1	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION			
2	AND			
3	STANDING COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS			
4	AND STANDING COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, CONSTRUCTION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT			
5				
6	JOINT PUBLIC HEARING:			
7	PUBLIC HEARING ON LONG ISLAND REGARDING REAL ESTATE AGENTS' DISCRIMINATION OF HOME BUYERS			
9				
10	Student Center Theater Mack Student Center Hofstra University			
11	Hempstead, New York			
12	Date: December 12, 2019 Time: 10:00 a.m.			
13				
14	PRESIDING:			
15	Senator Kevin Thomas, Chairman NYS Senate Standing Committee on			
16	Consumer Protection			
17	Senator James Skoufis, Chairman NYS Senate Standing Committee on			
18	Investigations and Government Operations			
19	Senator Brian Kavanagh, Chairman NYS Senate Standing Committee on			
20	Housing, Construction, and Community Development			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1	
2	ALSO PRESENT FROM THE STATE SENATE:
3	Senator Phil Boyle
4	Senator John E. Brooks
5	Senator James Gaughran
6	Senator Todd Kaminsky
7	Senator Anna Kaplan
8	Senator John Liu
9	Senator Monica Martinez
10	
11	ALSO PRESENT FROM THE STATE ASSEMBLY:
12	Assemblymember Charles Lavine
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	1

			3
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Arthur Brown	15	
3	"Long Island Divided"  Project Director	13	
4	"Newsday"		
5	Laura Curran County Executive	26	37
6	Nassau County		
7	Steve Bellone County Executive	26	37
8	Suffolk County		
9	Fred Freiberg Co-Founder	40	61
10	Fair Housing Justice Center		
11	Elaine Gross President and CEO	40	61
12	Erase Racism		
13	M. Ryan Gorman President & CEO	120	128
14	NRT, LLC (Realogy Holdings Corporation,		
15	parent company)		
16	Richard Helling Tester	209	209
17	Johnnie Mae Alston Tester		
18	"Newsday"		
19	Kimberly A. Kinirons Assistant Attorney General,	240	264
20	Suffolk Regional Office NYS Attorney General's Office		
21	Theresa Sanders	240	264
22	President Urban League of Long Island	240	201
23		0.40	0.5.4
24	Lorraine Y. Collins Director of Policy and External Affairs	240	264
25	Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.		

Г

SENATOR THOMAS: Hi, good morning, everyone. 1 Can everyone take their seat? 2 3 Thank you. Today is December 12, 2019. 4 5 I want to welcome everyone to the hearing on 6 housing discrimination here on Long Island. 7 I am state Senator Kevin Thomas, a resident of Levittown, and I will talk about that a little 8 9 shortly. I also represent this district that you are 10 11 all in right now. 12 I also happen to chair the Consumer Protection Committee. 13 14 And this hearing is also co-chaired by my 15 colleagues here: 16 We have Senator Skoufis of Investigations 17 Committee, and Senator Kavanagh from the Housing 18 Committee. Along with members of the Long Island 19 20 delegation, I have Senator Kaminsky and 21 Senator Brooks with me as well. 22 And we'll have more joining. 23 I am a resident of Levittown, and I'm saying that because many of you here know the history of 24

Levittown, and how institutional discrimination

25

plagued that community.

And after the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act, we would think this kind of segregation and discrimination would end.

That's hardly the case, and it's evidenced by "Newsday's" investigation, where they found unequal treatment of individuals wanting the American Dream, which is to purchase a house.

That's why we are having this hearing.

We have a number of panels coming up shortly, so that we can get the facts, get recommendations, and an opportunity for us elected officials that represent you to act.

You know, while I sit here, I think of what Martin Luther King said.

"An injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

With that, I'm going to turn this over to my partner here, Senator Skoufis, from the Investigations Committee.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much, Senator Thomas.

And a very good morning to everyone who's here.

We gather today in an attempt to begin addressing an issue that strikes at the very core of who we are as a state and as a people.

Ever since the Dutch and English co-existed in the 1600s, New York State has long possessed a reputation of unmatched embrace and diversity.

In the 1690s, accused witches in Salem,

Massachusetts, fled their colony for ours, knowing
they would find safe, inclusive refuge.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, New York's harbor would welcome

12 million individuals of varied races, ethnicities, and religions, all seeking a shot at the American Dream.

And over the last few years, people across our country have looked to New York State for inspiration amidst rampant xenophobia, a dramatic surge in racism, and an unnerving resurgence of hate crimes.

That is why, ladies and gentlemen, the issues raised by "Newsday's" recent exposé must begin to be addressed by this body.

These alarming allegations run contrary to our proud 400-year history.

This is not who we are, or at a minimum, this

is not who we ought to be.

Make no mistake, discrimination has, and likely will, always continue to linger throughout society.

But to witness it in such stark, systematic terms, here on Long Island, here in New York State, is offensive, repugnant, and unacceptable.

Which brings us to today.

Our Senate committees will begin the process of understanding what happened, how it happened, why it happened, and more importantly, what safeguards can be put in place to prevent it from happening again.

As a final note, I would like to publicly commend "Newsday" for their enormous undertaking and public service.

At a time when some people in our country odiously refer to the press as enemies of the people, "Newsday's" exposé is the latest demonstration of the exact opposite: they're the conscious of our nation.

With that, I look forward to today's testimony, and turn it over to my fellow co-chair, Senator Brian Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Skoufis

and Senator Thomas.

I will be brief.

This is the seventh hearing of the Housing Committee.

We have been proud to do one of those hearings previously, jointly, with the Investigations and Government Operations Committee.

And I want to also begin by thanking "Newsday" for the extraordinary work over the course of many years.

And the -- I also would like to add my thanks to the staff of our committees, and all the committee members, who worked very quickly to pull together this hearing together.

It's just a few weeks ago that we were, you know, educated, and some of us enraged, by some of the things we read in "Newsday".

And we thought it was very important that we promptly engage in this very public forum, to educate ourselves about what has been uncovered by this investigation, what the various perspectives of the folks involved in the industry, folks responsible for overseeing the industry, are, and hopefully, to look for steps we can take proactively in the coming legislative session.

You know, the Housing Committee has been engaged over the course of the last 11 months in reviewing every aspect of our housing markets throughout the state, with an understanding that most people view housing in New York as an aspect of our society that is in crisis.

We have people throughout New York State who are unable to find homes that are adequate, where the quality and safety standards are high, and where they can afford to live and work in our communities and raise their families there.

We took tremendous steps to alter the nature of the rental market, not only fundamentally changing the rent-stabilization system in New York, to ensure that we closed loopholes that have, for a very long time, diminished the effectiveness of that system, but also through the Housing Stability and Tenant Protection Act, addressing many inequities between landlords and tenants in every aspect of the manner in which they interact.

But we know, we knew even before, you know, "Newsday's" publication on November 17th, that our work is far from done, and that's because we know that:

There are affordability issues;

There are people facing foreclosure, and other issues;

There are housing-quality issues that we uncovered in a related investigation on code enforcement, and the deficiencies of that system, which is something we'll also be taking up in the next year.

But, of course, we know that the -- all the work we do -- all the work we do in government, all the work we do in our communities -- is diminished if New Yorkers cannot count on fair and equal access to housing, regardless of their -- the personal characteristics of themselves and their families.

So, again, it's very important what we're doing today.

We thank all of the witnesses in advance who testify today.

And just to take -- this is the cover of 
"Newsday" from the second day of their coverage, and 
the headline is "Not Here."

And "Not Here" was a reference to the apparent practice of steering certain families from -- to particular communities, and excluding certain communities from the work of realtors and brokers who were dealing with families seeking

housing.

Hopefully, at some point, we can look at the work we do here, and the work of people across this great state, and "Not Here" will refer to the fact that we do not tolerate these kinds of practices in New York, either on Long Island or anywhere in the state.

So, thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Kaminsky.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Thank you.

Having the privilege of representing

Long Island also means confronting its -- its

difficult challenges.

The "Newsday" reporting reflected in the culmination of a three-year investigation, is a scandal of the highest order.

This is a national embarrassment.

It's a -- it's a disgrace, and it's an affront to everything that we stand for as Americans, New Yorkers, and Long Islanders.

Today we are going to use the investigatory powers of the Senate, which, frankly, for too long, have gone unused and sat on a shelf. And we are going to use them to try to, as best we can, uncover what it is that could cause a headline this

startling.

As a former prosecutor, I believe in evidence much more than I believe in rhetoric.

And the evidence of hundreds of hours of recordings is overwhelming, that there is massive systemic discrimination in the real estate business that continues the legacy of segregation today.

That's something that we have to find a way to dismantle, figure out what's at the root cause, and those who are responsible for it must be held accountable.

That's what today is about.

The one thing that's troubling every
Long Islander --

I was fortunate enough to grow up here, as so many others were in this room as well.

-- is that: When has -- when has discrimination, or any other crisis, become so insidious, that people just go about their day, knowing somewhere in the back of their head that it's happening, yet not doing much about it?

"Newsday's" reporting has shaken us to our very core, and has woken up this island to something that many of have suspected or known has been there all along, yet just treated it as the way it might

be, perhaps the way it is.

That's unacceptable.

We're going to get at the root of undoing that today, and I'm very proud to be part of that process.

Hopefully, if "Newsday" started this story, this is the middle of that story, and I hope we take strong action, going forward, to finish this story and put us in a better path, going forward, for a just and equal Long Island.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Brooks.

SENATOR BROOKS: Thank you.

Good morning, everyone.

My name is John Brooks. I represent the southeastern portion of Nassau County and southwestern portion of Suffolk County -- or, just the opposite, southwestern Nassau.

This is a concern that all of us take very, very seriously.

My family happens to have lived on Long Island for over 400 years.

The community that we were, when my family first came here, was one that was open to everyone.

Most of my family were old baymen. They had houses along the shore and watched this community

grow.

It is alarming, the information that we see in the "Newsday" report.

We should be in a situation where anyone that lives here should live in the community of their choice, not have that dictated to them by others.

I want to be very brief, but I want everyone to understand, that all of us here take this situation very, very seriously, and intend to take corrective measures, going forward.

I welcome the comments of everyone today.

I think we are still in a discovery period, but I think all of us, as a community, are collectively concerned with what has been demonstrated in this report, and what we have to change, moving forward.

So I thank everyone for being here.

And I think we need to listen and learn today, and then put together a plan that puts corrective actions in the past -- in -- in the position to move us forward.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you, Senator Brooks.

We're going to start with our first witness.

Arthur Brown, if you can please come forward.

Arthur Brown is the Long Island Divided project director from "Newsday."

We felt, as committees here on the dais, that it was important for "Newsday" to kick off this hearing with a presentation of their investigation; lay the groundwork.

We acknowledge that it is somewhat unusual to have the press/the media here testifying at a hearing.

And so, with that understanding, the committees here have agreed, with "Newsday," to simply receive your testimony and leave it at that.

We will not be requesting answers to questions.

We really do appreciate your presence here.

ARTHUR BROWN: Thank you very much.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Oh, please.

We're going to be swearing in each of the witnesses.

So if, actually, you could please stand up and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

ARTHUR BROWN: I do.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

ARTHUR BROWN: Good morning,
Chairman Skoufis, Chairman Kavanagh, and
Chairman Thomas.

Good morning to all the senators who have taken an interest and are participating:

Senator John Brooks, Jim Gaughran, Tom Kamin -
Todd Kamisky, Anna Kaplan.

And, good morning to everyone in the audience.

I'm honored to represent "Newsday," and to explain how "Newsday" conducted the three-year investigation that led to our being here today.

I'm happy to do so, while noting that news organizations rarely appear in this type of forum.

We leave our work to speak for itself.

With that in mind, I want to make two points clear.

First, "Newsday's" report aimed for transparency, including how we conducted the investigation and how we reached our findings.

My statement will explain facts already in the public domain in a way that I hope you find helpful.

Second, "Newsday's" appearance here does not suggest an opinion about any legislative action you

may or may not choose to take.

Long Island Divided reported evidence of widespread disparate treatment of minority homebuyers, based on a paired testing program, equal on a local basis to once-a-decade nationwide surveys by the department of housing and urban development.

"Newsday" conducted that program in consultation with nationally-recognized experts in fair-housing standards and enforcement.

We based Long Island Divided's findings about individual tests on the judgments of two of those experts: Fred Freiberg, executive director of the Fair Housing Justice Center, and Robert Schwemm, professor at the University of Kentucky, College of Law, and specialist in fair-housing standards and law.

"Newsday" cited a test only after Freiberg
and Schwemm independently detected evidence of
disparate treatment by a real estate agent, and only
after informing agents and their corporate
leadership about "Newsday's" tentative findings;
offering them the opportunity to review what
appeared to be the evidence, including undercover
videos, in private; inviting their comments or
explanations; and subjecting the evidence to fresh

review when agents or their companies provided information that demanded consideration.

The general results were as follows:

40 percent of "Newsday's" 86 paired tests (34) showed evidence of disparate treatment according to the judgments of our two experts.

The rate for Black testers was 49 percent;
For Hispanic testers, 39 percent;
And for Asians, 19 percent.

It's important to remember that the rates reflect evidence of disparate treatment as discerned by the two experts.

They do not reflect conclusions of disparate treatment or legal findings.

Those are the province of regulatory authorities and the courts, not journalism.

Since shortly after the passage of the federal Fair Housing Act a half century ago, courts have recognized paired testing as the most viable tool for documenting housing discrimination.

Two individuals with comparable characteristics, except difference -- different in race or ethnicity, present comparable requests for housing to a real estate agent.

"Newsday" recruited 25 testers. They were

White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian. They ranged from a 20-something student to a 60-something lawyer.

They included both ordinary citizens and actors.

"Newsday" paid testers \$16 an hour.

The Fair Housing Justice Center, which does more paired testing than any organization in the United States, gave "Newsday's" testers daylong training in how to speak with agents.

A Fair Housing Justice Center staff member helped develop testing protocols for "Newsday's" investigation, and assisted in analyzing test results.

Additionally, Professor Schwemm, who is the author of "Housing Discrimination: Law and Litigation," widely accepted as the definitive treatise on the subject, gave "Newsday's" reporters a seminar in the fair-housing law over the course of two days.

Before they met an agent, "Newsday's" [sic] matched two testers as closely as possible in gender, age, and educational background.

"Newsday" equipped testers with comparable undercover identities, including names, marital status, and fictional addresses, employment, and credit scores.

Testers memorized those details, and "Newsday" drilled them on their identities.

"Newsday" also gave the testers the search criteria each would present to an agent.

The criteria included:

The maximum house price.

In our test, prices ranged from \$400,000 to \$7 million.

The number of bedrooms: 3.

And a geographic search zone; for example, an hour from Manhattan, or 30 minutes from communities such as Bethpage and Port Jefferson.

"Newsday" verified that agents had houses to sell when meeting with testers, based on analyses provided by Zillow, the online home site search -- home-search site.

Zillow draws an inventory of available homes daily from the Multiple Listing Service of Long Island, the computerized system used by agents to track the market and select possible houses for buyers.

The Multiple Listing Service informed "Newsday" that it does not keep that kind of historical data.

As permitted by New York law, "Newsday"

outfitted the testers with miniature hidden video equipment that memorialized how the testers conducted themselves, and how the agents responded in meetings and on house tours.

A professional court reporter created typed transcripts of the meetings between testers and agents.

"Newsday" journalists reviewed the transcript for accuracy, and used them to verify that the testers had, in fact, presented matching profiles to agents.

The transcripts of each test enabled reporters also to detect whether testers had inadvertently varied from script.

For example, one tester may have asked an agent for help finding a home within 20 minutes of Garden City, while the other tester focused [audio malfunction] on an area 30 minutes from Garden City.

"Newsday" disqualified tests where errors like that occurred or recording equipment failed.

In the 86 tests where the testers matched up, "Newsday" compared the transcripts for signs that the agent had or had not given comparable information or service to both testers.

On a different track, "Newsday" plotted the 5,763 listings provided by agents on maps down to census tracts.

That allowed us to visualize whether an agent had pointed two testers to overlapping or different communities.

Determined the demographic makeup of neighborhoods selected for each tester; in particular, the percentage of the population identified as White, and compute the average proportion of White residents in the areas recommended to White and minority testers.

When the transcripts and/or listings' maps suggested the possibility of disparate treatment, "Newsday" gave our experts, Fred Freiberg and Robert Schwemm, summaries of the tests, relevant transcript excerpts, and access to the listing maps, and stood ready to answer any of their questions.

Mr. Freiberg and Professor Schwemm rendered opinions in writing. Neither knew what the other had found.

As I said before, "Newsday" cited a test as showing evidence of disparate treatment only when they reached similar conclusions.

Plotting the listings by census tract also

enabled "Newsday" to calculate, with the help of a trained statistician, broad demographic patterns; for example, agents selected houses for Black testers most frequently in neighborhoods with comparatively low White representations, and less frequently in neighborhoods with higher White concentrations.

And those phenomenon flipped when the testers were White.

"Newsday" located the test in 10 zones, that stretch from Nassau County's western most border with Queens, out to the Hamptons, as well as the Gold Coast on the North Shore, down to many communities on the South Shore.

The 86 tests covered about 83 percent of Long Island's 2.3 million-person population, including 80 percent of the White population and 88 percent of the minority population.

So, that was an outline of how "Newsday" conducted the Long Island Divided investigation.

All this information is both, available, and placed in the context of "Newsday's" findings, at www.newsday.com/divided.

There is plenty of to read and plenty to view, including a behind-the-scenes video explainer

of the investigation, and a 40-minute documentary that shows the investigation in progress, presents its findings, and places them in historical context.

Given its importance, "Newsday" has moved the project out from behind a subscriber-pay wall to allow greater access, again, at www.newsday.com/divided.

So I thank you very much for this opportunity to have spoken to you about "Newsday's" work, and I wish you well in all of your important endeavors.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Brown.

We're very grateful for your presence here.

And we recognize it's unusual to have a member of the media coming to testify, but I think your outline really does set the stage for the rest of this hearing.

We're very grateful.

Thank you.

ARTHUR BROWN: Well, thank you very much.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I also want to acknowledge that there are a number of other senators who are here on the dais.

We have Senator Phil Boyle, who I know just walked in; Senator Anna Kaplan;

Senator Jim Gaughran. And we've also been joined by 1 Assemblyman Chuck Lavine. 2 SENATOR THOMAS: We're going to go next to 3 Panel 1, local officials. 4 And I would like to call county executive of 5 6 Nassau County, Laura Curran, to testify. 7 LAURA CURRAN: Thank you very much, Senator Thomas. 8 SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you, Laura. 9 Before you start, I want to swear you in. 10 11 Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the 12 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 13 LAURA CURRAN: I do. 14 SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you. 15 Please. 16 LAURA CURRAN: Thank you very much, 17 Senator Thomas, Senators, Assemblyman, for convening this testimony and inviting me to testify to you. 18 19 I want to start by thanking "Newsday" for 20 this comprehensive and thorough report. I'm sure we all read every word, and I think 21 22 it's fair to say we were shocked, but not surprised. 23 So I'm here today to talk about what we're 24 doing on the county level to combat historic housing

25

discrimination.

Last month "Newsday" revealed results of a three-year investigative project, revealing blatant housing discrimination throughout our county and, indeed, our island.

The investigation uncovered an inexcusable reality that offends our most cherished values as Americans: That all of us are created equal, and all of us deserves an equal shot.

It is important to first acknowledge that the practices revealed, racial steering and other discriminatory practices, are not a new phenomenon.

Racial discrimination in housing has a long and painful history on Long Island.

We must be honest in order to confront it and clear about what we must do.

Housing discrimination is wrong and it is illegal.

That's something the investigation showed.

The thing that I found quite troubling in this investigation is that, often, people don't know they are being discriminated against, which is -- makes it even more pernicious.

Housing discrimination closes doors of opportunity and robs people of their shot at the American Dream.

In Nassau County, we will not tolerate unequal treatment of our residents.

That's why, since I've taken office, my administration has made significant investments promoting equal and fair access to housing for all of our residents.

Earlier this year, the County reached an important settlement of a 14-year lawsuit, where we made a historic commitment to the promotion of affordable housing across our county, especially so in areas with access to good transportation and good public schools.

As part of this settlement, we kicked off an advertising campaign called "Welcome to Nassau," making clear our commitment to fair-housing laws.

But "Newsday's" report makes clear we have much work left to do.

Last month, I stood alongside civil rights leaders, stakeholders, and county legislators from both parties to announce that Nassau County will take comprehensive and bipartisan action to combat housing discrimination.

We will do this through increased enforcement, education, and community engagement.

I named Deputy County Attorney

Errol E. Williams, who is here with us this morning, as special housing counsel, to be charged with coordination of the County's action plan on housing discrimination.

Errol Williams most recently played a lead role in the historic settlement I spoke about earlier, reached in March. And I am pleased that he has accepted this new challenge.

The County is issuing, also, a request for proposals for legal services through our county attorney's office, that will increase enforcement of and compliance with open housing laws through enforcement of administrative proceedings, plenary actions, and special investigations.

I was pleased to reach bipartisan agreement with our county legislature to increase staffing at the county human rights commission, including the addition of an investigator and an administrative law judge, to assist with the resolution of fair-housing complaints.

I've also directed a review of existing forums and processes at the human rights commission to make sure we are handling housing complaints and investigations as best we can.

Rodney McCray, who is executive director of

our human rights commission, will lead this effort.

We are establishing the Nassau County Fair
Housing Advisory Board. So this is a permanent
county entity, not temporary, to be comprised of
community stakeholders and advocates and those from
the real estate industry, and they're tasked with
advising and providing the county with
recommendations regarding the promotion of fair and
equal housing practices and policies.

We realize education is incredibly important.

Since most people often, as was found in this investigation, don't know that they're being steered, don't know that they're being discriminated against.

So we must educate prospective buyers and renters to ensure that they understand fair-housing laws.

That's why I've directed my administration to initiate a robust educational campaign, including workshops and forums throughout the county, designed to inform residents regarding housing rights and resources that are available to them.

And there are resource available to them. Sometimes the challenge is connecting people to those resources.

In the coming weeks, we will announce the first educational workshops, which will be spearheaded by the human rights commission, and by Bishop Lionel Harvey, who is our deputy director for diversity and community engagement, and together with the office of minority affairs, the office of Hispanic affairs, and the office of Asian-American affairs.

I've also directed my administration to develop a new multimedia and multilingual public-awareness campaign to increase awareness about our commitment to and enforcement of fair-housing laws.

We also know that zoning localities are important partners in this effort, and that's why we will engage the already-existing Nassau County Fair Housing Committee Consortium members, which is comprised of towns and villages, to promote fair-housing policies at the municipal level as well, which is incredibly important.

Lastly, I'm pleased that the Nassau County

IDA (Industrial Development Agency) Board has

directed its staff to review their incentive

policies, to ensure the promotion of fair housing,

and eliminate discriminatory practices with those

they do business with.

These actions represent a starting point,
I acknowledge that.

I look forward to working with you, Senators, with my partners in -- and Assemblyman, and my partners in state government, and at the local government, to build the momentum.

I am grateful that the state Senate has called this hearing, and has taken a real interest in this incredibly important issue.

The problem we seek to address has deep roots, and making real progress will require our continued cooperation and resolve.

I will ensure that the -- that Nassau County proactively cooperates with state authorities and any ongoing or future efforts to hold real estate brokers, property-management firms, and lenders accountable regarding compliance with open and fair-housing laws.

We can't guarantee equal outcomes in America, but let's work together, to create a county, to create an island, where kids from every background can grow up knowing that, no matter what you are, what you look like, where you live, you can write your own story.

Thank you. 1 2 SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you, County Executive 3 Laura Curran. We are also joined by Suffolk County 4 Executive Steve Malone. 5 6 Sir, can you please stand up so we can swear 7 you in? Raise your right hand. 8 Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the 9 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 10 11 STEVE BELLONE: I do. 12 SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you. 13 Please, be seated. 14 STEVE BELLONE: Good morning, 15 Chairman Thomas, Chairman Skoufis, 16 Chairman Kavanagh, members of the New York State 17 Senate who are here today, and Assemblyman as well. It's good to be with you, and I thank you for 18 19 the opportunity to speak with you here today. 20 We're all aware, of course, of the "Newsday" 21 investigation that brought the issue of housing 22 discrimination out of the shadows on Long Island. 23 The results of this three-year investigation were disturbing and unacceptable. 24

Using paired testers, "Newsday" found that

25

there were numerous instances where real estate agents provided unequal treatment based on race, in seemingly clear violations of fair-housing laws.

Almost immediately after this report was published we took action.

My staff met with the New York State Attorney General to discuss how we can improve enforcement capabilities.

I also announced that the County would initiate a four-point plan to combat housing discrimination.

First, we said we would strengthen our ability to conduct housing-discrimination investigations.

We are issuing a request for proposals, to select a qualified organization to partner with, to enforce fair-housing laws, including funding the kind of testing that was employed during the "Newsday" investigation.

Second, we're expanding and strengthening the capabilities of our human rights commission.

I've authorized the hiring of an additional investigator for the purpose of examining alleged fair-housing violations. And we will add additional investigators as required by caseloads.

We are also in the process of hiring three administrative law judges that will be there to expedite claims of housing discrimination.

Third, we will issue a request for qualifications, to partner with organizations, to provide education and training.

We want the general public to understand fair-housing laws, and what housing discrimination looks like, and where they can go when they have experienced it.

Fourth, knowing that this problem cannot be solved alone, we've begun reaching out to leading industry stakeholders, including the Long Island Board of Realtors, to begin the process of identifying solutions that would help ensure better compliance of federal and New York laws for real estate agents.

On the state level, I believe that we need a consumer bill of rights regarding fair housing and interaction with real estate brokers and mortgage lenders.

There are currently several bills, I know, that are pending in the state Legislature that consider the concept.

I'd welcome the opportunity to meet with

members of the state Senate, to discuss ideas to better inform potential homebuyers.

Currently, real estate professionals are required to complete a total of 22 1/2 hours of continuing education, with only 3 hours of instruction concentrated in fair housing and discrimination.

This investigation highlights the need to thoroughly examine all aspects of the state's education and training requirements and standards involved in fair housing.

Finally, again, I want to thank each of you for coming here today, and for highlighting this issue and for focusing on this issue.

There are many advocates who have been working on this issue for a number of years, of working to address unjust and biased treatment.

Now is the time, this is a moment of opportunity, to address a legacy of housing segregation and discrimination that dates to the very beginning of America's first suburb.

We have to address this challenge on a regional basis.

And I want to thank my colleague to the west, to my left, Nassau County Executive Laura Curran,

for her leadership on this issue.

Please continue to utilize me, and us, as a resource, a partner.

And together we will work to break down barriers and to create equal opportunity for all.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you to both county executives for showing leadership after that "Newsday" exposé.

It's very hard on people to understand why this matters.

And both of your leadership, and this plan that both have, basically, talked about in their testimony, is -- is -- is very encouraging.

Before I start with questions, let me just acknowledge Senator Liu who has joined us as well.

Senator Kaminsky.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Thank you.

County Executive Curran, I have just a -- some quick questions for you.

And, very grateful for your leadership on this. And we all look forward to working with you, as well as County Executive Bellone, going forward on this.

You were present when Mr. Brown testified

from "Newsday" and talked about the results of the investigation.

For a good reason, we could not ask him questions, but I wonder if you came away with the same conclusion that I did?

That, based on how they scored what would be disparate impact, that it seemed to me that they were very conservative in how they judged that; only wanted to make sure, in very demonstrable situations, based on comparable evidence, and they always erred on the side of throwing something out that wouldn't reach that, that these numbers are actually, probably, in practice, greater than what they're reported to be.

In other words, the amount of discrimination reported, by percentage, whether it's 49, 39, 19, what have you, is probably more than that in actuality.

Did you get that same impression?

LAURA CURRAN: Senator Kaminsky, yes, I did have that same thought.

And as Arthur Brown testified here this morning, and as was made very clear in the report, they -- it is very clear to me that they erred on the side of caution, and that the numbers are

probably not as low as -- as were reported.

The -- we heard Arthur Brown say that, if there was any doubt, if there was any cloudiness in the sound, if there was any shadow of a doubt, they discounted that example.

So I believe that this shone -- this report shone a very bright light on the problem.

And I  $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$  -- I agree with your assessment that the problem was probably even worse.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: I appreciate that.

And I think what that should mean for anybody watching or participating in this hearing, going forward, is, certainly, for African-Americans, and perhaps for Hispanic or other groups, that we're talking about an amount of discrimination that is actually staggering.

It's probably a majority of whole groups of people are being discriminated against, not just a here and a there, or sometimes, or more often than you think, but, almost all the time, or -- or -- or, certainly, more than half the time.

And I -- I just find that to be even more troubling than any of the -- you know, any of these headlines can -- can suggest.

So, as we move into the fact-finding phase,

1 and as we work with both county executives, to figure out what's going on, I just think it's 2 important that we understand the gravity of the 3 problem ahead of us. 4 And we're lucky to have two great partners to 5 6 work with as we move forward to tackle this problem. 7 LAURA CURRAN: Thank you, Senator. STEVE BELLONE: Thank you, Senator. 8 9 SENATOR THOMAS: Senator Kavanagh? 10 SENATOR KAVANAGH: No, I'm good. 11 SENATOR THOMAS: Anna? 12 LAURA CURRAN: Thank you very much. 13 STEVE BELLONE: Thank you very much. 14 And, again, we look forward to working 15 together with you. 16 LAURA CURRAN: Absolutely. 17 SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you. SENATOR SKOUFIS: And now I would like to 18 19 call up our next panel: Fred Freiberg from the 20 Fair Housing Justice Center, and Elaine Gross 21 from Erase Racism. 22 Before you sit down, if can you just raise 23 your right hands.

Do you solemnly swear that you'll tell the

truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

24

25

1 FRED FREIBERG: Yes. 2 ELAINE GROSS: I do. 3 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. Welcome, and thank you for being here. 4 5 FRED FREIBERG: My name is Fred Freiberg. I'm the executive director and co-founder of the 6 Fair Housing Justice Center, a regional civil rights 7 organization based in New York City. 8 9 Our mission is to eliminate housing discrimination, promote policies and programs that 10 11 foster open, accessible, and inclusive communities, 12 and to strengthen enforcement of fair-housing laws. 13 [Audio malfunction] in 2005, we serve a 14 region that includes all of New York City and seven 15 surrounding New York counties, including Dutchess, 16 Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Suffolk, and 17 Westchester. 18 Our service area contains, roughly, 19 65 percent of the state's population and 3 percent 20 of the nation's. 21 In terms of my personal background, I've been 22 working in fair-housing enforcement for nearly 23 44 years. 24 I've supervised more than 12,000 testing

investigations in 20 states, personally participated

25

in over 1500 tests.

I've been named as a witness in over 400 fair-housing cases.

I directed a national testing program for the civil rights division of the department of justice that I helped to establish in 1992.

I was the field director for two national HUD-sponsored studies.

Relative -- relevant to the hearing today,

I was also a consultant, as you have heard, to

"Newsday" on a three-year investigation into real
estate sales practices.

From December 2015 to March 2017, "Newsday" contracted with the FHJC to train testers, assist in the design of testing protocols for the project, and assist with coordinating some of the early tests.

After March 2017, until the story was released in November 2019, I continued to serve as an unpaid consultant to "Newsday" on this project.

In my short remarks today I want to make several points.

First: Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to Senators Thomas, Skoufis, and Kavanagh, and all the members of the Senate committees they chair, for arranging this hearing,

and for providing me and others an opportunity to share our thoughts and recommendations.

I'm here today with Elaine Gross of

Erase Racism, and we've provided your committee with
a joint set of recommendations in response to
"Newsday's" investigation.

It's a five-point plan, with recommendations for the State of New York; the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; local, state, and federal enforcement agencies; and the real estate industry.

Second: I want to commend "Newsday" for the truly remarkable commitment of resources and personnel that it devoted to this investigation and story.

It was a distinct privilege for me to work on this project with an incredibly conscientious objective and dedicated team of professional journalists.

Third: I found the "Newsday" -- the results of the "Newsday" testing investigation deeply troubling, though not particularly surprising.

The results were entirely consistent with what my organization routinely finds in many of our testing investigations.

The problem of racial discrimination in housing is systemic.

The problem is not limited to the sales market or the real estate industry. The problem is not limited to Long Island.

The start patterns of residential racial segregation in our metropolitan regions were created by the intentional and coordinated actions of the housing industry, government, and other institutions over many decades.

The segregation has been sustained to this day by the very same institutions.

Our nation has never fully implemented or vigorously enforced the federal Fair Housing Act.

Residential racial segregation on

Long Island, throughout the larger New York City

region, and in many parts of the state of New York,

creates a vicious cycle of inequality that continues

to inflict serious harm on people and communities of

color by locking African-American people and other

populations out of many opportunities.

Racial discrimination in housing not only presents a formidable barrier to renting an apartment or buying a home, and accumulating wealth from that investment, but it can also limit access

to high-performing schools, employment opportunities, health care, parks and recreational facilities, safe neighborhoods, and even healthy foods.

Where one lives still matters.

Residential racial segregation, reinforced by discriminatory housing practices, has profound, and often perilous and lasting, intergenerational consequences for the populations that are excluded and for the communities that are subsequently divided.

Any remedies proposed to address racial discrimination documented by the "Newsday" report should be comprehensive in nature, and extend well beyond the discriminatory and odious practices of some real estate agents on Long Island.

The FHJC currently has one of the strongest testing capabilities of any private fair-housing organization in the nation.

We employ, on a part-time, as-needed basis, about 165 testers, all professional actors, who participate in undercover testing investigations.

It's a diverse pool of people who collectively speak 28 languages.

Over the past decade or so, the FHJC testing

investigations have led to the filing of more than 100 successful legal challenges that have opened more than 65,000 units of housing to previously-excluded populations, and resulted in a total monetary recovery of over \$39 million in damages and penalties.

We have changed the way many housing providers, governments, and others do business, and obtained greater compliance with fair-housing laws.

The FHJC filed the only two federal lawsuits against banks, alleging race and national-origin discrimination, in the 51-year history of the Fair Housing Act, based primarily on testing evidence.

The FHJC conducted investigations into discrimination based on race or national origin, and land use and zoning practices, and in suburban affordable-housing programs.

These investigations have resulted in federal litigation against the Town of Smithtown in Suffolk County; the Town of Oyster Bay, Village of Garden City, and Village of Great Neck Plaza in Nassau County; and the Town of Yorktown, the Town of Bedford, and the Town of Eastchester in Westchester County.

FHJC testing investigations also continue to uncover widespread discrimination in the rental market of the region, based on race, national origin, disability, and source of income.

Fourth: The nature of housing discrimination has changed over time.

Prior to the passage of the fair-housing laws, discrimination was quite overt.

African-American homeseekers were frequently met with slammed doors and racial epithets.

Today, the image of a slammed door has to be replaced, to a large extent, with a revolving door, where people are politely escorted in, out of, and, ultimately, away from the desired housing.

It all happens in such a subtle manner that the consumer is often unaware that discrimination has occurred.

Violators simply have learned to conceal their illegal conduct.

The real -- this reality calls into question the complaint-responsive approach that most public agencies have adopted to enforce fair-housing laws.

And it's really quite simple:

If victims of discrimination are unaware that discrimination is occurring, no complaints will be

filed.

If no complaints are filed, no enforcement action occurs.

If no enforcement action is taken, the illegal discrimination simply continues.

While complaints of discrimination must be thoroughly and expeditiously investigated, our entire fair-housing enforcement paradigm needs to shift to one that places a greater emphasis on the proactive enforcement and use of testing to ferret out subtle and systemic forms of housing discrimination.

This is one of the key lessons of the "Newsday" investigation.

The burden for enforcing our fair-housing laws should not rest entirely on the shoulders of those who continue to be victimized, or, on a media outlet.

Testing is a tool used by private fair-housing organizations to investigate housing-market practices.

Testing can and should be used as often as possible to investigate housing discrimination complaints, because testing evidence often enables victims of discrimination to meet their burden of

proof and prevail on their complaint.

But testing must also be used to conduct proactive investigations into patterns of illegal discrimination in the housing market.

Finally, let me briefly highlight some of the recommendations contained in the document that Erase Racism and FHJC have provided to you today.

Number one: New York State should fully utilize its licensing power to better regulate the real estate industry.

Two of our recommendations include:

Reviewing the results of the "Newsday" investigation, to determine if any licensees engaged in illegal conduct that merits disciplinary action by the department of state's division of licensing services;

And better screening of the qualifications of trainers and the quality of curriculum developed to provide instruction to licensees on fair housing.

Second: We need a well-resourced, proactive, and better coordinated fair-housing enforcement strategy.

Some of our recommendations include, more public funding for systemic testing, better coordination of fair-housing enforcement activities,

and a greater emphasis on conducting proactive investigations into systemic discrimination.

The real estate industry should take affirmative steps to ensure compliance with fair-housing laws, this is number three.

Some of our recommendations include:

Reviewing the "Newsday" test to determine if the conduct of any members violated the realtor code of ethics;

Implementing affirmative hiring programs, to create a more diverse real estate sales force;

Opening offices in communities of color to ensure that service is being provided to all neighborhoods;

And disseminating a model fair-housing policy, detailing better and best practices for non-discriminatory real estate marketing and sales.

Four: Local, state, and federal governments need to affirmatively further fair housing in all housing and community-development activities.

One of our central recommendations includes, asking the State of New York to adopt an affirmatively-furthering fair-housing law, to ensure local governments, housing authorities, and state agencies are taking meaningful steps to

affirmatively further fair housing in all housing and community-development activities.

Fifth: New York State should implement fair-housing legislative initiatives, policy changes, and support for programs that expand access to housing opportunities in all neighborhoods.

Some of our recommendations include:

Funding for regional mobility-assistance programs;

Passing a strong co-opt disclosure law;

Amending the human rights law to explicitly prohibit discriminatory land use and zoning practices by public agencies, enacting a statewide equitable-share housing program, and establishing a statewide zoning appeals board.

As you consider legislative solutions, we urge you to remember that housing discrimination and segregation continue to inflict serious harm on entire populations and communities.

Albert Einstein once said, quote: The world is a dangerous place, not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing.

We can ill afford to look on and do nothing, or pretend we are going to wait for hearts and minds

to change.

We need to muster the courage to act now.

We implore you, as policymakers, to demonstrate real leadership on this issue.

The late-Martin Luther King, Jr., when speaking about the need for civil rights laws and their enforcement, would often say, quote: It may be true that the law cannot change the heart, but it can restrain the heartless.

"Newsday" made a major contribution by shining a spotlight on one of the most hidden, enduring, and virulent forms of bias: housing discrimination.

Now it's up to all of us to do what we can to restrain the heartless, and create more open, equitable, and inclusive communities on Long Island and throughout the state of New York.

I'm happy to answer any questions from the committee members.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

ELAINE GROSS: Good morning, Committee Chairs, members of the committees.

I'm Elaine Gross, and I'm the president and CEO of Erase Racism.

It is an important -- it is important to note, that renters on Long Island often have far fewer housing choices because of the extreme limitations on building multifamily housing on Long Island, creating high competition for limited number of rental units.

Whether for sale or for rent, there should be no housing discrimination.

I speak from the perspective of an African-American woman who was born and raised on Long Island, and who currently owns a home on Long Island.

In another state, I was a victim of housing discrimination, so I also know, firsthand, the emotional and economic toll of housing discrimination.

Today I speak on behalf of Erase Racism, the Long Island-based civil rights organization that exposes and addresses the devastating impact of historical and ongoing structural racism in our region and in the nation, particularly in housing and public school education.

In this role, my expertise derives from

Erase Racism's direct experience, successfully

advocating for changes in the fair-housing statutes

of both Nassau and Suffolk counties.

I also organized, in 2016, a statewide coalition to amend the New York State Human Rights Law to include lawful source of income as a protected class.

That amendment became law in April 2019, thanks, in part, to the work of an expanded coalition which I co-led.

Since 2001, my experience also derives from our research on Long Island in such areas as residential segregation; segregation in public school education; fair-housing enforcement policies and practices, that's local, state, and federal; and the investigation of housing discrimination, including utilizing pair testing as a tool to revere disparate treatment, racial steering, and other violations of fair-housing statutes.

The pair testing that we used was similar to that conducted by "Newsday" for its landmark investigative report, "Long Island Divided."

We did our fair-housing investigation prior to "Newsday's," and on much smaller scale, but with similar results; and in partnership with the Fair Housing Justice Center.

Our goal was to determine whether Black

renters on Long Island were being discriminated against in the housing options that they were offered, or were, in other ways, the victims of housing discrimination.

The pair testing revealed that, in both

Nassau and Suffolk counties, property owners and

management companies were showing rental apartments

to White applicants and not to Black applicants.

When Black individuals and couples inquired about apartments, they were told, among other things, that nothing was available, that there was a long waiting list, that they should check back in the future, and they were sometimes quoted higher rent amounts.

Whites were shown available apartments and encouraged to apply.

Erase Racism's investigation led to successful litigation; resulted in court-mandated settlements with the offending real estate companies.

Our case in Minneola settled in 2014, and in Commack in 2016.

I mention that because, even though we are talking about home ownership today, I want you to understand the full breadth of the housing

discrimination that is going on here on Long Island.

And as had been mentioned, it is not the responsibility of those of us who are non-profits on Long Island, nor a media organization, to be responsible for shedding light on, and responsible for the enforcement of, both the fair-housing laws and the actions of real estate agents, nor the actions of municipalities.

So I will not talk about "Newsday's" investigation. You heard from them directly.

I, like everyone else, was not surprised, but I cannot say enough in praise of what they did.

And the work that they did has created a sea change in terms of the number and the breadth and the depth of individuals and organizations on Long Island that are now talking about and concerned about and trying to make changes related to this issue.

I would add that, you, the members of these committees and the state Legislature, have an essential role.

Real estate brokers need a license in New York. That license comes from the New York State Department of State.

And that department has not protected nearly

half of Black homeseekers on Long Island from discrimination in the twenty-first century, if looking at the "Newsday" investigation.

Not only does the state Legislature have an oversight role inherent in Article III of the state Constitution, the New York State Board of Real Estate, the department of state -- state's division licensing services, and the secretary of state, all have some responsibility for the integrity of systems that would ensure that real estate brokers are acting within the law.

Put quite simply, when it comes to overseeing fair-housing practices by real estate brokers and companies, at least as they occur on Long Island, the State is failing to do its job with rigor and urgency.

Every aspect of this structure, and the system inherent therein, need to be thoroughly investigated to determine what is broken and, thus, how to fix it.

This is the case for both the licensing of real estate brokers, and punishment for discriminatory actions, and the New York State Division of Human Rights which is charged with enforcing the fair-housing law.

I have a few recommendations that I'd like to speak to. I will not repeat the recommendations that Fred has summarized from our joint statement to you.

First of all, fair-housing enforcement, including the pair testing that Erase Racism and other non-profits do, needs to be further strengthened and supported by New York State. The resources need to be put forward in an aggressive manner.

Second: This form of housing discrimination exists in other areas of New York State. Both lawsuits and investigations by other non-profits document housing discrimination.

The investigations on Long Island should lead to statewide scrutiny, and result in rigorous enforcement and uniform protections for all New Yorkers.

Third: The practices of real estate agents explored in these investigations are just one component of the structural racism that drives racial discrimination and segregation in housing, and, therefore, in public schools and other government services.

The practices of the real estate industry are

intertwined with myriad policies and practices that produce and maintain residential segregation, long established and perpetuated on Long Island and elsewhere in New York.

The obligation to ensure fair housing exists at all levels of government, and throughout the real estate and banking industry, as does the obligation to remedy violations of fair housing.

Fourth: A culprit in perpetuating that -these myriad policies and practices is the State's
adoption of home rule, delegating specific powers to
local municipalities, including control of land use,
which enables exclusionary zoning.

Long Island's two counties include 13 towns and 97 incorporated villages, creating a municipal fragmentation that divides rather than unites.

In addition, with local control, local municipalities use their power to maintain the status quo: severe racial segregation.

Municipalities have engaged in such discriminatory housing practices, as using geographic preferences, exclusionary zoning, know-as-of-right multifamily housing, and, finally, concentrating affordable housing intended for Blacks in communities that are already a majority minority,

and affordable housing for seniors intended for Whites in communities that are majority White.

I recently wrote a paper that was commissioned by the NYU Furman Center on this particular topic.

And, finally, the State should amend the Human Rights Law in two significant ways.

First: The human rights law should explicitly prohibit discriminatory action by local governments and public agencies that operate housing programs, control land use and zoning decisions, or engage in other housing and community-development activities, to ensure that these programs and activities are not perpetuating segregation by making housing unavailable, or limiting access to housing, based on race, national origin, et cetera, which is discrimination.

Second: Similar to what the State of
California did in 2018, the Human Rights Law should
require state agencies and departments and local
jurisdictions, public housing authorities, and other
public entities, receiving state or federal funds
for housing and community development, to
affirmatively further fair housing, and take no
action that is materially inconsistent.

Thank you for these hearings, and I am happy to answer any questions.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you both very much for your contributions today, and, quite frankly, more importantly, your work filling a vacuum that ought to have been filled over the past many, many years by different agencies.

I have a number of questions I'd like to start with.

First, as a question on the onset here:
You're both experts, your organizations are experts, in pair testing.

Can you speak to "Newsday's" testing, and confirm or, I guess, deny, whether "Newsday's" testing is similar or identical to testing that enforcement organizations employ and academic researchers employ?

methodology employed by "Newsday," and I helped them develop it, is very similar, if not identical, to paired testing that we do in the enforcement realm. And it's also similar to testing that's done by national research organizations, like the Urban Institute in the periodic HUD studies that are conducted nationally every 10 or 12 years.

So it's very similar.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Thank you.

You noted, Mr. Freiberg, and I agree, that one of the lessons learned from this exposé is that, enforcement agencies need to be more proactive, and cannot rely on complaints before taking action.

That said, how do we better encourage complaints?

Clearly, if -- you know, if we have to wait for news organizations, or organizations like yours, to expose discrimination, we're not going to be able to expose all of it via complaints.

How -- how do we get on the ground, people who are not involved in testing, average people who are being discriminated against, to know that they should complain, know how to complain; how do we better encourage it?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, there are obviously things that can be done. Campaigns -- advertising campaigns, social media, and so forth, where you can elicit people to file complaints.

But, again, I harken back to my testimony, which was, that the real lesson, the underlying lesson, of the "Newsday" investigation, was that, most of the time, and it would be true of most of

the testers who were involved in the "Newsday" investigation, they did not know they were being treated differently than other people.

If you don't know you're being treated differently, all the advertising in the world isn't going to compel you to file a complaint.

So we have a problem that's more hidden.

We have a problem: violators have gotten more sophisticated.

I talk to groups all the time about this.

You know, it shouldn't come as a great surprise to us that some violators are clever enough to disguise their practices now.

I mean, it's true of all -- all law
enforcement.

There's a reason why bank robbers wear masks.

There's a reason why burglars wear gloves, so their fingerprints aren't found.

And there's a reason we all slow down on the expressway when we see a squad car on the side of the road, because we don't want to get caught speeding.

Well, why do we think people who are involved in the housing industry are any different.

They don't want to get caught, so they found

ways to elude detection.

So, therefore, my suggestion to you, is that, what has to be done, is there has to be more proactive testing done, people who pose, essentially, as surrogates of real homeseekers to ferret out this kind of illegal conduct.

It's what we do all the time, but it needs to be done on a much larger scale.

And if I can take just one more minute,

I would say, if you look at examples, I mean, one
person once said to me, who was an aide for a

federal legislator: Well, government is mostly
reactive. We're not -- we're not inherently
proactive as a body. We tend to just react to
complaints.

Well, my response to that is, that isn't always true.

I've lived in multiple cities around the country, and I've gotten food poisoning four times, only in New York City.

I've never had food poisoning before in any other place.

Now, if -- it's interesting to note, there are 27,000 real estate agents on Long Island.

There are 26,000 restaurants in

New York City.

The City pays the department of health enough money to hire 100 investigators who are required to make one unannounced visit every year to every restaurant.

I dare say, if they did not do that, we would not be here today, because --

[Laughter.]

FRED FREIBERG: -- because the abuses are so great and there's a serious health hazard involved.

Well, we have to see this the same way.

There's a serious hazard out there that's preventing people, based upon their race, their national origin, their disability, their source of income, from gaining access to a fundamental necessary part of our lives: shelter.

So we've got to see it in the same life-or-death kind of situation.

This is -- this is not something to be taken lightly.

And so my big answer to your question is:

It's fine to do what we can to elicit more complaints.

But we actually will not eliminate discrimination unless we take a more proactive

stance, and go out and affirmatively identify violators.

ELAINE GROSS: And I would also add that, because people know that nothing is being done, because there are so many -- I hear, personally, so many stories about how a person of color, for example, has been discriminated against. They might have filed a complaint, they might have tried to get something done about it.

And the story is: Nothing happened. Why did I bother?

And so it almost makes it worse, pretending that there is a system in place to deal with this issue, and then have that system be so broken, that both the perpetrators know that nothing will happen to them, and the victims know, don't bother, because nothing is going to be done, after they are discriminated against, even if they try to file a complaint or try to do something about that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And to that point, surely, the department of state; surely, law enforcement agencies, know that testing works, just like you know that testing works.

FRED FREIBERG: Yes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Why do you think that these

enforcement organizations do not employ more testing?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, that -- that is the 94,000-dollar question, but here -- there are reasons.

One is, that government agencies, particularly at the local and state level, are often subject to the political winds, and, as leadership changes, and so forth.

We know the department of state at one time had a testing program, and they proactively had people calling and investigating real estate agents, and they were sanctioning real estate agents.

Why is that gone today?

I mean, it will be interesting to hear from them today.

I think, you know, the problem with a lot of local government agencies, and state agencies too, is there's not the political will to actually sustain it. The resources are not devoted.

I helped the New York Attorney General's Office start its own testing program in 2008.

How many cases have you read about recently based on testing done by the New York Attorney General's Office?

I dare say, none.

You know, the government procurement processes, hiring policies, and so forth, make it very difficult for them to hire 165 professional actors like I have, to operate on a part-time basis.

And you need a very large diverse pool of people to do be able to do this -- do this kind of testing.

So, I think there are a lot of practical obstacles. Sometimes there are political obstacles.

But it is shameful that we know what works to ferret out discrimination.

Government knows what works, and yet it doesn't support it.

I mean, no fair housing -- there are six fair-housing groups in the city of -- or, in the state of New York, and not a single one gets a dime from the State of New York to support its activities.

We're in the city of New York, and we -- we get a small contract to do some source-of-income testing for \$20,000.

The Los Angeles fair-housing group gets almost \$900,000 from the City and County of Los Angeles.

So we're in a fair-housing desert here when it comes to resources and funding for testing.

ELAINE GROSS: And I would add that, in all of these agencies, we have people, and people have their own conscious and unconscious biases.

I can't tell you the number of times I've been told: Elaine, there really is no more housing discrimination. It's only based on income.

And, also, the sort of combination is: You know that you know Black people only want to live with other Black people.

So we contracted with the survey research firm to do telephone survey research in communities on Long Island that were 60 percent or more African-Americans.

And the findings of that survey indicated, number one, that it's not true that Blacks only want to live with other Blacks. Only 1 percent responded in that way.

Blacks prefer to live in communities that were multiracial.

The other thing that we found when we did some research, looking at census data, and the American Community Survey, is that it is true that some populations, Whites, Asians, have higher

incomes, in general, than Blacks and Hispanics.

However, it's not true, when you look at the residential patterns, that all of the high-income Blacks and all of the high-income Whites and all of the high-income Asians and Hispanics, they live in certain census tracts. And then all of the middle income, et cetera, et cetera.

What you see is that, in fact, it is about race; that the Whites, whether they are sort of wealthy, or less wealthy, are grouped in certain tracts. And the Blacks, whether it's kind of wealthy, or less wealthy, are grouped in certain tracts.

Et cetera.

So, the myths are there, and sometimes people don't even realize it, they're not thinking of it consciously, but I think it influences how seriously they take this issue.

If you have another narrative going on in your head, that tells you this isn't really a big deal, that it doesn't really happen, et cetera, you will not be aggressive in your work. You will not choose to put the resources that are required to do the [indiscernible] -- to take care of the task.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I have one final question,

briefly.

You made it clear that you don't believe the department of state, the division of licensing services, is taking this seriously enough.

For the record, on a scale of 1 to 10,

"1" being the, basically, not serious at all, and

"10" being serious -- the most serious, how would

you rate the department of state in their taking

discrimination -- housing discrimination in

New York State seriously?

ELAINE GROSS: I would put it at a minus 1.

FRED FREIBERG: I would agree.

I -- I think it depends on when you're
talking. But, right now, as of this moment, I'd say
it's a zero.

I don't think it's -- their efforts have really demonstrated any success in this area.

Thank you very much.

Senator Thomas.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you both for your testimony.

I have a question for Fred, and for Elaine.

I'll start with Fred, first.

Compared to the other tests that you have conducted, is there anything about the results from

Long Island testing that stand out?

FRED FREIBERG: No, I don't think so.

I mean, I -- I sort of cut my teeth in this field on doing sales testing back in 1976 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

We did a large sales investigation, very much like this, as part of a national HUD study. And we found a 63 percent level of race discrimination in that study.

Compare -- not that these studies can be -you know, they're not apples and apples in terms of
comparison. But it certainly is shameful, if all
the progress we've made is, from 63 percent, to
49 percent, in 40-some years.

I don't think there's anything remarkable about them.

Some of the tests were very similar to tests I saw back in 1970.

Some of them are more subtle, but yet still show the disparate treatment in some ways.

I mean, fortunately, testing can ferret that out even when there aren't remarks made, or, you know, direct evidence of discrimination.

SENATOR THOMAS: I heard from both of you, in terms of the lack of action by state agencies and

municipalities.

You were here when both County Executive
Steve Malone and Laura Curran were testifying to
what they are now doing to mitigate all of this.

ELAINE GROSS: Well, certainly, their testimony suggests that they are at the very beginning of a process. And so there are, you know, we would like to plan to do this. We are intending to hire more investigators. We are intending to, et cetera, et cetera.

What are your thoughts on their testimony?

So I think that these are definitely good steps to take.

And I do believe, and maybe this is, you know, the conservative aspect of my personality, but, I do think the -- you have to see the -- you know, the proof in the pudding.

So, I'm very pleased to have the county executive step forward at this time, in a relatively short period of time, and to say that they wish to take action.

But I just caution everyone: This is not -- this is not a sprint.

This is more like a marathon, hopefully, a fast marathon, a very fast marathon.

But I do believe that we have some -- we have some evidence that we can begin to make -- make change.

But it does -- sometimes it sounds a little bit too much, like, let's see what we can do around education. Let's see what we can do to -- you know, to get people together. And -- and that kind of a thing.

And we need legal action. People who are the bad actors need to be held accountable, and that include local governments.

So, I don't want us to forget that aspect of it.

SENATOR THOMAS: Both of you testified about the importance of testing.

Now, would you recommend that there be that kind of testing in the plan of both the county executives that testified today on what they would be doing, going forward?

ELAINE GROSS: Absolutely.

There should be more systematic testing, not necessarily saying that the counties should do that.

It would be good, perhaps, for them to commission those that have done work like this in the past, to do it, to continue to do it, and to do

1 it more robustly. But there should be funds made available for 2 this work. 3 FRED FREIBERG: I would agree. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Kavanagh. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you both for your 7 testimony today, and for your -- your tremendous work in many aspects of our housing markets, and our 8 continued effort to ensure fairness. 9 10 And I particularly commend you for -- as someone who's worked on the non-discrimination 11 12 [indiscernible] source-of-income campaign. 13 Congratulations on that. A great achievement 14 earlier this year. 15 ELAINE GROSS: Thank you. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just, you --17 Mr. Freiberg, you mentioned, you called it the "94,000-dollar question," which I think is inflation 18 from the old show. 19 20 [Laughter.] 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But I actually would like

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But I actually would like to get a sense, just -- let me start:

22

23

24

25

Is there -- is there a jurisdiction -- you mentioned Los Angeles has a substantially larger financial [indiscernible].

Are there jurisdictions beyond Los Angeles, that you're aware of from your many years in this field, that do this well?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, there are jurisdictions that support local fair-housing groups to do testing, and partner with organizations to do testing, yes, there are a number of them.

But there is a general, and I've seen it come and go over the years.

I mean, there was a time when the

Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination had
a very aggressive program. But then when leadership
changed, it stopped being so aggressive.

So, again, the political winds, again, dictate whether -- you know, the posture of the local enforcement agencies.

I -- so I -- I -- I see good examples, but how long are they going to be there?

And -- and that's always a fundamental concern of mine.

There has to be an ongoing commitment to carry on this work, and not just an occasional dabbling in -- in fighting housing discrimination. It should be sustained.

So I -- I think that's -- that's my real

concern.

The only people that have been able to sustain this kind of activity have, generally, been those involved in private civil rights organizations, because we know it works.

Government knows it works too.

I mean, HUD, for all the resources they've spent on testing nationally, they know that it's more likely a complaint filed with them will end up with a probable cause if there's a test done on the complaint, yet they do not have a testing program. They don't have one internally with their enforcement program.

So there is this disconnect between what we know works and what we actually commit resources to, to do.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And just to be clear:

You -- my understanding from your testimony is that,
testing is an important component of two different
aspects of this.

First of all, when there is a complaint, as an appropriate means of investigating and corroborating and validating that complaint.

But, also, given the nature of this field, where, as was testified earlier, people often can't

be aware -- you testified to this, and Mr. Brown as well, it's difficult for people to be aware that they are experiencing discrimination, until -- and because they're not present to see how other clients might be treated.

FRED FREIBERG: That's correct.

And it should be used in both contexts.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And do either of you have a -- an opinion on, sort of, an appropriate scale of funding?

If we wanted this kind of work to be done, noting -- you note that it takes lots of resources, it takes lots of people.

What would be the scale of a statewide program that does adequate testing to identify these issues as they arise?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, the curious thing is,

I mentioned HUD has funded testing for a number of

years. They have a fair-housing initiatives

program. And they give a one-size-fits-all grant to

every fair-housing group in the country, \$300,000.

So if you're in expensive New York City, or you're in Grand Rapids, Michigan, or Bend Harbor, you get \$300,000.

So, our dollars don't go very far in

New York.

And that number's actually gone down. It used to be closer to \$350,000 HUD was giving. So it's actually decreased over the years.

That barely sustains fair-housing groups around the country.

It's a small part of our budget, but it's 90 to 95 percent of many fair-housing groups in the country.

So, it has to be something above that amount if we really want to get serious about this problem.

I think it -- it really has to be gauged, based on how serious and aggressive you want to be in fighting housing discrimination.

The City has determined it takes

100 investigators to visit all 26,000 restaurants.

When you consider lenders and real estate companies and management companies and -- and rental-housing providers, and so forth, all involved in these activities, we have to talk about a significant amount of money to sustain testing.

So, I would -- I'm hesitant to say this, but if was a million dollars a year, it would only make a dent in the problem right now.

So, I mean, I think we have to think big

about this issue, and what kinds of resources would really make a difference in getting compliance.

We've had relatively modest resources and we've gotten significant results with individual housing providers, sometimes large providers.

But it's still a very fraction of the market that we've been able to impact.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Ms. Gross, do you have anything to add to that?

ELAINE GROSS: I don't. Not -- not -- but

I'm sure that, Fred, if he were given an opportunity

to, and you said, Well, "give me a number, how much

would you like?" he'll come up with something.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, well, kidding aside, you know, a hundred -- about 108 days or so the state budget is due. And so we are beginning that the process very soon.

So we look forward to having further conversations with you and your organization and your coalition about this topic.

FRED FREIBERG: Great.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Kaminsky.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Thank you, both.

Just want to dig into some of the questions 1 2 about what is, and then see how we can move forward. 3 So, in New York, let's take, in the last five years, aside from "Newsday", how much undercover 4 5 testing was done at all? 6 FRED FREIBERG: In the New York City region? 7 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Yeah. FRED FREIBERG: I can only speak to my 8 organization, but we usually are able -- we've got 9 three investigative coordinators who coordinate the 10 11 testers; they go out. 12 So it's largely dependent on how much of a 13 load those three people can take. 14 So it's about 200 -- 200 or so tests a year 15 that go out. 16 Some of those are in response to complaints, 17 but the vast majority are part of planned systemic investigations. 18 19 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay, so the -- the State 20 does not do this themselves? In other words, they don't have --21 22 FRED FREIBERG: No. 23 SENATOR KAMINSKY: -- okay. 24 Are there other states that actually do it, 25 undertake it themselves?

FRED FREIBERG: There have been, over time, 1 there was a time when the State of Kentucky did. 2 There was a time when the State of Massachusetts had 3 4 a very aggressive program. 5 It is very -- they've come and gone --6 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. 7 FRED FREIBERG: -- through different administrations. 8 9 SENATOR KAMINSKY: And out of these 200 or so tests, the State does not -- State, nor county, 10 11 funds any of these? 12 FRED FREIBERG: No, no. 13 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. And that test 14 represents what type of impact on the whole market? 15 Is that, this "200," a robust number, or is 16 it a pittance? 17 What does it mean? FRED FREIBERG: Well, for us, it's --18 19 we're -- we probably file more lawsuits based on 20 testing than any fair-housing group in the country. 21 So we've had some impact, we've opened up a 22 lot of doors, and so forth. 23 But as -- and when you're talking about the 24 New York City region, and the number of housing

providers, I mean, there's 300,000 co-ops in

25

New York City alone -- or, 300,000 co-op units in New York City alone. There's tens of thousands of property management companies.

It's very hard to tell you that we've had a massive impact, but we've impacted, where we have found discrimination, we have changed the practices of those housing providers.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: And what's happening across the state?

Are people doing this in Syracuse, in Buffalo, and Albany, and to what extent?

FRED FREIBERG: There are testing programs in Syracuse, Buffalo, and Rochester.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay.

So I think you've kind of -- without actually saying this, but you've kind of equated this to, like, an undercover officer. Like, someone going to sell drugs, perhaps, would be on the lookout for that. And it's obviously a deterrent that they might be selling to an undercover officer, or, someone in organized crime may have their phone wiretapped, et cetera.

You -- you're saying that, on the whole, that disincentive to do wrong is not very prevalent in the real estate industry because the chance of being

detected in one of these tests is very low? 1 FRED FREIBERG: You're absolutely correct. 2 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. 3 And if -- is there an example throughout the 4 5 country of a real estate company itself testing 6 itself? 7 FRED FREIBERG: There are lenders and real estate companies that have their own 8 self-testing programs. 9 And that's our recommended best practice. 10 11 If I owned a real estate company, or a bank or financial institution, I would do testing, to 12 make sure that my employees were complying with the 13 14 law. 15 I think it just makes good sense. 16 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. And should one of 17 the things we be looking at, possibly requiring them do that within their -- their own practices? 18 19 FRED FREIBERG: Yes. 20 However, you know, it's a little -- I mean, 21 I absolutely think it's a good practice. Whether it will deter all of the 22 23 discrimination that's out there, though, that's --

I think --

24

25

that's another issue.

8 5 1 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Yeah --FRED FREIBERG: -- you still need enforcement 2 3 action. SENATOR KAMINSKY: -- right. 4 I mean, I would like to think that, if one is 5 going to commit a crime within the confines of a 6 7 corporate structure or within a company, that you not only be worried about outside forces, but you'd 8 9 like to think someone inside the company wouldn't 10 want you doing it either. 11 FRED FREIBERG: Correct. 12 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. And has there been a system, that you know 13 14 of --15 Because I -- I like the idea of this in my 16 own head, I'm about to say it out loud. 17 -- but why don't we have some of the 18 real estate companies that are contributing to the racist outcomes help pay for testing from 19 20 organizations like yours? 21 FRED FREIBERG: Well, in our case, we do 22 often file as a co-plaintiff in the case, and we are 23 entitled to recover damages.

So that is part of the revenue we take in a

year from violators. So that is how -- how we've

24

25

helped sustain ourselves.

I've suggested, however, that the State might find one -- one way to raise money to pay for systemic testing across the state, is to raise the fees for licensees.

And because it's a very modest rate right -right now, and I think a fairly modest raise could
actually generate a great deal of revenue across the
state, that could be used for testing.

So I agree with your -- your concept.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay.

Now, this is for both Elaine and Fred, very difficult question.

But when -- what is your sense of what is happening, when a minority couple walks into an office, a real estate agent, just in a -- in a disparate fashion, steers them to a community they think would be more -- you know, more along their lines of where they think they should go, not exactly where the buyers would go if they had full choices presented on them?

What -- what is -- what is happening in that room?

What is the real estate agent trying to accomplish?

Where is this coming from?

And why, in 2019, are we -- are we -- are we talking about this as if this is 50 years ago?

What's happening in that room?

What's happening in their mind?

What's happening in this room?

Where's this coming from?

ELAINE GROSS: So first of all, I would say it's not possible for me to be inside the mind to understand exactly what real agents are doing it, and why it's motivating them.

But I can say that we do know that there are a lot of people who have not, for example, taken one of our two-day "Unravel the Racism" training programs, where you really begin to look at yourself, and understand, where have you gotten the ideas that you have about people who are different from you?

When was the first time that you learned that people were treated differently based on race?

And where did you get those messages?

We get those messages not only from our families, but from the media, big time.

And so it's all around us.

And unless you've been trained to understand

that, you assume -- you know, we're well-meaning people, we assume that everything's just fine.

But we don't know the narrative that's going on in the back of our head, that is telling us things that are going to have a disparate impact on people.

And so that's part what's going on, I think, with the real estate agents.

You know, they are -- some of them may be assuming that, as I said, in terms of our survey work: This is where they want to go, this is where they want to live. I'll take them over there.

Some of them may be intentionally saying, we know that sometimes they have said, "I don't want them" -- you know, "I don't want them in my community, so I'll take them over there."

So it's a lot of different things.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: And -- and is it your impression that one can become a real estate agent on Long Island and have never been having this discussion within their own company, within their training, within their manuals, at all?

ELAINE GROSS: Absolutely.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: So that seems, to me, a critical place where we want to focus; that one can

be in the position to have such an important, almost influence in what happens in our society, yet never have a conversation about diversity or race or ethics within their own company before they get to be in that position?

ELAINE GROSS: That's right, because, as a society, we don't want to talk about race anyway, you know.

FRED FREIBERG: And if [indiscernible cross-talking] --

ELAINE GROSS: It -- it's -- it is really considered -- I mean, some people even think, if you talk about race, you must be racist.

I mean, it's crazy.

So, we -- there is a lot that needs to happen, so that we are ready to have what is obviously an uncomfortable conversation for folks.

But, they need to understand our history around race, and how race has been enshrined in government, in our policies, in our geography, and how it is a part of all of us, whether we are consciously aware of it at any given moment, or not.

So that kind of understanding is very important for these gatekeepers. I mean, they are the ones that are -- really take the -- the

opportunities that people would have, they have that in their hands.

And what they do -- what happened to me personally, when I wasn't allowed to access housing that would have been cheaper for me, and nicer for me, and I was sent to a place that had vermin, had a big impact.

So this is not something that is just on paper. This is something that is real.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: And -- and I -- I know,
Ms. Gross, I speak for all of us when we say that
we're so grateful to have you at the helm,
helping -- helping fight back.

And your expertise is going to be very important to us, going forward, and your experience has helped guide us today.

Lastly, Fred and Elaine, what -- what happens to the enforcement side?

Let's say we're able to get money for testing, let's say we're able to get good training in place.

What happens when we find out someone is operating improperly?

Do we have enough?

Is the system set up to do something, where

that, something will matter, something impactful will happen?

Or, do we not have the penalties and/or enforcement in place to do something if we're -- if we're good enough to get to where you'd like us to be?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, I think there's a number of ways to answer that.

There -- the laws that exist right now, state and federal laws, fortunately, have the private right of action.

So when we have evidence of discrimination, we could go to one of the government agencies that enforce the laws and present our complaints there.

But we've had a dismal experience, frankly, with that. Every time we've gone to the state division of human rights, we practically had to go to an Article 78 in state court and have their decisions overturned. And we succeed each time, too.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Can you stop for a second?

So you'll go to a state agency and say, "Look what our testers found," and they will say, what?

FRED FREIBERG: And -- and they will come out with a finding that completely obliterates any sense

that there was disparate treatment, even though it's obvious.

So we have to take it to state court to overturn decisions.

And this happens time and time again.

The state agencies that are set up -- and yous got a glimpse of this a little bit.

If you listened to the county executives, you heard them say: We're going to get some staff now for our human rights commission. We're going to get an advisory board.

Well, is that to suggest that it was just cosmetics before that?

And I think you'll find at the local level that's often the case.

At the state level, however, you have real agencies that, potentially, could enforce the law.

But, for instance, the state agency is very consumed with employment discrimination, with other kinds of discrimination.

Housing has been a fairly low priority for them, and they haven't shown a real aptitude to investigate and -- and actually sanction housing providers.

We generally get six figures, seven figures,

in our cases as part of damages and remedies. 1 Show me the recovery from the state agency. 2 I'll match our list to their list any day of 3 the week. 4 And if you want to deter discrimination in a 5 6 capitalist society, you've got to have stiff 7 financial penalties to really dissuade people from continuing to engage in this activity. 8 9 SENATOR KAMINSKY: I appreciate you assuming the capitalist society. 10 11 FRED FREIBERG: Well, I think that's fair to 12 assume. 13 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Thank you. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 14 15 I want to acknowledge that 16 Senator Monica Martinez has joined us. 17 One very brief follow-up on Senator Kaminsky's question -- or, request rather. 18 19 Could you supply our committees with the data 20 that you have about just how often your 21 organizations have overturned state decisions in 22 court on these matters? 23 FRED FREIBERG: Sure. 24 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Thank you. 25 Next up, Senator Gaughran.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you both, not just for being here, but for your advocacy and what I know is your life work.

I recognize that there is a lot that we have to do in this area.

First of all, it's not a problem that's going to be solved simply by the State of New York.

This is an area where we have federal law, we have state law. We have counties. We have towns and villages that control the zoning.

So it's got to be done at different levels.

And I also recognize that, and that's why
these hearings I think are good, because we're
probably going to have to pass a variety of new laws
to deal with this, as well as, perhaps, you know,
and I would be supportive, of trying to get
something in the budget, so that we can really help,
particularly with the testing issue.

But when I first read the "Newsday" articles, the first thing I did was look at the law. And I saw that the section of the law that licenses the sales people, as well as the brokers, did not have any specific language in it that would allow the department of state to actually suspend or revoke a

license.

I mean, there's some language there. You know it speaks of fraud, misrepresentation, and trustworthiness, and competency.

So perhaps there's -- there's sort of some threads that could be used, but it seemed to me that there was nothing explicit.

So that's why I introduced legislation that would add to the law, that a real estate broker or sales person's license could be suspended or revoked by the department of state.

I recognize it's not the whole solution to the problem, but I guess my question is, on your thoughts on that?

And it would also seem to me that, in my mind, it would deal with the issue of, when you're talking about, Fred, when we slow down when we see the police officer, that, in the back of the minds of some somebody in the industry who, you know, may want to see what they can away with, at least they will always have in the back of their head, you know, I could lose my license, I could lose my livelihood.

And -- but I think it also goes to the question that was raised before, in terms of, but

how would this work if we're not getting people filing complaints?

So, you know, perhaps that's where, in conjunction with some funding, we would be able to do that.

What -- what's your, both you, thoughts [indiscernible cross-talking] --

FRED FREIBERG: Absolutely.

First of all, I commend you for the legislation that you proposed, because I think it makes it unambiguous then, that they have a duty and a responsibility to investigate claims of discrimination filed against licensees.

And I think that's important.

It was done, as you suggest, previously, based on trustworthiness, misrepresentations, and so forth, which is often part of the acts of discrimination that occur. So they were on solid ground to make those assumptions.

But I think your -- your law would make it unambiguous, and I think that's a good thing.

I think where it could help, because, actually, when I came to New York in 2004, by 2006, we already had some recordings of agents, licensees, who were involved in discrimination. And we went

and filed with the division of licensing services.

And lo and behold, investigators came to our office. They were professional, they were thorough. They listened to the recordings. They actually wrote up findings. And they took back -- they took it back to actually propose disciplinary action.

And we thought, well, this is a -- this a new day. This is -- this is great.

And -- and then we proceeded to say, okay, we've got some more licensees we've caught engaged in illegal activities, so let's bring it to licensing.

And then, by that time, we were told, Oh, no, no, no. We can't do that anymore. If you come to us with a judgment from a court, or a finding from the state division on human rights, then we'll look at it. But we're not just going to take your recording and -- and investigate that.

Well, that really shouldn't be the case.

They should be able to look at any compelling evidence, such as the recordings in the "Newsday" investigation, and make some call as to whether that constitutes a violation of the licensee's responsibilities, or not.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: So this is a follow-up.

So in that particular instance, do you think this change in law would have given them the tools to be able to act?

FRED FREIBERG: I would hope so. I would hope that your law suggests that they don't have complete discretion and options as to whether to investigate acts of discrimination, but that there's a "shall" in there somewhere.

And if there is, I think that's -- that would be a sea change.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Okay.

Ms. Gross, did you have any thoughts?

ELAINE GROSS: Yeah, I don't have anything to add to that, other than to thank you for putting the law forward.

Being more explicit is always better.

I just don't want anyone to think that there wasn't plenty of opportunity and evidence, in terms of ethical, professional behavior, to bring forward charges against those agents that were being discriminatory.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Thank you, both.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Boyle.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me.

[Inaudible comments from audience member.]

```
SENATOR SKOUFIS: Please we're not taking
 1
        comments from audience members. I'm sorry.
 2
                  [Inaudible comments from audience member
 3
          continues.]
 4
 5
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: We'll be happy to follow up
 6
        with you after the hearing.
 7
               AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. But I need
        everyone to know [inaudible comments from audience
 8
        member continues.]
 9
10
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: Please, we can't -- we
11
        can't have this interrupted. I apologize.
12
                  [Inaudible comments from audience member
13
          continues.]
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: With all due respect,
14
15
        ma'am, please, we have -- we have witnesses who are
16
        waiting. We have witnesses here who are testifying.
17
                  [Inaudible comments from audience member
          continues. 1
18
               SENATOR THOMAS: Let --
19
20
                  [Inaudible comments from audience member
21
          continues.]
22
               SENATOR THOMAS: -- ma'am --
                  [Inaudible comments from audience member
23
24
          continues.]
25
               SENATOR THOMAS: -- ma'am, let us -- let us
```

continue with --1 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: We are -- we are trying to 3 do the work that you're advocating for. You're disrespecting the witnesses who are 4 5 here. 6 Please. 7 [Inaudible comments from audience member continues.] 8 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Boyle --SENATOR BOYLE: Thank you. 10 11 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- apologize for that 12 delay. 13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't apologize. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Let me just say, that's --15 that's what we're here for. 16 SENATOR BOYLE: First, I'd like to thank 17 "Newsday" for their landmark series, and the Chairs for holding this hearing. 18 And thanks, obviously, to the panelists 19 20 today. 21 My question is very specific, actually. 22 One of the things I noticed, that -- since 23 the series came out, I've talked to a number of 24 advocates and real estate groups. Long Island Board

of Realtors wants to be very proactive in this.

25

We're all very concerned about it.

And one of the things that was in the series was that, a realtor might be asked by a tester --

Or, in actuality, I do a lot of real estate law.

-- you know, "What about the school district?"

Right?

That seems to be the number-one question that people -- that the people ask when they're going to realtors, whether they have kids, or whether they're older and they're going to sell their house at some point, going, "What about the school district?"

And I got the impression from the article that perhaps they were thinking, Is this a code, or a buzzword, or a dog whistle, as to who lives there and what's their ethnic make-up, about the school district?

Can you just tell me and the other panel -panelists here, what -- what's the appropriate way
of saying that without being racist or
discriminatory?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, I guess I'll take the first step, but I imagine you'll have something to say about this too.

I -- I think the real -- real estate industry know -- has known for a long time that references to schools, particularly in areas like New York City and Long Island where the schools are very segregated, that it can become a proxy for race.

SENATOR BOYLE: Right.

FRED FREIBERG: And so the problem with a lot of the conduct we viewed on the recordings, and in the tests that were conducted, was agents -- and in those cases, incidentally, just so you know, the testers did not bring up the subject of, How are the schools? or anything like this.

You may be describing the situation that a real homeseeker might do, but that's not what happened here.

The agents affirmatively brought up the subject.

So I think the general rule of thumb is, that agents are not experts on schools, and they ought not to be rendering opinions on the qualities of schools.

If they want to direct someone to a website or to information, I think that's -- and they direct everybody to the same information, then I think they're on pretty solid ground.

But when they start offering their personal opinions, "This school is bad," you know, "Elmont is a terrible place for schools," even though the Elmont High School is a 96 percent graduation rate, and -- you know, has -- you know, has -- has a great track record, I think they get into trouble, and because they're really talking about the race of the students, not -- not the performance of the school.

SENATOR BOYLE: Thank you.

ELAINE GROSS: Yeah, and I would just echo that, and also say that, you ask about, "Is it a dog whistle? or something."

And it goes back to the prior comment that I said: Usually, when the realtors get into that, they aren't giving everybody the same information.

And so, while you can't get into the head of that realtor, the reality is, that they're using that to talk about race.

And so -- and -- and it's clear, they're not supposed to be doing that.

SENATOR BOYLE: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Next up, Senator Liu.

SENATOR LIU: Thank you, Chair Skoufis.

Thanks for being here.

I feel like -- I feel like it's 1950.

And that some of the things that I'm hearing from the two of you, and reading in this report, it's just -- it's an awakening. A rude -- a rude and nauseating awakening, is what it is.

So I want to thank the Chairs for having this hearing.

You know, "Newsday," and Arthur Brown and his team --

And I've been on the receiving end from Arthur Brown myself, so...

-- but, his report, their report, stop at the confines of the Long Island borders. They don't -- they don't go beyond that [indiscernible] -- in Suffolk counties.

But you -- the two of you are experts on this matter.

What I would ask you: If this kind of project was conducted anywhere else in the state of New York, would you expect similar results?

I mean, this is not a problem that's isolated on Long Island.

ELAINE GROSS: It's not a problem that's isolated on Long Island, but Long Island's history, which Senator Thomas spoke to at his opening remarks, that history means that Long Island is

particularly pernicious.

And so -- you know, and we haven't had the kind of investigation that "Newsday" did. I don't believe that that's happened anywhere else in New York State, certainly not in recent history.

So, you know, maybe we don't have that kind of evidence, but I do think that, wherever it's happening, and if it's a little better somewhere else, or a little worse somewhere else, it doesn't matter. It's -- it's all bad.

FRED FREIBERG: My answer to your question would be: I think you could replicate this in most metropolitan areas around the country and get the same results.

It might be, as Elaine said, some slightly worse, some slightly better. But I think you'll find that the real estate industry has been given a pass for many years.

The last big racial steering cases were actually brought in the 1980s in this country. And since then, there's been sort of a tacit assumption, or, I don't -- I don't what -- you know, what the actual word is here, but it strikes me that they -- they've not been scrutinized the way they should have been.

And I've suspected all along the discrimination is just as pervasive everywhere.

From my experiences in working in other markets around the country, and the rental testing I've done in Detroit and Miami and Los Angeles, and other places, when I was with the department of justice, told me that there weren't a lot of variations between these metropolitan regions.

If they're very segregated, there's a good chance that there are violators operating in the housing market, and that race still infects, in a systemic way, housing-market practices.

SENATOR LIU: So, we're going to hear from some real estate executives, shortly.

I think, my guess, is that they will probably say that they're complying with the laws. And to the extent that they have violaters among the ranks of their agents, they're bad apples and they'll be dealt with.

Do you think that -- do you think the companies, the real estates companies themselves -- I mean, we have small -- small brokerages or agencies, but we have some very large companies all -- as well, that -- that either give out franchises, or operate their own company-run

brokerages. They provide training.

Are those companies responsible for some of this, or, is it just bad apples?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, the companies are responsible for the bad apples.

So if they have -- if they have agents who are violating the fair-housing laws, the principal brokers are -- are going to have to be looking at the potential that they will be accused of discrimination as well, because they're responsible.

If you run a business, and you have people doing business on your behalf, you're responsible for what they do.

So, it's incumbent upon these companies to have solid policies in place, not just the three credits of training that real estate licensees are required to get, but internal policies.

If you or I ran a company, presumably, we would want to make sure that our employes are following our rules.

And I'm not so sure that companies are always as conscientious about adopting solid fair-housing policies internally and enforcing them with their employees.

SENATOR LIU: Well, it was mentioned before

that, you know, part of the problem could be that it's -- it's very difficult to be caught, or, it would rare for some in -- either an agent or a company to be caught in this kind of discriminatory practice.

Is it -- is -- should the fines or penalties, therefore, much more substantial than they currently are?

And should it fall the individual agents, or the companies more so?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, the --

ELAINE GROSS: I think --

FRED FREIBERG: -- yeah, go ahead.

ELAINE GROSS: I think it's -- it's critical that we not try to say that, somehow, real estate companies are different than other companies.

Companies would not say, Well, it's okay if

I have these people working here, and they're in the

finance department, but they really don't have

finance skills.

You know, no one would say that.

But, somehow, it's okay to have people working in real estate companies, and -- you know, but they're really up on what they can do, and can do -- can't do, or what they're supposed to be

doing.

They really don't have a full appreciation for what it means to offer quality service to everybody who walks in your door; ethical service, non-discriminatory service.

So, somehow, you know, there's a real disconnect, that real estate companies, it's -- you know, the agents are -- you know, they're just on their own and they'll do what they do.

So, yes, the companies are definitely responsible.

And if it was a priority, like it was a priority for some other aspect of their qualifications, then they would see to it that all of the agents were doing what they're supposed to.

FRED FREIBERG: Let me offer one more explanation. I was going to flip -- flip this on its head with another question that was asked of me before, but I think it's -- this is probably a good opportunity to do it, and that is:

When you look at the history of real estate from the very beginning, 1908 was the beginning of the organized real estate industry in this country.

By 1913, they were advising all of their members to not contribute to race mixing.

By 1970, they -- '17, they were handing out race-restrictive covenants, and ordering their members to comply.

By 1924 to 1950, they had their code of ethics, which actually obligated a real estate -- a realtor to discriminate. It was an ethical obligation to discriminate. And they sanctioned agents who didn't comply with that.

Not only did the industry do that, but then they developed a model agreement, and sent it around to all the state licensing agencies, and said, "Adopt our code of ethics, and sanction licensees the same way."

And 32 states adopted that code, [microphone turned off] and did, in fact, sanction real estate agents who did not comply with the requirement to discriminate.

By 1927, they were circulating model race-restrictive covenants.

By 1928, half of all homes owned by White people in the United States have race-restrictive covenants.

Now that's compliance.

[Microphone turned on.]

They know how to get compliance with their

membership, if they want to, because they did it in segregating this society.

Now it's time to flip this on its head and say to them, Show the same zeal now in enforcing your code of ethics, which now requires agents not to discriminate.

SENATOR LIU: So I'm not -- I'm detecting a slight lack of confidence on your part about the real estate [microphone turned off] industry.

[Microphone turned on.]

My question is: Should penalties be raised?

FRED FREIBERG: Penalties --

SENATOR LIU: Should they be --

FRED FREIBERG: Penalties for the division of license and services certainly shouldn't be at \$1,000. Those should be raised.

But the penalties under the fair-housing laws are actually sufficient. It's just the lack of enforcement that is the problem.

SENATOR LIU: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Next up, Senator Brooks.

SENATOR BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A lot of comments that was made by several people this morning, already, in terms of the number

of complaints and violations, is the fact that most consumers don't recognize they've been discriminated against.

How do we change that?

How do we get the folks that are dealing with realtors, at whatever level, better understand what services and what actions they should be expecting?

ELAINE GROSS: Well, there certainly can be much more aggressive effort to tell people about their rights, and to -- you know, there should be, you know, the PSAs on television and the radio.

And the agencies responsible for enforcing fair housing, and the licensing, you know, the realtors as well, should be very up front.

Everybody needs to be much more vigilant and persistent in letting the general public know that they have rights, and what to do about it. And to make it -- you know, make it easier for people to file complaints, and that kind of thing.

But I think as Fred has said several times, it's very hard for an individual, even if they knew they had rights.

You know, when I was discriminated against, the person was very nice to me.

I only found out about it after the fact,

that I had been discriminated against.

SENATOR BROOKS: Do we need a consumer's bill of rights-type situation when dealing with realtors?

FRED FREIBERG: The problem, Senator, again, I think is that, if -- if I was to send you out into the housing market, and I had an African-American man your age go out opposite you, and you went in and you requested housing, and it was given to you, you were shown units, and so forth, and your African-American counterpart was treated very nicely, very friendly, given all the courtesies, but told, Uhm, I've got nothing here, but maybe I've got another building somewhere else; who -- you wouldn't file a complaint in this situation. And your counterparty wouldn't either, because he would have no knowledge that you were shown those apartments, or shown those homes.

And that's -- that -- I apologize for harkening back to that constantly, but this is the point of the "Newsday" story: You can't know that you're being discriminated against.

No amount of education.

I have worked with people with high degrees -- educational degrees, who came back and said, I didn't know I was treated differently than

my counterpart.

It has nothing to do with your awareness or education, or anything.

It really has to do with the nature of the discrimination itself, which has now been reduced to a point where people, consumers, can no longer detect that discrimination is occurring.

SENATOR BROOKS: It's absolutely something we have to address.

I think, too, as many of these problems are being identified, we have to look at continuing-education requirements that have to go to the realty community.

And there's been a quick discussion here in terms of penalties.

And I think, Elaine, in your response to one of the questions you had, your emotional reaction demonstrates, clearly, the real damage that's being done here, from an emotional standpoint.

And I think, realistically, when we look at this, and we realize how flagrant it is in the end, I think the penalty has to truly fit the crime.

ELAINE GROSS: And the best thing to do, is that those individuals cannot be licensed real estate agents. That's the best penalty.

And I understand, you know, there are 1 2 processes, and, et cetera, but that's where it needs to end up, and it needs to get there in a fairly 3 4 speedy way. 5 SENATOR BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 7 Rounding out this series of questions, Assemblyman Lavine. 8 ASSEMBLYMAN LAVINE: I'd like to thank the 9 10

Senate for convening this critically important hearing.

And I'd also like to thank my colleagues and friends in the Senate for allowing me, as a mere member of the Assembly, to participate.

And I want to thank as well, Elaine and Fred, for your commitment to justice, and for being at the frontline of the battle for human rights, not just today, but for years.

[Applause.]

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ASSEMBLYMAN LAVINE: That's a good applause line.

Fred, you referenced the need, perhaps you suggested the need, for a statewide zoning and appeals board.

How would you -- and this is a question for

both of you: How would you imagine or envision such an entity would function?

FRED FREIBERG: Well, we have a recent example of a community right here in Nassau County who was actually found liable for engaging in race discrimination in their -- in exclusionary zoning practices: Garden City.

It's taken 14 years to get an outcome on that case.

Is this how we propose to override and deal with exclusionary zoning on a community-by-community basis?

I would hope not, because there aren't enough attorneys to bring 14 years of litigation against each community that's engaged in these practices.

We have to find way to create a state agency that could -- would have the authority to override local zoning where it appears that decisions are being made for discriminatory reasons, or just to delay and stall in order to elude their obligations to produce some affordable housing.

And -- and we see this time and time again.

You just celebrated, I guess, the development in East Northport that had been languishing for 40 years.

And now, at the end of the day, eight units of affordable housing for people with disabilities is the outcome.

That's pretty sad, when it started out as an all-affordable development, and it took 40 years to actually get any housing built at all.

This -- this can't be the way we provide affordable housing on Long Island, or any anywhere else in the state.

So our belief is -- and there was a zoning appeals board in place at one point in our state's history, but it was actually -- its authority was taken away from it.

 $\,$  And -- and I know a little bit about the history.

And I think we need to look at it again because, without having -- there are cases where people, even as of right, have an ability to build housing, and there are delays by the locality to give permits, to get back to developers, and they try to stall as long as they can until the developer loses interest or financing.

And that's got to stop.

There has to be a way to short-circuit that process if it's known that it's being done

deliberately to try and avoid allowing this housing in the community.

We need to expand housing choices for people at all income levels. And -- and we have to find some mechanism at the state level to facilitate that.

And I know this is controversial, and I know, in Long Island certainly it would be.

But I think this is a serious problem.

It's a problem in Westchester County.

It's a problem in Rockland County.

It's not peculiar to Long Island.

ELAINE GROSS: I'll just add just one other footnote.

It was only a week ago, or two weeks ago, when I was offering testimony, when the final piece of funding to support the affordable-housing project that Fred was referring to, in Huntington, came before the Suffolk County Legislature.

And even after 30 years, after the

Supreme Court ruled that the Town had discriminated against the developer trying to build the housing, for that 30-year period, you would think that a Supreme Court case would make everybody stand at attention and do what they're supposed to do.

But it was 30 years later, and we also weren't sure, at that Suffolk County hearing, when they were voting on funding for infrastructure, that would be the last little financial piece to allow that development to move forward, it was not clear up until the day that we had the votes.

So that just tells you that the -- the persistence of being determined, that we are going to keep that community White, you'll have to walk over us in our grave before we'll change, I mean, that is the -- that's the attitude.

ASSEMBLYMAN LAVINE: So let me -- let me say this:

You have both highlighted the absolute need for government involvement here to address this crisis.

And after all, it's only fair because, government, along with other major institutions, certainly played a role in getting us to where we are today.

But -- and you quoted some of the giants of the twentieth century, Einstein and Dr. King.

I want to just add one other quote, that

I hope you'll use, and that is a quote of America's

greatest lawyer of the twentieth century,

Thurgood Marshall, who said, "Yes, laws really do change the hearts of men and women."

And, finally, Elaine, you described what had occurred to you with great emotion.

And we have -- we have felt that.

And, perhaps, and especially perhaps, given what's going on in our nation today with hate, hatred running rampant, and reasons for that lie elsewhere other than this hearing today, but, perhaps, each and every American of good faith must rise to the occasion, and become not just someone who has an interest in fairness, but become an actual anti-racist.

Our nation depends on that.

And thank you both.

ELAINE GROSS: Thank you.

FRED FREIBERG: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I want to sincerely thank you for your contributions today.

And I strongly suspect that in the coming weeks and months we will continue to be speaking with one another.

ELAINE GROSS: Okay. Thank you.

FRED FREIBERG: Thank you.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we have -- excuse me -- Ryan Gorman, president and CEO of NRT, LLC. 2 Thank you, Mr. Gorman, for your -- first of 3 all, just to begin: Do you solemnly swear or affirm 4 5 to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but 6 the truth? 7 M. RYAN GORMAN: I do. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Great. Thank you. 8 Okay, so, Mr. Gorman, first of all, you -- so 9 you understand you have an obligation to testify 10 11 truthfully here today. 12 Is there in you reason you cannot meet that 13 obligation? 14 M. RYAN GORMAN: No. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 16 Are you represented by counsel here today? 17 M. RYAN GORMAN: I have counsel here today. 18 I also have a written statement [inaudible]. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 20 Okay, thank you. 21 Why don't you begin with your open statement. 22 M. RYAN GORMAN: Sure. 23 Good morning, and thank you for the 24 opportunity to appear before you today, and to

participate in this important process.

25

My name is Ryan Gorman. I'm the president and chief executive officer of NRT, LLC, the company-owned real estate brokerage operations of Realogy Holdings Corporation, headquartered in Madison, New Jersey.

I've been with Realogy since 2004, serving in a variety of strategic development and operational roles.

I've served in my current role since January of 2018, and I'm a member of Realogy's Corporate Executive Committee.

Realogy is a global real estate services firm, with both company-owned and franchised real estate brokerages across six main brands:

Better Homes & Gardens Real Estate, Century 21,

Coldwell Banker, Corcoran, ERA, and

Sotheby's International Realty.

Realogy also offers a variety of real estate-related services beyond brokerage, including relocation, title, settlement services.

Finally, we maintain a residential mortgage-lending joint venture.

While Realogy operates globally, the U.S. is our largest market, and we have more than 10,000 employees and nearly 200,000 U.S.-based

independent-contractor real estate agents affiliated with either our company-owned brokerages or our independently owned and operated franchisees.

Realogy's company-owned real estate brokerage, NRT, operates as Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage, the Corcoran Group, Citi Habitats, and Sotheby's International Realty in the state of New York.

In total, for those NRT brokerages, there are 4,300 real estate agents affiliated with our company, operating out of 58 offices across the state of New York.

Within those statewide numbers, on
Long Island, there are approximately
1,240 affiliated agents, and approximately 25 office
locations of our company-owned brokerages.

In short, Realogy is a global, national, and local leader in residential real estate services.

And, as a leader, we embrace our implied obligation to lead the industry in crucial areas of both consumer service and consumer protection, both in word and in deed.

For instance, fair-housing awareness and acknowledgment have long been important components of NRT's agent onboarding procedures.

As an example, when a real estate agent affiliated with one of our company-owned Coldwell Banker brokerages on Long Island, affiliates, they're required to sign a fair-housing pledge, in which they commit to provide equal professional service to all, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, or other protected status of any prospective client, consumer, or resident of any community.

Each of NRT's agents is also required to maintain his or her real estate license with New York State.

Accordingly, each agent must attend fair-housing continuing-education classes to satisfy the requirements of the New York State real estate licensing regulations.

At present, the regulations require each agent to complete three hours of fair-housing training every two years.

[Audio malfunction begins.]

NRT agents also contractually agree to comply with all federal, state, and local laws, including fair-housing laws.

We take fair housing -- we take the recent fair-housing-related reporting by "Newsday" very seriously.

While many of the real estate agents tested by "Newsday" served all testers well and equally, we were deeply concerned with the actions and statements of those agents featured in the report, and did not [indiscernible].

Realogy does not, and will not, tolerate any notion of illegal housing discrimination.

Realogy supports the Long Island Board of
Realtors' investigation of any members identified in
the "Newsday" report, so that all the facts and
circumstances can be assessed [indiscernible].

It's the realtor's duty to provide services to all people consistent with New York law.

Realogy also fully supports the actions announced by Governor Andrew Cuomo, Long Island [indiscernible], and will participate in any continuing dialogue with state and local lawmakers [indiscernible].

[Audio malfunction resolved.]

While we await results of the investigation of the Long Island Board of Realtors, we are also conducting our own inquiry, with the assistance of

an independent third party, and we will take appropriate action based on our findings regarding any of the agents affiliated with any company-owned brokerage.

Further, these events have afforded us an opportunity to evaluate the training NRT provides and requires of its independent-contractor real estate agents and employees in New York and around the United States.

We'll be taking additional action to augment that [indiscernible] require today, specifically focused on fair housing and, potentially, other consumer protections.

Beyond compliance, we will work to grow our companies' and our industry's understanding of unconscious bias, as well as unintended consequences of even well-meaning actions that may be driven, in part, by assumptions or stereotypes.

We also believe more can be done to expand the scope and impact of existing fair-housing regulations.

For example, Realogy is a committed and active supporter of the Fair Housing Act, and is actively advocating for the expansion of these protections with the Equality Act.

In fact, we are proud to be the first residential brokerage to sign on to the Equality Act in HR 1447, to amend the Fair Housing Act to include LGBTQ+ as a protected class.

We're also a major supporter of many industry groups specifically focused on underrepresented populations within our communities and within our sales offices, working to help grow these organizations and move their missions forward.

Realogy is proud to receive the "World's Most Ethical Company" designation by Ethisphere Institute for eight consecutive years, and we continuously encourage, and expect, our independent-contractor real estate agents who choose to affiliate with us to uphold and prioritize the same commitment to ethics, including the ethical imperative of equality.

Realogy is committed to serving all consumers well and equally during an important milestone moment in their lives: the buying or selling of a home.

We're proud that the work of our agents, and that the work of our company, helps New Yorkers find a place to call home, and helps the communities across the state grow, prosper, and move forward.

As the largest residential real estate brokerage and franchisor in the United States, we accept our responsibility to lead the industry in recommitting to understanding and upholding both the letter and spirit of fair-housing laws, and, to doing our part to ensure communities we serve have equal and fair access to home ownership.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I do welcome any questions.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much for your testimony.

And just to note, we'll discuss this later, but we -- there were a number of participants [indiscernible] that were invited here today to testify. And we'll be discussing, later in hearing, our efforts to, you know, get that -- get them before us.

But, you know, we do acknowledge that you are a -- voluntarily here today to speak about these very important issues, and -- and your company's role in -- in the industry.

So we thank you for that.

Have you had a chance to review the "Newsday's" reporting on its investigation in its

entirety?

M. RYAN GORMAN: In its entirety, I'm not sure I have reviewed the "Newsday" reporting.

It's entirety, I'm not positive. There was quite a bit of video.

So I'm not sure [indiscernible cross-talking] --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: You reviewed it extensively and thoroughly. Okay.

M. RYAN GORMAN: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And did you, in particular, have the opportunity to review the -- there were about four or so hours of videos regarding employees or agents of NRT companies, including Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, I can't speak to any individual agents today.

I can say that I did review the video in the main store, as well as, I believe, the follow-up videos related to those agents.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, good.

Arthur Brown, the project director of

"Newsday's" investigations, testified earlier that

"Newsday" offered all companies the opportunity to

view videos and other evidence gathered during the

investigation, before publication.

Did you, or to your knowledge, anyone else at NRT, take that opportunity before publication of this article?

M. RYAN GORMAN: No.

I saw the videos when it was published.

We're, as I outlined, a large company.

I was not reached out to directly by "Newsday," but I do believe individuals in the company were.

And I did not take advantage of seeing the videos. I don't think anyone in the company did.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So you -- just -to make sure I caught that, you're saying that you
believe that that opportunity was offered, but that
nobody from NRT took that opportunity, to your
knowledge?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I believe so, yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

I'd like to move to a discussion of the actions of some particular real estate agencies who worked with NRT's companies, who are subject of the investigation.

So, first -- we're going to show a video clip in just a moment.

1 So first up, this is Akhtar Somekh of Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage of Great Neck. 2 And on August 16, 2016, Ms. Somekh met with 3 Kimberly Larkin-Battista, who was looking for a home 4 5 in the North Shore, near the water, at a price of up 6 to \$2 million. 7 And Ms. Larkin Battista was a "Newsday" 8 tester. Have you -- maybe we should show the -- let's 9 just show -- can we show Clip Number 10? 10 11 [Start of Video Clip 10.] 12 [Unable to transcribe video clip; poor 13 audio quality and acoustics.] 14 [End of Video Clip 10.] 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: First of all, let me 16 begin, the sound quality was not pristine. 17 Were you able to make out the dialogue in that? 18 19 M. RYAN GORMAN: I believe much of it, yeah. 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 21 So just -- I would just note that: Ms. Larkin Battista is a White woman. 22 23 And that the same comments made by the agent 24 there were not made to the paired tester, who was 25 Hispanic -- of Hispanic background.

So just -- let me just begin by asking:
What's your reaction to what you just saw and heard?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So I'm happy to participate today, and speak to the larger issue, and what we should do, moving forward.

But, with the ongoing attorney general investigation, as well as Long Island Board of Realtor investigation, and our own inquiry, I won't speak directly to any individual agents today.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So, just, you aren't willing to comment today on whether what you saw comports with the law or the standards of NRT?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Some of the topics that were lifted up by that video, one was referenced earlier today, in terms of school districts, as well as what the real estate agent's role would be related to school districts.

And I concur with some of the earlier testimony, that real estate agents should be able to point to alternative resources.

Real estate agents are not experts in school districts, and should point to alternative resources that a consumer can use to learn the information they want to learn about those districts.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

And just -- just to be clear, and, you know,

I'm not sure -- since it's a big room, I'm not sure

all of the audio was entirely clear, but, among the

statements, we just saw this quote:

"Recently we got a lot of Chinese/Oriental coming in Great Neck.

"In the beginning they start going to south because they have their friends and family, everybody south, and it became overwhelmed.

"Usually, the great thing about Great Neck, is they keep their amount of students smaller than 20.

"They tried do it, but South School, when it became very crowded, so they gave Kensington and Great Neck a choice of North or South.

"This is the new rule."

And just to be clear: Do you believe that that kind of commentary is appropriate?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So, again, while I can't speak the to any individual agents, certainly, you raised another topic, in terms of demographic information, which is another topic where real estate agents should not be participating in the general discussion of demographic information.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

To your knowledge, has NRT or Coldwell Banker 1 taken any action with respect to Ms. Somekh 2 concerning this incident? 3 M. RYAN GORMAN: So with respect to any 4 individual agent today, I won't be speaking to 5 individual actions. 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Can I -- I'm just going to give you a copy of some commentary from the 8 "Newsday". We'll call this Exhibit A. 9 M. RYAN GORMAN: Thank you. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And can you just read the 12 highlighted portion? 13 M. RYAN GORMAN: The Post-It note? 14 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Correct. 15 M. RYAN GORMAN: And you would like me to, 16 what, read this into the record? Is this not --17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, if you would. 18 M. RYAN GORMAN: -- okay. 19 So this is from the "Newsday" -- I guess 20 "Newsday" report, under "Agent and Company 21 Responses": 22 "Agent Akhtar Somekh did not respond with 23 an" -- "did not respond to an invitation to view 24 video recordings of her meetings with testers or to

follow up e-mails and phone calls requesting

25

interviews."

"The company provided the following statement" -- I'm sorry.

"The company provided the following statement:

"Incidents reported by "Newsday," that are alleged to have occurred more than two years ago, are completely contrary to our long-term commitment and dedication to supporting and maintaining all aspects of fair and equitable housing.

"Upholding the Fair Housing Act remains one of our highest priorities, and we expect the same level of commitment of the more than 750 independent real estate salespersons who choose to affiliate with Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage on Long Island.

"We take this matter seriously, and have addressed the alleged incidents with the sales persons."

I believe that's the conclusion of it.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: All right. Thank you.

And just -- so the question is: You stated publicly that NRT and Coldwell have, quote, addressed the alleged incident with the salesperson.

Can you just tell us what sort of action that

would entail?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Again, with respect to any individual agent or circumstances of this inquiry, I won't be speaking to individual agents.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So just -- again, just -- we're trying to get some clarity of a statement the company's already made publicly to the media.

You're unable to tell us how -- how, in what manner, that the company has -- has addressed the alleged incident, as you've said [indiscernible cross-talking] --

M. RYAN GORMAN: I believe this statement is a statement that preceded the publishing of the story, if I'm not mistaken --

And someone from "Newsday" could perhaps verify that.

-- where we were provided with letters, with certain excerpts.

And based upon those letters, as outlined here in this statement, action -- inquiry and action was taken.

Subsequent to this, the videos were posted, as you've mentioned, extensive videos were posted, which we -- have now made their way into our inquiry, and will make their way into our actions.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, again -- so just to be -- just to be clear, you can't answer today 2 3 any -- anything about any inquiry or action that was taken with respect to this agent? 4 M. RYAN GORMAN: Correct. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 7 I'd like to turn to the actions of a second agent who worked with NRT's companies as well. 8 This is Rose Marie Mirando [ph.] of 9 Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage of 10 11 East Setauket. Forgive my pronunciation. I'm 12 13 geographically-challenged on Long Island. 14 This is on May 27, 2016. 15 Ms. Mirando met with Lawrence Samuels, who's 16 seeking to purchase a home within 30 minutes of Port Jefferson, for up to \$500,000. 17 Why don't we roll Clip Number 27, please. 18 [Start of Video Clip 27.] 19 20 THE AGENT: [Indiscernible] bath, basement, 21 two-car garage, you know, something like that. Yes, 22 so I'm already, in my head, thinking of certain 23 inventory for you. 24 [Indiscernible] Stoney Brook, it's okay. 25 I just -- I -- you know, you may -- you don't

really know certain areas --1 2 THE TESTER: Uh-huh. 3 THE AGENT: -- what you're going to get next door. 4 5 THE TESTER: Right. 6 THE AGENT: That's the problem. And there's 7 pockets [indiscernible] too, you know, down by the train, any area there. 8 9 What I say is, always to women, Follow the school bus. 10 11 You know, that's what I always say: Follow 12 the school bus. See the moms that are hanging out 13 on the corners. 14 Wherever you're going to buy diapers, you 15 know, during the day, go at 10:00 at night, and you 16 see if you like [indiscernible]. 17 I mean, really, that's the way to really take 18 a look at. I tell women this all the time. 19 20 THE TESTER: Right, right. 21 THE AGENT: There was one fellow who would --22 like, insisted on this house. And the wife was

THE AGENT: There was one fellow who would -like, insisted on this house. And the wife was
pregnant, had a little one, and I said to him,
I can't say anything, but I encourage you, I want
you to go there at 10:00, with your wife, and buy

23

24

25

```
diapers. Go to that 7-Eleven.
 1
               He didn't buy there. [Laughing.]
 2
               THE TESTER: No, that's great.
 3
               THE AGENT: I have to say it without saying
 4
        it.
 5
 6
               You know, you have the knowledge of the
 7
        areas, you know.
 8
               THE TESTER: Yes.
 9
               THE AGENT: And, look, I care for families.
        I'm a family person.
10
11
               THE TESTER: Right.
12
               THE AGENT: I care for my children.
13
               And, you know, when you're putting them in
14
        other people's care, I take first-time homebuyers
15
        there all the time.
16
               I don't want to use the word "steer," but
17
        I try to --
               THE TESTER: No, that's [indiscernible] --
18
               THE AGENT: -- [indiscernible] I educate in
19
20
        the areas, you know.
21
               THE TESTER: Absolutely. That's
22
        [indiscernible] --
23
               THE AGENT: I was a first-time homebuyer
        myself one time, and I remember what the first agent
24
25
        told us, I don't know, 30 years ago.
```

1 And I'm, like, what a creep.

When you think about it now, you know, and how much I've learned over the years, I mean, it's all about the location.

THE TESTER: Right.

THE AGENT: And you're going to want to have good resale value.

THE TESTER: Right.

[End of Video Clip 27 stops.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So, again, this was during a 26-minute conversation between Ms. Mirando and Mr. Samuels.

And can I ask just for your reaction to what we just saw?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So with regard to any individual agent, I won't be speaking about the content or the company's reaction or action related to the individual agents.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Without commenting on the -- on the specific treatment of this agent, do you believe that the activity you just saw, that kind of exchange, is appropriate?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So generally speaking, it's inappropriate for a real estate agent to comment on

individual areas in ways that involve demographics and, in some cases, school information.

That is a segment that was just shown of something larger.

So I can say, with regard to demographics and school districts, it would be inappropriate to reference.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: If a -- if an agent says something as we just heard, like, "I don't want to use the word 'steer,' but I try to -- I educate in the area," do you think that the substitution of the verb "educate" for the verb "steer" alters the basic nature of that interaction?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So, again, I won't speak to individual commentary of agents, but, certainly, "steering," and any euphemisms for "steering," or any proxies for "steering," are inappropriate and unacceptable.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

And I won't hand you Exhibit B, which is a similar text from "Newsday".

But, again, this company stated that it took -- it takes this matter seriously, and have addressed the alleged incidents with the salespersons in question.

1 Again, can you -- can you confirm that NRT 2 has, in fact, addressed the incidents with respect 3 to the salespeople in question, as you stated in a comment to "Newsday"? 4 5 M. RYAN GORMAN: So, again, that statement was prior to the release of the article, as well as 6 the video. 7 And I believe, subsequent to the video, the 8 commentary we provided to the committee, was that we 9 have launched our own inquiry, and we're also 10 11 participating here today with the attorney general's 12 process, as well as the Long Island Board of 13 Realtors process. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But you had taken some 15 action in advance of publication, as you stated, in 16 the -- to "Newsday"? 17 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yeah, the statement made is 18 accurate. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you tell us what, if 20 anything, was done in that stage, before the --21 before the publication and the investigation?

M. RYAN GORMAN: No.

With regard to an any individual agent or circumstance, I won't be commenting on that.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

22

23

24

25

We'll continue that dialogue, going forward.

Can you speak to your -- some of your prepared remarks touched on this, but I want to discuss in more detail, NRT's actions, or your subsidiary's actions, that you've taken to assure compliance with federal, state, and local laws that bar discrimination.

So you mentioned that -- I'll quote you here: Fair-housing awareness and acknowledgment have long been important components of NRT's agent onboarding procedures.

Can you tell us how that works?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Sure.

In that particular instance, when an agent joins our organization, they, literally, sign and attest to a number of things, one of which is, their current and enforced license, which, of course, would require them to abide by New York State law. And, having taken initial licensure, as well as continuing-education courses that include Fair Housing Act.

Two is, the signature to the -- our own fair-housing policy, and acknowledgment, based on our fair-housing pledge, that they would separately acknowledge, separate and apart from the State

requirements.

And then ongoing from there, we have a number of programs and procedures, and we touch on, of course, fair housing, as well as other ethics and compliance topics, throughout the year.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And can you provide this committee with a copy of that document that's pledged, that your agents are asked to sign at the beginning of their relationship with NRT or [indiscernible cross-talking] --

M. RYAN GORMAN: I'm sure we can follow up.

It is publically available on all of our websites as well.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you -- is there a standard process and a standard pledge throughout all of the NRT companies, or is there -- does that -- does that process vary among different affiliates?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So NRT is an entity that's grown through acquisition. And, so, as different companies have become part of our organization, they've adopted the approach that I just outlined. But there is some variation among the different entities. For instance, Sotheby's, Cocoran, and Coldwell Banker in the state of New York have some

degree of variation.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you talk about what kind of variation that would be?

M. RYAN GORMAN: In terms -- for the most part, it relates to what is augmented, in terms of fair-housing-awareness training; programs that are put on during the year.

They may vary.

For instance, between New York City and
Long Island, New York City has a specific set of
laws, I'm sure you're aware, and the training
related to those laws is specific to New York City;
where, Corcoran and Sotheby's operate, largely, and
Coldwell Banker, largely, does not on the
owned-brokerage side.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So just -- just with respect -- we'll talk a little bit more about training in a minute.

But just with respect to this policy of ensuring that everybody signs a pledge at the beginning of their relationship, that -- you're testifying that that is a -- a standard practice across all of your -- your affiliates?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I can't say the same pledge is standard across all of owned-brokerage

components.

The majority I can attest to, yes.

But I want to answer honestly, and I can't say that it is every one of the divisions are signing the exact same pledge. I don't know that.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So it's standard practice to have a pledge, and have it signed, but some var -- perhaps some variation [indiscernible cross-talking] --

M. RYAN GORMAN: Standard practice to have acknowledgment of the fair-housing obligations and procedures, but it may vary between the entities.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Does NRT take any steps to confirm affiliates' compliance with that policy?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I'm sorry, the agents who affiliate to confirm it?

It is part of the onboarding procedure.

So, for instance, our onboarding team has a checklist that they'll go through, and then make sure that the files are as complete as they need to be when an agent joins.

So this would be part of that -- that compliance procedure.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So there would be a review of -- I mean, I guess I'm asking: So, Coldwell, for

example, which is one of the [indiscernible], is 1 there somebody reviewing whether Coldwell is 2 complying with that across their many agents? 3 M. RYAN GORMAN: So our 4 independent-contractor relations and licensing teams 5 6 would likely be the teams that are ensuring the 7 files are complete. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Have you -- so let's talk 8 9 about training. Actually, can you describe the training that 10 11 is available at that stage of their relationship. 12 M. RYAN GORMAN: At the onboarding? 13 There's not a specific training at the point 14 of onboarding. 15 There's training throughout the year, and 16 over the year. 17 So the number-one obligation, of course, is that an agent maintains their license, and completes 18 whatever training is required by the State, which 19 20 I think you're aware of what that is at this point 21 in New York. 22 So that's required. 23 Additionally, throughout the year, there's, 24 both, continuing-education credit, you know,

eligible, as well as non-eligible, training that

will take place.

It does vary considerably over different points in time and different areas, but fair housing is a component of a lot of different -- of our training programs.

Beyond that, we have partnerships with industry organizations that focus on different segments, and, typically, underrepresented segments, of our population.

We're often attending those conferences, and inviting individuals from those groups in.

We also have a number of programs, an example of which, on the Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage side, is Agents of Change, which is an inclusivity-focused program, that is sort of an evolution of a program we've had for a while.

So, as an example, we've put on, I believe six -- five or six of those in the last few months.

And we'll be doing more shortly.

Just -- that's a program that's evolved more recently.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you confirm -- I mean, do you have -- you have brokers sort of certifying that they've done the training, or do you sort of affirmatively confirm that agents are receiving the

training they need, and that --

M. RYAN GORMAN: So for the State training, the State's obligation would be to ensure that they have completed the continuing-education requirements. And our obligation is to ensure they've met the State requirements.

In terms of beyond that, obligatory training beyond that, that is, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, something that we're looking at, to -- as a potential augmentation to our current procedures, to add additional obligatory training, not just in New York, but nationally.

Today, that's not the case; there's not obligatory additional training beyond their -- their [indiscernible cross-talking] --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Beyond -- beyond the minimum required for the State -- the State's licensing program?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Right.

There's considerable training provided, and available, but not obligatory.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And the -- from the "Newsday" reporting, it sounds like most agents in this area are meeting their training requirements through Long Island Board of Realtors training

that's offered by that entity.

Is that your sense?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I can't speak to that.

Certainly, the Long Island Board could speak to it.

Continuing-education eligible training is available in a variety of places, both, online, in-person, at conferences, and at state and national.

So I can't speak to what the makeup is of it today.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: There was some discussion in the "Newsday" reporting about the quality of that training, the extent to which the training included the components that are required regarding fair housing.

Has your -- have your companies ever made any effort to assess the quality of that training -- the -- the quality of the training that's available, the extent to which it meets minimum legal requirements?

M. RYAN GORMAN: No, we've not eval -- to my knowledge, we've not evaluated the specific training available through Long Island Board of Realtors.

I can say that this process has led me to

believe that we need to have our own training, to augment that which may be available or required from the State.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

[No audio/microphone turned off.]

M. RYAN GORMAN: [No audio/microphone turned off.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: [Microphone turned on at very low volume.]

Is there any company policies that instruct staff to report information that someone may be working in violation of fair-housing laws?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Certainly.

So I mentioned earlier that ethics is obviously core to us as a company; has been for a very long time. And we speak extensively about that, all manner of ethics.

So all of our employees receive training that is obligatory about ethics, including how and when to report complaints, how and when to field complaints, and what action should be taken when a complaint, or any ethical concern, frankly, you know, arises.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Including complaints about fellow -- about colleagues in the industry, and

behavior --

M. RYAN GORMAN: Of course.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- they might --

M. RYAN GORMAN: In fact, those are the specific instances we use in training, to make sure awareness and understanding are high.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Would you be willing to share with the Committee the materials you use for that training, and the -- and any policies -- any formal policies that are distributed to employees and affiliates around that?

M. RYAN GORMAN: We can certainly follow up with the Committee's staff that we've been in touch with already.

I believe there have been some requests for information already.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Have -- has NRT or your affiliates received complaints of violations of fair-housing standards?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I can't speak to individual, you know, complaints, or sort of a number of complaints.

We certainly are very large, and have operated for a very long time. But I can't speak to a specific, you know, number or set.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay -- okay, can you answer, to your knowledge, has NRT or its affiliates 2 received any complaints of violations of fair 3 housing in the last year, say? 4 M. RYAN GORMAN: And, truly, in terms of time 5 frame, I can't speak to that. 6 7 So I won't be speaking to individual complaints that we've -- that we have received. 8 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, I mean, I'm not --10 maybe we'll get there, but I'm not actually asking 11 you about the details of any individual complaints. 12 Just, has NRT or your affiliates received 13 complaints about any of your agents beyond --14 outside of this "Newsday" investigation, have you 15 received any complaints of violations of 16 fair-housing laws and standards? 17 M. RYAN GORMAN: We as a company certainly received complaints in -- of all manner. 18 19 So I -- forgive me if I won't get into 20 details about fair housing, or what was potentially 21 a component of a larger complaint regarding fair 22 housing. 23 But we have certainly received complaints. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Received complaints about

fair-housing issues?

1 M. RYAN GORMAN: I think it's fair to say 2 that the scope our company, that's likely been the 3 case. I can't speak individually to it. 4 I did attest to answer honestly, and I cannot 5 6 answer this question [indiscernible 7 cross-talking] --SENATOR KAVANAGH: No, I appreciate that. 8 9 And I would -- I'm certainly not asking to you attest to things that you're not familiar with. 10 11 Is there somebody in your company who would 12 know the extent to which the company has received 13 that kind of complaint? M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, certainly, we take 14 15 complaints extremely seriously, both in the action 16 we take and the records we keep. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But is there some person 18 in your company that you -- I mean, if you wanted to 19 find out that information, presumably there's 20 somebody you would ask --21 M. RYAN GORMAN: I can defer to our in-house counsel and the committee staff, if you'd like to 22 23 follow up. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Who -- just -- who is the in-house counsel?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Depending upon the part of 1 the company, in terms of realty, we have a 2 relatively extensive legal staff. 3 So, for instance, NRT, my legal counsel, a 4 5 gentleman by the name of Ken Hoffert, is our general 6 counsel at NRT. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. All right, thank you. 8 Do you have a formal practice of 9 investigating complaints about fair housing and 10 11 other matters? M. RYAN GORMAN: We have formal practices 12 13 about complaints in general. 14 We don't specify complaint type separately. 15 But we have former -- formal policies 16 regarding complaints, how they should be handled, how they should be followed up. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you just explain a 18 19 little bit about that, how that prac -- that policy 20 and practice works? 21 M. RYAN GORMAN: Sure. 22 In general, if a complaint is lodged, for 23 instance, related to a real estate agent, we have an

independent-contractor relations team, as well as a

legal team, each of which would be involved.

24

At their discretion, and honoring whatever confidentiality is necessary for that -- that inquiry, they would pull in the operations and brokerage team as well, as necessary, to ascertain additional facts, and then to either determine or

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And are all -- all -- any complaint is -- is the subject of at least a preliminary investigation?

recommend what action should be taken from there.

M. RYAN GORMAN: The term "any" being very broad, I can tell you we have a robust complaint procedure.

So, to my knowledge, any complaint that appears to be a legitimate complaint of any kind, we take very seriously, yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you have any -- is there anything that you can say today about -- from your knowledge, about results of investigations, actions taken by the company, with respect to complaints about fair-housing matters?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Sure.

We've -- we've absolutely taken action related to complaints, and into the broad scope of ethics, for instance, which I would say this is, you know, under the broad category of "ethics," we have

taken action, from training, additional explanation and clarification, to separation, whether they be employees or independent contractors, to additional action even beyond that.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So just to be clear, you would -- when you say "separation," you're talking about terminating the relationship between your companies and a given agent, in response to a fair-housing complaint, if that would be one potential consequence if the complaint were substantiated?

M. RYAN GORMAN: As a potential consequence.

So employees, of course, there would be termination.

With regard to independent contractors, it would be disassociation.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you just answer, do
they have -- has -- have you, or -- to your
knowledge, has your company, or any of your
affiliated companies, actually terminated the
relationship or ended the relationship with an agent
based a fair-housing complaint?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I won't be speaking specifically to that.

I'm happy to follow up and, you know, field

inquiries with the attorney general and others. But I won't be speaking directly to actions we've taken with regard to specific complaints.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, I'm not asking for the action of a specific [indiscernible].

I'm asking whether your company has taken that action in -- in any circumstance, that you're aware of, without -- without asking you for the specific agent involved, or even the specific affiliate company involved?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Yeah, so speaking more generally, in an attempt to be as helpful as I can, with regard to ethics complaints, we certainly have terminated relationships with both employees and independent contractors.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. That's helpful.

Have you ever conducted paired testing, or any other kind of proactive program, to determine whether employees are, and agents are, complying with fair-housing law?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So I've been in this position since January of last year. And over that time, no, I am not aware of any.

I believe, though -- again, I want to attest

1 honestly -- we as a company have in the past. But since I've been in this position since 2 3 January of last year, no, we have not. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, so you believe --4 5 you believe that your companies have actually -have done that kind of proactive testing at some 6 7 point, but not since you've been there [indiscernible] -- you said -- when you say "last 8 January, you mean January of two thousand and...? 9 M. RYAN GORMAN: '18. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- eighteen? 12 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yes. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, so in the last 14 couple years. 15 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yes. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Who in the company would 17 be familiar with that longer history of that 18 practice within the company? 19 M. RYAN GORMAN: We can follow up. 20 Like, truly, I do not know. 21 We are -- our company is of considerable 22 scope, so we would have to do some work on that. 23 But, truly, I'd have to follow up. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, but you're willing 25 to provide this com -- these committees with

additional information about that practice in the 1 2 past? M. RYAN GORMAN: I'm willing to have 3 additional conversation with the Committee staff 4 about that. 5 6 I want to be just very cognizant of the 7 additional investigations that are going on, with the attorney general, as well as LIBOR, and others, 8 9 and make sure we take the appropriate steps. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Thank you. 10 11 Moving on to a new topic, how many offices do 12 you and your affiliates have on -- in -- on 13 Long Island? 14 M. RYAN GORMAN: In terms of the 15 owned-brokerage operation, I believe it's 25 offices 16 on -- that would qualify Long Island-specific. 17 And I do not as have the total affiliate count, meaning the franchisee count, on Long Island 18 19 with me today. 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And how do you -- how does 21 NRT and your affiliated companies choose office 22 locations? 23 M. RYAN GORMAN: So NRT -- I'll take the two 24 separately, if you don't mind.

NRT being the owned-brokerage segment, we

have history of growth through acquisitions. So, for the most part, we have not opened new offices, but, rather, acquired offices over time.

The most typical path would be for a broker-owner -- an existing broker-owner to reach out to us, to seek to be acquired, and for to us evaluate that opportunity, and then decide whether or not to move forward with the acquisition.

On the franchise side, the non-company-owned side of the business, similarly, it would be an existing broker-owner, typically.

We, typically, are not starting new brokerages. We're, typically, a -- what we would refer to as a "conversion franchise."

An existing broker-owner reaching out and wanting to explore the opportunity with one of our franchise brands, and then for them to meet with our team, explore the brand, and decide whether or not they want to sign up for a franchise.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And just -- just to be a little more specific, what factors determine whether you choose to make an acquisition?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: To affiliate.

M. RYAN GORMAN: -- sure.

A lot of factors go into determining whether or not to make an acquisition, including our existing market presence, and what market presence we desire.

But the financial profile and operations of the company being one of the most determinative.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just any other factors that you'd like to mention at this stage?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Myriad factors, but, no, I'd probably not like to list them all.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

So in terms of -- you said that, you know, the market -- the market -- your current market presence, and the markets you'd like to be in, do your off -- do you have any other office in communities where most residents are individuals -- people of color?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I honestly don't know the racial breakdown of all the communities of our offices. It's not something we've ever -- I've ever seen.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So I'm going to list a few communities that are mentioned specifically in the "Newsday" article.

Just, if you -- if you have -- if you can

say, yes or no, whether you have a presence in those 1 communities, that would be appreciated. 2 3 So, Fremont? M. RYAN GORMAN: Forgive me, my answer is 4 5 going to be frustrating here. I don't know all of the locations of our 6 7 affiliates, for sure. We can definitely follow up on that. And, 8 9 obviously, feel free to list them. But we can follow up with answers about where 10 11 our affiliates are. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 13 So I just -- I -- we would ask about Fremont, 14 Elmont, Hempstead, Brentwood, Central Islip, Union Dale, Roosevelt, and Wyandanch. 15 16 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Wyandanch (correcting 17 pronunciation). 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Wyandanch. Forgive me. 19 I'm originally from Staten Island, not 20 Long Island, and I'm a Manhattan boy now. 21 But, Wyandanch. Thank you. 22 So, again, just to -- just to make a point, 23 "Newsday" noted that there was a lack of 24 larger-scale brokerage businesses in the market in 25 any of the communities in New York that -- in

Long Island that are predominantly minority. 1 that those are serviced by smaller localized 2 brokers, and then, your company, and other 3 companies, have chosen not to locate there. 4 M. RYAN GORMAN: Chose not to locate offices 5 there [indiscernible cross-talking] --6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Or locate office 7 [indiscernible cross-talking] --8 9 M. RYAN GORMAN: -- [indiscernible.] The function of a real estate office today, 10 11 of course, being, for the most part, to service the 12 business of the real estate agent. 13 Consumers, typically, not spending much time 14 in our real estate offices. And there being fewer 15 of those offices every day, as agents are more 16 mobile, and as consumers prefer to interact with our 17 agents when shopping with home -- for homes, or 18 working in those agents' homes as well. SENATOR KAVANAGH: But the off -- yeah, but 19 20 the offices do serve a role within your business of 21 providing access to your services? 22 M. RYAN GORMAN: The -- in terms of 23 consumers? 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes. 25 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yes.

So there was point in time where consumers would definitely avail themselves of an agent's services, primarily through the sales office.

That's definitely not the case today.

But they are a component of a larger service profile, yeah.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, but you're still provide -- I mean, so if I, for example, were to walk down the main street of West Hampton, and to note that there are, you know, five or six brokerage offices with storefronts there, I might conclude that those companies -- and I don't know whether any of your affiliates -- but I might conclude those companies believe that that's a place where there might be customers who are looking for services, and want to avail themselves of a kind of an in-person meeting in an office.

Is that a fair assumption?

M. RYAN GORMAN: It's certainly a fair assumption the way the industry worked historically, more so than today.

So, for instance, my decision on whether or not to relocate an office, or shrink an office, or, frankly, today, to consolidate an office, relates much more to our real estate agent's work process,

and whether they work more in an office and prefer a 1 location as opposed to work more remotely. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, and I'm less 3 concerned about the difference between working from 4 home and working from the office, so much as the 5 decision about locating particular offices in 6 7 particular places. So, again, if you have -- you're saying, if 8 you have agents that want to work in particular 9 communities, you're more likely to have an office 10 11 there. And you're -- I mean [indiscernible 12 13 cross-talking] --14 M. RYAN GORMAN: [Indiscernible 15 cross-talking] --16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and you're -- I mean, 17 wherever this industry is going, you have dozens of offices currently, so one presumes they're serving 18 19 some purpose? 20 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yep. 21 Yes, sir. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 23 What steps, if any, do you take to promote diversity among the agents working for you? 24

M. RYAN GORMAN: Considerable, I should note,

first, we don't know the racial profile of either our employees or our agents.

It is a voluntary self-identification process that we honor with regard to both.

The National Association of Realtors has done some, I assume, mostly survey-generated work, that shows that, in general, the profile of the average real estate agent today lags behind the increasing diversity of the country.

And I would argue, given our size, we probably are somewhat akin to the National Association of Realtors' profile.

We believe that that's a -- behind where it needs to be, and we have a significant imperative to grow that.

So some of the ways that we work, are partnering with industry organizations that focus specifically on groups that are underrepresented in our industry, not solely on racial lines, but there certainly are significant groups that do so.

For instance, the National Association of Real Estate Professionals, National Association of Real Estate Brokers, NAGLREP, AREEA, there are a number of groups that focus on these groups.

We participate very close with them.

I personally participate very closely with them.

But we, as a company, sponsor events, participate in events, and bike groups, and partner with them on things, like, our Agents of Change initiatives, which are more locally based, but also partnered nationally at our national and global conventions as well.

So, it's certainly an imperative for us.

And we'll be doing, you know, more tomorrow than we did yesterday, and, hopefully, more the day after that.

But we have considerable work to do as an industry and as a large industry player.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you just quantify, or at least give us a sense, of how far you think that the industry is from being representative [indiscernible cross-talking] --

M. RYAN GORMAN: I can't.

I mean, the only thing -- honestly, the only thing that I've ever seen, to go on, is the National Association of Realtors' member profile.

And I -- while I don't have that with me, that is -- that is readily available, and we can certainly follow up with it.

population of the sales associates.

But I do believe it lags significantly across a few major groups that I can recall, in terms of African-American real estate agents, Hispanic real estate agents, and Asian real estate agents.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

So in your testimony you stated that you are, quote, conducting your own in -- NRT is conducting its own inquiry with the assistance of an independent third party.

Can you, with -- again, without getting into the specific results or the specific findings about agents, can you talk about -- a little bit about what the inquiry would entail?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So without speaking directly about these, I can say that, one, I and we are taking extremely seriously the use of, for instance, independent third parties, to ensure that we're doing so in as clear-eyed and unbiased way as possible, so that we can then determine what action we need to take.

So while we're taking this event seriously, and the agent's profile in this piece very

seriously, there's a much larger opportunity we see here, to improve as a company and as an industry.

And so I'm quite focused on the actions that would then flow from this, to try to change the outcomes in the future.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And when -- upon conclusion of that investigation, would you be willing to share the results with these committees?

 $\label{eq:M.RYAN GORMAN: I'd have to follow up on that.} % \begin{picture}(20,0) \put(0,0){\line(0,0){100}} \put(0,0){\line$ 

Again, I -- I -- I am unlikely to want to share details of the internal investigations, for a variety of reasons, including the attorney general's inquiry. But -- but we can follow up.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

I will note, we will be hearing from the attorney general's office later today about this matter as well.

Just -- Mr. Freiberg testified earlier about the long and profoundly disturbing history of the real estate industry affirmatively promoting discrimination and exclusion as a matter of official policy and practice.

Are you familiar with that history?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I think the level

familiarity in this room probably varies 1 significantly. 2 I don't know where I am in that spectrum. 3 I certainly have a relatively deep awareness 4 of our industry's history. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 7 You testified that you are -- have been designated among the world's most ethical companies. 8 9 That's quite a designation. And you're, obviously, a major participant in 10 11 this industry. 12 Do you believe that NRT and your affiliates 13 an ethical obligation to affirmatively promote 14 inclusion beyond minimal standards set by federal, 15 state, and local fair-housing laws? 16 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yes. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 18 And -- so that obligation would go beyond 19 being neutral with respect to race and ethnicity and 20 other protected classes, but, you know, 21 affirmatively working to ensure that our communities 22 in places like Long Island and elsewhere are inclusive? 23 24 M. RYAN GORMAN: Yes, absolutely. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Is -- just -- you've testified for a while, and I do want to allow my colleagues to -- to ask questions.

Are there just any other activities or steps that you haven't mentioned, that you'd like to share, that are intended to promote that -- to comply with that ethical obligation?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, I think the -- one of the best ways to comply with the ethical obligation, is to ensure that our real estate agent sales force is diverse and reflective of the communities that they serve.

The vast majority of consumers today select their real estate agent based upon personal relationships, as opposed to, you know, overtly seeking them outside of their, sort of, you know, sphere of friends and family and recommendations.

So, one of the best ways to make sure that we're serving the full community is to make sure that we reflect the full community.

So that is where a great deal of our efforts are focused today, not just in our real estate sales, independent contractors, but also our employee population.

We have considerable work that has been done,

and will be done, on both fronts, to make sure that 1 we're making ourselves open and available to every 2 3 community, and overtly and proactively trying to be a partner with communities, especially, that we 4 think have been underserved to date. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, so thank you. 7 And I'm going to -- yeah, I'm going to -- I'm going to first defer to my colleague 8 Senator Skoufis, and I know we'll have other

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

senators with questions as well.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And thank you for your appearance this afternoon.

My first question: Did you or anyone you know within NRT direct or advise your real estate agents to not appear at this hearing today?

M. RYAN GORMAN: No.

To not appear today, no.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Would you describe the discrimination revealed in the "Newsday" investigation as systematic?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Based upon the percentages of the story, it certainly would appear to be pervasive, based upon the testing.

I don't know the definition necessarily of "systematic," but it certainly seems to be severely problematic, deeply concerning, and requiring urgency of action.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Just to dig into that a little bit further, you know, unless one believes that 49 percent of people -- or, real estate agents, are racist or have unconscious bias, surely, this must be systematic, because that is the percentage of real estate agents here on Long Island in the "Newsday" exposé that discriminated against African-Americans.

And so can you speak to how in the world

49 percent of real estate agents have taken

discriminatory actions against African-Americans
here on Long Island?

Clearly, this must be systematic.

How did it get to that level here on Long Island?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, I can't speak to necessarily the percentages.

I can speak to what action we think needs to be taken from here.

This morning, for me, frankly, was, I spent listening, and learning, to some of the best

practices that are recommended by professionals who spent their careers focused on this matter.

And it seems likes there's a lot of work for many to do.

We as a company are certainly focused on taking action and raising, not just awareness, but understanding, of not just the law, but the spirit behind the law, and especially focusing on things like unconscious bias and the implications of actions.

So that's where we'll be focusing our training efforts, our requirements, as we move forward, and our actions.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I appreciate your focus on being prospective, and I think that's certainly an important element of this, for not only the industry and your company and affiliates, but, certainly, here in the Legislature as well.

But I do think it is important to reflect upon how this is happening and how this happened.

So I don't want to move on from this just quite yet.

Do you believe that real estate agents, among themselves, communicate about avoiding the word "steering" and using this language instead?

Do you believe that even directives come down from executives, or, you know, higher-ups, management, to their real estate agents, Here's how you avoid fair-housing laws?

To reach 49 percent discriminatory -49 percent of real estate agents discriminating
against African-Americans here on Long Island,
clearly, you know, this is not a coincidence -right? -- where half of agents are doing,
effectively, the same exact thing.

Do you believe these practices are shared amongst one another, or are directed to agents?

Can you speak to that?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So the portion of your question related to, for instance, directives, I believe I can speak to at least for our organization.

So, I have no awareness of ever, ever, any directive of that nature occurring.

And, certainly, if it did, we would treat it with the gravest of seriousness and take significant action.

While we are one player, we are a large player.

I don't know that that's reflective of the

larger population, but it's certainly reflective of us as a company.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you believe that, at the agent level, these practices are shared amongst one another?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I honestly can't -- can't -- can't speak to it.

I think fair-housing training takes place.

And as part of the story, there was an examination of the efficacy of fair-housing training, which appeared lacking, and in need of considerable attention.

But I can't speak to what, you know, beyond that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Is it fair to say that, given that nearly half of agents discriminated in the "Newsday" exposé, that it's not a coincidence that this many agents are discriminating?

That they're all, effectively, exhibiting some shared practices here, this is not a coincidence?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, it's certainly fair to say that this requires action.

And if it were not pervasive, or were not concerning, it wouldn't require action.

1 So, I think it's very fair to say that this requires action beyond pinpoint action; but, rather, 2 pervasive, probably, relatively sweeping, action. 3 We as a company will certainly be looking 4 5 into what we require broadly, not just in New York, but across the entire country, as we move forward. 6 7 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you believe that NRT and, quite frankly, the industry, owes an apology to 8 people of color here on Long Island? 9 M. RYAN GORMAN: I honestly don't know what 10 11 is owed. 12 I can say what I personally will give, which 13 is the deepest apology for not having done more. 14 And the best apology I think I can give is 15 doing more, and that's exactly what we're committed 16 to doing. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I think Senator Thomas has 18 19 some questions. 20 SENATOR THOMAS: I just have one question. 21 We had panels prior to this. You probably 22 heard their testimony. 23 They talked about needing testing of 24 real estate agents.

Do you agree or disagree with that?

SENATOR THO

SENATOR THOMAS: But in your opinion, do you

M. RYAN GORMAN: I believe any action that would prove to be effective in progressing the spirit and mission of the Fair Housing Act is something that should absolutely be considered.

If the assumption is that, that testing is an effective means of doing so, which I realize was somewhat debated this morning, but, if it was viewed as effective, then we would fully support effective measures to progress the mission of the Fair Housing Act.

SENATOR THOMAS: Do you believe that state agencies have not done enough to stop the discrimination and segregation of localities?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I think what was uncovered in the "Newsday" investigation was severely disappointing.

Who is specifically to blame, or what group and groups are to blame for that, I can't say.

I can say that it would appear, from the testimony earlier of experts, far more expert than I am in terms of fair housing, they appear to have a strong belief that it requires State action to really get the kind of outcomes that I think we all seek.

believe that state agencies have failed communities 1 when it comes to this? 2 M. RYAN GORMAN: I believe the "Newsday" 3 investigation demonstrated that we as a society have 4 failed. 5 I personally don't know which components of 6 7 those. I can say we, as a company, will do more, for 8 sure. And we'll certainly support the State in 9 exploring what more the State should -- should and 10 11 could do. SENATOR THOMAS: All right. Thank you. 12 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Kaplan. 14 SENATOR KAPLAN: Thank you. So, first of all, I want to thank everyone 15 16 here for their testimony today.

As it's mentioned, it is a big problem, and there's no single way to solve this. So we really have to look at this in many different ways, and all different, really, stakeholders to take action on this.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You talked about, a little bit, that your affiliates and your agents come -- when they come on board, they sign a pledge; a fair housing pledge.

How about, possibly, would you consider,

adding a new policy that they would sign this pledge every year?

Because just signing it once when they come on board, and then it goes on file, and just stored away somewhere, maybe is not enough. But possibly doing this every year brings a certain amount of reminder how important this commitment is, and bring more awareness.

M. RYAN GORMAN: It's certainly one of the things that we'll be considering.

So what we want is a really effective outcome in raising not just awareness, but understanding.

Awareness may, in fact, even be high, but understanding an action may still be lacking.

And so we'll be exploring additional training requirements, additional attestation requirements, as part of that.

What specifically we'll land on, I cannot say, but it's certainly part of that exploration.

SENATOR KAPLAN: And you talk about that they have to go through this training every two years.

Possibly, maybe, if it's a three-hour training, maybe this could be down a yearly basis again.

Something that could --

M. RYAN GORMAN: It's possible.

I think the -- I think it's a very healthy debate about what should be required of licensees, and over what time period, as well as, in that portfolio of requirements, what weight fair housing should have, as well as, some of the components of fair housing are mentioned by some of the earlier -- the earlier witnesses providing testimony, that it may be not just awareness of law, but, really, the underlying, you know, spirit behind the law, the biases, the unconscious biases, and stereotypes.

SENATOR KAPLAN: Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Kaminsky.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Thank you.

So we're being tough, and are going to continue to be tough, on you today.

But it's shameful that you are the only person who showed up out of the myriad companies and agents that were requested to be here today.

And in a moment Chairman Skoufis is going to opine on that.

But, for now, I just want to state for the record, that it's completely shameful that, at a table of, you know, a number of seats that are empty, you're sitting there with no one surrounding

1 you.

No one bothered to come.

Everyone, obviously, thought it was their duty to either look out for themselves or to ignore this completely, and that is just unacceptable.

That being said, my understanding is that, we are not the only body asking questions, and there are other enforcement agencies that are investigating this as well.

Is that your understanding?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So right now I'm aware of the attorney general, as well as the Long Island Board of Realtors.

If there are others, I'm not yet aware of those.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. And have you received subpoenas or search warrants from the attorney general's office?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I know we've received communication from the attorney general's office.

What specifically that communication included, I'm -- I'm not certain.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay, but you haven't, for example, seen agents with, like, raid jackets, pulling computers out of your office?

1 M. RYAN GORMAN: I have not; I have not seen 2 that, no. SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: You would have noticed 4 5 that. 6 M. RYAN GORMAN: I probably would have 7 noticed that, yes. 8 [Laughter.] 9 SENATOR KAMINSKY: And is it your intention, or is it your current position, to be complying or 10 11 cooperating with the attorney general's 12 investigation? 13 M. RYAN GORMAN: Absolutely. We have every 14 intention of cooperating, to the extent that we can, 15 with all of the work that's being done on this 16 front. 17 And that's inclusive of third-party 18 organizations that are just working to improve the 19 outcomes in general. 20 SENATOR KAMINSKY: What does that mean? 21 M. RYAN GORMAN: So, for instance, there's 22 a -- there are other groups, including industry 23 trade groups, that we work with, who are taking this 24 as an opportunity to shine a light on a problem that

25

needs attention.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: What is -- what are the communications from your office to your employees about how to deal with investigators?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Any investigation that came in would likely be leveled up to our -- likely our legal team, for guidance on how and who should respond.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: And is your legal team telling the attorney general's office not to interview employees without their attorneys present?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I'm not certain the attorney general's office has asked questions to which that would even be a viable answer.

So I don't know.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: And are you providing attorneys for -- private attorneys for clients; like, are you funding their defense?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So any -- any employee or independent contractor associated with our company is entitled to defense, depending upon the reason for the inquiry.

As you can imagine, there are things that live outside of that entitlement, depending upon the actions that the individuals took.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Let me ask you about your

reaction to the videos we saw today, and the evidence, overall, documented in the "Newsday" story.

What was -- what was your reaction?

Were you appalled? shocked? stunned? -- any
of those things?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I'm here today because

I believe that the "Newsday" story shone a light on
serious, serious, issues that we have, that are not,
to the early discussion, individual in nature, but
are larger and more pervasive, and require more
serious action.

We as a company, regardless of this hearing or other procedures, would be taking action based upon merely what we learned in the "Newsday" story.

But certainly, now, this gives us an opportunity to hear from other experts, and partner with other organizations who can lift up best practices, of which, perhaps, I wasn't aware, that we can then implement not just locally, but nationally.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. And the compensation structure for the agents, like the agents we saw in the video, is based on, I assume, some form of, "the more you sell, the better you

do"?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So an individual agent is compensated -- an individual independent-contractor sales associate, typically --

I can speak to our organization, and this is a good proxy for the industry.

-- on a per-transaction basis.

That transaction closes.

The consumers involved in the transaction paid a commission.

That commission is paid to a real estate brokerage. And then that commission is split or shared between the real estate agent, who typically receives the majority of that commission, and the real estate brokerage.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: So that's a long way of saying "yes"?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, your question was, I think, more about the progressive nature of it.

It's a transaction-by-transaction basis.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. But if you're an agent who has more transactions, you're -- you're -- you're --

M. RYAN GORMAN: Oh, certainly --

SENATOR KAMINSKY: -- a more lucrative pay?

M. RYAN GORMAN: -- yes. All compensation is per transaction.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: And is there any compensation -- is there any measure of compensation, without your company, for agents who either act more ethically than other agents, or work toward more inclusive practices, or anything other than raw sales factored into it?

M. RYAN GORMAN: No. The independent-contractor relationship with the sales associate, we honor that in all its many forms.

In other words, the compensation is clear:

It's based upon their work, and we have supervisory obligations. But it is their work.

And so when they -- when they conduct their business and close the transaction, they're entitled to the compensation that was in the original agreement with them.

There's not other forms of, sort of, to your point, the valuation, or more subjective analysis, that would adjust their compensation.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Does your company have like corporate good-citizen requirements, like, doing things in the community? Showing up to -- you know, I know sometimes you'll see a whole

community -- a whole company wearing the same 1 T-shirts, cleaning up a given area. 2 They must have --3 M. RYAN GORMAN: Sure. 4 5 SENATOR KAMINSKY: -- some type of thing they 6 need to check the box on. 7 Like, where do you go? M. RYAN GORMAN: Oh, well, we certainly have 8 no "check the box," we have no requirement. 9 We are extensively involved in our 10 11 communities. 12 I think, most likely, many of you have seen 13 us in your communities. 14 So the very practice of real estate is all 15 about communities. And so it's a large part of 16 [indiscernible cross-talking] --17 SENATOR KAMINSKY: Well, I think we see today it's all about some communities. 18 19 M. RYAN GORMAN: So -- you know, 20 unfortunately, we are examining some unfortunate 21 elements of the work. 22 But there is a lot of work, that, hopefully, 23 all of you have taken advantage of at some point in 24 time, that our real estate agents do in building

their communities, shaping their communities.

Well outside of the work that they do, they're typically involved in community organizations, community work, philanthropic and voluntary work, throughout the world.

It's something we support very strongly.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay. Can we have a commitment to you today, that those who engage in these discriminatory processes will be held accountable, and that you will have a way, going forward, to ensure compliance with best ethical practices, going forward?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So we stand firmly on the side of ethics, firmly on the side of compliance; we always have.

What is true today, after reviewing some of the "Newsday" stories and videos, that we can, should, and will do more, very specifically, and very soon.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Hey, look, in all fairness, before I conclude, I think I would say -- I would underscore that a lot more than you have in a calm, cool fashion.

But, clearly, there's a lot going on in your company that you guys have no idea about, that is extremely troubling, and that is obviously occurring

far more than the random examples that happen to be test and documented.

So I would urge you guys to turn everything

So I would urge you guys to turn everything upside down to try to get this thing in order.

M. RYAN GORMAN: Absolutely, it's an opportunity for us to improve dramatically as a company and industry.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Kaminsky.

Senator Liu.

SENATOR LIU: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank Senator Kaminsky for being kind and generous, which he is not always kind and generous.

You should hear him behind closed doors.

And you may actually still have the chance to do so.

But, you know, I -- earlier, I think you said, you know, you weren't sure if it was systematic, but certainly be -- it certainly seems to be a pervasive problem, as opposed to an isolated incident, or a couple of isolated incidents.

I mean, I imagine that the videos you saw probably made you cringe a little bit, even though

you were kind of cool on the exterior? 1 Inside you were, like, cringing, trying to 2 hide somewhere? 3 It was embarrassing. 4 Right? 5 6 I certainly would be embarrassed if I was the 7 president and chief executive officer, and I saw my employees conduct themselves this way. 8 9 M. RYAN GORMAN: As an individual, and as an industry, this is embarrassing, and requires, 10 11 obviously, urgent action. 12 SENATOR LIU: And so these -- these 13 individuals, they are facing sanctions; legal 14 sanctions? other sanctions by your company?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So I can't speak to individual --

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR LIU: I know, I know, you're taking the Fifth on pretty much everything.

However, my question is, like:

You say -- say one of these -- these agents has -- has been doing this for a long time. Over the years, even the last few years, they've generated a number of sales. You know, they probably get half their commiss -- half of the commission, and the company gets half the

commission.

So if this person gets fired by your company or faces other legal sanctions, you know, what kind of penalties will your company face?

Because you've already taken at least tens of thousands of dollars of commissions generated by that person who is guilty of this wrongdoing.

Does the company face any kind of penalty?

M. RYAN GORMAN: If you could clarify the question, penalty of what nature?

SENATOR LIU: Okay, well, I mean, I -I think that your company will fire some of these
employees.

That's just me. I don't have to take the Fifth here.

But I think that's what -- I think that's what you will probably have to do, even just to cover yourselves.

But say that employee is fired.

They've already generated huge amounts of commissions based on these, to put it kindly, unsavory practices.

What consequence is there to NRT once this person is fired, other than you lose potential revenue from this agent that you probably could

replace with other agents?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So I can say a decision related to an independent-contractor sales associate, continuing to be affiliated with our company, when I'm evaluating, for instance, an

Is there any consequence to the company?

ethical issue under the broad category of "ethical issue," I do not take into account the productivity of that individual agent.

We take into account the actions that were taken, and whether or not we need to take actions as a result.

SENATOR LIU: I mean -- all right.

Well, you know what?

To be fair to you, Mr. Gorman, you said earlier that this is a problem that is not -- really, not just the fault of your company, but society as a whole.

We have failed on a number of fronts, including government, including state government, I'll be very frank with that.

Which is why our Chairs have convened this hearing.

We feel some responsibility to take action. Since we're legislators, we feel responsibility to

take some kind of legislative action. Perhaps, strengthen the law to prevent this kind of thing from happening. Perhaps, increased penalties on companies such as NRT.

Because as I -- as I'm listening to all this stuff, and reading the report, it doesn't seem like NRT faces any kind of consequence, other than having to fire employees.

The company has already reaped lots and lots of commission dollars from these said employees.

And all the company has to do, going forward, is fire these employees, but NRT doesn't really face any kind penalties whatsoever, as far as I can tell.

And so what that leads me to is that, you know, Senator Kaminsky was -- was kind to let you off the hook, allowing you to say that -- that, maybe, you know, the company didn't know of these practices.

Unfortunately, sir, I'm not that generous.

I think NRT has been fully aware of all these practices, and has, at best, been turning a blind eye to this, because, what consequence do you face when your employees do this?

If you -- if someone gets caught, which they have, the company just fires those employees, faces

no other consequence.

Maybe some reputational risk.

But because you have such a large market share, it doesn't really do that much in terms of, finding new customers, finding new homebuyers and sellers.

So I think that this is a much more pervasive problem.

And -- and -- and the company, you know,

I don't want to personalize this, Mr. Gorman, but

I -- I have no doubt that executives at NRT are

aware of what's happening, and turned a blind eye.

And I think that, legislatively,
Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Chairman,
we need to take some action. We need some
penalties. We need some kind of consequence that
will dissuade this kind of activity from happening
in the first place.

And executives, such as yourself -- and

I don't mean to personalize this -- such as

yourself, you need to face some kind of reality as

to what's happening. You cannot -- the penalty

cannot only be limited to, embarrassment, or some

minor reputational risk.

There has to be some real penalty.

1 And -- and the last point I'll -- I'll --I'll make, since it's not really a question, is: 2 You know, according to the letter that you 3 responded to, to the Senate invitation with, it does 4 appear that you're here on behalf of all the people 5 6 who work for you. We sent invitations to many of the people 7 affiliated with NRT, to testify, to tell us what's 8 9 happening. 10 Maybe -- maybe they didn't really know what 11 was happening. 12 But you're here, basically, in lieu of all of 13 them. I think those were your own words. 14 Your testimony "will be in lieu of multiple 15 company employees appearing to testify." 16 So you're here to take the Fifth, 17 collectively, on their behalf. 18 And that's why you're in the hot seat, and you're going to continue to be in the hot seat, and 19 20 we're going to need to take some legislative action. 21 That is my opinion. 22 Thank you. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Liu. 24 M. RYAN GORMAN: I appreciate your comments.

25

May I?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes.

M. RYAN GORMAN: So for clarification purposes, I want to make sure that we're on the same page.

I am appearing in lieu of the employees that were noted.

The independent-contractor sales associates, which I believe was part of the question, I am not here in lieu of anyone else, or anyone else in the industry, or franchisees; but, rather, our employees.

I was not asked to appear.

Some of our other employees, who report up through the organization to me, were asked to appear.

I decided to appear.

So just a clarification on that.

I appreciate your hesitancy to make it personal, but I also appreciate that this issue is, in fact, personal.

It's deeply personal for those who are negatively impacted by it, and they're taking it personally, as they should, and we all should, for sure.

What more needs to be done?

I completely agree, vastly more needs to be done.

I will say, on the record, and under oath, definitely, I, and to my knowledge, we, were not aware of practices of this nature, which I understand, it may not be in comporting with your perspective.

But I can say that, had these been raised differently, or earlier, we would have taken action then, and it's action that we will be taking now.

SENATOR LIU: So something that happens pervasively within your company, you have no idea about?

M. RYAN GORMAN: So this particular issue that's highlighted, that does appear in the "Newsday" reporting to have been pervasive, is not unknown to the industry; however, the practices that we have undertaken to try and ensure that we are leading the industry in compliance with not just the letter, but the spirit of the law, do appear to have failed to be effective.

And that is something that I realized from this reporting.

SENATOR LIU: So you're prob -- you're aware this probably happens in the rest of the industry,

1 but not in your company? M. RYAN GORMAN: We certainly take action to 2 3 ensure that we're leading. We are a large company. That means we can have a significant impact on the 4 industry. 5 6 And that's what we intend to do. 7 SENATOR LIU: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 8 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Liu. 10 Just for the record, I'll stipulate that 11 Senator Kaminsky is not overly generous or nice 12 person. 13 SENATOR KAMINSKY: I appreciate that. 14 Next up, Senator Gaughran. 15 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 Some perspective buyers walk into a real 17 estate office, one that's -- that, you know, your organization is affiliated to. 18 19 So I presume buyers may have some 20 preconceived notion that they would express of, you 21 know, what they're looking for in terms of a house, 22 size, et cetera. 23 Somebody comes in from out of town.

Are there any standard practices in terms of

questions that an agent would ask a buyer?

24

Like, I presume you would ask them size of a 1 2 house, something about property? M. RYAN GORMAN: Yeah, so every agent will 3 have their practice, but there are many checklists, 4 for lack of a better term, that an agent might walk 5 6 through with a prospective buyer. 7 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: So what would some of the things that would be on a checklist? 8 9 Size of property? Number of bedrooms? M. RYAN GORMAN: Yeah, for most part, trying 10 11 to get a sense of the consumer. 12 So their -- their timeline. 13 The reason for their desire to move. 14 The reason for their contact with this agent 15 in this particular area. 16 What their knowledge is of the area, if they have friends or family in the area, that may help 17 the agent to have a better understanding of what 18 19 level of knowledge, you know, they're dealing with. 20 What type of home they want to buy; type in 21 all nature. 22 So, you know, single-family detached. What 23 type of architecture may be important to them. Bedrooms, bathrooms. 24

Family needs. The -- how those needs may

change over the near term.

How long they wish to stay in the property; whether they're viewing this as a potential investment property that would need rental income in the future, or an owner-occupied property.

I mean, I could go on, but those are the -those are some of the key questions that may be
asked.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Would be -- would school district be one of the questions on that checklist?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, certainly, school districts are often extremely important to, you know, parents. And so that's high on the mind of lots of consumers, sure.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: So a question might be asked: What school district -- do you have a school district in mind that you would like your family to live in?

M. RYAN GORMAN: I think it's a very common thing put forth by consumers, and a very common question that agents may ask if they're not certain what the criteria is that the consumer is looking for.

Typically, consumers will have, if they're familiar with the area, towns in mind, potentially

school districts in mind. Sometimes those overlap 1 and sometimes they don't. So, oftentimes, agents 2 will be directing consumers to resources where they 3 can learn more about school districts. 4 5 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Would it be possible to present some of these checklists to this Committee? 6 7 M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, those checklists are individual agent checklists. 8 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Sure. 9 M. RYAN GORMAN: There could be 10 11 [indiscernible cross-talking] examples. SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Perhaps you could reach 12 13 out? 14 I would presume that there's a standard 15 checklist that one, you know, brokerage firm might 16 use? 17 M. RYAN GORMAN: So, to my knowledge, we do not have one standard checklist. 18 19 Our agents have -- have many. And there's 20 lots available online. [Indiscernible 21 cross-talking] --22 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: So maybe we could get 23 samples of them from some of your --24 M. RYAN GORMAN: Possibly. 25 We can follow up.

I truly don't know that we have a standard.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: And once an agent takes in all that information, what do they do with it?

Do they run it through a program to come up with possible homes?

M. RYAN GORMAN: It's relatively idiosyncratic, and person-specific, how an individual agent will work with a consumer.

So, for instance, some consumers want to begin looking right away, but they're comfortable doing so online.

Others don't want to decide on what next step to take until they gain a very -- a more physical familiarity with an area. So they might get in a car with an agent, to drive around and explore areas, or look at available properties to get a better sense of what the community may be.

So it really does differ considerably.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: But are there any particular sites, or software, or program, that an agent might use if somebody just comes in and has done, you know, no research ahead of time?

M. RYAN GORMAN: In order to educate consumer about --

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: In order to come up with a

specific list of listings to show them.

M. RYAN GORMAN: So most real estate agents in most areas will rely upon their MLS, or third-party tools that use MLS information, for existing available inventory, to then get some feedback from the consumer on what reactions are to different inventory that's available.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: And with that MLS, they can plug in all these criteria that they may have gotten off the checklist?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Many of those that we discussed, they cannot. Some they can, of course.

Even square footage, for instance, varies dramatically by area, as to whether or not it's a criteria that's available in an MLS or on an individual listing.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: What criteria could they not use?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Well, as an example, the size of the home, that does vary, through -- due to various litigation over time. And some areas, size of home is not something that is an MLS criteria any longer for active listings.

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: But school district is standard?

M. RYAN GORMAN: Most programs, for instance, consumer-facing websites, use third-party firms, that take the address of a home, and then match it up against third-party databases of school districts, in part, because school districts do change on occasion, and, in part, because the providers of those websites don't want to necessarily take liability for incorrect information being provided to a consumer. 

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Okay.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

So just one more question for me, and then I'm going to turn it back over to Senator Skoufis.

You testified that you are considering a very, sort of, proactive [no audio] enforcement, and investigation methods, within your company.

And we've had a lot of testimony today that additional enforcement and investigation is necessary, perhaps not just on Long Island, but statewide.

We are, as has been noted, going into a new legislative session, with a new state budget process.

And you and your industry are well

represented in Albany.

Would you support addition -- based on what you've seen in this investigation, and your knowledge of the industry and issue, additional efforts, additional resources, provided by the state government to ensure this kind of practice is properly investigated?

M. RYAN GORMAN: In general, yes,
I definitely would.

Specifically, what, we would be happy to, you know, provide feedback on any individual proposals.

But, any efforts that we think could be -"we," collectively, believe could be effective in
achieving the outcomes that were sort of promised by
the Fair Housing Act in the first place, we would
fully support.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Thank you.

Back to Senator Skoufis.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

And I don't have any -- I don't think any of us have any further questions for you.

I do just want to make a note, as a matter of fairness, that, certainly, while there are a number

of stakeholders within your company and your affiliates who were involved in the discrimination found by the "Newsday" exposé, I believe two of your affiliates were exonerated.

And I do just want to make that point for the public record.

But thank you very much for your attendance today.

M. RYAN GORMAN: Thank you.

Thank you all for the work you're doing.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Before we call up the next set of witnesses, again, as my -- as my colleagues noted, we want to thank Mr. Gorman for his testimony; equally, his compliance with our request to appear.

And so it's at this point I'd like to note that we issued requests for testimony to

35 real estate agents and 33 representatives from real estate companies that were involved with

"Newsday's" exposé.

With the exception of Mr. Gorman, the remaining 67 individuals either neglected to respond to our request or outright refused to provide testimony.

As is often the case, there is an easy way to

1 go about things, and there is a hard way. It's unfortunate that 67 of 68 individuals 2 3 chose the hard way. Following today's hearing, subpoenas will be 4 served to many of these 67 individuals in order to 5 6 compel future testimony. We look forward to their participation. 7 Thank you again. 8 9 Next up we'll call Richard Helling and Johnny Mae Alston, who were testers in the "Newsday" 10 11 investigation. 12 And I just want to confirm Lenora Smith is 13 not here. 14 If she is, she certainly should come up at 15 this time as well. 16 Thank you for your attendance. 17 Who would like to go first? 18 Do you have prepared testimony --19 RICHARD HELLING: [Inaudible.] 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- you'd like to share? 21 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: No. SENATOR SKOUFIS: No? 22 23 Okay. So then we'll jump right into questions, then. 24 25 Can you briefly explain how you became

involved in the "Newsday" effort? 1 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: I was -- I was notified 2 through an acting magazine. 3 When I first got it, they asked -- you know, 4 I -- I turned them down a couple of times. And then 5 I spoke with one of their representative [sic], 6 7 Bill. And we were -- we went through training -- he 8 told me what it was about, he told me to come and 9 check it out. 10 11 So I came and checked it out. 12 And they gave us a couple of days of 13 training. 14 And I thought it was a great idea. It was 15 sort of like my kind of work. 16 I'm a background actor, basically. 17 And, you know, it was just a new challenge, 18 and an exciting challenge for me. 19 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And you, sir? 20 RICHARD HELLING: Oh, for me it was, a friend 21 of my husband's was already involved with the

And so I met her at a party, and she talked with me about the project. And that's how I became involved.

22

23

24

25

project.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Very good.

Did either of you or both of you have any expectations to the scope of the discrimination that was ultimately found in "Newsday," heading into this effort?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: I had no idea what was out there.

You know, being an African-American, you always have in the back of your head, there's always somebody trying to get over on you all the time.

But I had -- I never even thought about this when I went into it.

You know, I'm, like, you know -- you know, you think that there's nothing out there, but, we'll test it and see.

But I didn't think anything of it, to be quite honest with you.

RICHARD HELLING: And I'm relatively new to Long Island, so I really didn't know Long Island. So, yeah, I had no expectations.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

There came a point, eventually, where the -the results of your pairing were made apparent to
you. Is that correct?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes.

1 RICHARD HELLING: That's right.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And can you describe, briefly, your feelings when you were told what happened with those you were paired with?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: When I was told what -- what happened, I didn't know until we actually did the taping.

And even though I know in the back of my head that I'm always going to be discriminated against in some way, I really didn't think about it, because, when I went to these places, these people were absolutely wonderful.

We were actors, but they were better actors, you know.

And I didn't feel at all that I had been discriminated against, except for, like, one person that I had went to, that really, like, said to me, Oh, no, no, no, no, and shooed me away.

That was the only one out of all the tests I did that I felt like, you know, she's kind of crabby.

And -- but, otherwise, I would have never known. I thought I was treated very well.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And you, sir?

RICHARD HELLING: Yeah, I was shocked when

I saw the footage, and that was the first I really 1 had an inkling of the scope of what the problem was. 2 There were a few times on the individual 3 tests that I heard sort of inappropriate comments. 4 5 But, without knowing what was happening to my 6 counterpart tester, I had no idea of how they were 7 being treated. SENATOR SKOUFIS: And this question is 8 primarily for Miss Alston. 9 So you were clearly surprised, and you were 10 11 both surprised, when you were told what had 12 happened. 13 What were the rest of your feelings like? 14 Did you feel betrayed? 15 Certainly, I suspect you were personally 16 hurt. JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: I was very hurt. 17 I was very hurt. 18 19 You know, it's, like, in life, things go 20 around in a circle, and you think that everything is 21

so good and so great, things have changed.

But in reality, it just goes around in a circle and come back to where you started off in the beginning.

I was very hurt.

22

23

24

1 It like hurts you to your heart, because, you're a human being, and everybody should be 2 3 treated the same. And I felt that I wasn't treated the same. 4 I was -- I was -- I was treated differently because 5 6 of the color of my skin, which I thought is so -- is 7 so unfair, because there's so much potential in 8 everybody. And it's, like, one thing I had -- one job, 9 I had \$500,000 to put down. 10 11 It didn't matter, didn't care, about what --12 how much money I had to put down. 13 So that, to me, that was no issue at all. 14 She was just looking at the color of my skin. 15 She wasn't looking at nothing else. 16 Once I walked in the door, that's all the person saw, was the color of my skin. 17 18 They didn't see me. 19 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you for sharing that. 20 One of the tests that you were involved with 21 was a real estate agent by the name is 22 Anne Marie Queally Bechand. 23 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: That's the one. 24 SENATOR SKOUFIS: She's with

Signature Premier Properties in Cold Spring Harbor.

```
1
               I'd like to play you a clip, which I'm sure
 2
        you've seen, showing a conversation between this
 3
        agent and Cindy Perry.
               Ms. Perry is White.
 4
 5
               So if you could please play Clip Number 32.
 6
               Sorry, one second.
 7
               This is right, yep, yep.
 8
               JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: No.
 9
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: It's Clip 30.
10
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: 30.
11
               JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: That's not Cindy.
12
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Excuse me --
13
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: This is 32.
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: -- this is 32?
14
15
               Play 32. My apologies.
16
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: This is 30.
17
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Are we playing 30, or
        32?
18
19
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: You're playing 32.
20
        Му --
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Okay, okay.
21
               [Start of Video Clip 32.]
22
23
               THE AGENT: Just because we want to be on the
24
        ground here, is to start in this area, and fan our
25
        way out.
```

THE TESTER: I'll let you [indiscernible] --1 2 THE AGENT: Okay, so then --THE TESTER: -- [indiscernible] --3 THE AGENT: -- what I'll do is, I'm going to 4 5 be sending you, obviously, an email, some houses to 6 look at. [Indiscernible] have photos. 7 I also, with that, send a map of where they 8 are. 9 THE TESTER: Uh-huh. THE AGENT: So you'll get e-mails that, when 10 11 you open it up, it will have a map up front, with 12 all the little numbered houses, and then the 13 listings below it, with the details on the house and 14 the photos on it. 15 THE TESTER: Okay. 16 THE AGENT: It's something -- that's why 17 photos are so important on listings. 18 If something strikes you, or you're just a 19 little bit curious, or you're not sure, we make an 20 appointment. You tell me what you want. 21 THE TESTER: Okay. 22 THE AGENT: And then the -- again, the 23 benefit of working with an agent, is you're not 24 going to [indiscernible] houses. You're actually

saying, okay, I'm available on Wednesday afternoon,

starting at twelve. And then I just -- and I -- you 1 know, you decide, we want to see five on in a day, 2 we want to six in a day. Maybe [indiscernible] more 3 that in a day. Maybe not. 4 And then [indiscernible cross-talking] --5 6 THE TESTER: How long, from your experience, does it take to --7 [End of Video Clip 32.] 8 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Can you also play 33? [Start of Video Clip 33.] 10 11 THE AGENT: How many times [skip in video.] 12 You want to know about the taxes, and you 13 want to go over the closing costs with him. 14 THE TESTER: Right, yeah. 15 THE AGENT: How many times have you spoken to 16 Richard? 17 THE TESTER: Just once. THE AGENT: Oh, good. Okay, because all of 18 that [indiscernible] next conversation will 19 20 definitely be covered. 21 THE TESTER: Yeah, yeah, no, they just 22 mentioned it [indiscernible cross-talking], started the process. [Indiscernible.] 23 24 THE AGENT: Okay, so they will, next time you 25 speak to them.

```
1
               THE TESTER: Uh-huh.
 2
               THE AGENT: Let's see.
 3
               I'm giving you this. This is just your
        [indiscernible.]
 4
               THE TESTER: [Indiscernible.]
5
6
               THE AGENT: And take these, because there's
7
        my number on it, so you'll always have it with you.
8
               THE TESTER: Okay.
9
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible.]
10
               THE TESTER: Oh, that's so cool.
11
               THE AGENT: Isn't it, though? I know.
12
               THE TESTER: Yeah, that's so cool.
13
               THE AGENT: I love my pen.
14
               And, like I said, I'll send out an
15
        introductory e-mail to you, so you have my
16
        information in your phone. And then I'll put some
17
        listings together and send them to you as well.
               THE TESTER: [Indiscernible.]
18
19
               THE AGENT: If you're ready this week, we'll
20
        go out later this week.
21
               If you want to wait and start fresh next
        week, then we'll do that.
22
23
               THE TESTER: Oh, okay. Yeah, sure.
24
               THE AGENT: You let me know.
25
               THE TESTER: Uh-huh.
```

THE AGENT: If I have something, as you know, 1 I'll tell you I have something. 2 [End of Video Clip 33.] 3 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 4 I know the audio is a little bit foggy, but 5 6 do you know how long the real estate agent there and 7 the potential client spoke for? JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: That wasn't Anne Marie. 8 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: That was the clip 9 [indiscernible] --10 11 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: That wasn't Anne Marie. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, I'm getting some 12 13 conflicting information here. 14 Regardless, the conversation that took place 15 with the real estate agent I described, do you know 16 how long that conversation took place with, with the White tester? 17 18 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: No. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Over an hour. 19 20 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Oh. 21 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And as you probably know, 22 she was not asked to provide a pre-certification 23 letter -- a mortgage pre-certification letter. 24 And I want to, hopefully, put up the clips of 25 you speaking with the real estate agent, Marie.

```
Clip 30.
 1
                  [Start of Video Clip 30.]
 2
               THE AGENT: So it's just you and your
 3
        husband?
 4
               THE TESTER: Yes.
 5
               THE AGENT: How many bathrooms?
 6
 7
               THE TESTER: It doesn't matter.
               THE AGENT: Okay. So at least one and a
 8
        half?
 9
10
               THE TESTER: Anything.
11
               I don't know. We've never looked at houses
12
        before.
13
               THE AGENT: Okay.
14
               Are you pre-qualified? [Indiscernible] --
15
               THE TESTER: My husband is working with
16
        somebody in the bank.
17
               THE AGENT: Which bank?
               THE TESTER: I am not sure.
18
19
               He's taking care of that. And then he had to
20
        go out of town to do a training.
21
               So, I don't know about that.
22
               I have to get to him about that, because I've
23
        been running like a dog.
               THE AGENT: I know.
24
25
               So I really need that. I won't take out
```

```
anyone unless you have a pre-qualification letter.
 1
               THE TESTER: So that means [indiscernible] --
 2
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible] pre-qualify for a
 3
 4
        mortgage.
               THE TESTER: Oh. So that means I can't go
 5
 6
        out to see anything --
 7
               THE AGENT: I won't -- I won't do it.
               You can try another person, but I don't have
 8
        the time to do that --
 9
10
               THE TESTER: Uh-huh.
11
               THE AGENT: -- because I need to know that
12
        you're serious.
13
               THE TESTER: Uh-huh.
14
               THE AGENT: I really need a pre-qualification
15
        letter.
16
               It also shows on that your price range.
17
               THE TESTER: Yeah, my price range is, like,
        $500,000.
18
19
               THE AGENT: Okay.
20
               So -- but I need to have the bank say, yes,
21
        that's your price range.
22
               THE TESTER: Okay.
23
               THE AGENT: You may think it's fast.
24
               Maybe it's a little more, maybe it's a little
25
        less. But if we're at that range that the letter
```

says, then I know we're full steam ahead. 1 THE TESTER: Oh, okay. 2 THE AGENT: That's why -- that's why it's 3 really important. 4 Also, what's great about that, it tells you 5 6 how much in taxes you can afford. 7 THE TESTER: Uh-huh. [End of Video Clip 30.] 8 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: If you couldn't hear, the agent says, "So I really need that," meaning, a 10 11 pre -- a mortgage pre-certification --12 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. 13 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- letter. 14 "I won't take out anyone unless you have a 15 pre-qualification letter. So I need to know that 16 you're pre-qualified for a mortgage." 17 And then you note, "I didn't realize I needed 18 that, " effectively. 19 And the agent replies, "I won't -- I won't do 20 it. You can try another person, " and she goes on 21 for a little bit after that. 22 I'd like to now play the final clip here, 23 which is Clip Number 31. 24 [Start of Video Clip 31.] 25 THE AGENT: And then as soon as you get that

```
pre-qualification, that would be wonderful.
 1
 2
               THE TESTER: Okay.
               THE AGENT: And here is this [indiscernible].
 3
               THE TESTER: Oh, okay, you have a brochure.
 4
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible.] Here's our
 5
 6
        contracts.
 7
               THE TESTER: Okay.
               THE AGENT: And, that's it.
 8
 9
               THE TESTER: How do you say your last name?
10
               THE AGENT: Bechand.
11
               THE TESTER: Bechand?
12
               THE AGENT: Yeah.
13
               THE TESTER: And how do you spell your middle
14
        name?
15
               THE AGENT: Anne Marie Queally.
16
               THE TESTER: Bechand?
17
               THE AGENT: Yeah.
               THE TESTER: Okay.
18
19
               What is that, is that French?
20
               THE AGENT: Yeah. [Indiscernible.]
21
               THE TESTER: Okay. All right.
22
               Okay. Thank you so much, Anne, for your
23
        time.
24
               THE AGENT: I'm so sorry for your running
25
        around.
```

1 THE TESTER: Oh, well, I made it here. [End of Video Clip 30.] 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: So there, again, she 3 requests a pre-qualification, a pre-certification. 4 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. 5 And also, before, she did ask me for 6 pre-qualification. And I told her that my husband 7 8 was working on it. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 9 10 What's your reaction to watching those clips 11 again? JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: She really didn't like 12 13 me at all. 14 She --15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Did you know that at the 16 time? 17 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: -- she -- you know what? She made me feel like she was annoyed. 18 19 She's the only one that made me feel like she 20 was annoyed, and that, you know, I would, like, come 21 in there without, you know, any pre-qualifications. 22 And, like, I don't know what I'm doing, so here's 23 what you have to do. You got to do this, this, and 24 this, but I really can't.

It's, like, there's no way that she was going

25

1 to take me out. You know, I just -- you feel it. 2 3 Sometimes you just know when somebody is, like, I'm not with you at all. 4 5 But she -- out of everyone, she made me feel 6 unworthy. 7 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Did you know at that time that you did not need a pre-qualification letter --8 9 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- to be able to see homes? 10 11 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. 12 SENATOR SKOUFIS: You did? 13 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And, so, did you realize 15 then that you were being discriminated against? 16 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: With her, yes, only 17 because of the way that she spoke, and her adamancy about, "I'm not taking you out." 18 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And --19 20 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: And even -- because 21 I had been out with other people before, even without it I [indiscernible] been out. 22 23 SENATOR SKOUFIS: If you weren't a tester, if

you weren't acting out a situation there, and that

was actually happening to you as a real prospective

24

25

homebuyer, would you have filed a complaint after being treated that way?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: No, I probably wouldn't have. I probably would have just went on to somebody else, and told everybody what a lousy person she was, because I wouldn't have known that I could do anything, or could tell anybody what happened. And I'm thinking that it's, just, it happens all the time to everybody --

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I think --

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: -- of color.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I think you've -- you've hit the point here, which is, that, yes, we know the discrimination is existing. And certainly now we're aware of the scope of that discrimination.

But equally as important, we cannot -- as was noted by a couple of the previous witnesses, we can't simply rely on complaints to drive a solution here.

Would you agree?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: You can't, because a lot of people just get fed up and they'll go someplace else.

And then, as I said, it's hard to get people to believe what you say without proof.

Without proof, you ain't got nothing, unless
you take a tape recorder and a video camera every
time you go, and say, Well, look at this.

And then you send one of your White friends

in and -- with the same scenario.

That's the only true way you're going to find out.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you recall how many agents each of you spoke with, met with?

RICHARD HELLING: Oh, I would say it was probably about 15, or so.

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: I would say about that many, also, yeah.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

And now knowing what you know, and seeing the results of this exposé, would you characterize this discrimination as systematic?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes.

RICHARD HELLING: Absolutely.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you believe that these practices are shared amongst real estate agents, where they talk with one another, hey, you know, this is the way I treat these kind of situations, these are how I handle these types of people, if you will?

Do you think that --1 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- those conversations 3 happen? 4 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes, yes. 5 6 RICHARD HELLING: I can't -- I can't speak to 7 what the --8 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: I think so. 9 RICHARD HELLING: -- real estate agents are 10 thinking. 11 SENATOR SKOUFIS: But, surely, I -- actually, 12 I shouldn't lead you. Do you believe that it's a coincidence that 13 14 49 percent of African-Americans were found to be 15 discriminated against, or do you think there --16 there is really something more there, and this is --17 this is truly systematic, and there are practices 18 that are shared amongst the people who are doing 19 this? 20 RICHARD HELLING: I think that it's 21 absolutely systematic. 22 But whether practices are intentionally 23 shared between realtors, that's -- you know, I don't 24 know. 25 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you feel that your

training was adequate?

2 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes.

RICHARD HELLING: Yes.

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: They did -- we did tests before we even went out on tests.

They questioned us about our scenarios that we had. They would quiz us before we went out.

And even with the testing that we had,

I think we had a great testing -- great training.

RICHARD HELLING: Yeah, and I think the question has came up earlier, too, about the rigor of the testing.

And I've been involved with research in the past. And I was very impressed at the professionalism and the quality that the journalists put into this project, so as to -- that we -- our role was to gather information. And -- and we did it in a very professional way.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

And not just for your presence here, but, more importantly, certainly, on being an instrumental component of bringing this all to light, you know, quite frankly, I would say the central component of bringing all this to light.

I now will turn it over to Senator Kaplan.

SENATOR KAPLAN: So I have a quick question to ask you.

You talked about, knowing what you know now, would you file that complaint?

And you said -- at the time, you said you wouldn't have filed it. You just moved on to the next person.

Can you give us, as someone who's gone through this process, any insight what we could do to actually inform people, like yourself, when they're going through this process, to actually take that step to report this?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: You know what? I think that, you know, there's always information out there.

Everything you do, there's plenty of information, but the problem is, where do you find it?

You know, everybody has this information.

And it's, like, now, since I've been in it and I've done a couple of jobs for a couple of other people, I would know where to go.

But prior to that, like, from today,

I wouldn't have known, because, since I've done it,

I know.

That's the only thing.

But I don't know if there's any way to make it better, besides putting out information so that people can see it and know about it. That's about it.

SENATOR KAPLAN: So you've gone through it now, and now you know where to look -- correct? -- at least ask the questions.

If you were -- someone asked you before, do you have any suggestion how we could actually reach out to all these people who really don't want to be bothered to -- and they don't know where to look?

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Well, I think every office is supposed to have a -- something up in their offices about discrimination.

So that -- that would help if you would see them in the offices when you go there, that you have a right, if you feel like you were discriminated against, blah blah blah.

A lot of people, they don't have the discrimination disclosure in their offices.

I think that would be a good one, but it's got to be so people can see it, because sometimes the things that are posted, it's not posted where people can see it.

It's either on a back wall over here, so if 1 anybody asks, they'll say, Oh, yeah, we have that 2 discrimination notice. 3 But, it's in the back room, so nobody gets to 4 5 see it. 6 SENATOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I think that 7 actually is very helpful. Maybe that's something we could look into, and have something that has to be 8 posted, that's really in plain view, and readable by 9 a lot of people who visit these offices. 10 11 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yeah, and not in tiny 12 print. 13 SENATOR KAPLAN: Right. 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Gaughran. 15 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Well, thank you both 16 for participating in something that looks like 17 it's going to be something very important for Long Island. 18 19 And appreciate your testimony. 20 Ms. Alston, question for you. 21 Did I hear you correctly that, with -- with 22 this agent that you were talking about, you 23 communicated that you had \$500,000 --

JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: To put down --

SENATOR GAUGHRAN: -- to put down?

24

25

1 Okay. 2 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: -- yes. 3 That was Anne Marie, yeah. SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Was there a price of a 4 home that was being discussed? 5 6 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: No, no, no. 7 I was telling her how much I had to put down. Like, usually you have money in your savings 8 or checking account. 9 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Right? 10 11 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: And then you have your 12 money, and you say, well, I can put down \$500,000. 13 So that -- that's just to give you a hint, 14 like, I do have money --15 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Right, I mean --16 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: -- you know, that I can 17 put down. SENATOR GAUGHRAN: -- 'cause -- 'cause 18 19 I think, even in today's real estate market, if 20 you're putting down \$500,000, for most homes on 21 Long Island, you're probably going to be able to buy 22 the house and qualify for a mortgage, because you're 23 putting so much of your money into it. 24 Just seemed -- that seems a real red flag to

25

me.

1 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: No, I got to change 2 that. \$100,000 down for a \$500,000 house. 3 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Oh, one hundred for 4 \$500,000? 5 6 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Yes. 7 SENATOR GAUGHRAN: Okay, okay. But thank you for what you did, what you both 8 did. 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Kavanagh. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, 12 Senator Skoufis. 13 So, Mr. Helling, I just want to go into a 14 particular -- one of the particular [indiscernible] 15 you had. 16 You were involved in a paired test, Test 17 Number 96, that was designated by "Newsday," 18 involving a real estate agent, Leanne Vicari [ph.][sic], then of Keller Williams 19 20 of Hauppauge. 21 As part of this test you were paired with 22 Kelvin Toon [ph.] who is African-American. 23 On November 18, 2016, Mr. Toon met with Agent Vicati [ph.], and I'd like to play the clip of 24 25 that, if we can.

```
It's Clip Number 96.
 1
                  [Start of Video Clip Number 96.]
 2
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible.]
 3
               THE TESTER: Hi, yes, my name is Kelvin Toon.
 4
        How you doing?
 5
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible]?
 6
               THE TESTER: Yes, [indiscernible].
 7
               THE AGENT: Hi, how are you?
 8
 9
               THE TESTER: Me and my wife are looking to
10
        purchase a home --
11
               THE AGENT: Okay.
12
               THE TESTER: -- in the Brooklyn area.
13
               THE AGENT: Okay.
14
               THE TESTER: Do you have a couple of minutes
15
        to talk to us?
16
               THE AGENT: Sure. Come on in.
17
               THE TESTER: Thank you.
               [Indiscernible] all those -- all those are
18
        agents that work for the company?
19
20
               THE AGENT: Yes.
21
               THE TESTER: She was told -- she thought she
        was that this was a big real estate agency. Is it
22
23
        [indiscernible] --
24
               THE AGENT: It is. Actually, the largest
25
        company in the world.
```

```
This is the only Suffolk office.
1
 2
               THE TESTER: Okay?
               THE AGENT: And we're actually -- I actually
 3
        just looked at the market share the other day.
 4
               THE TESTER: Uh-huh, yes?
 5
               THE AGENT: So out of 978 offices in
6
7
        Suffolk County, we're Number 14.
8
               THE TESTER: Wow.
                                  Okay.
9
               She said [indiscernible]. Well, I guess you
        [indiscernible] --
10
11
               THE AGENT: This is such a wonderful office.
12
               THE TESTER: She didn't send me on a wild
13
        goose chase?
               THE AGENT: No, she didn't.
14
15
               THE TESTER: Okay.
16
               THE AGENT: Come sit down.
17
               THE TESTER: Okay. Thank you.
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible.]
18
19
               THE TESTER: [Indiscernible.]
20
               THE AGENT: You live in Brentwood right now?
21
               THE TESTER: No, I live in New York.
               THE AGENT: Oh.
22
               THE TESTER: [Indiscernible.]
23
24
               THE AGENT: In the city?
25
               THE TESTER: In the city, yes,
```

```
[indiscernible].
 1
               THE AGENT: What brings you out here?
 2
               THE TESTER: Well, she's found a job.
 3
        [Indiscernible.] She works for -- at NYU,
 4
        [indiscernible].
 5
               THE AGENT: Oh, how nice.
 6
 7
               THE TESTER: And she's coming here to the
        Brentwood area to work.
 8
 9
               THE AGENT: But I have to tell you, my
        clients in Brentwood are the nicest clients.
10
11
               I always tell everybody that.
12
               Every time I get a new listing in Brentwood,
13
        or a new client, I get so excited because they're
14
        the nicest people.
15
               THE TESTER: [Indiscernible.]
16
               THE AGENT: [Indiscernible], I don't know
17
        why, [indiscernible] Brentwood is like my -- my
        favorite areas to work because people are so nice.
18
               THE TESTER: Oh, okay. This sounds good.
19
20
               THE AGENT: Yeah.
21
                  [End of Video Clip 96.]
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: So, just again, I think
22
23
        that because the sound quality in the room may vary,
24
        there was just one -- one -- this is from the
25
        transcript:
```

"I have to tell you my clients in Brentwood 1 2 are the nicest clients. I always tell everybody 3 that, every time I get a new listing in Brentwood, or a new client, I get so excited because they're 4 the nicest people." 5 6 So we have -- I'm just going to give you, 7 I guess this is Exhibit B of this hearing, but this is the text from a text message you received from 8 the same agent. 9 Would you mind just reading that? 10 11 RICHARD HELLING: Sure, sure. 12 And also, just to clarify, that the "Newsday" 13 team were handling all the text messages at this 14 point. 15 I wasn't the one who was handling that --16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Oh, I see. 17 You didn't receive it? You were -- you 18 were --19 RICHARD HELLING: -- no, no. 20 They were doing it on my behalf, as part of 21 the test. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Got you. 23 RICHARD HELLING: So... 24 "Remarks made to White tester, agent in a

25

text message:

"Hi, Dean. 1 "You may want to look into recent gang 2 killings in the Brentwood area online. 3 "As mentioned, please kindly do some research 4 5 for the gang-related events in that area, for 6 safety." 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So how do you interpret that message relative to what was given to the --8 the other tester in this pairing? 9 10 RICHARD HELLING: It's disgusting. 11 I mean, she's -- she's warning me about 12 something that she didn't share with my counterpart. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Fair to say you're not 14 getting the message that they're the nicest people 15 over in Brentwood? 16 RICHARD HELLING: That would be the message. 17 I mean, if -- if I were an actual buyer and 18 looking at this, I would pause, thinking, you know, 19 even though part of that test was, I wanted to be in 20 a specific area near to Brentwood. 21 So that was -- and -- and she was -- looked 22 like she was steering me away from Brentwood. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 24 Again, thank you.

I don't know if we have any other?

25

Again, I'd just like to thank you for your 1 2 participation today. 3 And, also, your participation was incredibly important to the investigation. 4 5 We really appreciate it. 6 RICHARD HELLING: Thank you very much. 7 JOHNNIE MAE ALSTON: Okay, thank you. SENATOR THOMAS: All right, next up we have 8 Panel 5. 9 We have Kimberly Kinirons from the New York 10 11 State Attorney General's Office, Suffolk Regional 12 Office; 13 We have Theresa Sanders, president of the 14 Urban League, Long Island; 15 And, Lorraine Collins, director of public 16 policy and external affairs at Enterprise Community 17 Partners. 18 Welcome. 19 Before you start -- before everyone starts, 20 can all three please stand up? 21 They're not paying attention. 22 Can all three please stand up, please? 23 Raise their right hand. 24 Do you testify -- do you solemnly swear that 25 you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and

nothing but the truth?

2 [All three witnesses say "Yes."]

3 SENATOR THOMAS: All right.

Take a seat.

You may start.

KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: Good afternoon,
Chairs Skoufis, Kavanagh, and Thomas, as well as
every other distinguished person who remains at this
time.

My name is Kimberly Kinirons. I'm an assistant attorney general in charge of the Suffolk regional office of the attorney general,

Letitia James.

As you're aware, and as has been mentioned earlier today, our office has already announced an investigation into the allegations of discriminatory practices here on Long Island by real estate agents which are the subject of today's hearing.

For that reason, I'm somewhat limited in what I'm able to say today; however, we wanted to make clear that the office of the attorney general takes these allegations seriously, and we look forward to working with all of you, and all of the players, that can help address these issues.

We look forward to bringing changes, and

finding the appropriate set of remedies.

Our office held a roundtable discussion in Melville on December 2nd, where Attorney General James and our staff had the opportunity to hear from elected officials, advocates, business leaders, and others, some of whom have come before you today.

The consensus was, that while these allegations are disturbing, they are far from surprising. Long Island remains one of the most segregated areas in the country.

However, we also saw at the roundtable, the commitment, and the will, to make a real change.

It is in that spirit that I'm here before you today.

The civil rights bureau of the New York State Attorney General's Office enforces laws that protect all New Yorkers from discrimination in housing based on race, color, or national origin, including the Fair Housing Act and the New York State Human Rights Law.

These laws generally prohibit agents from making statements about the racial makeup of a community, or providing disparate services based on a customer's race or ethnicity.

If your constituents have experienced such discrimination, we hope you will urge them to contact our office.

We've prepared some cards that perhaps can be given out if anybody is spurred on by everything that's going on, and comes in and does wish to make a complaint.

Fair access to housing is a basic civil right that all New Yorkers, including Long Island residents, are entitled to.

The pattern of discrimination uncovered by "Newsday's" reporting is deeply disturbing and calls for decisive action.

Along with our ongoing investigation, we look forward to working with you, and the rest of the Legislature, to find measures to better prevent such discrimination, going forward.

To be clear, housing discrimination is not unique to Long Island.

Just last week, our office took action to fight discriminatory housing practices that have occurred in the town of Chester and Orange County.

In the town of Chester and Orange County,
there are actions that have been utilized to prevent
members from the Jewish community from moving into

that area.

Attorney General James filed a motion to intervene in a lawsuit against the Town of Chester and Orange County, alleging that they have engaged in a concerted and systematic effort to prevent Hasidic Jewish families from moving to Chester by blocking the construction of a housing development.

The original lawsuit that was filed in July 2019 outlined countless discriminatory and unnecessary actions that Chester and Orange County had taken to stop the homes from being built, in order to prevent Jewish families from purchasing and occupying them, which we allege constitute gross violations of the Fair Housing Act.

Now, more than ever, our state must step up and fight this pernicious sort of discrimination, which bars New Yorkers from accessing a basic human right, based on fundamental identity.

Over the past three years, the federal government has dramatically curtailed its enforcement of fair-housing laws, freezing fair Housing Act actions against local governments and businesses, and suspending a rule that would have required cities and towns that get federal funding to look at housing patterns for signs of racial bias

and discrimination.

In recent months, Attorney General James led a coalition of 22 attorneys general in fighting back a rule change that would have all but eliminated disparate impact investigations under the Fair Housing Act.

The current rule protects against discriminatory housing and lending practices that have the effect of harming individuals based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability, and familial status.

The proposed changes would create uncertainty and make it harder for states to ensure equal housing opportunities for all Americans.

In this case, as in others, we will do everything in our power under the law to protect the civil rights of New Yorkers, and ensure that no one is denied housing based on their personal background.

We know that we have strong partners in the Legislature with whom we will work to protect against the type of discrimination that's the subject of this hearing.

We look forward to working with you to ensure that these wrongs are righted, and that New Yorkers

all across this state are safeguarded against such bias, going forward.

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today, and for holding this hearing.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you.

Theresa.

THERESA SANDERS: Thank you to the Chairs, Senator Kavanagh, Senator Skoufis, and Senator Thomas.

Thank you for having us here, and to everyone that took time out of their schedule to attend this important hearing.

I want to take this opportunity to share my views, channeling over 25 years of experience as the president and CEO of the Urban League of Long Island, and 13 years as a history professor at State University of New York, College at Old Westbury, and a resident of Long Island for the past 56 years.

I was born in Harlem, New York, and my introduction to Long Island was in 1963, where my father, an NYPD officer, enlisted in the Navy, and moved his family from Harlem to a military base in East Meadow called Mitchell Field. I was enrolled in Bottomwood Elementary School in East Meadow.

And it was a turbulent time in America, with the Civil Rights Movement for racial justice gaining support from a broader sector of Americans, while, at the same time, facing resistance from those indoctrinated with an ideology that there is a White race that is superior to all races and cultures, and, therefore, should have access at the expense of others to the basic of all human rights, such as safe and clean housing, quality education and health care, and access to engagement in voting, and other basic constitutional rights, without the fear of intimidation, violence, or incarceration.

While racism is morally unethical, it also has an economic impact on everyone.

In the "Equity Profile of Long Island," released in 2017 by the State of Black Long Island Equity Council, with the membership of Black leaders and others fighting racism, the region's economic economy would have been nearly \$24 billion stronger if its racial gaps in income had been closed.

This report is available on the Urban League of Long Island website.

To build a sustainable Long Island economy, public, private, and non-profit leaders across the region must commit to advancing policies and

strategies that increase health equity, wealth, and economic resilience for all Long Islanders.

Relative to the topic at hand, it is important that I first reinforce for the Committee that the real -- the reality of Long Island is that, in 2019, we still remain one of the 10 most racially-segregated metropolitan regions in the United States of America.

Severe racial segregation in housing and schools means that families live in racial isolation.

As a result, there are very few occasions where residents from different racial groups can interact with one another.

This, in my judgment, is tragic, yet all too common occurrence in modern America and in this multicultural world.

To tackle destructural [sic] racism underpinning this segregation, last year the Urban League of Long Island partnered with a co-host, to co-host a Long Island-wide public discussion, "How Do We Build a Just Long Island?" which was launched by Erase Racism, who you heard from the CEO, Elaine Gross, earlier.

This launch consisted of 5 public forums held

over 12 days in November and December in Nassau and Suffolk counties.

The forums were co-hosted also by such leading institutions as the Long Island Association, The Center for the Study of Inequity Social Justice and Policy at Stony Brook University, the National Center for Suburban Studies at Hofstra Universities, the State of Black Long Island Equity Council, and the Town of Riverheads Anti-bias Task Force.

In addition to this constructive dialogue that was generated through the forums, new evidence of structural racism and discrimination is documented on such a large and massive scale by this three-year investigation by "Newsday" that was published, the "Long Island Divided."

And I won't go into the details about the investigation, because I believe you've heard it all today and -- from the authentic researchers and from the testers.

And while the "Newsday" investigation found that these agents continue to steer Black

Long Islanders, you know, I've had personal experience, not only as a fair-housing tester in the early '90s, when I worked for the Long Island Housing Partnership Services, residents had let

their dogs out on me in the yard or called me offensive names, but, also, this personal experience was when my father was discharged from the military and we were seeking to stay on Long Island.

Although we were only a couple of miles away from Levittown, we were not shown homes in Levittown.

My family used their GI bill, and they were steered to other communities on Long Island.

Real estate steering on Long Island occurs when homeseekers are guided by housing providers to communities where their race is already highly concentrated.

So as people of color channel to integrated or predominantly non-White neighborhoods, and Whites are shown homes primarily in White communities, this steering contributes directly to the segregated housing patterns that have long persisted in urban and suburban communities, and the many causes associated with that separation.

From my organization's experience, steering on Long Island has historically taken several forms:

"Information steering," which occurs when minority homeseekers are shown or given information on fewer homes or neighborhoods that non-White --

I mean, than non-minority homeseekers;

"Segregation steering," which occurs when minorities are shown homes in areas with large minority populations;

And "class steering," which occurs when neighborhoods shown to minority homeseekers are of lower socioeconomic status than those shown to non-minorities.

New evidence of this discriminatory patterns unearthed by "Newsday" concluded that several actors in the housing industry actively engaged in steering.

Mortgage lenders, insurance agents, often provide less information, and offer fewer and more expensive and lower-quality products to non-White households or residents of non-White communities than they do for Whites in predominantly White communities.

These practices influenced the location and range of housing options for minority families; however, racial steering is most closely associated with the practices of real estate agents, who are often the gateway to housing opportunities, which often differ for White and non-White families.

You will shortly hear, and have heard,

corroborating evidence of this today.

From my vantage point, racial steering has been motivated by several factors.

Real estate agents on Long Island generally serve selected neighborhoods and rely heavily on word-of-mouth advertising to recruit new clients.

Many fear loss of business if they introduce a minority family into a White neighborhood.

Historically, some agents feared strong repraisals [sic] from area residents if they introduced the household that would have been detrimental and have a detrimental effect on home values.

Some maintain they are simply responding to the preference of renters and buyers who prefer to live in neighborhoods that look and feel just like them.

If overt racial discrimination has declined in recent years across the nation, the more subtle variety, in the form of racial steering, clearly persist at high levels in the nation's suburban and metropolitan communities, such as Nassau and Suffolk counties, and steering has increased.

Steering, along with other forms of discrimination, contributes to the ongoing

segregation of American cities and many social costs.

Segregation nurtures the concentration of poverty and, particularly, the concentration of people of color, as the values in the wealth accumulation associated with home ownership are undercut for racial minorities because of their continued isolation for more favored neighborhoods.

Consequently, African-Americans and other people of color are disproportionately trapped in neighborhoods where school achievement is lower, crime rates are higher, and most public services and private amenities are of lower quality.

Despite these clear and present headwinds,

I am here to argue that consumer education and
fair-housing enforcement is a solution, and it
appears to be working.

For example, in some areas, reductions in discrimination during the '90s suggest that efforts of HUD and other law enforcement authorities, along with the work of non-profit fair-housing organizations around the country, had the intended effect.

During this period, lawsuits filed by non-profit housing centers generated more than

180 million for plaintiffs. But the fair-housing agenda remains unfinished and is under attack at the federal level.

Racial steering is clearly one of the issues that should be the focus of future enforcement efforts, persisting high levels of discrimination, even if lowered in previous years, indicate that equal housing opportunity through the law of the land is not yet to be reality on Long Island.

To be perfectly clear, what propelled the infamous era of redlining, and the current status of predatory lending and other standard industry practices outlined by "Newsday," that produced discriminatory effects is, in fact, racism.

But from the standpoint of industries, those policies and practices were, and remain, legitimate business decisions. They are protecting investments and making a profit.

Here is where the legislative and regulatory powers of New York State Legislature must focus.

Similarly, local governments on Long Island and elsewhere have a major role to play, though we must also confront the fact that these units of local government historically protect their communities of primarily White residents by

systemically excluding Black people through housing policies that include geographic preferences.

If you already live in a community, you can access affordable housing there.

But if you live outside the community boundaries, you are denied. The stated region -- reason, is to give preference to existing residents.

But given the existence of racial composition of current residents, this housing policy of geographic preferences is producing a discriminatory effect.

This is but one form of the example.

I wholeheartedly applaud the New York State
Senate, through the Committee on Housing,
Construction, and Community Development; the
Committee on Investigations and Government
Operations; and Committee on Consumer Protection,
for holding this unique and urgent joint field
hearing, and for documenting throughout the region a
pattern of housing discrimination that can no longer
be ignored.

Its existence, it's proven.

The question now is: What will government, real estate, and civic leaders do?

While "Newsday's" focus report on practices

of real estate industry, those practices intertwined with various policies and practices that produce and maintain residential segregation long established and perpetuated on Long Island.

In my view, and in the view of the National Urban League, the obligation to ensure fair housing exists at all levels of government throughout the industry.

The failure to do so exist in all those areas as well.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my views and perspectives.

I'm available to answer any questions you may have.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thanks, Theresa.

Lorraine.

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: Good afternoon.

My name is Lorraine Collins, and I'm the director of public policy and external affairs for the New York office of Enterprise Community

Partners, a national affordable-housing non-profit whose mission is to create opportunity for low- and moderate-income people through affordable housing in diverse, thriving communities.

Enterprise invests capital to create and

preserve quality affordable homes, reinvest revenues to develop programmatic solutions, and scale these solutions through policy change.

One of our organization's top priorities is advancing fair housing and racial equity through housing and community-development policies and programs.

And as a national organization, Enterprise is committed to furthering fair-housing work across the country.

On behalf of Enterprise, I would like to thank Chair Thomas, Chair Skoufis, and Chair Kavanagh for convening this hearing, and for the opportunity to testify today about the persistent housing discrimination facing people of color, especially Blacks and Hispanics, here on Long Island.

While the recently reported findings of the "Newsday" investigation are appalling, they are not surprising, as you've heard.

Residential segregation in the New York City metropolitan region remains among the most persistent in the country, and our local fair-housing partners have long understood the systemic barriers that some New Yorkers face when

trying to secure housing in the communities of their choice.

As you are aware, most of the work of the affordable-housing industry has centered around multi-family development; however, Enterprise and many other organizations have overseen several homeownership programs over the years, since we believe in the importance of an array of housing options available to households of all incomes.

Renters may eventually become homeowners, and homeowners transition to rental housing.

We strive to improve the quantity and quality of options available in either scenario.

In recent years, Enterprise has funded both a local community land trust and two land banks on Long Island. Both programs provide affordable homeownership opportunities to Long Islanders who might not otherwise become homeowners.

We continue to consider ways in which to deepen the equity considerations inherent in both programs, particularly through a racial-equity lens.

Also in recent years, we have been engaged in work furthering fair-housing initiatives in a broader form of the housing industry in the New York City metro area and beyond.

In October 2017, Enterprise co-convened with the Fair Housing Justice Center, a regional, affordable, and fair-housing roundtable.

A dynamic working group comprised of nearly 30 affordable-housing, fair-housing, disability-rights, community-development, education, faith-based, and for-profit and non-profit, organizations.

Three of the participating organizations are based on Long Island, with several others engaged in business here.

Over a yearlong process of deep discussions, immense trust-building, and cross-sector education, the roundtable published "Closing the Divide:
Creating Equitable, Inclusive, and Affordable
Communities," a shared-policy agenda, highlighting several recommendations for further fair housing in the region and statewide.

This process underscored that

facially-neutral land-use barriers, like

exclusionary zoning, have also historically been

used to maintain racial residential segregation, an

issue that our partners at Erase Racism and

Long Island Housing Services have been battling.

Today, these barriers keep communities

segregated by effectively preventing families of color from accessing housing opportunities in many areas.

Two policy recommendations, some of which were mentioned earlier today, the group highlighted, to try to stimulate more development of affordable housing in affluent White neighborhoods in suburban communities, were creating a statewide equitable-share housing plan and a housing appeals board.

The equitable-share housing plan would establish a minimum affordable housing goal for every community in the state, offering financial incentives to develop housing that reaches lower income bands, as well as supportive in accessible housing.

A state-level housing appeals board would have the authority to override local zoning decisions in the face of local opposition to affordable developments and fast-track proposals that have zoning as of right.

This could include both affordable rental and affordable homeownership developments.

Members of the roundtable were part of a successful campaign to address discrimination

experienced by many New York State residents who attempt to use non-wage sources of income to pay for their rent.

This discrimination is pervasive, and is often used as a proxy for racial or disability discrimination.

This year, the Statewide Source of Income

Coalition, which was started by Erase Racism, and is

now co-lead by Enterprise, successfully advocated to

expand statewide protected classes to include lawful

source of income, and prohibit discrimination

against tenants using non-wage income to pay for

housing.

However, legislation is not enough to protect individuals and families from housing discrimination.

We are now shifting our efforts to advocating for enforcement and education resources.

The State does not currently fund fair-housing groups to carry out their housing activity, and as you now see, these resources are desperately needed.

During the summer of 2016, Enterprise partnered with the local design studio, designing the WE, to bring their exhibit, which highlights the

federal -- a major federal housing policy whose
impact still lingers today.

"Undesign the Redline" is an interactive exhibit connecting the intentional and systemic racial housing segregation of the 1930s to political and social issues of today through powerful narratives of the people and communities affected by the redlining and its legacy.

The exhibit invites participants to interact with its -- with this history and these stories to invent the future of undoing structural inequities.

Since its Enterprise debut over two years ago, the exhibit has been displayed at all of our regional market offices, and returned to New York this year, with a focus on the New York City metropolitan area.

Given the profound impact that redlining has had on housing on Long Island, the exhibit establishes critical grounding for work in equitable housing policy, highlighting local stories, such as "The Creation of Levittown."

We are challenging those who have the "Undesign the Redline" experience to go beyond just educating -- or, just being educated about the historic facts that not only divided our communities

and intentionally demobilized wealth-building opportunities for Blacks, but to consider ways in which corporations can operate differently, community-development corporations can engage more strategically, and elected officials can enact policies that will help to undo, or "undesign," redlining.

Enterprise hosted members of both the state Senate and Assembly housing committees for a tour and post-tour discussion earlier this fall.

And I'm happy to report that leadership has expressed an interest in bringing "Undesign the Redline" to Albany in 2020, and this was before the "Newsday" investigation.

If this is some of the good that can come out of the reporting, I am more hopeful that we can all work together to ensure that more of your colleagues and New York State residents and guests can be educated about this history, and can participate in the "undesign" challenge.

In closing:

I would like to thank you again for the opportunity to testify here today.

The systemic forms of housing discrimination can only be addressed through policies that will

attempt to get at the root of the discriminatory practices, and investment in fair housing and civil rights organizations.

More strategic proactive enforcement methods, such as testing, are required to root out the housing discrimination we see today, as proven by the "Newsday" investigation.

I am happy to answer any questions, and
I look forward to working with you to ensure that,
after years of illegal, unequal treatment and
disinvestment, all people in New York, especially
those who bore the biggest brunt of the
discriminatory burden, will have access to safe,
affordable housing, whether they are a renter or a
homeowner.

Thank you.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you to all three for your testimony.

My first round of questions is for Kimberly from the attorney general's office.

So when an agency, like the attorney general's office, gets involved in fair-housing discrimination cases, what is the process?

KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: So I can only speak generally --

1 SENATOR THOMAS: Yeah, of course. KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: -- obviously, because 2 we have an ongoing investigation. 3 SENATOR THOMAS: Uh-huh. 4 5 KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: But, at this 6 juncture --7 SENATOR THOMAS: Can you speak into the mic? KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: This one? 8 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yeah, they're dual mics. KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: You got me twice. 10 11 Okay. 12 At this juncture, like any investigation, we 13 begin by collecting information. 14 And so that -- that is a process that 15 sometimes can take some time, to both collect the 16 information, and then carefully review the 17 information, and then decide what actions can be 18 taken. 19 I know that's a broad response, but that's 20 the general footprint of opening an investigation. 21 SENATOR THOMAS: In the past year, how many 22 of these investigations have you started? 23 KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: You know, I don't know 24 the answer to that question. 25 We have a bureau that is specifically

designated, staffed with attorneys and staff members, just to work on civil rights cases.

I run the regional office. And while we partner with them to address those issues, it's not information that I have at hand.

I'm certain it's something I can you, but I do not know the answer.

SENATOR THOMAS: Just a few panels ago we had Fred Freiberg, the co-founder of the Fair Housing Justice Center, testify that he worked along with the AG's office to create the testing.

Are you familiar with the testing part of this?

KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: I'm familiar with what I learned from the "Newsday" investigation, and the use of testers in other situations.

But what he referred to, I don't have personal knowledge of.

SENATOR THOMAS: Okay. Do you know, within the past year, how many testers went out from the AG's office?

SENATOR THOMAS: Does the agency at least conduct similar tests to what "Newsday" did, in the

past three years?

KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: Again, I'm going to cautiously say yes, because I'm aware, broadly, of investigations that our civil rights bureau has done in the past.

In other areas, and we do use investigators and certain type of testing mechanisms.

But I can't answer as to what's been done recently.

Again, I'm not in the civil rights bureau, but I do know that that is something that's very valuable, and it's a tool used in investigations if warranted.

SENATOR THOMAS: Okay.

The next couple of questions are for Theresa and Lorraine.

Were you here for the testimony of both the county executives?

THERESA SANDERS: Yes.

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: I was en route.

SENATOR THOMAS: Okay, you were en route.

But maybe Theresa can answer this question.

They talked about some policy changes, and what they're going to be doing now.

What's your opinion?

Are they going far enough?

Do you recommend that they do more?

THERESA SANDERS: Well, I'm hopeful that this has garnered so much attention, that they're in a position that they have to respond to their constituents.

I'm a little more closer to what happened in Suffolk. Our SOBLI counsel has been meeting with the county executive for several months about the SOBLI agenda, and how we can improve the economic condition of Black Long Islanders, based on the baseline data that we provided in our report.

So as a result of that, he's put together some things that I believe are going to be helpful in sustaining any efforts of making sure, not only in the real estate market that we have equity, but in other markets.

SENATOR THOMAS: Okay.

Lorraine, in your testimony, you basically said legislation is not enough.

I may have missed this, but what more can we do as legislators here?

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: I'll use the source of income as an example.

I think, during our expert panel with Fred

and Elaine, they made reference to it as well, and by "legislation being not enough," meaning that enforcement has to come with legislation.

It's not enough just to pass a law, and the law sit on the books, if there aren't resources that are going to be provided to the enforcing agencies to ensure that the law is effectively being implemented.

SENATOR THOMAS: Okay.

Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Again, I'm not sure if you can answer this on behalf of the attorney general's office, but, is the -- is the investigation -- is it -- has it been established whether the investigation that you're -- that are in the preliminary stages is a criminal investigation or civil investigation, or potentially both?

KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: I can't answer that. It is an ongoing investigation.

I can tell you that, generally speaking, when we look at some type of misdeed, we consider all of our options, which usually encompass both criminal and civil options.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. And, again, if you

can answer, has -- have subpoenas been issued in the course of this current investigation?

KIMBERLY A. KINIRONS: That, I can't answer.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I guess, for Ms. Collins, first of all, I did have the opportunity to view the redlining exhibit, and found it, you know, very -- it was a very compelling story.

And although I'm somewhat familiar with that history and that issue, it really -- it really was eye-opening in many respects.

So, you know, thank you for that, and for my colleagues who are working on bringing that exhibit to Albany sometime during the session, so that people will have an opportunity to view it there.

Can you just talk about -- you mentioned, you know, you've been involved in this coalition that was discussed earlier as well, to get source-of-income discrimination to be one of the protected for -- sort of, illegal forms of discrimination in New York.

Can you just talk about how discrimination, based on income, and other factors, intersects with discrimination and race and ethnicity, in your view?

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: Yes, certainly.

Well, oftentimes, when we hear "source of

income" or "non-wage income," some of the items that initially come to mind are Section 8 voucher holders, although there is an array of different types of non-wage incomes, whether it's social security, spousal support, child support.

With the Section 8 voucher holder and that rental assistance, oftentimes what comes with that is a negative perception.

Oftentimes what comes with that is an idea of, okay, when I say "Section 8 voucher holder," who am I thinking of in the back of my mind?

And, quite frankly, oftentimes it's the image of a single Black woman, who is uneducated, not working, with multiple children.

And although that may be an experience, or there may be someone who fits that mold, that isn't the full, because there's also the single Black woman, who is a divorcée, who is educated, who is working, but still needs the supplemental support.

And so, with Section 8, it's often, "those people."

I don't want "those people" in my neighborhood. So, if there's a way to get around, you know, specifically directing to race and ethnicity, I'll use another route, and that other

route being the rental assistance.

From a disability perspective, they're similar.

So, without saying "I don't want someone with a physical disability in my building," I'll get around that by saying, oh, well, I don't accept this type of non-wage income.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

And you mentioned, and I'm somewhat familiar with the work that, you know, Enterprise was involved in convening this broader group of stakeholders, to talk about access and fair-housing issues, and produced the report you mentioned.

I -- again, I'm somewhat familiar with the report, but just to refresh my recollection: Were there -- were realtors or real estate agents or their representatives involved in that process?

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: No.

So for the members of the roundtable, primarily, the executive directors of organizations that fit one of the buckets that I made reference to. So, either affordable housing, fair housing, civil rights, the disability community, education, LGBTQ, seniors.

So it was, primarily, that was our target

audience in getting -- you know, pulling together to work on this process.

However, at the end of our initial year, together, we did hold a summit, which we extended an invitation to a much broader group, and held a summit of upwards of five -- or, 400 participants, which some of them I think were real estate agents.

I know we had extended an invitation to local officials as well.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And is there a follow-up that's coming from that -- that was sort of a presentation of the work that had been done by the initial roundtable.

Is there sort of a -- sort of a follow-up report, or sort of subsequent recommendations, that are coming from that sort of broader airing of the issues?

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: Yep.

Well, for 2019, several members of the roundtable were engaged, in some form or fashion, in the tenant protection laws that were passed.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, they were.

LORRAINE Y. COLLINS: So whether it was specific to SOI or to the Tenant Protection Act.

And what we are now in the process of doing,

is pulling together our 2020 policy priorities, which will also include tenant protections, but is going to touch into some of the exclusionary zoning areas, and increasing density, that I mentioned earlier.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Great.

Well, it's been a long day, so I know we have another panel of witnesses, and I'll keep my questions short.

But, just, thank you to all of you for the work you do, you know, for being here today, and also the work you do every day, to ensure that fairness is the norm throughout our housing markets.

Thanks.

SENATOR THOMAS: Last set of questions from Senator Kaminsky.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Hi, Ms. Sanders.

Thank you for being here today, and for your -- for your compelling testimony.

Could you tell us what you'd like, whether in broad stokes or in detail, up to you, what would you like the members sitting in front of you today to do when we get up from this hearing?

THERESA SANDERS: Support the funding of consumer education.

I hear a lot about education for realtors and the bankers.

But I really believe the strength lies with the consumer, so that they understand what their rights are, so that they can recognize the discrimination when they're going into a situation.

And then the second one is the enforcement, so that, if there is a report, that there's something punitive that happens, because people will continue their behavior if they think nothing will happen.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay, so that -- and that and -- that -- you would like that to be the main focus?

THERESA SANDERS: Yep, consumer education, and enforcement.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay.

And how do you feel about the comments before, about requiring more education within the companies, self-testing within the companies, and just a mandatory training regimen or ethics regimen, that you would think happens in most of corporate America, but has obviously missed this -- missed this industry?

THERESA SANDERS: You know, I'm a history

professor, so, historically, the outcomes of self-monitoring are not that great.

And it's nice to ask people to monitor themselves, but I don't have that much faith, because, if you are a corporation or an industry making a lot of money, and if you do happen to uncover some malfeasance by your employees, who's going to go to the Senate or to a regulatory agency and go, look, this person in my company is doing this stuff?

They're not, because they're ultimately responsible.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: So outside oversight is what's required?

THERESA SANDERS: Absolutely.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Okay.

Thank you very much.

THERESA SANDERS: Thank you.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you all.

And go for our next panel.

THERESA SANDERS: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible comments.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So there are two

microphones here. I think one is feeding the --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible comments.]

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: [Indiscernible] talking 1 2 about, you're very hard to hear. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Oh, the senators are hard to hear. 4 Is that better? 5 6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. [Inaudible comments.] 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. I was duped by there being a second mic, and 8 9 I thought one -- I thought they were both working 10 equally. 11 But I appreciate [indiscernible] your 12 mentioning that. 13 All right, so, first of all, before we begin, 14 if you could raise your right hand. 15 If you want to stand. 16 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the 17 whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MOSES SEURAM: I do. 18 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I do. 19 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 21 So you have, I think, prepared statements? 22 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We do. 23 MOSES SEURAM: Yes. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Why don't you begin. 25 MOSES SEURAM: Good afternoon, and thank you

for this opportunity to testify.

My name is Moses Seuram, and I am the 2019 president for the New York State Association of Realtors.

In addition to serving as the NYSAR president, I'm a licensed real estate broker who lives and work in Queens.

I am joined by Duncan MacKenzie, NYSAR CEO.

NYSAR is a trade association with approximately 60,000 members statewide.

We represent, roughly, 30,000 members in the Long Island and the New York City metro area.

Not all real estate licensees are realtors.

We are a voluntary membership trade organization.

We provide a variety of services to residential and commercial real estate brokers, real estate appraisers, and property managers.

Every realtor member belongs to a local board of realtors; a state association of realtors, like NYSAR; and the National Association of Realtors.

There is no room for illegal discrimination in the realtor community.

As a condition of membership, every realtor subscribes to an industry-leading code of ethics and

must complete an ethics education program on a regular basis.

NYSAR's statement of policy, which is reviewed and approved annually, clearly outlines where we stand on illegal housing discrimination.

It reads as follows:

"We believe that equal opportunity in housing is a fundamental right. We oppose all illegal discrimination."

If there is one message we want to convey to you today, it is this:

We are appalled by the action reported by "Newsday," involving real estate licensees. And NYSAR wants to work with New York State to be part of the solution, moving forward.

So how can we help?

First, you know -- first you should know, that NYSAR has a long history of fighting against illegal housing discrimination.

In 2006, NYSAR was the primary advocate for requiring fair-housing education as a core learning module.

That year NYSAR won legislative and gubernatorial approval that three hours of State-mandated continuing education training be

dedicated to the topic of -- topic as a requirement of license renewal.

The law became effective in 2008.

In 2010, NYSAR was one of the first state association in the country advocate for sexual orientation to be protect -- protective class in the realtor code of ethics.

That inclusion was finalized in 2011.

In 2013, NYSAR helped lead the fight to add gender identity as a protective class in the realtor code of ethics.

That inclusion was finalized in 2014.

During 2016 and 2017, NYSAR pushed for the inclusion of three hours of advanced fair-housing and fair-lending training to the real estate broker qualifying course.

The revised curriculum became effective in 2018.

In 2019, NAR's [sic] code of ethics was amended to prohibit brokers from refusing to cooperate with other brokers on the basis of a broker's race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familiar [sic] status, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

As a state realtor association, NYSAR's

primary role on the topic of fair housing is member education, and legislative and regulatory advocacy.

Providing educational opportunity for the realtor membership is a primary goal of NYSAR and the Long Island Board of Realtors.

We both independently and jointly offer courses on real estate-related matters.

Upon learning about the "Newsday" report, NYSAR took immediate action.

We suspended NYSAR-sponsored classes taught by independent contractors course instructors.

We then set a new requirement, that any instructor wanting to teach fair housing in the future must complete a comprehensive retraining program.

The retraining will be provided by fair-housing organization from across the state and who are totally independent of the realtor community.

We are also undertaking a comprehensive retraining effort that will be available to realtor members, including managers, brokers, and local-board course instructors.

Looking forward, one area where NYSAR would recommend proactive action, and, indeed, have been

advocating for it since 1992, is battling the end discrimination in the purchase and sale of co-ops.

Today, New York law provides co-op board the ability to unfairly deny housing opportunity to persons deemed undesirable by simply taking no action on valid purchase applications.

Nothing in current law requires a response to an applicant from a co-op board.

When an applicant is denied the ability to purchase a unit, nothing requires the co-op board to provide a reason.

To address this opportunity of illegal discrimination, NYSAR has advocated for legislative en -- legislation entitled "The Fairness and Cooperative Homeownership Act."

This legislation will significantly improve the transparency of the cooperative-purchase process to the benefit of all parties.

It adds uniformity and predictability to the application procedures.

The Senate passed this legislation in 2016, 59-to-2, and we urge its passing again in 2020.

NYSAR strongly supports the Long Island Board of Realtors' investigation of those members identified by "Newsday".

If any member is found to have violated the 1 realtor code of ethics, the member can face 2 penalties that includes expulsion from our 3 association. 4 This is in addition to any disciplinary 5 6 action initiated by governmental agencies. 7 NYSAR also fully supports the action announced by Governor Cuomo on November 21st. 8 9 We look forward to working with the New York State Division of Human Rights, Division of 10 11 Human and Community Renewal, and Department of 12 State, towards a shared goal in combating illegal 13 discrimination. 14 We will also participate in any continuing 15 dialogue with the State and local lawmakers on this 16 important matter. 17 No effort should be spared to combat the scourge of illegal discrimination. 18 19 Thank you again for the opportunity to 20 testify, and I welcome any questions you may have. 21

Thank you again for the opportunity to

testify, and I welcome any questions you may have.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

So -- okay, so we just have one.

Okay, I just wanted to make sure.

Thank you.

So can you just begin, so "Newsday" obviously

22

23

24

25

```
identified many people by name, who, apparently,
 1
 2
        participated --
               AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible comment.]
 3
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Let's try this again.
 4
               Is that better?
 5
               "Newsday" identified many people by name,
 6
 7
        who, apparently, participated in behavior that
        appears to be discriminatory.
 8
 9
               Are -- have you identified whether those are
        members of your association?
10
11
               DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Yes, some of them are
12
        members.
13
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.
14
               And -- just, also, you spoke about LIBOR and
15
        their investigation.
16
               Is LIBOR a component of NYSAR?
17
               Are they related, are they affiliated, in
18
        some way?
19
               DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I would say "related" is a
20
        good way to put it.
21
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: [Indiscernible] mic closer.
22
        Can you pull your mic closer?
23
               DUNCAN MACKENZIE: This one?
24
               SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yeah.
25
               DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Okay. Is that better?
```

1 Okay. I'd say "related" is a good word to use. 2 So both NYSAR and LIBOR are, in essence, 3 franchises of the national association. We have 4 charters with them. 5 LIBOR has its own independent governance 6 7 structure, as we do. So we work together on many things, but we 8 are self-governed, as is LIBOR. 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And members of -- people 10 11 might be members of LIBOR and also members of your 12 association? 13 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: They all are. 14 So if you are a realtor, to use that term 15 "realtor," you must belong to a local board, the --16 a state association, and the national association. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I see. 18 So by definition, a member of LIBOR is also a 19 member of your association? 20 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: That is correct. 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 22 And you mentioned that you have suspended 23 courses by independent contractors. 24 Can you explain why you made that decision? 25 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Yes.

We were concerned that -- that, from the 1 2 report in "Newsday," that, perhaps, the courses were not being taught the way we would like them to be 3 4 taught. 5 We do not have a way at the present time to 6 monitor them. 7 So what we did is, decided we just wouldn't have any more classes dealing with fair housing 8 until we could retrain all of our trainers. 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And is that statewide? 10 11 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: That's statewide. 12 It's important to know, that, so, we have our 13 own instructors for courses that we sponsor. 14 The local boards will have, sometimes, their own instructors that they would sponsor. 15 16 So these are only -- this will only apply to 17 the instructors that we would be sponsoring for 18 coursework. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And you're distinguishing 20 between independent contractors and -- and --21 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: They're all independent 22 contractors. 23 All the instructors are not -- they're not

employees of ours. They're independent contractors.

So

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

24

25

[indiscernible] -- so when you say you suspended training offered by independent contractors, you're effectively saying, you suspended all training that your association is offering?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: That deals with fair housing, yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

And can you -- have you done -- previous to the "Newsday" report, had you ever done an assessment of the quality of the training, the -- the effectiveness at conveying the obligations of realtors, with respect to fair housing laws?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: The only measurable that we use for our instructors is comments from the participants.

So the instructor will collect a sheet at the end of each coursework, which will have an evaluation by the people taking the class.

So, previously, that has been our only way of having a measurable of the classes.

We also will have, where we can, a person from the local board sit in on the class, or at least part of it, to do part of the evaluation. But they don't often stay from the beginning till the end.

At least that's my understanding.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And those -- does that result in some sort of formal report to your association about the quality of what they -- at least what is witnessed in [indiscernible cross-talking] --

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Correct.

So those evaluations will help us decide if we will continue to employ those instructors in future.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Did -- and so you've suspended it now.

Is that -- that's for the purpose of retraining the trainers?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: That's correct.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. And then you -- is there a time where you expect to be relaunching training as a service that you're offering?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: So we have our first retraining in February, and will hold several of them throughout the year. So there will be a number of opportunities for trainers to go through the process that we think is necessary.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And is training offered by your organization or the local affiliate -- the

local related organizations, in your view, the most common way in which realtors are receiving this -- the -- the training that's required under state law?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Well -- so you're talking about for continuing education?

Generally, our fair-housing education is for, we offer what they call "designations."

So, realtors have an opportunity to get specialties, to have certain additional skills, to just being a licensee.

And so we will teach fair housing as a component of what we call our "Graduate Realtor Institute," that may also be eligible for continuing-education value.

But we don't often, ourselves, offer CE courses for fair housing.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So to the extent LIBOR -
I mean, there was -- there was -- the "Newsday"

reporting on training indicated that, in many cases,

present and former executives of LIBOR itself were

the trainers.

And, I mean, there was some very disturbing -- I want to keep this brief -- but there were some very disturbing assertions about what was going on in that training, including, in one case, a

trainer apparently telling a class that it's supposed to be about fair housing. That, fair housing is sort of like being a taxi driver and speeding, and having a client who is late to get to the airport. And, you know, it's your choice whether to speed; it's your choice whether to obey the law or not.

Can you -- I mean, maybe just start by, can you comment on that as a -- assuming that is somebody who is a leader in your industry, how -- just -- your feelings about reading that portion of the "Newsday" reporting?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We didn't think that was, obviously, a very effective way to teach fair housing.

And that is part of the reason that we suspended our fair-housing education until we can retrain all of our educators.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I just -- from my perspective, "ineffective" [sic] might be something of an understatement.

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I wouldn't necessarily disagree, Senator.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Do you believe, based on what you now know,

and your decision to suspend your courses, which are not -- not necessarily the core courses that people are required to take by law, that there are additional steps that state government and your industry ought to take to ensure the ongoing quality of the training that is -- that is offered, and -- and is that -- that is the basis for realtors and others in the industry meeting their legal obligations to be trained?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We're open to that discussion, Senator, and it has been a relatively short period of time since the "Newsday" report.

One of the things we've come here to tell you, is that we're willing to work with you on the solution; on what is the best way to educate licensees, not just realtors, but all licensees, on what the fair-housing laws are and how they should be following them.

We also support the Senator's bill that was recently introduced, that would require a disclosure, a fair-housing disclosure, as part of the real estate process.

So, we're really open to new ideas, and we're here to tell you that everything is on the table.

We'd like to talk about how we can -- you

know, how we can solve this problem.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And we had a conversation with Mr. Gorman earlier about the practices of NRT and its related companies.

Does your association offer any kind of standard, any model policies, that you believe that participants in the industry ought to be adopting?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We don't have -- we have our code of ethics. I suppose that could be used for that purpose.

And it very clearly talks about -- Article 10 of our code of ethics talks specifically about fair housing, and how we support that, and how we believe that's a really basic tenet of housing.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: It -- it -- we've had several people testify today that a core part of an effective strategy [no audio] is testing -- paired testing, as we saw "Newsday" do.

And, obviously, that required [no audio].

[Microphone turned off] There was a specific proposal to fund that by raising fees that licensed participants in the industry have to pay.

[Microphone turned on.]

Can you comment on that proposal?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We'd be happy to talk

1 about that as well. We certainly think that qualified [microphone 2 turns off] testers, and testing in general, is a 3 valid activity. 4 5 We can certainly talk about where the funding 6 comes from. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: [Microphone turned off.] You talk about it in possibly -- (microphone 8 turned on) you're open to supporting that? 9 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We're open to discussing 10 11 it, for sure. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 13 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I don't have the authority 14 to commit to that, Senator. So we have a due 15 process, I need to go through that. 16 But we are committed to dealing with the 17 issue before us, and, again, everything is on the 18 table. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, we'll take your 20 commitment to assess it for -- at least for today. 21 Do we have other senators with --22 Senator Skoufis. 23 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Hey, thank you. And thank you both for your appearance today, 24

25

and your testimony.

And I've been in the state Legislature for seven years, and, certainly, I -- you know, I respect the profession.

I've worked with NYSAR, and your affiliate in the Hudson Valley, well over seven years.

And I appreciate your remarks that this was startling to you all, and you share the disgust that many of you us have expressed with what was revealed in the "Newsday" exposé.

I do have a few questions.

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Sure, please.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I'd like to first have you comment, if you will, on the lack of appearance by the real estate agents who were requested to testify today, many of whom, no doubt, are your members.

And, specifically, as you comment on that, are you aware of any discussion, directive, e-mails, any conversation, that advised those individuals to not appear today?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: So on the decision not to appear, that is a personal decision.

I don't know what is going on in each individual's head for that decision, so I don't have any way to come on that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: But there's no

communication between NYSAR --1 2 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Oh, no. SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- and those individuals 3 about today's hearing. 4 5 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Oh, gosh, no. 6 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 7 Has there been any conversation about the Long Island Board of Realtors who was also requested 8 9 to appear today? 10 You know, I suspect there was -- whereas an 11 individual, perhaps, may not be available, I suspect 12 there was someone in LIBOR who could have come 13 today, but they chose not to. 14 Are you aware of why they're not here? 15 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I am not. 16 That -- as I said, they have their own 17 individual governance structure, so that's something 18 you'd need to ask them directly. 19 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 20 If it comes up, I certainly, strongly, 21 encourage you to urge your members, and LIBOR, to 22 comply with any subpoenas they might receive, moving forward. 23 24 Testing was brought up. 25 I -- I'm curious, has there ever been

self-testing, you know, within your affiliates, your organization of members? DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Not that I'm aware of. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Has there been -- in light of, you know, what we've seen last month in this exposé, do you think there should be any consideration of self-testing, if you will, within the profession? DUNCAN MACKENZIE: It's something -- it's a new concept to me, Senator, so I really don't know. It's an interesting one. 

I think I agree with one of the previous folks who testified just before us, that self-testing tends to be something that creates a problem by itself, because, when you're testing yourself, there's the inherent sense that there might be a conflict.

I think independent testing makes more sense in terms of getting to a positive outcome.

But, again, not knowing a lot about self-testing and how it might work, I don't know that I can comment on that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yeah, thank you.

And when I say "self-testing," I do mean, you know, basically, hiring an independent entity to do

1 that testing. The word's come up a number of times. 2 Do you consider the discrimination that was 3 revealed systematic? 4 5 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I guess I don't know the word I would use. 6 7 Again, I go back to say, it's just incredibly disturbing. 8 9 I don't know how you quantify it, but it was incredibly disturbing, and it's something that 10 11 really was a call to action to us, and to you as 12 well. 13 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you think it's a cultural problem within the profession? 14 15 You know, it's -- it's hard -- at least to 16 me, it's hard to explain how 49 percent of instances 17 involving an African-American resulted in discrimination if it's not systematic. 18 There's no way, you know, by coincidence, 19 20 half of those situations resulted in discrimination. 21 So what do you think is the root of the 22 problem? 23 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I don't know, Senator. I don't know. 24

It seems to be something deep-rooted,

21

22

23

24

25

I think, in our culture, and not just in the real estate industry, but in many areas.

So, it's hard to say what's in someone's heart, and why they make the decisions they make.

But we do our best to try and make sure our members are aware of their responsibilities under the fair housing laws.

And the decisions after that are individual

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you think that there ought to be some inflection into that point?

You know, is NYSAR going to try and -- not just respond, which is, obviously, very important, but, understand why this happened, fundamentally?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I think that's a challenge for us to do, absolutely.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

I raised the question to some of the experts earlier today, and I would like to ask you the same

On a scale of 1 to 10, how serious do you believe the department of state treats housing discrimination currently, "1" being little to no seriousness, and "10" being the most serious?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I have to put an asterisk

on that, because I think they care about it.

I'll say they care a "10."

I would say that they do not have the resources at the present time to conduct the kind of investigations that you and I think we would like to see.

So I don't think it's a lack of will or a lack of desire.

I think it's a lack of resources in many ways.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: You think it's just a lack of resources?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Yes.

I can't believe that the department of state puts -- turns a blind eye to something like illegal discrimination.

I just don't believe that.

I do believe that, if they had the resources, that they would do things, as they have at one point in the past. I do believe they had testers at one time.

But, as you know, New York State has limited resources, and even more limited in recent years.

And I think it's probably fallen upon the department of state as well. And then not having

the resources, they have to make decisions.

Would they make different decisions now based on what they know?

Perhaps.

But I think a lot of this is a resource issue, and not an issue of will.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you have a sense, or an approximation, of how many housing-discrimination complaints, including steering, have been filed, let's say, over the past year --

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I don't know.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- against your members?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: I don't know that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

You had raised -- and I'm aware of this, and I applaud it -- NYSAR's advocacy to help end co-op discriminations. And you raised a number of other items that you've all advocated for in the past.

My question is, and I know it's -- it's, you know, not even a month later after this exposé came out, do you have any new advocacy?

I mean, you talked about previous advocacy.

Do you have any new advocacy that you're proposing, or anticipate proposing, in light of what was revealed?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Not at this moment, but we are really hoping that this is going to be an ability to focus on Senator Kavanagh's bill, really, on the co-op disclosure.

It has been an insidious way, that, in this area, co-op housing is entry-level housing in many cases.

And as you know, even in the -- in the Lower Hudson Valley area, it's -- it's -- it's -- it's a way for co-op boards to say "you're not welcome here" for any reason that they want to.

They're shielded by the business-judgment rule, and they don't have to follow same rules that a rent -- a normal landlord might have to.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I agree with your sentiment, and I personally support the legislation, but let's be clear what was revealed in "Newsday."

You know, the majority of those situations were not co-ops. Right?

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Yep.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And so there needs to be more than that.

DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Sure.

Again, we're here to -- right, in a month, we haven't had the time to come up with anything new.

But I'll just reiterate, we're here to work 1 2 with you on that. SENATOR SKOUFIS: 3 Okay. As you're well aware, when we start 4 5 legislative session in, literally, a matter of 6 weeks, and so I -- I'm sure that we all will be 7 coming forward with some ideas and proposals. And we certainly welcome your conversation 8 9 and input. But my hope is, speaking for myself, that you 10 11 too will come with some ideas, and not just be 12 responsive to ideas that we come forward with. 13 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We will do that. 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 15 I appreciate you being here. 16 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Thank you. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Kaplan. 18 SENATOR KAPLAN: Thank you. 19 So what steps does the New York State 20 Realtors Association takes to identify potential 21 violations of the Fair Housing Act by its members? 22 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Sure. 23 So we -- in terms of that, we are a

So it would, for the most part, take another

self-policing organization.

24

realtor to accuse another realtor of violating 1 Article 10 of our code of ethics. And then we have 2 a process of adjudication that would be carried out. 3 SENATOR KAPLAN: Okay. What are the steps 4 you take after receipt of these complaints? 5 6 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: So it would go in --7 I have to say I'm not an expert in all the exact steps, but, we have a grievance committee. 8 9 Every local board, and the state association, have a grievance committee. 10 11 They will review the accusations. 12 If they are found to be valid, then they 13 would go through a process where both the parties 14 would have due process. And then there would be a 15 determination based on a hearing. 16 SENATOR KAPLAN: And do you have any type of 17 penalty for the members if they are found --DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Sure. 18 19 There are financial penalties. And you could 20 also be expul -- you could have your realtor status 21 taken away. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just one follow-up to 23 that. 24 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Sure.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you have any -- any

1 sense of the number, the frequency, of those complaints, the -- kind of, the various dis -- the 2 frequency of various dispositions, whether they're 3 found to be -- you know, whether they're founded or 4 unfounded, and what the results are? 5 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: We don't have that as the 6 7 state association. They are mostly done at the local-board 8 level. 9 Occasionally they come to us for 10 11 adjudication, but, generally, they're done at the 12 local-board level. 13 So we could poll the local boards and ask them, but I don't have that data in front of me. 14 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 16 So -- I mean, you know, the realtors often 17 emphasize that, as realtors, you're -- if you're 18 using a realtor, you're getting somebody of a 19 particular quality with particular training. 20 I gather, because you're here today, you 21 agree that -- you know, that you and your industry 22 have some work to do to live up to that? 23 DUNCAN MACKENZIE: Absolutely. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Any other questions from senators?

1 Okay.

I think -- are we going to do any closing?

Or...

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I think Todd wanted to say something, and at least one of us should.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

So, again, thank you for your testimony.

I think we'll have some closing remarks from a few of the senators here today.

But -- so maybe we will begin with Senator Kaminsky.

SENATOR KAMINSKY: Thank you.

I really wanted to thank the Chairs for convening this today, and having what I thought was a very important hearing that will be the jumping-off point for a good deal of action.

But I particularly want to thank, and underscore the importance of, Senator Skoufis, the Chairman of, the Investigation Committee's actions today.

For a very long time, the Senate powers embodied in its investigation's committee, along with the use of subpoena power, but, generally, its ability to draw attention to important topics, and find important facts, to help move legislation along

has languished.

It's really sat on a shelf and has not been used barely ever meeting.

That took a significant change last year.

And today I think marks a watershed moment in the use of the Senate's beneficial use of its investigatory powers.

I hope we continue to do so.

I look forward to following where the facts lead in this case.

And I'm proud to serve on a committee under the Chairman's leadership, as we continue to pursue facts in favor of justice on behalf of the public.

SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you so much, everyone that showed up today.

This was a huge undertaking ever since "Newsday" exposed the unequal treatment of homebuyers on Long Island.

The three Chairs here, including myself, we and our staff did a lot to get to where we are right now.

And like I said in my opening statements, this hearing we convened, to get the facts, to get recommendations, and for us to act accordingly.

And just like Chair of Investigations,

Senator Skoufis, said, a lot of real estate agents did not show up.

And the power that we have, those subpoenas are going to go out pretty soon. And they will know we are deadly serious about discrimination here on Long Island, and segregation, we must end this.

I want to thank my staff, and staff of the two Co-Chairs here, for everything that they have done today to make this happen.

And thank -- of course, our audio-visual team here, thank you so much.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Senator Kaplan.

SENATOR KAPLAN: Thank you.

I echo the same sentiment.

I thank everyone who participated in today's hearing.

I think we all realize that we have a lot of work ahead of us.

But I think it's really important to see everyone that was here from the Senate Conference.

This is something that we truly care about, and we understand there's a lot of work to do.

And we're all working together, and it's going to take all the different stakeholders to work

together, to, hopefully, resolve this.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Want me to go?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Go ahead (motioning).

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Go ahead.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

So I'll just wrap up by saying, you know, the Senate Housing Committee has a very broad and ambitious agenda, that is intended to give life to the notion that many of us have, but is not often a reality, that, every New Yorker has a right, and should able to expect a right, to be honored to a decent affordable place to live, whether they be renters or homeowners, potential renters, potential homeowners; whether they be living in single-family homes or two-family homes or multiple dwellings.

And, obviously, the work we're doing today to ensure fair-housing laws are complied with is an important part of that.

And I will just say that, you know, we have a lot of work to do in many areas of the law.

But it's particularly gratifying to have such partners in the Investigations Committee and the Consumer Affairs Committee, bringing their expertise

to this particular issue [no audio] and working together to achieve something [no audio] this coming session.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: There's not much more to say.

I'll just -- I join my colleagues in thanking all the witnesses, everyone who participated, and made this the compelling hearing that it was.

And, certainly, I want to thank my two Co-Chairs, Senator Kavanagh and Senator Thomas.

You know, this came together pretty quickly.

We decided just a number of weeks ago, following the "Newsday" exposé, that this was called for, this was needed, and that we needed to begin to address this.

And all three of our offices worked very hard, very diligently, to get us to this point.

I want to particularly note, in my office, Sara DiBernardo and Michael Mazzariello from our investigative team, joined with the staffs of my colleagues' offices, in really putting this together.

I certainly want to thank Senator Kaminsky,
Senator Kaplan, and all the other senators who spent

a great deal of time here today.

And let me be clear, as others have said, this is just the beginning.

There will be further testimony.

We hope that, once subpoenas go out, that the individuals who receive those subpoenas comply.

And it is critical, some of the very most important people that we needed to hear from today, were not here, and these are the individuals who participated in the alleged discrimination that was revealed in the "Newsday" investigation.

We need to hear from them directly, why they did what they did, and how they came to embody that discrimination that we saw in the compelling video statements, et cetera, from "Newsday."

And we will hear from them.

So this is the start.

We return to legislative session in just a few weeks, as was just noted a short while ago.

And we, as a Legislature, are taking this with the utmost seriousness.

This won't just be hearings. We will be addressing this in the legislative process as well.

So thank you to everyone, again, who participated.

1	Thank you, especially to "Newsday".
2	Certainly, it goes without saying, again,
3	that this wouldn't exist if you didn't reveal what
4	you revealed.
5	And I wish everyone a happy holidays and new
6	year.
7	Thank you.
8	(Whereupon, the joint committee public
9	hearing concluded, and adjourned.)
10	
11	000
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	