadership has allowed us to create, is very special, it's very important.

And we are, and my -- (indiscernible) will just speak for myself, I am committed to making sure that the change does happen, even if it's just inch by inch.

So thank you so much.

We hear you, and we appreciate all of your recommendations, and the things that you've said to us today.

MARIE GUERRERA TOOKER: Thank you.

God bless all of you.

Thank you so much.

CYNTHIA LOWNEY, ESQ.: Wait, are they done?

MARIE GUERRERA TOOKER: Yep.

CYNTHIA LOWNEY, ESQ.: Is that it?

I thought the others would ask a question.

1 MARIE GUERRERA TOOKER: Nobody's going to ask 2 us anything. SENATOR BIAGGI: Councilwoman 3 Helen Rosenthal. 4 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Just stretching. 5 6 HELEN ROSENTHAL: Keep stretching. You're 7 knocking it out of the ballpark here. 8 I'm sure you're -- I'm feeling emotional, and 9 I'm sure you're feeling emotional as well. 10 This has been a hell of a day, just 11 phenomenal testimony. 12 Good afternoon. 13 My name is Helen Rosenthal. I represent the Upper West Side in the New York City Council. 14 I'm Chair of the Committee on Women and 15 16 Gender Equity. And, I often say that the real title 17 of the committee should be, that it is the Committee of Men's Bad Behavior. 18 19 And, I'm hoping to work myself out of a 20 committee. 21 I thank you so much, to Chairs Biaggi and Crespo and Walker, for convening the hearing on 22 23 sexual harassment in the workplace, and for staying. 24 And, Senator Niou and Assemblymembers Simotas

and Simon, thank you for staying.

25

There are a lot of people who are watching this, they might not be in the room, and they're noticing that you're still here. And, it means a lot to the public.

Today's hearing, in fact, gives the public another opportunity to hear directly from harassment survivors about the real-life impact of current laws, or the lack of current laws, so that the failures of the current system can be brought to light, and addressed through legislation.

It also gives the public an opportunity to hear from government officials responsible for addressing sexual harassment in the workplace, whether it's in government or the private sector.

Your joint hearing in Albany in February, the first state-level public hearing on workplace sexual harassment since 1992, revealed the necessary -- the necessity of comprehensive systemic improvements to workplace culture.

Sorry.

I commend you for this second hearing.

I heard elected officials ask the administration, good, commonsense questions about accountability, the need for trauma-informed investigations, and as well as process, numbers, and

transparency.

And I heard you asking about, how complaints are accommodated during an investigation.

You dug into the details; your questions were thorough, smart, probing, rigorous, and spot-on.

And I have to say I was disappointed, when the administration looked at you, in particular, Senator Biaggi, like you had three heads.

And I just want to remind you, that you have one head, and the person sitting here had three heads.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

HELEN ROSENTHAL: I didn't say that out loud,
I thought it. But I didn't say it out loud.

The public is very grateful to each of you for persisting, and I support you.

The personal, professional, and societal effects of sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace are staggering.

Harassers interrupt the lives of survivors.

They stand in the way of their ability to earn a living, and rise professionally. They intimidate, coerce, manipulate; they attempt to strip away survivors' dignity.

And due to the longstanding pervasiveness and

culture of silence around discriminatory workplace behavior, we can never fully know the number of women who have been driven from jobs because of sexual harassment, or the pain and suffering that harassers have inflicted, or the talent, the sheer talent, that has been drained from workplaces and industries.

Thanks to the brave voices of so many survivors and advocates who are challenging the status quo, we are on the way to eradicating this toxic culture.

Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

We owe these survivors not only gratitude, but action.

As the State considers reforms on sexual harassment, they should look at New York City as a model. We have led the way in establishing sexual-harassment practices and policies.

Last spring I was proud to play a leading role in the passage of the Stop Sexual Harassment Act in New York City.

The act requires enhanced training for all public- and private-sector employees;

Provides recourse for people who have been harassed and discriminated against, through

establishing a trauma-informed statute of limitations;

And increases transparency and accountability with city government, the largest employer in the five boroughs.

And we are moving forward with a second hearing in June, to review additional legislation.

Since 2009, New York City has applied a standard that sexual harassment exists, under City Human Rights Law, when an individual is "treated less well than other employees because of gender," and the conduct complained -- sorry, and the conduct complained of, consists of more than "petty slights or trivial inconveniences."

We rightly codified this more protective standard into law, and, as a result, workers in New York City enjoy far greater protections against sexual harassment than workers elsewhere in New York State.

Your slate of legislation, which will provide these protections across the state, is now under consideration.

And I will proudly introduce a resolution in the city council next week, supporting all of your bills, and chief among these is Assembly Bill 7083

and Senate Bills 3817, which will finally remove the current "severe or pervasive" legal standard for demonstrating discrimination under State Human Rights Law.

Thank you for that.

This burdensome standard clearly impedes employees experiencing harassment from bringing claims forward, and must be changed.

And you heard from the City Commission on Human Rights today, talking about that commonsense change, and the fact that it had only a positive effect on the workforce.

My resolution also supports your legislation, which will strengthen protections for workers;

Extend the statute of limitations for filing a discrimination complaint;

Amend the State Constitution to expand protected classes, and increase language access.

While it's essential that the State pass these bills, doing so does not mean our work will be over.

New York must continue to lead on this issue.

We must ensure that survivors know their rights, that bystanders know how to intervene when they see sexual harassment, and that harassers know

that the days in which they could operate with impunity are over.

As elected and public officials, we must clearly draw the line against what has been tolerated for so long.

Ending sexual harassment and discrimination is fundamentally a social-justice issue, in which an injury to one is an injury to all.

This issue demands the same persistent energy and attention given to the Reproductive Health Act, to rent reform, and speed cameras in school zones.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and thank you for bringing the experts who testified today.

I learned so much from them, and it has informed my work, going forward.

I thank you for that, and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Councilwoman, thank you for being patient, and your testimony, and also for your leadership.

I think it's become abundantly clear that the City standards that you all have set forward really should be our standard.

And, we look forward to working to pass our

colleague's legislation to do the same statewide.

I'm really curious, though, do you have an early indication of what some of those additional pieces you may consider in June, are?

HELEN ROSENTHAL: Uh-huh.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Are those being formulated, or do you have already have a sense of proposals that have been put out?

HELEN ROSENTHAL: We've learned from the reporting requirements that we put on the City, that they weren't clear enough.

So it's remarkable how you think, in the wording, you're getting something right. But, then, when it comes to rule-making, perhaps what we get out of the analysis isn't what we should get.

For example, we passed a bill, requiring that all government workers be given an opportunity to fill out a climate survey about sexual harassment.

That was done, and we have the results of that survey.

And it is, even for somebody like me who loves to dig down into the weeds, I looked at the result and my head was spinning.

There's no way to really understand what the findings tell us.

So we have another piece of legislation that calls for better analysis, more agency-specific analysis, and more meaningful findings, rather than just a regurgitation of answers to questions.

That's one.

There were some others.

We're looking at requiring agencies to be very clear about accommodations, and there being some sort of recording -- reporting requirement, perhaps even in the climate survey, for making sure that people are given accommodations; that they are interviewed by someone who is -- has trauma-informed investigative skills.

You know, we always talk about these EEO officers, and how they're trained, and they're so expert.

Are they?

What -- I mean, are they trained?

This is a new era, where we're changing the culture and calling out sexual harassment.

The same old training manual does not apply.

Our understanding of trauma is so much more advanced now.

We know now that, you know, someone's story might change three times over the course of three

days, and that is normal, right, not to be dismissed.

So -- and I would add to that, that some of the things we learned won't necessarily result in more legislation.

But, I will be calling for activists to engage in making sure that the sexual -- the anti-sexual harassment laws that are supposed to be posted in restaurants, for example, we should be going out and checking the restaurants; are they posted?

You know, there's so much more work to be done. We're just scratching the surface.

I appreciate the question, Assemblyman.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I just briefly want to comment on my incredible amount of gratitude for you waiting here, Councilwoman, and for sharing your testimony, and for also reminding all of us about, just, when it feels wrong, it's wrong.

And that is an important thing, sometimes, because the work that we do, and the individuals we interact with, obviously, are not always forthcoming.

And so that was really very important and helpful.

I also just want to say thank you for your expedient response to so much of what's going on in the city council.

And it's all different types of behavior.

And I think one of the most important things is that, you set a tone that is, from where we are in the state, it's hard to meet, but we're reaching to catch up.

And I think that it also allows for some people maybe who wouldn't be as brave to come forward or to speak up, or wouldn't want to speak up, to do that.

And I think, the last thing I'll say, is that, what has, you know, transpired in the city council is not such a foreign thing. It's in every workplace.

HELEN ROSENTHAL: Yes.

SENATOR BIAGGI: But what is really interesting, and what has been really important for us, at least for myself, in the state, is that there's isn't just one definition, or one consequence, or one outcome, of harassment or sexual harassment in the -- or discrimination, in workplace.

It's a scale.

So, it really just solidifies, at least for
me, that the "severe or pervasive" standard is so
out of touch with where we are culturally, and that,
you know, not every act is a 10, but not every act
is a 1.

And so there's this scale that the law has to

And I am very much in appreciation of your willingness to put a resolution to the city council, for myself, and Assemblywoman Simotas's bill, because it is the better-off bill.

It will change so many people's lives, and, we'll just make all of these workplaces that are not as safe, safer.

So thank you so much.

HELEN ROSENTHAL: Thank you.

It doesn't happen unless people like you lead the charge. Right?

Hasn't happened prior to your being in office, tells you something.

And -- yeah.

adjust with.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Councilwoman, thank you for your leadership on this issue.

2009, it was 10 years ago. It's about time that the State caught up to what the City did, what

the City did all that time ago.

I have a question about sexual-harassment policies and -- for you.

Does the City require updates to those policies on a regular basis?

HELEN ROSENTHAL: Update to the policy, or update to the complainant, which was another issue that was raised today?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: I know, with respect to the Assembly, we just went through a renewed version of renewing our policy.

I know, because I worked on it extensively.

And the one thing that we were able to do is, provide additional examples of what "offensive," you know, "harassing behavior" is.

One example, that actually we heard today during testimony, is when you're asked repeatedly for social interaction, and whether you're approached in person or with social media.

And I thought it was important to update the Assembly's policy, just as we're going through training, for our own members, but also for staff, for people to understand that that's inappropriate, and can constitute harassment.

And it's my belief that, not only state

agencies, but all agencies, should be looking at these policies regularly, at least, you know, every two years, potentially, every year, because you hear about certain situations that -- examples, that, sometimes, you know, you put a policy in place, some -- a lot of us are lawyers here -- you read the explanation, and you think you understand, but it's different when somebody explains or gives you an example, because, then, you can really understand that, and understand whether you've observed that behavior, or you might have done it yourself.

So, again, that's why I would love for you to go back and look at whether the City requires updates -- regular updates to the policy; where, I know for the fact the State doesn't.

But I would welcome if you would do that for the City as well.

HELEN ROSENTHAL: Yeah, I'm going back to my office now, so I'll be submitting that idea.

And, you know, it's so interesting, and you brought this out, you know, as lawyers, I guess, or as legislators, we can make these directives, but we can't write the rules.

I mean, that really is the administration's job to do the actual writing of the rules.

And we -- you know, I like the idea of updates, because, if they're public, then it forces them to say, very publicly: Here's what the rules are, here's the date.

So that, then, as legislators, in our oversight capacity, we can say, That's not good enough.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you so much.

Up next is Black Women's Blueprint, Decrim
New York, and Kingsborough Community College.

If any of these groups are still here, you are second-to-last, and we are so grateful for you.

Oh, and New York City Anti-Violence Project as well.

LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: Good evening.

My name is Dr. Leeja Carter. I'm here on behalf of Black Women's Blueprint.

Founded in 2008, Black Women's Blueprint works to place Black women and girls' lives and struggles squarely within the context of larger racial-justice concerns, and is committed to building movements where gender matters in social-justice organizing, so that all members of

Black communities achieve social, political, and economic equity.

We are the conveners of the Black Women's Truth and Reconciliation Commission held three years ago at the United Nations, as well as the March for Black Women, which was held right outside this very room in 2018.

With recent federal administration's threats to make vital cuts to anti-rape, anti-battery, and anti-stalking service programs, guaranteed by the Violence Against Women Act, we are running out of places to turn to for safety and justice.

New York must be on the front lines of protecting the rights of its most marginalized residents.

Women and girls in our communities are under siege. We need policymakers to listen to them, and we need to institute mechanisms for public involvement and oversight over any and all genderand racial-equity efforts.

The #MeToo movement has created a necessary conversation on sexual harassment in the workplace; however, women of color, especially immigrant women of color, and those working in lower-paying jobs, are often left out of the conversation.

Women working in the food-service industry, blue-collar jobs, and factories are often overlooked, further marginalizing their experiences.

It's time that we centered the experiences of those -- of our most marginal women, making their lives, needs, and experiences visible.

As women continue to report, seek support, and ways to address workplace cultures that violate their most basic rights, we have to dismantle the misogyny and patriarchy that lives between our sheets, sits at the counter and bars of our neighborhood businesses, lurks in our parks, and violates women that walk through them day and night.

To where do we run when offices and restaurants foster a culture of harassment and violation?

There is risk in bystander intervention, and innocent bystanders also fear for their lives in those moments of advocacy.

We must center community and systematic accountability for the protection of our women.

Regarding prevention, recognizing that few resources exist that are culturally relevant and focus on preventing harassment and sexual assault before it occurs, we developed innovative programs

focused on identifying and preventing sexual violence before it occurs.

Our Institute for Gender and Culture delivers prevention education and curricula based on an understanding of the complex interplay between the individual, relational, social, cultural, environmental, historical, and persistent structural factors that influence the spectrum of discrimination, oppression, and violence that impact people's lives.

We specialize in liberatory bystander intervention models, transformative and healing models, as well as asset-based community-accountability models.

Using proven effective pedagogy and methodologies, our institute works to equip people, groups, and organizations with the framework for developing strategies anchored in civil and human rights as key points for intervention.

We are grateful to you all for calling this hearing, to give further light and conversation and hope to creating the necessary change that benefits women in our state.

Thank you.

DR. RED WASHBURN: Good evening, everyone.

I want to thank you for listening to my testimony.

In particular, I am grateful for

Assemblymember Simon's points about higher

education, Assemblymember Quart's points on

retaliation, Assemblymember Gottfried's and

Assemblymember Niou's points on GENDA and trans

issues.

I want to clarify that I am not representing Kingsborough; but, rather, testifying about my experience of gender-based violence there as an employee.

My name is Dr. Red Washburn. I am a transgender, non-conforming, and non-binary associate professor of English, and the director of Women and Gender Studies at Kingsborough Community College.

The concentration, the first of its kind in CUNY, is celebrating its 25th anniversary this year, together with the 50th anniversary of Stonewall.

I want to underscore that, while we're talking about sexual harassment, it also has important implications for transgender, non-conforming, and non-binary people in terms of both sexual harassment, harassment in general, and

gender identity-based issues.

Six months after I came out as trans at work, by requesting a name, gender, and pronoun change, and sharing that I was getting top surgery, Kingsborough's administration announced it was defunding women and gender studies.

I suspected that I would face transphobia, so I waited until after tenure to come out on campus as trans.

It turned out that my suspicions were correct.

I filed a complaint regarding my concerns as an employee. I filed with the New York City Commission on Human Rights, and I did that in November. I'm still going through that slow process while the harassment and retaliation is ongoing.

However, I also feel that I must speak out as a citizen of the city, regarding the harm being done to our students, your children, and to our precious higher-education system.

As I have fought for students to have access to women and gender studies, the administration has increased its harassment and retaliation, not only against me, but against our students, and against women and gender studies programs.

Kingsborough's administration has discriminated against me during my transition, public safety. Ordered me to come in for an investigation when I was on annual leave, and on post-surgical bedrest.

The administration would not update my name in its system, its directory, and its course offerings.

It switched my teaching schedule one day before the fall semester.

It repurposed the women and gender studies office the first week of fall classes; changed the locks the week after my revision surgery, just before the spring semester started; and put all the women and gender studies archives and my belongings in storage.

It recently blocked me from making curricular decisions as a director.

I still don't have a suitable office.

They temporarily put me in a storage office next to a high-voltage, "Danger, Keep Out," closet that made me break out in hives.

Harassment based on gender identity or disability, and retaliation for complaints of discrimination, runs contrary to New York law and

CUNY regulations.

And these actions ignored my surgeon's and therapist directives.

Kingsborough still has me listed under my deadname, and calls me by my deadname, my former name, publicly as well.

Earlier this year, New York State passed the Gender Expression Non-Discrimination Act after a nearly two-decade battle led by trans advocates.

Last year, New York City Council passed bills to create non-binary birth certificates, and educate business owners on requirements for all-gender restrooms.

Two years ago, CUNY issued a statement to project -- to protect transgender and gender non-conforming students.

Despite the anti-trans sentiments and regressive policies of our federal administration, New York City has taken bold steps to protect trans New Yorkers, and yet Kingsborough has fallen out of step with these protection, both in CUNY and in New York, administratively.

The non-discrimination law is excellent, and key; however, an order to get justice and support with reporting, we need these bills under discussion

to pass today.

The sustained harassment has caused me, my students, and the women and gender studies program much harm. It created the need for me to take sick leave in the fall, and get a second revision surgery this winter.

Not even a month post op, there's a likelihood that I will require yet another, a third procedure, in the late spring.

At this political juncture of #MeToo,

Times Up, Black Lives Matter, Trans Lives Matter,

and sanctuary campus movements, women and gender

studies, and I would argue, other area-based

studies, is more relevant than ever.

Community-college students deserve women and gender studies for the pleasure of learning, for opportunities to transfer, and for access to work.

And the shrinking academic opportunities connected to social justice for LGBTQ and women students, the majority of whom are working-class students of color, at this moment, is unconscionable.

I am not alone here.

The Association of American University

Professors issued a report on gender and gender

studies.

We have received the overwhelming support from across the CUNYs, from women and gender studies faculty and students; the National Women Studies Association; and other prominent faculty across the nation, in the form of letters, petitions, lectures, and roundtables, among forthcoming events tied to NWSA's Gender Studies Under Fire.

The institutional transphobia, coupled with Kingsborough's sexist devaluing of women and gender studies, elucidates that the college administration has created a hostile environment for LGBTQ students who are both interested in these issues, along with multiculturalism and diversity, and trying to live their truths.

It is neither a safe place for gender non-conforming and trans faculty to work, nor LGBTQ and WGS students to learn.

Thank you for hearing my testimony.

Today's hearings have given me much hope for women, trans, and queer survivors of violence to receive the justice that we all deserve, and to heal in this process.

I'm honored to be a part of it.

Thank you.

AUDACIA RAY: Good evening.

My name is Audacia Ray, and I'm the director of community organizing and public advocacy of the New York City Anti-Violence Project.

AVP is an almost 40-year-old organization that provides services, legal services, counseling services, all which are free, to LGBTQ survivors of hate, intimate-partner, and sexual violence.

And, I also serve as a founding steering committee member of Decrim New York, which is a coalition to decriminalize, decarcerate, and destignatize sex work in New York.

I am a queer woman, and, I'm a former sex worker. I am a survivor of sexual and intimate-partner violence, so I have skin in the game of all these things.

And, today, I am going to testify a little bit about the impacts of workplace sexual harassment on people in the sex trades, especially people who identify as LGBTQ.

AVP and, of course, Decrim New York, are very clear that sex work is work, and that people who participate in the sex trades are doing so to meet their economic and survival needs.

I also acknowledge that all labor under

capitalism is exploitation, and sex trades are part of that.

Sexual harassment and violence in the sex trades show up in ways that are both unique to the industry and familiar to other workers.

A lot of the stuff I've heard today about domestic workers, about people in the modeling industry, and lots of other industries, sound really, really familiar to me as a former sex worker.

And, so, because of this widespread employment discrimination for LGBTQ people, LGBTQ communities disproportionately engage in sex work for survival. And this is particularly true for trans and GNC people.

AVP's report, "Individual Struggles,
Widespread Injustice," which my colleague Briana
will talk about more extensively, found that
22 percent of trans and gender non-conforming people
who were survey respondents were unemployed, and
this is in New York City, over the past two years.
The survey was done in 2016-2017, so it's very
recent.

And that rate, 22 percent, is more than 5 times higher than the unemployment rate in

New York City.

And so, as a result, lots of TGNC people engage in sex work to survive.

Another report to cite, "Meaningful Work," which is co-published by the National Center for Trans Equality, and also the Red Umbrella Project, an organization I used to run, found that 40 percent of Black trans people self-report having engaged in the sex trades.

And, finally, the Urban Justice -- or, the Urban Institute report, "Surviving the Streets of New York," found that LGBTQ youth in New York participate in the sex trade at 7 to 8 times the rate of their peers.

We know that LGBTQ people participate in the sex trades by choice, circumstance, and coercion, but because the sex trades are criminalized and stigmatized, people who experience discrimination, labor exploitation, and sexual violence on their jobs, and because of their jobs, have little recourse.

People in the sex trades are really skilled at negotiating boundaries, and communicating was acceptable to them in the context of the exchange of sexual labor for money.

However, because criminalization, in combination with other factors, that make workers vulnerable, like immigration status, race, and gender identity, people in the sex trades can't safely report the harassment that happens in their workplaces.

Criminalization really flattens the understanding of what qualifies as harassment and discrimination in a workplace where people are trading sex or selling a fantasy of sex.

When management in a massage parlor pressures workers to (indiscernible) sex acts that they don't want to perform in order to maintain their employment, that is harassment.

When a dancer is told she cannot get a shift in the strip club she works in because she's Black, and there's already a Black dancer scheduled for that shift, that is discrimination.

And when an independent escort consents to meet a client in his hotel room for an hour, and he removes the condom they agreed on, that is violence.

I'm going to briefly share an experience of harassment that I experienced. There were a lot to choose from.

So, I chose this one, because it is about me

being a sex worker, but it's also -- takes place in a space that was, essentially, kind of a workspace to me, and so that felt significant.

And I also want to say that, there is a lot of harassment that happens on the job, but there's also harassment that happens as a result of being any kind of visible sex worker.

So, for me, while I was a graduate student at Columbia, I was doing sex work to support myself.

And, although I was already an actress at the time, I wanted to keep my identity as a sex worker private at school, because I felt like it could do bad things for me.

One of my fellow students had connected the dots. I was very public online. I had, you know, like, ads as a sex worker, and had done porn.

And so he connected that identity to my identity on campus, and started printing out copies of my ads and photographs of me, and information about me from the Internet, and spreading them around campus. And, also, tracked my schedule.

So he would, like, walk by and drop a bunch of papers, printouts, of my sex work, around campus and near me where I was studying.

And it created a really terrifying

environment for me.

And in order for me to be able to get any recourse for it, I would have had to tell people that I was a sex worker.

So I didn't.

And, I went to campus much less. I ended up going part-time. It took me much longer to finish my degree.

And I just felt like I had -- I had no recourse.

And, you know, and I'm fairly privileged.

I'm White, I'm sis gender. I was going to school at Columbia.

And I just felt like I had no way to push back against this.

And that harassment really impacted my health and well-being while it was going on.

And I also in that, want to make a call back to some of the earlier conversation around the statute of limitations, because this -- you know, this has come up a couple of times today, and, I was thinking about this in the context of being an activist, and having a feminist consciousness.

And I know that, at the time, I felt, like, this is bad, but it's not that bad. And, also, that

it felt, like, well, it is -- it just -- it is what it is. And, this is just -- this is just this thing that I've accepted, that might be part of this career, or this work, that I'm doing.

And so, if that's true for me, while I was also very much engaged, an activist, it's definitely true for lots of folks who can't quite name, even to themselves, what is happening to them.

And so it's really important to expand that statute of limitations, because it often takes a long time for people to even understand what's going on, and name it to themselves, much less to figure out, okay, I'm going to report this and start talking to other people about it.

So that's something, that I just really wanted to underscore that.

So, of course, there are lots of experiences like mine, and much worse, in the sex industry.

And I want to end by saying:

That criminalizing the whole sex industry does not help workers in my situation, or in other situations.

And, you know, ensuring that these bills that are under discussion can create pathways to reporting harassment, and receiving support for

people in the sex trades, is important.

AVP and Decrim NY advocate that the sexual-harassment workgroup's entire legislative agenda pass.

But the State also must pass legislation that decriminalizes sex work, because that will help ensure that sex work is recognized as work.

A lot of other workers that talked today, there's no question that their work is work.

And there is still that question for people in the sex trades, and, decriminalizing it would help to resolve some of that.

So, in general, in order for sexual-harassment legislation to work, it has to work for every member of the workforce, and that that has to include people in the sex trades, and people who work in informal labor, and people who are marginalized by being LGBTQ, by being immigrant, and being survivors.

Thank you.

BRIANA SILBERBERG: Hi.

Thank you for having us all here today.

My name is Briana Silberberg. I'm a community organizer at AVP. I'm a transgender woman.

Very appreciative, and glad to have the opportunity to speak to everyone today.

As Audacia mentioned, we have this report out, "Individual Struggles, Widespread Injustice:

Trans and Gender Non-Conforming People's Experience of Systemic Employment Discrimination in New York City."

I've included a copy of it for everyone with my testimony, so you can go through it and read it at your leisure and pleasure, afterwards or during.

What we wanted to go over in this is that, in our work, and through the report, AVP has noticed a few trends about how sexual harassment uniquely affects transgender, gender non-conforming, and non-binary (TGNCNB) communities, in ways that we find very disturbing, that warrant the attention of the Legislature.

And we want to make it clear also that,

TGNCNB people experience both, you know, sexual

harassment and harassment based on our gender

identities. And that these forms of harassment are

not the same thing, and that we have to be cognizant

of that when we're considering these issues.

So, often we hear solely about these issues, and discrimination, solely from the perspective of

the hiring process.

I wanted to share with you today some of the things that we have in the report, about on-the-job harassment for TGNCNB people in the workplace, and touching on just not harassment, but also the reporting piece, and what factors contribute to, if people are reporting, and also why they might not, in cases that they don't.

So when it comes to harassment in the workplace, what we're seeing is that --

And we had 118 TGNCNB respondents in this, and as Audacia said, this was collected between 2016 and 2017.

-- so of our respondents:

33 percent of them reported that they received unwanted sexual comments in the workplace.

65 percent of the respondents said that they were outed as TGNCNB to at least one person in the workplace, 81 percent through an in-person disclosure.

But 63 percent of our respondents, who said they were not out to anyone at work as TGNCNB, said that they did so because of barriers that they felt were in their way.

56 percent of those who were not out at work

said that they cited fear of discrimination as their main barrier as to why they were not coming out.

About half of respondents listed uncertainty of co-workers, supervisor, responses. No desire to disclose. Anxiety and isolation as contributing factors there.

When it came to folks's (sic) experiences with human resources, what we were seeing were, of the respondents who were employed in workplaces that HR departments, 76 percent did not actually report a discriminatory incident to HR.

And although the number of respondents who reported was very small, it was only 13 of those respondents, 77 percent of the discrimination reported to HR departments did not end, and 77 percent of respondents felt that HR responses were inadequate.

And we were seeing a lot of listed reasons from people, why they weren't reporting.

Some of the things that people told us were, and these are quotes:

HR is actively transphobic.

HR is useless, and is way less sensitive or competent than my co-workers or supervisors. The last place I would go with a sensitive issue. So

far removed from my actual workplace.

HR will tell others, without my knowledge or consent, and I don't want to deal with that or be outed (indiscernible).

I don't want people to think I am difficult to have around, or a problem, or someone who they want to have stressed out about as a result of my gender.

I was too traumatized.

My supervisor instructed me not to tell HR.

When it came also to issues where people were factoring in supervisor respondent -- responses, of our respondents who actually had a supervisor, and were in a workplace where that was a part of it, 42 percent reported incidence of discrimination to the supervisor.

However, of the 58 percent of people who did not report it to their supervisor, 46 percent of those respondents cited they are not -- they did not do so because of complaints they had about their supervisor.

When respondents were reporting to their super -- reported to their supervisor, the most-often reported follow up was a meeting or mediation with the involved parties.

24 percent of respondents said they were retaliated against for reporting an incident.

Reporting incidents did not lead to resolution.

71 percent of respondents continued to be subjected to discrimination after reporting.

And 76 percent did not feel that their supervisor's response was adequate.

When it came to other ways that people dealt with these issues, only 32 percent of respondents chose to directly confront the person or persons in the workplace who discriminated against them.

After this conversation, 52 percent of respondents said the discriminatory incidents continued at the rate, and, 28 percent, that discrimination got worse.

Only 4 percent of respondents filed a claim with an outside agency, such as New York City's Human Resources Administration or the New York City Commission on Human Rights; although, in recent years, the City has made efforts to increase reporting through public-education efforts.

13 percent of respondents consulted a lawyer about the discrimination they experienced. Of those, about two-thirds had their cases taken on, while the remaining third were informed that there

wasn't enough evidence.

And what we saw was that, 10 percent of respondents worked in a job, such as sex work, in which they did not have legal protections or recourse in any case.

This situation is obviously untenable, it's intolerable.

The TGNCNB communities deserve to have comprehensive and helpful resources to prevent and combat the harassment that we're experiencing.

I would ask that the Legislature pay particular attention, not just to the levels of discrimination reported, but also, again, how hard it is for, especially marginalized communities, to even report incidents of harassment and discrimination.

It needs to be made easier and less onerous for people who have suffered harm, and have documented the ways that they've dealt with and experienced harassment; otherwise, it's hard to see how things get better.

And, you know, we at AVP do support the bills that are in discussion. We think that they go a long way to helping with these issues.

I would say that, there are questions that we

see, and some of these, you know, talk about reporting to the police and to law enforcement.

From my work, and from we've seen, that the police, especially TGNCNB communities, and other marginalized communities, are part of the problem for a lot of folks. And that is something that is difficult for us.

That being said, we do support these bills, and we would be happy to see their passage.

Thank you again for your time.

I hope that these hearings help you in creating structures and systems that better protect the folks that experience the most harm.

And, it's been over 11 1/2 hours -- [Laughter.]

BRIANA SILBERBERG: -- and I (indiscernible) you for going through all of this, and, it's quite impressive.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Yeah, we've surpassed the timing of the last one.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you all for staying here in this late hour, and for your testimony.

I have a, I guess, a simple question.

What can we do to make it easier for the LGBTQ community to report these incidents?

How can we make the process more sensitive to your communities' real specific issues?

AUDACIA RAY: I mean, New York City is doing some of this fairly well. The City Commission on Human Rights has now a trans community liaison, who is actually a former AVP employee, and she's, to our knowledge, one of the first trans women of color who's a City employee at that level.

And I think that that has been very helpful.

Like, seeing our community as reflected in the bodies that are supposed to be accountable,

I think is very, very helpful, and that also creates jobs for folks in our community.

So -- so that's -- that's really important.

And, you know -- I mean, like Briana mentioned some of the stuff about our problems with police.

And so we also want to caution that, just -just installing faces of people who look like us in
positions of power doesn't fix all the things. And,
also, just doing trainings for folks doesn't
necessarily fix all the things.

So -- so it is like a complicated and slow

process, but, that is a place to start.

BRIANA SILBERBERG: And what I would just add is, and I think this relates to things we heard in other testimonies, I think there's a reason that the #MeToo movement launched, and took a lot of momentum in, say, 2017, and not 1996, is that, the more and more that affected peoples are given resources, and have positions of power where it's harder for retaliation to take such an extreme effect, and where people have more access to recourse and resources, in the case they do have something to report, that it empowers communities.

And so I think that, you know, as Audacia mentioned, the unemployment rate for TGNCNB people, at least as we found it in our report, is five times higher than that of the general population in the city.

I think, for a lot of folks, the lack of access to resources, the fear of retaliation, is just really compounded by the fact that they don't think they can get another job, if they have a job where reporting something, you know.

So, the more and more that folks are secure, and have a steady access to resources, and know that, you know, retaliation won't be as extreme as

their fears are, and as reality has shown them it will be, then reporting could increase.

AUDACIA RAY: And, also, just the speed of the process.

I mean, you know, like, Red has now been in this process since last November.

And lots of our data that Briana showed, shows that, that folks don't report because they don't think anything's gonna change.

And, if we -- we can't show that -- that things will shift, or that their complaints will actually be moved forward and taken seriously, it's just this -- it's a very traumatic process of having to tell your story over and over again, and, have these awful meetings, and have lawyers send you terrible documents, rejecting your claims, and, you know, all that is terrible. And lots of folks feel, like, why bother?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: And I have one more follow-up question, because I am uniquely familiar at how long these processes can take at times.

Do you feel that you've been updated during the process that you're going through, Doctor?

DR. RED WASHBURN: Are you talking about with regard to the CCHR?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Yes.

DR. RED WASHBURN: I have received no communication from them.

I have a private lawyer who's assisting me in it, who's updated me on, for instance, adding additional claims of retaliation through this whole process, because, when I filed the complaint, it worsened tremendously, if you can believe it.

So, no, I've received no communication whatsoever from CCHR.

I did receive one statement that my lawyer passed on, that was the CUNY response.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: In your ideal situation -- because I've heard this complaint, and we've heard this complaint, from multiple employees who have gone through some kind of investigation, some kind of process.

Ideally, how much communication would you receive, and at what point: every month? every two months? every -- after every real substantial phase of the investigation?

Would you have any recommendation that we can adopt, or maybe legislate?

Because, it is a constant complaint that we hear from employees, that they just don't know where

their cases are. And that's just, cruel.

DR. RED WASHBURN: I mean, I don't know this area that well, but I've heard one response since November.

And, you know, obviously, this occurred before then. It took me several months to heal, and then find a lawyer who would actually represent me at a reasonable, you know, price.

So I would say, you know, definitely, the process has to be expedited. I don't know how long that is.

I think even waiting 30 days is very long, when, like, you know, in my case, for instance, like, they moved me to an office, that makes me break out in hives. I haven't had an office all semester.

So, like, you know, if you have to wait that long, it's, like, the consequences are not just for me as an individual. They impact my students, my colleagues, a number of people.

So, 30 days seems very long for me.

I would say -- I don't even know if it's feasible, but I would say, a minimum, two weeks.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMOTAS: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Assemblywoman Niou.

1 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: I have a couple questions for each of you, if that's okay. 2 3 But, Red, how -- how long were you at Kingsborough? 4 5 DR. RED WASHBURN: I've been at Kingsborough 6 since 2011. 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So it's like a pretty long time, and, you're obviously valuable enough for 8 9 them to give you tenure. DR. RED WASHBURN: (Nods head.) 10 11 This process didn't start until after 12 I received tenure. I didn't expose myself until 13 after tenure. 14 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So it was really obvious 15 the difference in treatment? 16 DR. RED WASHBURN: I mean, I've taught at 17 7 institutions for 17 years, and at Kingsborough 18 since 2011, and I've never had a problem. 19 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Uhm, I'm speechless. 20 Do you have any advice for the State on how 21 we can weed out the systemic discrimination against 22 TNG -- TGNC folks, and, how my best friend likes to 23 say, gender smooshees (ph.)? DR. RED WASHBURN: I mean, I would defer to 24

the folks doing this work, AVP, the Black Women's

25

Blueprint project. 1 But I would just say, definitely, expediting 2 3 the process, making it more available. I don't have a background in law at all, you 4 5 know, so, this whole process, I had to learn. 6 And --7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: You also had --DR. RED WASHBURN: -- it took a long time --8 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: -- had a hard time 9 finding somebody to represent you? 10 DR. RED WASHBURN: -- yeah. 11 12 I got someone through Lambda Legal, through 13 their network, but it took a long time, because 14 I tried to work with the union, for instance. 15 But, there's nothing under CUNY that I can do 16 with regard to gender identity. 17 So, that process took a while, because I had to go through the union first. 18 So I would say, you know, definitely 19 20 knowledge, and accountability. Really expediting 21 the process, and making legal help available. 22 But, I don't know, I mean, I think the issue 23 is really prevention, not just dealing with what's happening, but how to prevent it. 24

And, obviously, as an educator, I'm biased.

25

I think that knowledge is really important in that process.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Can you tell me more about the union situation?

DR. RED WASHBURN: I had the union intervene.

I had top surgery July 31st.

I had the union intervene a couple days before my top surgery, about which Kingsborough knew, because I had to notify my department and HR, even though I was on annual leave, because I'm still expected to answer certain requests, and, also, to check in regarding scheduling, and a number of other issues.

So, I contacted the union, and they intervened because, public safety called me in for an investigation, that was unidentified for much of the threats.

Then they told me it was some alleged flyer campaign.

So I had to have the union intervene because, I had told them, public safety, that I was unable to come to campus because -- I was actually teaching at Vassar, and I was on annual leave. And then I was -- I had drains in my body.

And then the union sent another e-mail,

because public safety contacted me again, demanding that I come in.

And then, after that, the union intervened and said, that I was not coming in, for all of these reasons, and that they should communicate directly with the union.

Public safety said that they would delay the case until September.

And, at that point, I had gotten a private lawyer.

So I asked the union to -- like, you have to pick the union or the lawyer, and I went with the lawyer, because the lawyer, actually, was advocating for gender identity (indiscernible) issues, and the union didn't have anything.

So they really just intervened in terms of correspondence while I was in recovery.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: When you said that "they didn't have anything," what did that -- what does that mean; what were you indicating?

DR. RED WASHBURN: They told me that I did not have a discrimination case, one, and -- as an employee.

And then, two, that there wasn't any language regarding gender identity.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Did you guys want to follow up on the questions that I had asked, since Red had deferred to you guys?

LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: Yeah, I did, one thing from what Red has shared.

I'm also a professor at Long Island
University Brooklyn. And so there's been a number
of things that have come up throughout the day that
I've -- unfortunately, I've seen, I've experienced
as well.

But, particular to Red's experiences, that -one thing that I've -- I've experienced myself
personally, but also I've seen, is that, when we're
talking about sexual harassment, oftentimes, I think
the ways in which harassment and sexual harassment
survive, particularly with marginalized groups, is
that, one, it survives in silence, but it also
survives in these -- in an -- this broader
harassment condition. Right?

And, so, it's not someone groping you, it's not someone touching you, or unwanted advances.

It's someone -- I had someone stand outside of my classroom, and listen to what I was teaching, for a semester, to make me uncomfortable. Right?

It's -- the unfortunate experience with Red,

having your -- not having an office. Right?

So these are ways in which a department, and a university, is making someone (indiscernible) feel uncomfortable, right, by not doing what is the naming, right, of sexual harassment.

So, therefore, when you go to your union, and to HR, they can say, There's nothing -- you know, there's nothing we can do.

Because they found a way, a savvy way, of harassing without harassing, for what actually its named for.

And there's nothing to protect individuals in that respect for true harassment, and in a way that creates the worst of toxic workplace environments.

Right?

And so that's kind of another area that really needs to be talked about, and addressed, in addition to, then, how it's brought to HR.

In my experience, and what I've seen with others, is that, you know, the interest of HR is the interest of the institution, or the company, which is why many people will say, "I'm not going HR," because all they're going to do is try to figure out a way to keep it in-house, and to, you know, make everything okay.

Right?

So, really, it's trying to create some type of compromise, not in a way of really getting justice for the person who has been victimized.

So, individuals, just so you know, I'm just not going put myself through that, because, actually, I'm not getting justice. It's just keeping the peace.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And I would liken it to some of the tenant-harassment stuff that happens. Right?

So like -- folks, like, you know, some landlords will make it so it's unbearable for tenants.

They're going in to fix another apartment next door, and the noise is so crazy that, like, literally, people are forced to move out.

Or, in this case, quit, or, in this case, you know, try to make it so that it's almost, like, unbearable for you to be there.

And I think that that -- I mean, there's -- it's hard to define that.

And I really appreciated Briana's testimony because of that one line, you know: Both sexual harassment and harassment based on our gender

identities, and that these forms of harassment are not the same thing.

You know, these are -- that's very, very profound, and, also, really helps us to really be able to put things into words.

So thank you so much for that as well.

Briana, did you have something you wanted to add on that, or...?

BRIANA SILBERBERG: Not particularly that comes to mind in the moment.

And -- no.

But I -- I support everything that was just shared, and think that -- as you say, that, you know, we have figure out something to get around the way that people obfuscate the way that they find ways to harass people.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And I really appreciate, also, in the study that you passed out, the recommendations that you guys have put forth.

You know, MWBE's, you know, workforce programs, all of these things should have some -- some, I guess, considerations for prioritizing TGNC, owners, et cetera, because I think that that's very, very important.

Thank you for those recommendations.

I mean, I've been kind of thinking about what else we can do to change these things systemically.

And, the discrimination is so deep and systemic, that -- I mean, when we're talking about, say, for example -- when we're talking about sex work, when we're talking about even people, like, walking on the street, there's -- there's, you know, criminization (sic) when -- I mean, when there isn't a crime.

I do want to bring up about decrim, I wanted to talk a little bit about that, if that's okay with you?

AUDACIA RAY: Yeah, sure.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So, you know, one of the most painful group of stories I've had to hear in my -- in my time working on the state level, has been from -- from women, and TGNC people, who have been victimized, and -- and -- and hurt, when they were, you know, either walking on the street, or working, physically abused, and unable to report or too scared to report.

I think I told you this personally, but, a person -- when I was still working in Ron's office, actually, I was his chief of staff at the time, a woman had walked into our office, and, she,

literally, had her head beat in on the side, so hard, that her eye was coming out of her head. And she was not going to go the hospital, and she was not going to report, and she was not going to say anything, to anybody, because she -- she was afraid for her grandson, that her grandson would have nowhere to go. And that she was afraid to go to jail, because, if she reported it, people told her that she would be seen as the criminal.

Could you -- could you just -- I mean, just for the record, tell us about why it's so important that folks be able to report in these situations.

AUDACIA RAY: Yeah, I mean, today I was really struck by hearing all of the testimonies that folks -- you know, there are lots of reasons why people don't report.

And, for all of the workers who spoke today, there -- you know, there are lots of reasons that they don't report, or that it takes a while, and all those things, but, that their -- their jobs are legal.

And, when you work in an illegal industry, or when you're criminalized for being profiled for being a sex worker, it makes recourse absolutely impossible.

And it's -- and it's not just like you can't report violence that's happened against you.

But, like, you're talking about, you don't go to the hospital.

And, you know, I mean, like there was an incident last summer in Jackson Heights, where a trans Latino woman was stabbed in a clearly anti-trans moment. And she didn't go to the hospital. She was stabbed.

And -- and it was because she is a sex worker. Was not doing sex work at the time, but had previous arrests.

And, yeah, and she turned to community to get help with a stab wound.

And -- so it -- it's just -- it's really impossible for folks to make a way forward with their lives when you're criminalized, for being who you are, for trying to survive.

And so that's -- that's a really important piece of why we're pursuing decriminalization of sex work, so people can have access.

And, of course, you know, everything we've heard today, like, the access you have, you know, has a lot of problems with it, so -- so it's not like promising a perfect thing.

But, knowing that you don't have access at 1 2 all, is deadly. 3 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Thank you, guys. ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Assemblywoman Simon. 4 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Yeah, thank you. 5 I'll be brief. 6 7 You know, Dr. Washburn, I once had a case against the College of Staten Island, for a man with 8 9 a disability. And it was exactly the same kind of harassment; the changing of the schedule, the moving 10 the office... all of that stuff. 11 12 And, you know, we've heard it about in other 13 situations. 14 I think it really just goes to, you know, the 15 intimidation, and the sort of 16 messing-with-your-brain kind of thing, that is the 17 essence of this harassment, and this misuse of 18 power. 19 And I'm really sorry to hear that that is 20 till going on in the CUNY system. 21 And I wish you the best with all of this. 22 I -- you know, Dr. Carter, I -- you have a 23 paragraph about misogyny in the workplace, which

And one of the things you talk about is

I think is very powerful, and also very poetic.

24

25

accountability.

And this a question that I come back to often, and that is, you know, what does accountability feel like, right, what does it look like?

People can lose their jobs, they can be disciplined. Elected officials can be -- you can lose an election. Right?

But, beyond certain things that are pretty obvious, what does accountability look like, and how do we legislate that?

How do we, you know, put that into policy in a way that actually works, that makes people who have been victimized feel that there's accountability, and actually is severe enough to cause a change in behavior?

And it's something I struggle with, because you used that word a lot, "accountability," but I don't know that we all necessarily know what we're talking about.

And I'm curious, if, you know, you can -- if you have ideas about that, from your work, or your experience, that you could share?

LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: That's a great question for tenant night.

1 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Sorry. 2 LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: You're fine, you're 3 fine. So, I'm going to position it into a very 4 specific context, just because, I think to try to 5 6 speak broad won't -- it just won't be helpful. 7 So, right now, BWB, we're doing a lot of work on trauma-informed care and cultural competence with 8 9 medical practitioners. Essentially, when you go to the OB/GYN, or 10 11 any medical practitioner, are they trauma-informed? 12 And, the things that they say or do, do they 13 understand, might they understand, that they could 14 re-traumatize someone, or traumatize someone? 15 What does that mean; right? 16 And so just within the context of health-care 17 professionals, because we had -- we've had -- we have talked about that today, what would an 18 accountability model like? 19 20 I think some of that is kind of what someone 21 said earlier, I can't remember who it was, was, 22 like, mandating certain forms of training.

And if those forms of training haven't been done, then -- then -- then there's something that happens with that individual's license, or, if they

23

24

25

have a private practice, then their practice comes under review in some way, shape, or form.

So that could be a mechanism for accountability.

Accountability can also be things that are tied to ethics, right, like, that being a part of your culture of ethics.

So we've -- we've had conversation around background checks for health-care providers. Right?

That should just happen. Right?

That's a mechanism for their board being able to say, that we think that this person, in order to work with human beings, they've -- you know, they have a clear record. Right?

And then if something were to happen, and they were to commit a crime, or some form of misconduct, in some way, shape, or form, then there's a very specific set of consequences that happen, that there isn't wiggle room to kind of waver on.

Right?

So I think that's another reason why we see some of the things that happen, especially in the health-care industry.

That, if a doctor were to do something that

is inappropriate, then, essentially, a jury of his peers could say, Well, I know this person. And, you know, maybe we'll just talk to this individual, or we'll have him do a training, instead of saying, Well, actually, what happens when you do this, this is the consequence regardless of who this person is. Whether they've been in industry for 30 years, or they're early-career professional, this is what happens to you.

Right?

So I think that there should be some very concrete consequences for actions that are inappropriate, or, violates, you know, patients' rights, and as well as training, that health professionals, or anyone, has to go through every three years, or every two years, in order for them to kind of, just -- you know, a basic form of ethics when it comes to what they engage in.

Another thing, which might be a little bit off-tangent, but I think on-tangent, is that some of the training should be around allyship.

And, so, accountability is also, like, how do you intervene in certain situations?

And one thing that I've seen, just in teaching students, being a teacher, right, is that,

1 if we send a student out to an internship site, and, their supervisor is engaging in poor behavior, then 2 that student is learning that poor behavior. And 3 then they're going to become a professional that 4 thinks that's okay. 5 6 Right? 7 And so, we have to start early in exposing our, you know, next generation. Like, what does 8 9 good -- "what is allyship?" 10 Right? 11 How -- what does it mean to be an ally, 12 especially for men? 13 Right? 14 What is allyship? 15 What is professional? 16 What is trauma-informed care? 17 And then, how do you, when you're in a 18 setting, that maybe the culture doesn't align with 19 that, what do you do? 20 What are your resources? 21 Who can you turn to? 22 And then who can you process with after that? 23 Because, when you engage in advocacy or an 24 intervention, intervening in some way, it's going to

be hard on you as well, which is why you might see

25

people who don't intervene. 1 So it's not just intervening, but the 2 assistance that you might need afterwards. 3 So it's kind of a complex answer I just threw 4 out at you, but, that's -- that's the answer. 5 [Laughter.] 6 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you, I appreciate it. 8 9 LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: You're welcome. 10 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: One quick question. 11 You mentioned in your testimony, you have curriculum for...? 12 13 LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: Bystander intervention. 14 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Yes. 15 Where is that being used? 16 LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: So, that curriculum, we 17 are the technical-assistance providers to all of the 180 HBCUs. 18 19 And so we use that bystander -- it's called 20 "Bystander Mixtape intervention," with those college 21 campuses. 22 And we also do do that bystander intervention 23 with non-HBCU colleges and universities as well. But it's used on university and college 24 25 campuses.

SENATOR BIAGGI: One quick comment.

Thank you so much for what you've all shared.

It's really disturbing, and very upsetting, to be totally candid and honest with you.

And I think that one of the things that was said earlier, I don't know remember now by whom, but -- oh, maybe it was by Dr. Washburn, but, the idea of, like, don't report because you don't think things will change.

This is -- this is like the poison of cynicism in all of the systems. Right?

And it's -- the only way I can make sense of it, analogously, even though I know it's, like, oh, yes, of course report, reporting, by the way, I believe is a privilege.

So I know that, I know what comes with that, and I get it, I really get it, I really, really do.

But the analogy that I can draw is, like, the opposite of a similarly evil type of energy, which is jealousy. Right?

Like, when you feel jealous towards -- or,
I'll just say, I'll speak for myself.

When I feel somebody has something, or is doing something, that I feel jealous of, my instinct is to reject that person, right, or, like, push that

person away.

When, like, the reality is, if you acknowledge, like, "why am I jealous?" I'm jealous because that person has something that I want, and therefore, I should probably ask that person questions about how they got to that place or did that thing.

And so it's like transforming that idea.

And so the same thing with cynicism, it's like transforming what it means, and trying to think about it in a different way.

Like, "don't report because things won't change," is a story that people in positions of power want to keep going, and people in positions who don't want you to disrupt or, like, undermine the way it's always gone, or -- or will say, oh, this is problem, or you're a problem, or, you know, it wasn't really that bad, it wasn't really that bad.

Well, you are the -- we are all the judgers of what's bad and what's good.

And I just think that, you know, the more and more that we can dispel the cynicism, and we can make it so it's not that case, we should do it.

But, to dispel something like this, it's

about reporting.

And I acknowledge that reporting is a privilege, so it starts with where we began here.

So, I just wanted to share that, because,

I think that -- I feel like one of my jobs, or one

of -- part of my role, is to inject, or un -
I should say, un -- to help to unlearn some of the

bad stories that the world has told us, that are

not -- they're not real unless we continue to make

them real.

AUDACIA RAY: Yeah, to speak to that a little bit, I think it's also important to talk about what reporting actually is and what it means.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Uh-huh, yes.

AUDACIA RAY: Because that's something I saw a lot, like, in the -- I don't know, one of the last rounds of Internet outcry about -- you know, about reporting, and people -- and telling stories about why they didn't report.

And when that started happening, I was, like, okay, but we need to actually talk about "what it is" when you report.

So, at the Anti-Violence Project, we operate a 24/7 hotline for LGBTQ survivors of violence.

And calling the hotline is reporting.

Reporting doesn't necessarily mean, like, walking into a police precinct and laying out your horrible story.

It can be finding a peer or finding a community-based organization, and talking to them about your options.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Hmm.

AUDACIA RAY: So, like -- like, with the hotline, you know, we gather annual data about people reporting on hate violence and sexual violence and intimate-partner violence.

I've talked a lot about hate violence this week, so this number is in any head.

But, of the people who call us to talk about hate violence, two-thirds of them are calling to report, to be heard, and to get support around safety planning.

So, they're not calling with the intention of saying, like, I'm reporting, and I want to take this to the top. But they want to be heard, they want to be acknowledged, and they want to make a plan.

And so, yes, like, figuring out, like, what is the proper government way to do the thing, and, like, reports, and, like, hold someone accountable, get them to, like, get fired or lose their license,

or -- you know, whatever, like that can be a thing, but, also, figuring out your options.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So can I just share something with you?

AUDACIA RAY: Sure.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Because I think this is like another remarkable moment of this day.

Similar to what the young women before you had testified and shown to me, what you just did right now, actually, was you took -- you just unearthed another blind spot of mine, and I think that that is actually so incredible.

Because, to redefine what reporting means -And I am an extremist by nature, so I go
from, like, zero to 100 on everything. It's like
all or nothing, that's it.

But, that's not really -- like, the world is not that way. There's gray areas.

-- and so for you to say, though, that reporting can just be sharing it with someone, to say, like, how do I -- how can I be safe?

You don't need to have -- it's not a privilege. We shouldn't have to have a privilege to do that. But we need to understand where to call, or who to tell, or, where can I go to be safe?

That just kind of blew my mind a little bit, 1 even though that probably is so obvious to you. 2 So, thank you, because I think that I needed 3 to hear that. 4 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: And can I just add one thing? 6 7 SENATOR BIAGGI: Yes. ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: So I just wanted to add 8 about, you know, the woman who came into our office, 9 because, she didn't think that we were a government 10 11 agency, or anything like that. She didn't realize 12 who we were. She just knew us as "10-A." 13 And this is, like, a little bit of a thing 14 between Alessandra and I. She's, like, oh, it was, 15 like, Are you 10-A? 16 Because, everybody in the Flushing community 17 did not know us as, like -- it was just, like, word of mouth, 10-A gets things done. 10-A can fix all 18 19 the problems. "10-A." 20 And so we were just "10-A." 21 And -- and so, when she came in, you know, 22

it's so important to create space.

And I just wanted to put that out, it's really about creating space.

23

24

25

And I -- I think that that's something that

we need to do on all different levels, to be able to make things change systemically. It's about creating space, and making sure that there's different voices that can be heard in those spaces.

And it's so important, like Alessandra said, what you just said was so important, because of that reason.

People do just need to have a space to be able to have somebody tell them that what they experienced was even real.

And, so -- you had something (indicating)?

LEEJA CARTER, Ph.D.: It sounds like "10-A"

was also familiar to her, and culturally aligned.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NIOU: Yeah.

Yes, 100.

And, I just also wanted to briefly touch on a case, particularly in Flushing. You know, people talked about it a little bit.

But, Yang Song was a sex worker in Flushing.

And when she did try to report something that
happened to her, she was stalked, harassed,
intimidated, and, killed.

And so I just wanted to, you know, say that, you know, sometimes, when we're talking about a system that is a privileged system, it doesn't

necessarily make it so that it's even safe for anybody -- not everybody is safe in those systems.

And so, you know, it's just something to acknowledge, and something to also work on, because that does happen, all the time.

And when -- when, say, for example, you're walking down the street and, all of a sudden, just because you look a certain way, or dress a certain way, and you get arrested for something you didn't even do, you know, then, why would you go to the police to report that?

So, just want to put that out there for folks.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: I actually have a follow-up.

So -- your comment about reporting being just calling someone, one of the things that I know that Assemblywoman Simotas and I have talked about, is that, under the Assembly policy, for example, that we are all mandated reporters.

So if some person comes to you, and wants advice, and doesn't want to report, but needs to talk, and seeks you out, we have to report it.

And that's not something that person wants, or may not want, because then they're put into this

process, right, and that process then turns along and demands that there's some invest -- there's investigation, et cetera.

And -- so it's something we've struggled with because, sometimes what people need is an "office grandma" that can just listen, and give them advice, and maybe that advice is, yeah, it's okay to report and go through this process.

I'm just curious, given your experience, if you have any guidance with regard to that?

AUDACIA RAY: I mean, I'm not a social worker, I'm not a mandated reporter.

People tell me terrible things all the time, that I don't have to tell anyone if I don't want to.

I mean, I think, like, someone says about, oh, it's about consent, and -- and informing folks about what -- you know -- so the folks I know who are mandated reporters have a practice of saying, Before you go further, I need to tell you this, that I'm mandated to report this.

And then you can make a decision about what to do with that, and they can be steered in a different direction.

So -- so I think that's really important, that the person knows that, because -- because it

can feel like a violation, you know.

And that's a thing, and particularly in workplaces, and the way that human resources' regulations and, you know, workplace policies work, like, you do sometimes have to run it up the chain, and that can feel like a violation to someone who's just starting to talk it out and explore their options.

And -- and that -- that's also why, like, hotlines exist. You know, I mean, people can call AVP and call anonymously. You know, we do ask for a variety of data from folks, but they don't have to give it.

It's -- you know, it's a New York
City-focused service because, once folks call, we
try to connect them with in-person services.

But, it's about exploring options, and that's really important, because sometimes folks want to talk right after something has happened to them, but aren't ready to take action. And that talking is the action, and that has to be enough for that moment.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SIMON: Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you all so much.

We appreciate you waiting this long, and

1 staying and answering all of our questions.

It really, actually, was an incredibly valuable aspect of this day.

Thank you.

Our last, and final, individuals to hear testimony from, are from the Restaurant Opportunity Center of New York.

Thank you.

I thought it was you.

Thank you.

Wow.

Before you begin, I just want to share something with you.

One of the most important voices that we wanted to hear from were individuals in the restaurant industry.

And, so, I'm so glad that you stayed.

VERONICA AVILA: Yeah.

Yeah, we started the day with ten, but, unfortunately, obviously, if your wage is dependent on tips, Friday night before a three-day weekend is prime-money time.

So we -- maybe we wanted to start with Yasmine (ph.), who's one of the members that was able to stay. But she'll be reading a testimony of

a woman that was here, but had to go.

And then I think you have copies of the rest, so you can read them.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you for sharing that, because I think that that actually -- again, another blind spot, had that knowledge been on top of our mind, perhaps we would have put you up sooner on the list.

But that's really -- I'm grateful that you just said that.

Thank you.

YASMIN (ph.): Hi. Good evening, everyone.

Thank you so much for listening to the testimony of a fellow worker.

I too worked have in this industry as well, and so it's an honor to use my voice to speak for someone else.

Her name is Gemma Rossi.

"Thank you, Assemblymembers and Senators, for giving me this opportunity to share my comments on sexual harassment and "One Fair Wage."

"My name is Gemma Rossi, and I live in Brooklyn.

"I'm a member of the Restaurant Opportunity
Center of New York, and I've work in the restaurant

industry for 15 years, nearly half of my life, and I spent most of that time as a tipped worker.

"My first job was a coat-check attendant at a bar. I was 18.

"Since then, I have gone on to work as a hostess, bartender, server, barrista, and manager.

"I like the work that I do. I love the fast pace of working in restaurants. I enjoy the camaraderie amongst the team, and I like working with people of different ages and backgrounds.

"Though there's a lot I enjoy about working in the restaurant industry, depending on tips to make ends meet causes me to endure constant harassment.

"Us servers rely on guests, co-workers, and management to earn tips, and that means they all have a layer of power over us.

"I entered the industry when I was 18. It was one of my first jobs, and sexual harassment was the norm.

"Throughout my career in the industry, I have been pressured for dates, pressured for my phone number, and received inappropriate texts.

"I have endured deliberate inappropriate touching, and I've been repeatedly instructed by

management to dress sexy.

"I worked in one restaurant that strictly hired women. They wanted us to have what they called "a certain look." Servers were told to wear more makeup and tight, revealing clothing.

"And when you're worked in a fast-paced environment, moving a lot, and constantly having to bend over, this attracts a lot of inappropriate behavior.

"This was also a restaurant where the owner's friends constantly came in, and professionally went" -- "professionality" -- excuse me -- "went out of the window. There were no boundaries.

"If I was told something inappropriate, I had to either, engage, or run the risk of having them tell the owners I had a bad attitude.

"The job went beyond giving good service, but for the sake of my livelihood, I had to set my pride side and just deal with it.

"I was there for over four years, until I couldn't deal with it anymore.

"But this is not an exception, this is the norm.

"When I was younger, an owner of a restaurant
I worked at was really inappropriate. He'd just

walked up to you and massage you. And he'd also go into gruesome detail about his love life. He was so erratic, that he'd go from screaming at you, to trying to give you a fur coat. It was really uncomfortable. He was explosive and unapproachable, unless he was approaching a member of his female staff to make an advance.

"But it's not just guests, and management, that take advantage of our dependence on tips; it's co-workers too.

"Relying on tips means you have to stay good with the kitchen. You rely on them to be able to give good service. You have to deal with sexualized greetings, and comments, and a response, you just have to giggle, because you need them to move things quickly for you, so you can give food out to guests.

"You do what you have in order to earn a tip.

"When I was in those moments of experiencing harassment, I never considered approaching management. I just dealt with it.

"Approaching management felt like something that would backfire, especially when harassment is coming from management.

"How do you rationalize going to them for a solution?

"I knew that attempting to address harassment can mean receiving a smaller tip, or no tip, or some sort of retaliation action. You're labeled as being weak, or not cut out for the job or being able to deal with the public.

"I've seen workers that address harassment given less lucrative schedules and sections, which directly impacts how much you earn from tips.

"Management and owners help foster situations that drive sales. They try to create an environment that sells, and a sexualized environment is how many people think sales are created, and, unfortunately, servers are left to grapple with how to respond to this environment.

"In tipped roles, sexual harassment is a normal part of the job. For a long time, I didn't even have any consciousness of it.

"I entered the industry when I was so young.

"I quickly understood that tolerating inappropriate behavior was the name of the game: it was expected of me. And if I couldn't handle it, then this industry wasn't for me.

"I thought, well, I guess this is what
I signed up for. And because it was my first job, a
tip job, it shaped my norms.

"Being constantly harassed, it's what

I expected, and, normally, I didn't think twice when
having to navigate a situation that made me
uncomfortable.

"I recently also started working as a writing tutor, and the difference in treatment is astounding. Women aren't afraid to speak out.

"Sometimes, when I see what people complain about, it's shocking to me what others' threshold is. Sometimes my reaction is, Really? Come on.

"But that just stems from this behavior being so normalized so early on for me.

"Being dependent on tips leaves this largely-women workforce vulnerable to experiencing sexual harassment at work by anyone that has any influence over your capacity to earn a tip.

"My income is directly connected to how willing I am to give in to an advance. There's a literal transaction attached to it.

"If I didn't have that burden, if I didn't have to solely depend on tips, if I knew I had a base wage I could depend on, regardless of shift or section, it would free me, and a lot of people, from having to tolerate harassment at work.

"Thank you for your time.

1 "I hope that you help us make New York the eighth "One Fair Wage" state, because a dependence 2 3 on tips leaves us tipped workers dangerously vulnerable to experiencing sexual harassment in the 4 workplace." 5 VERONICA AVILA: So I thought maybe it would 6 7 be -- has anyone ever worked at a restaurant, can I ask? 8 You have. Okay. 9 Okay, so there's some familiarity with -- we 10 11 use a lot of jargon. I'm just noting that we use "section" a lot in a lot of these testimonies. 12 13 So, just for people that haven't worked in 14 the industry, "section" is, essentially, the floor 15 plan, and it's the way the restaurant's cut up. 16 So sometimes you can have a great section; 17 that's all the tables by the window. Or you can have a bad one; that's every table by the bathroom. 18 So that's sort of the difference in, you 19 20 know, the potential of income. 21 So that's what we say when we refer to 22 "sections." 23 I just sort of realized that they all have

So my name is Veronica Avilia, and I work

24

25

that jargon.

with the Restaurant Opportunities Center of New York.

We're a restaurant workers' center that engages workers, consumers, and employers, to try to improve restaurant-industry standards.

I've also myself worked in the restaurant industry.

So here in New York, we have about 400,000 restaurant workers, most of which are actually in the restaurant industry.

The restaurant industry is one of the state's largest private-sector employers, and, it's massive. And it's also one of the industries that, again, houses the most tipped workers.

And tipped workers are allowed to be paid a subminimum wage, which, in New York, ranges between 7.50 and 10 dollars an hour.

So that means that, for tipped workers, most of whom are people of color; 60 percent of whom are women, and about a third of which are immigrants, they're dependent on tips to make ends meet.

And so, you know, one of the things that we know, is that, obviously, sexual harassment is a societal problem, and it's, obviously, undeniably felt in every sector.

<u>۲</u> ک

But given our experience and our conversations with workers and our research, we know that a dependence on tips really gravely exacerbates tipped workers' vulnerability to sexual harassment in the workplace.

One thing that's been repeated a lot today, is that sexual harassment is a manifestation of power relations.

And we know that the power balance that is created by the subminimum-wage system is evident, in the fact that so many facets of the tipped workers' income and experience from, you know, how much they earn, whether they're hired or fired, are completely dependent on their relations with and interactions with guests.

But it's really a triangulated power imbalance.

Gemma's testimony sort of highlights this, that tipped workers are dependent on employers to provide them with the opportunity to earn tips.

They rely on employers providing them the most-lucrative sections and the most-lucrative shifts.

They also depend on their co-workers to push out food correctly and promptly.

And they, of course, actually, obviously, rely on the guests to leave a tip.

And one thing that's really important to note about tips is that they're relatively arbitrary.

There's a bunch of research out there that shows that the amount of tip you receive can be influenced by how many times you touch a guest, by whether or not you're wearing red lipstick, and by the color of your skin. Workers of color are known to receive less in tips.

So, given that dynamic, it's not particularly surprising that the Center for American Progress indicates that, the accommodation in food-services industry, which is where most tipped workers fit, is consistently the largest source of EEOC sexual-harassment claims.

And I would say today, that we've actually heard a thread of restaurants being pervasive sexual-harassment sites. We've heard it in the beginning, we heard it in domestic-worker testimony.

It's something that we know, and it's something that was so great to hear reflected in other people's testimony as well.

So, recently, ROC actually conducted a survey of over 100 restaurant workers in tipped occupations

in New York.

We found that 80 percent of restaurant workers in New York experienced unwanted sexual harassment at work, and over half reported that this was a weekly, or daily, occurrence.

So, one of the things about being a tipped worker is that your wage, your income, fluctuates weekly. It can depend on someone's mood, it can depend on the weather, it can depend on whether it's a busy or a slow day, if it's sunny.

So, it's particularly shocking to know that, quite frankly, for over half of tipped workers in this state, the only thing that they can depend on weekly, and daily, is an occurrence of sexual harassment.

And we -- you know, it's, quite frankly, a privilege to be in this role, where part of my work is to get to those community with restaurant workers.

And in doing that, we, obviously, get to know people's stories, and we carry that with them.

There's a young woman who is a member of ROC, who also shared a similar story, that her first job was in the restaurant industry.

And so she was a server, and her supervisor

took it upon himself to initiate her into the industry.

And so, when she began work, he told her that, every day, that, at the end of the shift, that he was going to tell her a dirty joke, because she needed to get used to the industry.

And, so, the only thing that -- Mersa (ph.) could depend on, was not, you know -- she didn't have a stable wage, but she always knew that, at the end of the shift, her supervisor was going to whisper in her ear a dirty joke.

And that's, you know, quite shocking, when we know that 60 percent of women, at some point in their lives, have worked in the restaurant industry.

This is what young women are entering; this is the experience that they have, this is what's shaping their norms in workplace.

We also conducted a larger study with a partner, Forward Together, that surveyed
700 restaurant workers across 39 states on the issues of sexual harassment in the workplace.

And we found that it's incredibly widespread, it's felt by all genders. And that the power dynamics and the highly sexualized environments of restaurants impact every major workplace

relationships.

Restaurant workers reported high levels of harassing behaviors from management, co-workers, and customers.

The majority, again, also reported that sexual harassment was an uncomfortable aspect of work life, and reported experiencing scary or unwanted sexual behavior.

And so when we looked at the data from the seven states that have no subminimum wage, and compare that to the states that do have a subminimum wage, we found that tipped workers in the states with no subminimum wage --

There's a massive typo there if you're reading the testimony.

-- experienced half the rate of sexual harassment.

But the study also found that workers in states with a subminimum wage were also three times more likely to be told to dress sexier than workers in states with no subminimum wage.

You know, oftentimes, because you are relying on tips, in places like New York, management will give what they think is a brilliant advice, to help you boost your tips, right, and that advice tends to

be: Dress sexier, wear tighter clothing, change your appearance, so that people are more likely to give you tips.

And so, you know, we found that these instances of sexual harassment that workers face, not only impact them, in terms of, you know, being traumatic experiences, but they also increase turnover, and cause really sluggish career advancement for women.

So many women are forced to cope with these experiences by leaving their place of employment.

One thing that Gemma's testimony highlights is the norm: When people say, if you can't hack it, just go find another job. Or, you should take it as a compliment.

So people are really forced to repress what they feel, what they're going through.

You know, there was actually a really high-profile case that happened shortly after the reemergence of #MeToo.

There's an owner of the restaurant called
The Spotted Pig, which is an acclaimed New York
restaurant, was found to be rampantly sexually
harassing his workforce. Allowing guests that
visited this off-hours floor, which employees

disturbingly dubbed "the rape room," to abuse staff as well. The owner was known to send inappropriate texts, grope women, force himself on them.

One woman even shared a story of having to kneel down to collect glasses on a low shelf, and the owner grabbed her head and pushed it towards his groin.

The workers that came forward were, namely, women; they were, namely, servers; and they reported that the owner instilled fear in workers by proclaiming that he would blacklist them if they came forward.

And these weren't empty threats.

The workers actually stated that they saw the owner blacklist and harass employees that stood up to him.

And it was even reported that the co-owner told women, when they brought these claims forward, that they should either leave or get used to it, which is something that women, quite frankly, hear a lot in this industry.

So the women silently endured public humiliation and instances of grave sexual violence, because they fear financial repercussions of coming forward.

The owner, obviously, yielded a tremendous power over them, and their financial well-being.

You know, to sort of add to that, the EEOC finds that workers who experience sexual harassment in the workplace don't report harassing behavior or file a complaint because they fear disbelief of their claim, or inaction, or professional retaliation.

We also -- you know, one of the reports that we mentioned, that we didn't share, so we should probably e-mail copies of that, we found that women that experienced sexual harassment were also compelled to quit their jobs. About a third reported that they felt compelled to leave their job as a result of sexual harassment.

And we know, at large, that women that experience harassment in the workplace are found to be 6 1/2 more times likely to leave their jobs than those who don't.

So, you know, just to reiterate:

We find that a dependence on tips helps breed sexual harassment in restaurants, and it keeps tipped workers; in particular, women, in a constant state of career stagnation, and economic precarity, in a culture where the customer is always right, in

a country that really professes that the country -- or, the customer's always right.

In order to address the intense prevalence, and the extreme normalization of sexual harassment in this industry, we stand by having to adopt what we call "One Fair Wage."

So that's, essentially, a measure that says, that tipped workers would gradually, gradually, over the span of five of years, move up to earn the full minimum wage, with tips on top.

So it would shifts tips to be a staple of income, to really be a reward for good service.

You know, we think that this would diffuse a lot of the points of vulnerability that women face.

It clearly would not eliminate societal sexual harassment, but it would enable tipped workers to stand up to abuse, if they wouldn't have to fear retaliation, in terms of having shifts changed or sections changed, because they would have a stable base income.

So, we also think that this would really break through the normalization of sexual harassment in the industry.

And, it's not something we made up in extract. There are, quite frankly, seven states

that have what we call "One Fair Wage."

So, Alaska; California, again a leader;
Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Montana, and Nevada
currently have phased in "One Fair Wage" for tipped
workers.

So, you know, we think that tipped workers deserve to have an industry -- the industry move away from a tiered wage structure that really leaves them vulnerable to experiencing sexual harassment.

You know, we thank you so much, for those of you that have sponsored legislation that's moving in the Senate and the House.

This summer, we were actually hopeful -- or, last summer, actually, we were hopeful that maybe we would make some progress, that "One Fair Wage" would be enacted.

There was a series of hearings that happened across the state, where, you know, tons of tipped workers came out in support, and some not in support, of "One Fair Wage."

And we thought that, you know, when the Governor broached the subject, he said that he wanted to address an inequity in the wage system, and it's been almost a year, and we've heard nothing.

So we definitely thank you, for those of you have stepped up in leadership, and have sort of responded in the face inaction.

And we think that "One Fair Wage" is one way that women in the restaurant industry, workers in the restaurant industry, wouldn't have to grapple with all the sexual harassment that they do now.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: Great.

First of all, thank you.

And you deserve a lot of kudos for sticking it out to the end, and appreciate the sacrifices your team made, in waiting.

A few questions.

The conversation around "One Fair Wage," the impact it has to the industry, and all of that, can be looked at from a number of lenses.

And when we've often talked about it, it has been mostly under the premise of just labor practice, and, wage-theft issues that arise from it, in that context.

But trying to put this lens of harassment in the workplace, and in this industry in particular, is -- so let me follow a train of thought, and forgive me if I'm wrong about some of this. I did work in a restaurant, but I hardly remember what

the employer still has a responsibility to make you whole to the minimum wage. Correct?

So if you're working a shift, or -- for that -- for that pay period, but you didn't make -- people were just stingy for those days, whatever was going on, your tips did not make you whole, and the employer has to fill that gap.

So, in other words, no tipped employee is making less than minimum wage, or should not be, unless it's a wage-theft issue.

Correct?

VERONICA AVILA: In theory, yes.

But the wage system is so complex, and I can go into that, but I feel like that --

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: No, no, right, right, okay.

But in theory, they're supposed to?

VERONICA AVILA: In theory.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And in any situation where you're not, now you're getting into wage-theft violations --

VERONICA AVILA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: -- that would have to be investigated and dealt with.

And we've done some things to try to address wage theft.

Let's say that you eliminate the tipped wage. You now go to making minimum, plus whatever you make in tips.

But a lot of the dynamics that you've described would still seem to exist, where the shift determinations, the section determination.

The impetus for somebody, if I'm working at a restaurant, I want to maximize my earnings no matter what. Whether I'm making the minimum or not, I'm not aiming for the minimum. I'm aiming for as much as I can make.

Which still leaves that pressure point for someone, an employee to maybe want to go above and beyond, to try to earn more, and/or put up with whatever harassment by the supervisor, because you want that right section where you're gonna maximize that income.

So there's still -- some of those dynamics would still exist, not -- or not?

VERONICA AVILA: I mean, you know, we have one testimony, she had to leave as well, where she

writes that, "I was so happy when I didn't have to deal with any of this."

And I don't know that there are many people out there that would say, I would put my self-esteem my dignity, my body, out there on the line to get more.

I mean, I think people are used to doing it because, since the history of the restaurant work, there's always been a tipped occupation.

So I don't necessarily agree with that, also because we have done research to show that, in states that do have "One Fair Wage," that people experience half the rates of sexual harassment.

And part of that is, you are emboldened to address it. Like, you don't have to give your phone number. You don't have flirt with someone who's disgusting, and who wants to just act like you're their girlfriend for the night.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: No, I completely agree with you.

And I guess what concerns me is that, in terms of talking about where we are with policy, what -- where we are with oversight, and where we are with enforcement, none of those situ -- conditions that are prevailing in this industry, and

I understand how the tip dynamic can exacerbate that, but I'm -- but none of those things should be able to exist as it is.

So even if we weren't discussing the tip structure, even if we were just saying, in this industry, this is happening, none of those descriptions, the employer who suggests that you need to dress sexy in order to do this, or, somebody who is creating a hostile work environment, or forcing you to listen to crude -- I mean, a lot of that is captured by existing regulations around harassment in the workplace.

And -- so I guess my other questions is:

Does ROC have a position on policies to strengthen sexual-harassment protections in the restaurant industry now, whether or not the tip structure is addressed?

VERONICA AVILA: So we, fundamentally, think that passing "One Fair Wage" is one way to really get at the crux of the issue.

We've done a number of sexual harassment trainings.

We've been around since 9/11.

So we've done a number of sexual harassment trainings, often in partnership with different

government agencies. We go into restaurants, we do them. But it doesn't get at the heart of the issue.

And so that's why we're sort of pushing this as a way that we think it can be addressed.

And I think, to the point of enforcement, the subminimum-wage system is so complex, it's so confusing, it puts the burden on workers to prove that they've made enough money.

And so when you're already in this strange power dynamic, where you're, like, concerned about given the opportunity to maybe earn tips, you're not going to come forward with issues.

And so the Governor actually, recently, released the report that found, that about \$35 million in lost wages and tips were recovered.

And the highest -- the way that people stole the most money were through violations of the subminimum wage.

And when we did the hearing last summer, there was an attorney that pulled up case records from both, you know, New York, and one of the "One Fair Wage" states, and found that the cases that were brought forward on --

You know, there's still laws that govern tips. Right? Like, who gets to be a part of the

tip pool.

-- but that, clearly, there was much less litigation in the restaurant industry in these "One Fair Wage" states, because there wasn't a confusing system.

And, quite frankly, sometimes people are super-well intentioned. They're great employers, but it's confusing, even for employers.

And so we think that phasing it out, not even (indiscernible) it from one day to the next, but phasing it out for this industry, would also in -- decrease liability for employers. It would put them in a position where they don't have to get in trouble, or get into, like, ridiculous lawsuits.

We have had workers, you know, once -- that person that was gonna speak today, that's also a restaurant workers, does have a story of living in Minnesota, that's a "One Fair Wage" state, and then moving to New York, and immediately experiencing a case of wage theft, but, it was unintentional.

But it's because the system is so complex, and the burden is on workers to come forward and show that they haven't made enough money.

So I hear you, but we, fundamentally, do believe, just based on our experience of working in

the industry, and dealing with a bunch of restaurant workers across the country that face these issues, that phasing out the subminimum wage is one thing that would really get at a lot of what restaurant workers are facing; in particular, women.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: The dynamics of reporting, currently, in a restaurant setting, and, obviously, reporting a supervisor, or filing a complaint against the management, compared to addressing the harassment by a patron, what is that experience like?

And, I don't know if, anecdotally, or you guys --

(Indiscernible cross-talking)

VERONICA AVILA: Comparing the -- or, addressing harassment from management --

(Indiscernible cross-talking)

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: So I could imagine -I mean, look, we've heard, in almost every industry,
there have been challenges with coming forward, with
filing complaints, and having those looked at and
addressed appropriately.

How much more difficult, or what has been the dynamics, dealing with, when you report to a supervisor or the manager at the restaurant, look,

the guy at Table 10 is being completely rude and disrespectful, or saying things that are inappropriate. I refuse to, you know, serve that table?

What does that look like for most of the folks that are --

(Indiscernible cross-talking)

VERONICA AVILA: I mean, I don't know if

Gemma kept it in her testimony, but one thing

that she says is that, owners create environments

that drive sales, and sometimes those are

hyper-sexualized environments.

And one thing that does happen, is that, when you have an instance with a guest -- you know, we've had this happen, where you have an instance with a guest, it's a regular, you tell the manager. The manager -- you don't want to lose your regular, right, so you just sort of let it slide.

You know, she tells the story of, sometimes the manager is friends with the people that are coming in, so you can't really address it, because they are -- they're dependent on that business.

And she can't -- she feels like she has to engage, she feels like she has to engage, because she's also waiting for that tip.

So I think even to the point -
Go ahead.

YASMIN (ph.): I've just been listening to

you, share (indiscernible).

I think what's maybe not being said so

I think what's maybe not being said so specifically, is the culture of the environment of the job itself.

The culture of the environment of the job is sexualized, so -- like you were sharing just now.

So you're, basically, complaining about something being wet, but you're in a fish bowl. You know what I mean?

Like, it's -- that's what it is: a fish bowl has water, it's going be wet.

So you're in an environment, a restaurant, that is creating an atmosphere in which everything is overtly sexualized, because that is the -- what is pushed to push sales.

So if you are -- and everyone wants to do well at their job, no matter what their job is.

That's just a fundamental thing about being human, and working. You want to do your best. Right?

So you're not, in that particular cultural environment, going to speak out to your boss and say, You know, this particular guy here in Table 4

is saying such and such to me.

Because, you already learned that, if you do speak out, then you're going to get a shift that's less desirable, and, you're also not going be taken as somebody that wants to do their job well, because you are complaining about a guest.

You're complaining -- I mean, most places don't even call them "customers." They say "our quests," "our friends."

That's the language that we use in restaurants.

So it's -- so, therefore, that's passed on to the employees as well, that this is what you're supposed to do.

"One Fair Wage" would be so useful because, what's -- Gemma doesn't speak about this, but, fellow workers, fellow comrades, fellow people that I work and support, are parents, are single moms.

So, when you are working on tips alone as your basic foundation of economics and financial security, you're automatically insecure, because tips fluctuate, like she just shared earlier, based on weather, based on customers, based on, anything. Right?

So, it's difficult to plan ahead and to plan

for your financial security for your family, if you're based on tips, if that's what you're dealing with.

A wage that you know, okay, I'm going get paid, this amount, every time, then I can begin the opportunity to plan ahead.

Which is what we encourage all citizens to do, to think ahead to -- ROC does that, actually.

As a member, I was asked to take on, and I'm grateful I did, financial literacy classes, that helped me understand how I can save better.

You know, I worked in this industry.

I had the fortune of working this industry, and being in school. So I had an opportunity to have other opportunities afforded to me, so I didn't have to stay in the industry.

But I still remember what that was like.

And, you know, to be quite frank, I did not have to raise a child as a student.

But people are raising families in a city that's increasingly becoming more expensive for those of us that have jobs that have set wages, and other avenues in which we don't have to depend on the kindness of strangers, like it's a plague. You know, we're "Streetcar Desire." Like, this is

people's lives.

"One Fair Wage" would be about equality, and it would make it so that you can impact working families across the state, so that they're able to then take care of themselves and their families.

And it should not be something that we have to rely upon others to do for us.

So, it's such an interesting issue.

If you shift this one thing, it affects so many things in so many positive directions.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I don't -- let me -I think earlier I made a question that may have been
misunderstood, and I don't want that to happen here.

I'm not -- I'm not expressing these questions out of a position on whether or not "One Fair Wage" should pass or not, or -- 'cause -- and my committee is going to have to work on this as well.

I'm really just trying not to lose focus of fact that, you're right, these positions, and this industry, is hyper-sexualized. The perception of a young, innocent, female waitress is there for me to, you know, whatever, as a patron.

And some of these are, particularly, what bartenders go through as well.

So, I guess, acknowledging that, is that

I don't want to lose sight of the fact that none of those wage issues will completely eliminate, nor should they prevent us from strengthening protections in the workplace, how reporting is done, how enforcement is done, within this industry.

And -- and -- so I -- that's the reason why
I'm asking, because I think, representing workers in
the industry, I would love to hear some of your
recommendations for strengthening those protections,
whether or not the tip issue gets addressed.

And I'm -- again, I don't -- I'm not losing sight of the fact that changing that structure could have a tremendous impact on the numbers, based on the data you provided.

But it's really that I don't want to lose sight of the fact that we can do more now, without waiting on a solution to the other policy issue, wage issue, to say, the harassment that is happening shouldn't be happening to begin with, it shouldn't be happening now.

And, I just don't want to lose sight of that in this industry.

One last question.

Earlier today we heard about the Fair Food campaign, and the approach that the farmworkers

used, where, you know, they use their bargaining power, and all of that.

Have -- has -- have you guys considered that approach, and/or are any major restaurant chains or major players in this industry agreed to come forward and work with you, and say, proactively, You know what? We will set a standard of paying a minimum wage.

Are there any examples of that already?

And are they trying to change the dynamics outside of policy, but by practice?

VERONICA AVILA: So, two things.

I would say that, like, you know, we agree with most of the recommendations that people have provided today.

But we want, on record, to say that we think that "One Fair Wage" would a way to really diffuse the power dynamic that people grapple with.

I mean, customers also know, there's also research on this, they know that their tip wields power over you, right, so they carry that into the space.

And this work has existed, as a job, since the early 1800s. And since the early 1800s, people have been fighting to not have to be paid a

subminimum wage.

And so I think, you know, every time there's an increase to the minimum wage, tipped workers are told to wait, restaurant workers told to wait; wait their turn, wait till next time, let's strengthen enforcement.

And I think we're in a moment where, like, it's just not enough anymore.

It's -- we want a holistic change, right, but we think, for us, "One Fair Wage" is a central piece of the puzzle, and these other things would be supports.

So to the other question of restaurants, we do actually have an employer roundtable that's called RAISE. It's a wonderful acronym, that I don't remember what it stands for.

So, it's a network of employers that are trying to promote this high road to profitability. And they do things, like, you know, offer benefits, that they don't have to. They do something that's above the law.

And so here in New York we have about 60 partners.

So, for example, Danny Myers (ph.) is a partner.

You know, Andrew Tarlow's group, the Marlow Collective, is a partner.

Even small restaurants, like a new restaurant that just opened in January, named (indiscernible), right, they are also partners.

So we are trying to have an informal network that does promote the sustainable pathway to profitability.

But one thing that we know, is that the industry has to make this change together. It has to make this change together.

If you have one person that's out there doing above and beyond, it does -- you know, it does give others that are following the subminimum wage a competitive advantage.

And so, when we think about this, we think that it has to be legislated. It has to be legislated, because the industry has to make this change together.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I have one question, and then I think that's all of the questions, unless anybody -- (looking around) -- okay. Very good.

So have you -- actually, let me ask it this way: Has the mandated department of labor policy on sexual-harassment training, and having sexual

harassment policies, changed anything about the 1 daily harassment that you endure? 2 VERONICA AVILA: I would say no, no. 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: I thought that that would be 4 the answer, but I just want to make sure that I'm 5 6 not missing anything. 7 Thank you so much, and thank you for waiting, and providing all of this testimony. 8 And I think that that concludes --9 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: I mean, unless we want 10 11 to, like, stall till midnight, and say -- no, I'm 12 just kidding. I'm kidding, I'm kidding. 13 VERONICA AVILA: Thank you. 14 YASMIN (ph.): Thank you; thank you so much 15 listening. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN CRESPO: And for those of us that 17 remain, if we could just give a round of applause to 18 the staff that had stayed in the room and worked 19 everything. 20 [Applause.] 21 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you all so much. 22 23 (Whereupon, the joint public hearing 24 concluded, and adjourned.) 25 ---000---