CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

----- X

April 5, 2022

Start: 10:37 a.m. Recess: 1:42 p.m.

HELD AT: REMOTE HEARING - VIRTUAL ROOM 2

B E F O R E: Nantasha M. Williams, Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Rita C. Joseph Christopher Marte Rafael Salamanca, Jr

Inna Vernikov

Adrienne Adams, Speaker

Gale A. Brewer Amanda Farias Shekar Krishnan Farah Louis Althea Stevens

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

JoAnn Kamuf Ward, Deputy Commissioner of Policy and External Affairs at the New York City Commission on Human Rights Sapna Raj, Deputy Commissioner of the Law Enforcement Bureau at the New York City Commission on Human Rights Katherine Greenberg, Special Counsel at the New York City Commission on Human Rights Senator Jessica Ramos Winston Tokuhisa Charisma White Kecia Kemp Kathryn Wylde Margaret Price Andrea Johnson Merble Reagon Julia Elmaleh-Sachs Amelia Adams Barbara Kushner Tim Johnson Jessica Walker Gloria Middleton Beverly Neufeld Debipriya Chatterjee Seher Khawaja Elizabeth Stone John T. O'Malley Mary Luke Linda Hartley Solange Charas Nicholas Natoli Miriam Clark

2	SERGEANT LUGO: PC recording started.
3	SERGEANT HOPE: Cloud recording rolling.
4	SERGEANT LUGO: Good morning, everyone.
5	Welcome to today's remote New York City Council
6	hearing of the Committee on Civil and Human Rights.
7	At this time, would all panelists please
8	turn on your videos for verification purposes?
9	To minimize disruption, please place
10	electronic devices to vibrate or silent.
11	If you wish to submit testimony, you may
12	send it to testimony@council.nyc.gov. Again, that's
13	testimony@council.nyc.gov.
14	Thank you for your cooperation. Chair
15	Williams, we are ready to begin.
16	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Good morning. My
17	name is Nantasha Williams, and I am the Chair of the
18	Civil and Human Rights Committee. Thank you for
19	joining our virtual hearing today on the New York
20	City Commission on Human Rights Complaint Process
21	Times and Resolutions.
22	Before we begin, I would like to

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge my Colleagues who have joined us today, Council Members Marte, Stevens, and Farias.

Although this hearing has been

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

overshadowed by Intro 134, today's oversight topic is a very important one as it examines a process that is integral to the work of the New York City Commission on Human Rights. The Commission is dedicated not only educating New Yorkers on their rights and obligations under the City's Human Rights Law but also protecting them from discrimination and hate. Receiving and processing complaints is crucial to ensuring that New Yorkers have recourse in the face of discrimination while serving in its role to protect the rights of New Yorkers. CCHR has seen major growth in inquiries alleging discrimination, especially in recent years. The Commission has seen the number of inquiries received double over the course of 5 years with 5,296 inquiries in 2015 compared to 10,015 in 2020. As of fiscal year 2021, the Commission has reported a total of 9,983 inquiries.

During this hearing, the Committee seeks to learn more about how the Commission processes such a large volume of inquiries as well as how and why different types of inquiries receive certain outcomes and resolutions. The Committee is also interested in hearing whether CCHR's processing time can be

2.2

2.3

2 improved and how. Additionally, the Committee will 3 also hear Intro 134 in relation to employers required

4 to post minimum and maximum salary information.

I'd like to thank Speaker Adams in her leadership for allowing for ample time to have true deliberation on this important legislative matter. On December 2, 2021, the Committee heard a bill now known as Local Law 32 in relation to prohibiting employers from posting job listings without minimum and maximum salary information.

Testimony and feedback received during and after the hearing has informed the amendments that Intro 134 seeks to make to the original law. I also want to assure everyone that I am interested in hearing all sides and am amenable to changes pending the testimonies of today's hearing.

I'd also like to note that while Local

Law 32 is one step in the right direction towards pay
equity, we still need to do more, and it is not the
only provision that will resolve pay equity in its
entirety.

I'd like to thank Committee staff,

Jayasri, Senior Counsel to the Committee, <u>Wiam Diouri</u>

our Policy Analyst, Jack Kern, our Financial Analyst,

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

and, of course, my wonderful staff, Everton Smith and
Ashley Meza.

I will now turn it over to the Committee Counsel.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair Williams. I am Jayasri Ganapathy, and I'm Counsel to the Committee on Civil and Human Rights, and I will be moderating this hearing.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone that you will be on mute until you are called on to testify, at which point you will be unmuted by the host.

During the hearing, I will be calling on panelists to testify. Please listen for your name to be called as I will periodically announcing who the next panelists will be.

At this hearing, we will first be inviting testimony from the Department of Civil and Human Rights and then from members of the public.

During the hearing, if Council Members would like to ask a question of the administration or a specific panelist, please use the Zoom raise hand function, and I will call on you in order.

2.2

you represent, if any.

2 For all panelists, when called to 3 testify, please state your name and the organization

We will now call on representatives of the administration to testify. We will be hearing testimony from JoAnn Kamuf Ward, Deputy Commissioner of Policy and External Affairs at the New York City Commission on Human Rights and Sapna Raj, Deputy Commissioner of the Law Enforcement Bureau at the New York City Commission on Human Rights. We will also be joined for questions by Katherine Greenberg, Special Counsel at the New York City Commission on Human Rights.

At this time, I will administer the affirmation. Panelists, please raise your right hands. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth before this Committee and to respond honestly to Council Member questions? Deputy Commissioner Ward.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: I do.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Deputy
Commissioner Raj.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I do.

2.2

2.3

preliminary budget hearing on the Commission, we had

the opportunity to speak in depth about the breadth
of the Commission's work across New York City and
today I will give just a brief overview before we

5 turn to the substance.

2.2

2.3

The Commission is the local civil rights enforcement agency that implements the New York City Human Rights Law, which is one of the broadest and most protective antidiscrimination laws in the country with 27 protected categories which covers housing, employment, and public accommodations.

By statute, the Commission has 2 main functions. First, the Commission's Law Enforcement Bureau enforces the city's Human Rights Law by investigating complaints, initiating its own investigations and utilizing testing to help identify violations of the law, all of which my Colleague, Sapna Raj, will discuss in her testimony.

Second, through the Community Relations
Bureau, the Commission provides workshops and
trainings on New Yorkers' rights and the obligations
of businesses, employers, and housing providers under
the city Human Rights Law, and we work closely with
community partners and sibling agencies in these
efforts.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Seven years ago, the Commission established the Office of the Chair which houses the agency's policy, legislative, rulemaking, and adjudicatory function, and this is the office in the Commission where I sit.

This morning, I will start with the discussion of the Human Rights Law's employment protections as context for discussion of both Local Law 32 and Intro 134, and then I will turn it over to Sapna.

Since 2015, the New York City Human Rights Law has been amended by the City Council 38 times. More than a dozen of these amendments are in the area of employment, which is also the area where we see some of the highest numbers of filed complaints. I want to note some of the significant amendments in the employment arena to contextualize our conversation. A number of the Human Rights Law expansions from the past 7 years relate to language that appears in job advertisements and which require employers to take specific steps in hiring to comply with the Human Rights Law. Today, the city's Human Rights Law prohibits discrimination on the basis of criminal history, which means that employers can't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

include language such as no felonies or criminal background check required in job advertisements. The Fair Chance protections in our law also limit when in hiring employers can ask about criminal history, and, where employers make a inquiry, they're required to seek information from applicants themselves and to conduct a balancing test that they then share with an individual if they choose not to hire them after conducting the criminal background check. The law further prohibits discrimination on the basis of credit score, which includes prohibiting employers from using language such as credit check required in job advertisements. Our Human Rights Law also contains one of the nation's first bans on salary history inquiries, which prevents employers from asking any questions during interviews or in job applications about prior earnings and benefits. Lastly, the law ensures that the rights of pregnant and nursing people in employment including requiring employers to designated spaces for employees to express milk and to create written policies regarding lactation accommodations.

Each of these amendments that I've mentioned apply to employers with 4 or more

2 employees. There are some provisions of the Human

3 Rights Law that apply more broadly to all employers,

4 | even those with only 1 employee. That includes

5 prohibitions on sexual harassment as well as newly

6 instituted protections for domestic workers in

7 employment, but most protections apply to employers

8 | with 4 or more employees.

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Because the New York City Human Rights
Law's coverage is broader in many and most instances
than federal law, which generally covers only
employers with 15 or more or 20 or more employees,
our law provides vital protections for hundreds of
thousands of New York City workers who otherwise
would have little recourse against discrimination or
retaliation at work.

With that background, I'll turn to the subject of today's hearing, Intro 134. In December, as has already been mentioned, there was a hearing on what was then Intro 1208 on Salary Transparency, and I testified in front of City Council about pay equity, speaking in support of the intent of what is now Local Law 32, which requires covered employers to include a salary range in job advertisements. Local Law 32 is currently slated to go into effect on May

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

15, 2022. To assist employers in complying with this new provision, the Commission has developed a fact sheet on Local Law 32 and also begun outreach. Our publicly available fact sheet which can be found on our website explains that when employers advertise a job that would be performed in New York City they have to include a good faith wage range. Here, good faith means the range that the employer honestly believes they're willing to pay at the time that they post the position. As our fact sheet indicates, the term salary refers to the base rate of pay, be it hourly, annually, or paid at any other frequency. The fact sheet further clarifies that salary does not include other benefits or incentives that may be part of a compensation package. That can include things like commission, tips, bonuses, or stocks.

In addition to developing written

materials, the Commission is getting the word out to

potential employers and employees about job posting

requirements as part of our outreach and education

mandate. Commission staff have already been speaking

with business owners and attorneys about these new

protections. Earlier this month, the Commission

presented at a Workplace Compliance Consortium, and

we're joining several more trainings this month

including one for attorneys this afternoon and one in

a few weeks alongside the Department of Consumer and

Workplace Protections. I should underscore that we

endeavor to speak with business owners and potential

employees at every opportunity with the real goal of

fostering compliance with the Human Rights Law in

order to advance equity for all New Yorkers.

In addition to the work that we've been doing, there's been a significant public interest and media coverage of Local Law 32 to date. This includes legal alerts and trade publications, Forbes Magazine has covered the salary transparency law twice since December, there was a recent piece in Newsweek, and my Colleagues have spoken on CBS segments as well.

Looking ahead, the Commission plans to ensure comprehensive outreach in the business corridors in each borough and to collaborate with Chambers of Commerce and BIDs as well as professional associations to share information on salary transparency legislation, and that's if we stay with Local Law 32 or if the law is ultimately amended as we're discussing today.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

Any new protections will be built into our Human Rights Law training, and information will be shared at the resource fairs and round tables our agency attends, pathways in which we engage with tens of thousands of New Yorkers annually.

In our outreach, we plan to collaborate with small business services along with other government partners as we have done in several instances in the last several years.

As the City Council contemplates Intro

134, which amends Local Law 32, the Commission again
offers wholehearted for measures that advance pay
equity including efforts to foster transparency in
hiring and other measures that level the playing
field for employees and aim to tackle existing
disparities. This is consistent with our mission and
our commitment to ensure that all New Yorkers can
live and work with dignity, free from all forms of
discrimination, and our commitment to advancing
racial and gender equity more broadly.

The Commission believes that laws and policies that intentionally seek to eradicate the root causes of discrimination and inequity are pivotal. Each of us have seen or personally

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

experienced discrimination that is overt and 2 3 intentional. However, every day, discrimination occurs as a result of practices and policies that

disproportionally disadvantage particular individuals 5

and groups. In the employment context, hiring 6

7 practices that may seem neutral on their face can

8 perpetuate and even exacerbate inequity.

Discrimination in pay or in the terms of employment can be difficult to detect, as employees are often hesitant to share salary information with colleagues and often do not realize or are unable to find out that they are being compensated at lower rates for comparable work. Recognizing this reality, local and state governments across the country, including in New York, are taking steps to advance pay equity. Salary transparency is one of the tools that can level the playing field for employees and for women and people of color and other New Yorkers who have historically been and continue to be harmed by wage disparities.

Wages are important because they can be determinative of quality of life. They define what's affordable for us in the short term, and they can impact the ability of individuals and families to

2 improve intergenerational wealth so actions taken to
3 address pay inequity today can yield long-term

4 benefits.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

This is an issue that the Commission has long been focused on. In 2019, the Commission convened a public hearing on pay equity alongside the Commission on Gender Equity and the Department of Consumer and Worker Protection. This hearing and all of our work in this area have emphasized that federal, state, and local legislative and policy changes are needed to foster fairness and equity. That hearing in 2019 underscored a range of recommendations to address disparities in wages, which include the need for increased transparency surrounding pay, one of which is to post salary ranges. Additionally, there was support for employer reporting of pay data and demographic information as well as periodic audits that can be publicized. Testimony in the 2019 hearing also suggested that there's a need for greater services and supports for individuals that have been most impacted by wage disparities and underpayment, and that included measures such as raising the minimum wage, expansion of access to affordable childcare as well as outreach

2.2

2.3

and training programs that enhance career development and workplace readiness.

The Commission looks forward to work with this City Council as well as it's sibling agencies and relevant stakeholders, many of whom are here today, to promote gender and racial equity and advance pay equity in New York City.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to speak today. My Colleagues and I look forward to continuing to discuss Intro 134 and to working with you to ensure that New Yorkers can thrive, and it's now my pleasure to turn the floor over to Deputy Commissioner Sapna Raj to talk about the Commission's innovative law enforcement work.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Deputy

Commissioner, before you go, I just want to

acknowledge that we have been joined by Speaker

Adams, Council Member Brewer, Council Member Joseph,

and Minority Whip Vernikov.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: Thank you. Good morning, Chair Williams and Members of the Committee on Civil and Human Rights. I'm Sapna Raj, Deputy Commissioner of the Law Enforcement Bureau at the New York City Commission on Human Rights.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

It's my pleasure to speak about the work of the Law Enforcement Bureau. The attorneys in the Law Enforcement Bureau evaluate and investigate allegations of discrimination brought to the Commission by members of the public and utilize the agency's investigatory and prosecutorial powers to root out (INAUDIBLE) practice or other forms of discrimination through Commission-initiated investigations. LEB, which is the Law Enforcement Bureau, and its specialized units, the Early Intervention Unit, the Source of Income Unit, and Gender-based Harassment Unit offer the option of resolving claims in lieu of filing the complaint, leading to quicker resolutions. Resolutions through the pre-complaint intervention have significantly increased over the past several years as LEB has worked to provide timely resolutions despite an increased caseload.

In fiscal year '21, the Commission fielded 9,055 inquiries from members of the public in the form of phone calls, emails, letters, visits to the Commission offices, and queries to Mobile Intake Units dispatched to community sites or at Commission events.

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The Law Enforcement Bureau uses a variety of tools to investigate and determine whether violations of the Human Rights Law have occurred and to provide redress. We are an enforcement agency, but we do not simply issue determinations when violations have occurred and the damages should be paid to the complainant or that civil penalties should be paid to the City of New York. Our aim is always to repair harms experienced by individuals and communities impacted by discrimination and to prevent future Human Rights Law violations. The Commission takes a cooperative approach to fostering Human Rights Law compliance. In many instances involving first time violators of the city Human Rights Law, when no complainant was harmed by the violation, the Commission has sought to educate businesses and housing providers about their legal obligations and work with them in creating nondiscriminatory policies and practices rather than levying fines.

The Commission has several great pathways to identifying violations of the Human Rights Law.

Any individual can contact the Law Enforcement Bureau by our info line to report allegations of discrimination and to file an individual complaint.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Any New Yorker has the right to file a complaint with the Commission in the jurisdictional areas covered by our law. The Law Enforcement Bureau may also become aware of alleged unlawful discriminatory practices through an anonymous tip, information shared by a community-based organization, an elected official, through social media, or media reports. In these instances, the Commission can launch a Commissioninitiated action. The Law Enforcement Bureau also uses testing as an investigative tool to determine whether there is discrimination in housing, employment, or public accommodations. The agency has the authority to use testers to determine if they're treated differently or given different information by potential employers, landlords or real estate brokers, restaurants, hospitals, stores, or other public accommodations because they belong to a protected class. This is a historically effective tool used in civil rights litigation.

When the Commission learns of potential discriminatory conduct through a tip, testing, or a complaint filed by a member of the public, the Law Enforcement Bureau has many options as to how to proceed. The Commission has the authority to take a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

range of actions before a complaint is ever filed. One is to issue a cease-and-desist letter to notify the alleged wrongdoer that actions taken may be a violation of the New York City Human Rights Law, demand the discriminatory actions cease and that specific actions be taken including, for example, restoring the victim of discrimination to the status they were in before the discriminatory action or change policies and procedures. While cease-anddesist letters can be very effective, the Commission uses a suite of investigative methods such as requests for information on policies and practices, demands for documents and data, and interviews of key witnesses to build a comprehensive record of what occurred. Each of these tools can help build a factual record.

The amount of time that it takes to respond and investigate depends on the unique factors of each case, the underlying claim, the factual and legal complexity, the availability and responsiveness of those harmed by discrimination as well as any witnesses and respondents. Ultimately, at the conclusion of an investigation, the Law Enforcement Bureau reaches a determination as to whether the

2 evidence it gathered supports the allegations in the

3 complaint or not. If the Law Enforcement Bureau finds

4 probable cause, the cases proceed to a hearing at

5 OATH presided over by an administrative law judge.

6 Before initiating the prosecution, the Law

7 Enforcement Bureau attempts to settle or conciliate

8 | the case. If the case does not settle, then OATH will

9 hold a hearing, and the Commissioner of the

10 Commission on Human Rights will issue a final

11 decision dismissing the case or ordering relief for

12 | the complainant.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

At all points during the investigation, once probable cause has been found and until a decision and order is issued by the Commissioner, the parties can and do enter into settlement of the claims. Not all complaints are resolved by a Law Enforcement Bureau determination on the merits. Many cases settle for monetary restitution and/or affirmative relief such as policy creation, training, monitoring of the covered entity's business practices, or community service.

In fiscal year '21, 30 percent of cases were resolved through settlements. It is important to note that not all inquiries become filed complaints.

The Commission has instituted a range of approaches to quickly resolve matters. In the ongoing effort to foster accountability and justice for New Yorkers facing ongoing discrimination and harassment, the Law Enforcement Bureau has increasingly pursued precomplaint interventions. This is where the Commission attempts to resolve claims prior to the filing of a complaint. In fiscal year '21, the Law Enforcement Bureau obtained a positive outcome for a complainant in 214 matters, such as a reasonable accommodation for a disability or a transfer away from a harasser without filing a complaint. In fiscal year '20, the Law Enforcement Bureau resolved 403 matters in this way. In fiscal year '21, the most common precomplaint interventions involved disability accommodations in housing, unlawful source of income discrimination in which a tenant or prospective tenant was denied an apartment or the renewal of a lease based on the use of rental assistance. Because of LEB's interventions, New Yorkers were able to get a ramp installed at their apartment building or have the employer grant reasonable accommodations that were requested due to a disability, pregnancy, or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 religious beliefs without filing a complaint and 3 ensuing a litigation process which can be lengthy.

The Law Enforcement Bureau remains a venue for justice where recoveries and affirmative relief are calibrated to address the harms caused to New Yorkers. Through conciliation and decisions and orders, the Commission can award monetary damages for the complainant, including lost wages, emotional distress damages, and attorney's fees. The Law Enforcement Bureau can also impose civil penalties of up to 250,000 dollars that are paid to the general fund of the City of New York. Since 2015, the Commission has broken records year after year with respect to damages and penalties assessed. Last year was no different. In fiscal year '21, the Commission recovered 9,741,000 dollars in compensatory damages and civil penalties, the highest in Commission history for the third year in a row, and 2.2 million dollars more than fiscal year '20. Of that, 8,069,000 dollars was awarded in compensatory damages to complainants and 1,678,000 in civil penalties to the general fund of the City of New York.

In addition to securing monetary relief, the Law Enforcement Bureau continues to innovate

creative resolutions that deter future harm and put restorative justice principles into practice to

4 change the dynamics that lead to harms in the first

5 place.

2.2

2.3

Through case resolutions, the Commission can order respondents to perform wide-ranging affirmative relief including posting notice of rights the Commission has issued, creating or revising policies, conducting trainings, performing community service, and more. Settlements and agreements usually involve some combination of policy changes, training for staff and management, civil penalties, posting requirements, or other forms of affirmative relief.

In instances of employment

discrimination, the Commission has negotiated

resolutions that require respondents to invest in

employment pipeline opportunities for

underrepresented groups and to engage with community
based organization to facilitate broader recruitment.

In housing cases, settlements have included set asides of apartment for voucher holders and broker incentives for working with voucher holders. The Law Enforcement Bureau continues to identify strategic interventions to address

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

discrimination in housing, employment, and public accommodations and to respond to retaliation.

We look forward to working with the administration and Members of the City Council to identify and root out all manifestations of discrimination and harassment.

Thank you for convening today's hearing today. We look forward to your questions. Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you.

I will now turn it over to questions from Chair

Williams.

Panelists, please stay unmuted if possible during this question and answer period. Thank you.

Chair Williams, you may begin your questions.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I will start with the complaints process and results. One of the primary functions of CCHR is the intake, processing, investigation, and determination of complaints. This process includes several steps, and each case will be unique. I also want to mention the quality of an investigation is very important. In the first 4 months of fiscal 2022, there were 105

2.2

2.3

complaints filed and 253 closed. Additionally, the
average age of a complaint was 447 days. Does this
mean that of the open complaints, the average number
of days those cases have been open is 447?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: Yes, that means that the cases were open for that period of time on average. Some cases, depending on the complexity of the case, some cases will remain open longer because an investigation involves filing of the complaint, filing for an answer by the respondent, submitting a rebuttal by the complainant, investigating further by getting documents and data and interviews of witnesses so all of that can take a long time depending one the complexity of the case, how many witnesses are involved, what the data is like, and how many documents are involved.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. What is CCHR's goal for the time it takes CCHR to complete an investigation?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: Again, I think it depends on the case. I don't think we can say that in general a case should take only X amount of time. We try to resolve our cases as promptly as possible. However, depending on the complexity of the case and

2.2

2.3

the parties involved, cases can take longer and cases can take a much shorter period of time. Some cases close in a very short period of time, and others take much longer for the investigation to be completed.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Can you please describe the process of a complaint? I know you mentioned there's investigation and a series of things that take place from the incident to its determination from CCHR. What is the life cycle of a case?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: If a complainant comes forward and wants to file a complaint and is jurisdictional, we will draft the complaint. The complaint is then reviewed by the complainant and signed and notarized. All of that can take a little bit of time depending on the complainant's, sometimes it's hard to get in touch with a complainant and haven them sign the document. Once a complaint is filed and served on the respondent, the respondent has 30 days to respond and file an answer and a position statement. In litigation, usually there is a period of time when people get extensions of time in order to do that. Once they have filed an answer and position statement, the complainant has a chance to

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

submit a rebuttal. Once that rebuttal has been submitted then we start the investigation by asking for documents and information policies, data, and names of witnesses that we may want to interview. We also review the respondents. During this whole process, at any point in the process, the case can settle. Sometimes we are involved in settlement negotiations at the same time that we are doing the investigation. Once the investigation is complete, then we determine whether we will find probable cause or not. If we find probable cause, that case can still settle but can be referred to OATH. Once it's referred to OATH, there is a settlement conference then there is a hearing scheduled. Once the hearing is held, then the ALJ, the administrative law judge, issues a report and recommendation. That report and recommendation comes back to the Chair of the Commission who issues a decision and order.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. What parts of the process do you feel take the longest amount of time? Is it in the responses or is it in just the investigative work?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I think that also depends on the case and who is involved.

2.2

2.3

Sometimes it takes a long time to get complainants to respond, it takes a long time to get respondents to respond. Other times, that happens quickly, but the investigation takes longer because there's a lot of information we are looking for. We want to make sure the investigations are as thorough as possible so that we reach the right determination, whether we decide to find that there is no probable cause, that we are going to administratively close the case, we want to settle the case because we think there are issues that show that there's some liability or whether we want to refer it to OATH. I think it's hard to say that it's always one or the other. It depends on the case what takes longest.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Would you say that additional staff in your particular unit will decrease the time it takes to complete an investigation or is this something that cannot be changed from staffing?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I think we always welcome more staff. I'm very, very proud of the Law Enforcement Bureau and the work that we've done despite the pandemic, despite all the other issues we've had, that we are able to process the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

complaints and we're able to find justice for New
Yorkers as promptly as possible, but I think no one's
going to say no to having more staff.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Got it. What is the current total caseload of CCHR?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I think on average the attorneys have about 70 cases that they are handling at any one time.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: What's the total though, because that's the average caseload per attorney, but what's the total number of cases?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I don't know exactly how many cases we have currently pending. I can always look into that and update you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Yes, we would love to know how many cases in total. I have a few more questions. CCHR mediates some complaints through their free and voluntary mediation office. From fiscal 2019 through fiscal 2021, annually the average number of complaints successfully mediated is 42, and that (INAUDIBLE) maybe someone can mute, awesome. CCHR has had 3-year average for filing 653 complaints annually. This would be approximately 6 percent of opened complaints resulting in a successful

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

mediation. Can you please describe the mediation

process and has the feedback on the mediation process

been positive?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: Do you want to answer that, JoAnn, or do you want me to?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: It's fine for you to answer. I think I just want to clarify.

Mediation is actually separate than law enforcement, but Sapna intimately knows the process so I think

(INAUDIBLE)

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I could just talk about how, I will say in the beginning to start that our mediation process has received I would say 5-star reviews. People have been amazingly impressed by how well our one mediator has handled mediations that have been referred to her. The Law Enforcement Bureau refers cases where both parties are represented and we think that a mediation would be a process than either investigating the case further in our assessment or whether it goes to OATH.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. In reference to what you just said, how do you prefer mediation as an outcome of a complaint? When you receive a complaint, how do you determine which complaints

2.2

2.3

2 should seek mediation, how is it prioritized in the 3 process of a complaint?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I am going to have Katherine Greenberg, who handles our mediation referrals, to respond to this. Katherine.

mediation program, we choose cases where we feel there's a lot of investigative work still yet to be done before we'd be ready to reach a determination, where both parties have made compelling allegations and we want to give them an opportunity to try and negotiate a resolution among themselves before the bureau really digs in to gather the evidence we would need to reach a determination. It's typically cases that are early in the process that get referred, where we've served the complaint, gotten a response, and where the parties are interested in trying to resolve the matter with the facilitation of a mediator before we begin an active investigation.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Switching gears a little bit, the most common outcome of a complaint is administrative cause where CCHR finds dismissal appropriate due to the inability to locate a complainant, repeated failure of a complainant to

2 appear at meetings, unwillingness to provide

3 information, attend a hearing, and other items. This

4 accounted for 48 percent of closed complaints in

fiscal 2021. Why do you think that so many cases are

closed under administrative causes? 6

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: There are many reasons under administrative closures that we would close a case, not only because we're not able to get in touch with a complainant, but we have completed the investigation and we think that there is not going to be a finding of probable cause. Once we close the case as administratively closed, what we call an AC, the complainant, if they want to come forward, can, of course, appeal that to the Office of the Chair or they can file in state court for another 3 years so actually we find that a better determination than finding of no probable cause.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Are there any other new challenges in relations to complaints or processing that CCHR has confronted due to the COVID-19 pandemic?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: I will say that the number of complaints decreased during the pandemic because of the eviction moratorium, because

testing continued on a robust regimen. We did most of

2.2

2.3

our testing. We weren't doing any in-person testing because we weren't sending our testers out into the city to do in-person testing, but we did most of the testing by telephone and online, and we were able to complete quite a number of tests. It kind of reduced a little bit from 2020 to 2021 and also in 2022, but

I think we are picking up the pace at this point.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. I will actually pause there and open it up to my Colleagues for questions in relations to complaints process and results before we ask questions in reference to Intro 134.

All right. No questions. Okay. Thank you,
Deputy Commissioner. We look forward to following up
with you to get the numbers and some of the other
metrics we asked during this hearing.

Now, I will focus my attention to testimony by Deputy Commissioner JoAnn regarding
Intro 134. Deputy Commissioner, does CCHR foresee any difficulties in enforcing the amendments found in Intro 134?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: Hi. Thank you for the question, and thank you all for your time. I think it's always difficult to anticipate exactly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

what enforcement will look like before a law goes into effect, the transition from paper to practice, and in Intro 134, before this amendment, we were gearing up to start enforcing Local Law 32, and a major component of that work, right, is letting people know about the change in the law so education is the first step to realizing our ultimate goal of compliance with the Human Rights Law. I think one piece that we see as the Commission that is very helpful in terms of both outreach and education and enforcement is clarity in the law and consistency of who is covered by our law, be it in the employment context, in housing, or in public accommodations. As I noted in my testimony, the majority of the provisions of our law apply to businesses with 4 or more employees, and we believe it's a strength that there's clarity in the protections that employers have so that is one piece that I will flag between Local Law 32 and Intro 134.

The other piece that I would flag is also related to this point on clarity of protections and requirements, relates to what actually employers are required to put in their job advertisements, and that, if you look at the text of the Local Law 32 and

our fact sheet, and, as I said in the testimony as		
well, we define salary to be the base rate of pay or		
the base wage regardless of the frequency of that		
payment. Intro 134, I think, adds in some new		
language that appears to go further in terms of what		
is required for employers to include by referencing		
compensation, which if we look to federal law and		
other state law, compensation is more comprehensive		
than salary and can include bonuses, tips, stocks,		
and many other factors so I think in terms of		
enforcement we would like to ensure clarity in what		
is required by City Council for employers, but I will		
turn it over to my Colleague, Katherine Greenberg, to		
see if she has anything to add.		

SPECIAL COUNSEL GREENBERG: No. No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. As a followup to what you just said, and I know there's been a lot of conversation around the number of employees, are you aware of the city's administrative code and its definition around microbusinesses?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD:

Microbusinesses, it's either 19 or 15 or more, so,

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

2 yes, I'm aware of it, but I have not read it
3 recently.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, because I think a part of the intentions around the bill is to have a special carve-out for small businesses and there are definitions in different parts of the law, of course not in your law, that sort of defines the number of employees based off of their makeup as a microbusiness or a small business, so just wondering if you all thought through that. Okay, so how will CCHR use the 6-month extension of the efficacy date to make changes and conduct outreach to ensure compliance? Can you unmute Deputy Commissioner JoAnn, please? Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: I look forward to these hearings being in person. In terms of thinking through enforcement, and I think I referenced this a little bit already, the Commission is always, as Deputy Commissioner Raj indicated, interested in a cooperative approach and in fostering compliance so we work very closely, we have a Community Relations Bureau, which actually has an office in each of the 5 boroughs, and works with Chambers of Commerce and BIDs on a regular basis to

literally pound the pavement in communities and to do
business corridor outreach, and that's something that
we would certainly leverage between this point in
time and either the May effective date or, if there's
an amendment enacted, then into the November date so
we will be in communities spreading the word.
Obviously, we have a fact sheet that can disseminate,
but we also will include information on this law in
all the trainings and outreach that we do, which is a
mandate of the Community Relations Bureau. I think I
alluded to this in my testimony, but last year in
August and September when Key to NYC, the city's
vaccine mandate, was put into place, our Commission
was called upon to help small business owners
understand their obligations and how to comply with
Key to NYC. We worked very closely with Small
Business Services, with the Mayor's Office of
Nightlife, with DCWP, and with other community
partners to spread the word, and that's exactly what
we would do for this protection as well.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. I know in the budget testimony, I think for me what came out of it is the fact that CCHR is severely under-resourced, right, that's like a fact. Maybe you all can't say

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that. I know you all have to work with OMB, but it is clear that CCHR could use more resources, and so just wanting to understand sort of how you'll allocate resources to conduct outreach because I know outreach has been a concern in regards to what you said, the fact that the lovely Council that I'm now a part of has amended your law 38 times and each time that the law is amended, of course, we then instruct the agency to do all of this work but don't necessarily attach all of our amendments to resources for you to actually do the work to the highest quality so just wanting to understand with the PEG, with such budget constraints that you are already under, how you envision sort of shifting resources to accommodate both outreach and enforcement of the existing law?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: Thank you. It's a great question, and I think I have to start by echoing what Sapna said which is that we would always welcome more resources as an agency, and we are a small agency and there have been many amendments to our law, but I think we are very proud of the fact that with each of these amendments, we have been able to either pivot in the short term in our policy work, for example, to ensure that we are focused on getting

2.2

2.3

the word out, to use our communications team to
ensure that we are getting the word out in as many
languages as possible to as many both employers and
potential employees as possible, and so we welcome
support, but we are confident that with the staff and
the resources that we have we will be able to get the
word out effectively, and that's because we're able
to leverage community partnerships and sibling
agencies and City Council with whom we partner a lot
in doing outtake and education and outreach so thank
you all for the work you do with us.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Before I ask my next question, I just wanted to acknowledge Council Members Krishna and Louis who have joined us today.

Did the Commission interpret Local Law 32 to apply to jobs that could be performed outside of New York City? Can you unmute Deputy Commissioner...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: There's just a slight delay. We talked a little bit about the importance of consistency and clarity in protections, and that same theme applies to the application of our law in the employment context so the general way that our law has been approached is really a single unified understanding that our law applies where the

impact of discrimination is felt. In this context, if
a job would be undertaken in whole or in part in New
York, and that is known at the time of the posting,

5 then an employer would need to comply with the Human

6 Rights Law.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Did the

Commission interpret Local Law 32 to apply to general

notices that an employer is hiring such as a help

wanted sign? If not, does CCHR find the clarification

in Intro 134 to be helpful?

written advertisement is defined in our fact sheet, our interpretation of Local Law 32, to date to say that when you are posting and there are known positions, you would be required as an employer if you fall within the covered set of employers to include a salary range, and that would include a help wanted poster. In response to the second question, I am a bit concerned that the carve-out, which I understand conceptually, has the potential to swallow the rule so there's the potential that an employer can just have an open we will be hiring or we are hiring and they might know the salary range but they can use the potential carve-out to evade having to

advance pay equity.

include a salary range, but we would be keen to talk
to City Council and the stakeholders on this call and
elsewhere to think about how do we ensure that we are
finding the right balance between the potential
burden on employers and covered entities under our
law and protecting the rights of New Yorkers to

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. I guess in that same vein, do you anticipate that larger employers will use general advertisements to avoid compliance with the law?

generally operate from a position of good faith, and I see, as we've seen these types of law pass in other jurisdictions, we've seen general compliance, and I would hope that for all the reasons people support pay transparency and leveling the playing fields that employers who may even be covered by the law in other jurisdictions would do their best and as the law requires put in a good faith effort to include the knowledge that they have about their ability to pay potential employees in job advertisements so I will go with I'm hoping for the best and we are prepared

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 in the event that folks are not working in good 3 faith. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Got it. The fact sheet that you mentioned, is that the official guidance that CCHR has put out? I know there is something online. If so, what informed the guidance?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: Sure. These are great questions. That is our interpretation of Local Law 32. Obviously, is the law is amended along the lines of Intro 134, we would go back to that guidance and update it. That guidance was informed by a few things. One, by a review of our own existing protections and case law, interpretations of our law and how it has been applied by courts as well as conversations with stakeholders which include business groups and include advocates who have been working towards salary transparency, and I mentioned in my testimony that we have been working with sibling agencies on pay equity for several years and many of those actors are people that we consult with on a regular basis. I should flag that we are also always open to feedback. That's from now until any effective date and after the effective date, right? Our goal is always for our materials to be clear and

mentioned in my testimony, many provisions of our law

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

already apply to small businesses, and we are well aware that this is a new requirement, and our focus in the coming months, and that's including after the law goes into effect, right, we don't do education and then have enforcement. Education is an ongoing part of our mandate so we will be consistently working with small business owners, Chambers of Commerce, and BIDs to explain what the law means, and we understand that we are asking, our City Council and this legislation is asking small businesses to add something to job advertisements. I think often employers have a sense of the universe in which they are able to afford employees, and this law's really asking them to share that information. As we discussed previously, it's about a good faith salary range so it's at the time of posting what do you think you're able to pay. It doesn't prohibit employers from being able to offer something different if they find a candidate that they think is fantastic and is more qualified than they ever imagined or if their financial circumstances change that the ultimate amount that is paid is less than what's in the range. I think the intent here is really about leveling the playing field and ensuring

2.2

2.3

process.

that potential employees have a sense of whether it makes sense to move forward applying for a job, is it potentially a good fit, and asking employers to put one of their cards on the table during the hiring

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Okay. Thank you.

You said that education comes first, right? You
educate the small business owners and then you roll
it out and is this also being provided in different
languages as well?

as a threshold matter we translate our materials, our core materials, into 10 languages at least, but with protections like this we also look at what is the universe of business owners, what are languages that might be helpful, even if it's not required for our agency to publish something in that language, how are we going to reach the most people, and a huge asset on our staff is not only that we do written materials in a range of languages but we have staff on our Community Relations Team that speak more than 20 languages and Lead Advisors, Lead Liaisons across the city in each borough and with relationships in a variety of communities so we will leverage that

humongous asset in our outreach. Our trainings are
also done in multiple languages so it's speaking,
writing, and being able to respond to inquiries that
we receive in the languages that are accessible to

we receive in the languages that are accessible to

6 the New Yorkers that need to know information on the

7 Human Rights Law.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Wonderful. Thank you so much. Thank you, Chair.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Council Member Joseph. We have Council Member
Brewer's hand raised. Council Member Brewer, if you'd
like to go ahead.

much. I've tried to listen. There's a lot going on in the office right now, but I tried to listen. As it is, it's a good law that Helen Rosenthal passed, and I think there are people who think it should stay the same and then there are people who think that Intro 134 should be instituted. My question to you, I get you're not taking a position, what you're stating is that you're going to enforce whatever law comes along. I think that's really what you're saying. My question is do you have any opinion on this? What's going on guys? Do you have any opinion on this or is

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 there (INAUDIBLE) complicated these things can be so

3 my question is when you answered the question about

4 New York versus not New York in terms of many of

5 | these companies go, as you know, nationally not to

6 mention internationally, and also the size of

7 (INAUDIBLE) what is your experience about whether

8 this law should or should not, this Intro should or

9 should not be passed? Do you have an opinion?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: There are many different pieces of it, which influence my answer to that question. I think in terms of the effective date and what we've been hearing from folks on this call, we are very open to ensuring, again, our goal is compliance with the laws that we enforce, and as an agency we are committed to continuing expansive protections for all employees in New York so I think the law that gets human rights protections to the most people possible while also recognizing there's a balance of employer needs and actions that we're asking businesses to take or that this law will ask businesses to take is something that requires ongoing conversation. I stated, I think before, Council Woman Brewer, that we see a value in clarity and consistency so ensuring that the provisions of our

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

law.

law to the extent possible apply equitably to businesses and then that can be known in a fairly concise and clear way to sophisticated businesses, unsophisticated businesses, and everyday New Yorkers who will benefit ideally from the protection of this

understand what you're saying. It's not, you're doing what I said, which is you're going to enforce, I'm sure equitably because the Commission's always done that, but not taking a position. Can you just clarify one more time how you handle, because this is the issue with all of your challenges, those businesses that have borders beyond the city of New York, how do you handle something like that as so many of them do?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: Sure. I did
want to clarify that the one piece where I think we
have a strong position is having clarity in the
drafting on what employers are required to include in
the job postings and so the current Intro 134
includes legally defined terms that are compensation
and salary and so clarifying what the intent of City
Council is and obviously we work with the Law
Department and City Council and other stakeholders

2.2

2.3

between this hearing and the eventual discussion of
what law is passed, but those are pieces that I just
wanted to flag.

I think my Colleague, Katherine

Greenberg, I'm going to pivot to you on the question of looking at employers that are in multiple jurisdictions.

SPECIAL COUNSEL GREENBERG: Yes, of course. The focus of our law in terms of where it applies has to do with the specific job itself because, as Deputy Commissioner Ward had said before, it's where the impact of the discrimination is, and so that's typically going to be where the work is being performed so an employer who has a brick and mortar location in the 5 boroughs and that's where their employees work, they are covered by the law and all of their employees who work at their brick and mortar location have the protections of the law. For an employer who's based outside of New York City, it would only be employees who are performing work within the 5 boroughs, only those positions, that would come under the New York City Human Rights Law.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I assume (INAUDIBLE) days is the same thing. I assume you have

2.2

2.3

Member. That definition is uniform across the entire city Human Rights Law and for housing providers and public accommodations as well, but this is a definition that's understood by employers, by their counsel, by business groups so that they can have a consistent understanding of which provisions of the law would apply to them.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I'm still a little confused, Madam Chair, but I'll yield to somebody else. To be honest with you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Council Member Brewer. We have Council Member Farias with her questions.

council Member Farias: Hi. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for testifying. I just wanted to ask a followup, clarity question around remote work and hybrid work. What we've seen post-pandemic or throughout the pandemic is employers have had to adapt and their employees have had to shift quite a bit to either keep their jobs or the level of hours

2 that they need to make the wages that they're given.

3 How is that under the law right now in terms of

4 remote and hybrid work?

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: I'm actually going to turn this one back over to Katherine because I think it's a continuation of the point that she was just making.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Thank you.

SPECIAL COUNSEL GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and thank you for the question. It's an excellent question that we've been hearing a lot of as the way people work evolves. Currently, the city's Human Rights Law, all of the employment protections apply to people who are performing their jobs in New York City, whether they're working in an office, working in the field doing sales, or whether they're working from their home remotely so in this context, and all of the city's Human Rights Law's protections that apply to hiring, if the employer is going to be hiring somebody who works from New York City, including working remotely, then the protections of the law would apply to that person and the requirements of the law would apply to the employer so if an employer is going to be posting a job that

2 can be performed remotely from New York City, they

3 would be expected to comply with our law as is the

4 case with many other laws across the country.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Okay. Great. Thank you for that clarification.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Council Member. Chair Williams, I don't see any other hands raised if you'd like to go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I just have one more question because we didn't talk about the fines, which I think is really high for a very small business, and so just wanted to know your thoughts on the fines and whether or not it be appropriate to potentially create a cap for small businesses around the fines. Again, we've had a lot of conversations about the number of employees and I understand exactly what you mean in terms of previous laws on the threshold that you all had to use and so just wondering what your thoughts are on the fines.

Because you said something that I thought was interesting about a delicate dance and making sure that, of course, we're not being over punitive but at the same time wanting to protect workers.

2.2

2.3

2	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER WARD: Sure. I will
3	just give a brief response and then I'll turn it over
4	to the experts on enforcement, which are Deputy
5	Commissioner Raj and Special Counsel Greenberg. I
6	want to underscore here, first off, that we are not
7	an agency that walks around looking for violations or
8	issues, really fines alone. I think Sapna Raj talked
9	through the approach that we take, and there are many
10	tools in our toolbox before we get to the step of
11	fines and fees, and one of those is just letting
12	business owners know if a potential violation comes
13	to our attention what the requirements of our law are
14	and providing for a cure period through something
15	called a cease-and-desist letter so I think in many
16	instances that would be an approach that we would
17	take, but there's a number of factors that we have
18	used in looking at enforcement for the employment
19	protections I've already mentioned so I'll turn it
20	over to Sapna to respond more fulsomely.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: Thank you,

JoAnn. I think one thing you should remember is that

the fines that we're talking about, the 250,000

dollars, is a maximum. It's very rare that we have

imposed that. I would say that the times that I

2.2

2.3

remember that we've imposed that large of a fine was in the settlement that we had with Fox News, which was a sexual harassment Commission-initiated matter and we had assessed 250,000 dollars per violation and it was a million dollar settlement. That's extremely rare. The maximum is 250,000. We look at the size and sophistication of the business, we look at the violation as JoAnn said and I have said today. We also look to make sure that policies and practices are changed, and a lot of times we will look at that in order to determine what the fine needs to be, the civil penalties need to be so it isn't a blanket fine of 250,000 dollars. It's up to. It's a ceiling, and it's not a floor.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you so much,

Deputy Commissioners, for your testimony. I look

forward to working with you to address these very

important concerns for New Yorkers.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Chair, we do have a question from Council Member Farias.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Sorry. Thank you,
Chair, for allowing me one more followup. That was a
great question. Can I just quickly get the minimum,

do we have an estimate of what a minimum of a fine
would be for a small business, roughly, if there's an
estimation. Then the followup also is do we have a
time period for curing for a small business that's

6 typically utilized?

2.2

2.3

particular case and not just with this particular legislation, but in all of our protected categories there is no minimum. There are a lot of cases, if you look at our website and our settlements page, you'll see that a lot of cases are settled without a fine. It can be just affirmative relief where the respondent changes their policies and practices, gets training, does postings, maybe they do community work, but we don't always assess a fine. We don't always assess damages either. It all depends on the case, the complexity, what kind of respondent it is, and what the facts are in each case.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: That's great to hear so we're already protecting small businesses as it is in this. Great. Is there like a minimum cure period? Is it like 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, or is this also case by case?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER RAJ: That's also on a

case-by-case basis. There isn't necessarily a cure

period. We are looking to make sure that the

businesses comply with the law, know about the law,

and change their policies and practices so there's

not always a cure period.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Awesome. Thank you so much for my followup and today's testimony from all 3 of you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,

Council Member. I will now turn it back over to Chair

Williams for any additional questions.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Nope. We can move to the next panel. Just want to thank the administration again.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you. We will now turn to public testimony. I'd like to remind everyone that unlike our typical Council hearings, we will be calling on individuals one-by-one to testify.

Each panelist will be given 2 minutes to speak. Please begin once the Sergeant has started the timer.

2.2

2.2

2.3

Council Members who have questions for a particular panelist should use the raise hand function in Zoom, and I will call on you after the panelist has completed their testimony. Council Member do have at most 5 minutes for any additional questions.

For panelists, once your name is called,
a Member of our staff will unmute you and the
Sergeant-at-Arms will give you the go ahead to begin
on setting the timer. Please wait for the Sergeant to
announce that you may begin before delivering your
testimony.

I would now like to welcome Senator

Jessica Ramos to testify. After Senator Ramos, I will

be calling on Winston Tokuhisa and then Charisma

White to testify. Senator Ramos, you can go ahead

when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

SENATOR JESSICA RAMOS: Buenos dias. My
name is Jessica Ramos. I represent Senate District

13, which includes Corona, East Elmhurst, Jackson

Heights, and parts of Astoria, Elmhurst, and Woodside
in Queens. I also Chair the Senate Committee on Labor

and, like many of you on the City Council, bring my

2.2

2.3

2 experience working in service of my neighbors and the 3 labor movement to my position as a legislator.

In the labor movement, we know the best answer to the question of guaranteed pay equity is a collective bargaining agreement. Until that time where every worker has the ability to negotiate through a collective voice and on even footing with their employer, we have a role to play as lawmakers to address pay disparity that discriminates based on race, gender, or any class. I don't need to review the horrible statistics that outline the reality of racial and gender-based pay discrimination with you. The City Council acknowledged the importance of pay transparency as a path to closing pay gaps when you passed Local Law 32. You already know how this deeply entrenched issue impacts women of color across sectors.

Instead, I testify before you today to share the concerns of the labor movement and raise my own concerns with elements of the recently introduced Intro 134, which on its face effectively weakens the ability of Local Law 32 to meet its goals. I want to thank Council Member Williams for graciously making the time to discuss our shared goals of supporting

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2 small businesses and M/WBEs while addressing pay

3 disparity, and I remain open and available to

4 collaborate and ensure the strongest possible outcome

5 is achieved.

2.2

2.3

First, language in Intro 134 defines a small business as one of 15 or fewer employees rather than the threshold of 4 employees codified in the state Human Rights Law. There should be consistency across the city and state, and the threshold that exempts a business from posting their wages should only be permitted to businesses with 4 or fewer employees. Offices with fewer than 15 employees can still be highly profitable and open to practices of pay discrimination. The implied argument with the carve-out for small businesses, however you define them, is that they should have the opportunity to engage...

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

SENATOR JESSICA RAMOS: In opaque and discriminatory hiring process. Whether you are a microbusiness or a startup, pay discrimination should not be a tool at your disposal to scale your business. This is an implication we must reject and

2.2

2.3

2 instead look to give support to even our smallest 3 businesses with other legislative tools.

Second, the exemption for general notices that an employer is hiring without reference to a particular position creates a loophole for companies of all sizes to avoid compliance and transparency. I cannot foresee what the purpose of this exemption would be other than to create a venue for employers of all sizes to attempt to recruit talent without having to disclose the wage they intend to pay. By creating unnecessary ambiguity, this provision is likely to be used by employers to avoid compliance and risks swallowing the entire law.

I will close by saying that I carry a complimentary bill to Local Law 32 in the State Senate with my counterpart, Assembly Labor Chair Latoya Joyner. S5598B would mandate that employers disclose compensation or range of compensation upon announcement of a job opportunity and would provide the state Department of Labor with improved enforcement capacity. By enhancing transparency around compensation at the start of the hiring process and limiting the role of employer bias, this bill will empower applicants with critical

the hiring process.

2.2

2.3

information, prevent wage discrimination, reduce
negative negotiation outcomes, and address systemic
gender-based wage disparities that originate during

I look forward to our continued partnership as we work at every level of government to ensure that as people return to work after the pandemic they have the ability to earn equal pay for equal work. Thank you for your time.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Senator Ramos. I would now like to welcome Winston
Tokuhisa to testify. After Winston Tokuhisa, we will
be calling on Charisma White followed by Kecia Kemp.
Winston, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls
time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

WINSTON TOKUHISA: Ever since I first
became homeless in 2006, I've repeatedly been robbed
in the very worst way imaginable. Not in the
conventional sense with regard to money or property,
not to say that it has not happened, but worse still
are the best years of my life. It is not lost on me
that had the New York City Commission on Human Rights
(INAUDIBLE) appropriately I could have saved at least

2 a few. It was only by chance that a City Council 3 Member's office referred to the (INAUDIBLE) training 4 conducted by then Partnership for the Homeless and Neighbors Together. Through them, I learned how to 5 find apartments for voucher, what my rights were, and 6 how the city then could assist me. Little did I know 8 even this knowledge in isolation would not be enough to get me a house. In January 2019, I documented and filed a complaint for my first (INAUDIBLE) experience 10 11 before being introduced to the CCHR investigator 12 assigned to my case. Previously, I'd heard stories 13 about (INAUDIBLE) scenarios where an intervention 14 took place and voucher holders were placed in the 15 apartment they wanted or a comparable one. 16 Unfortunately, I was not so lucky. While the 17 investigator was encouraging, by June she was no 18 longer with the organization. This change, while 19 seemingly innocuous, marked the beginning of the end. 20 For the subsequent months, (INAUDIBLE) investigator 21 became less and less frequent until they stopped 2.2 completely. The last I heard, I have some money 2.3 coming to me as an outcome of a trial, but who can say. It's unfortunate that this (INAUDIBLE) gives 24 25 hope to the hopeless but then (INAUDIBLE). As

of Income (INAUDIBLE) Unit. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

(INAUDIBLE) said, (INAUDIBLE) it's more like Uno. For far too long, the most vulnerable of your neighbors, such as myself, have gotten a raw deal. I hope you'll take it upon yourselves to make it right by ensuring no less than 1 million dollars is allocated to fund the New York City Commission on Human Rights Source

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Winston. I would like to now welcome Charisma White to testify. After Charisma White, I will be calling on Kecia Kemp followed by Francilia (phonetic) Wilkins. Charisma, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

CHARISMA WHITE: Hello. My name is

Charisma White. I am an advocate for homeless New

Yorkers throughout the 5 boroughs. It took me around

3 years to get a lawyer from the CCHR. The process

was of income discrimination against me and help me

get the apartment that I am in now. During those 3

years, I was homeless. My landlord is currently

trying to evict me with a family of 3. I'm in the

process of looking for a new place to live, and it's

taken me over a year to find a new apartment. I'm

2.2

2.3

working the CCHR, but they are not responding fast enough for me to find a new home for my family and me. When the Commission does not respond in a timely manner, it leaves people like me homeless. The only lawyer in the SID unit that I have been working with to try and help me get housed is leaving Friday, that was last Friday. If I don't have a mediator from the CCHR to help me get a viewing with landlords that don't respond to me, I'm left with nothing. It is critical that the Source of Income Discrimination unit at CCHR gets its funding it needs. In fiscal year 2023, CCHR...

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

CHARISMA WHITE: Should be funded at a baseline of 1 million dollars to meet this critical need. Thank you for your time.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you.

As a reminder, if any Council Members have questions,
you can use the Zoom raise hand function.

I would like to now welcome Kecia Kemp to testify. After Kecia Kemp, we will be calling on Francilia Wilkins followed by Frank Curbine (phonetic). Kecia, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

KECIA KEMP: Hello. My name is Kecia Kemp. I was in possession of a CityFHEPS voucher while I was in NYCHA apartment in Brooklyn, New York. The landlords were not accepting my voucher. I reached out to CCHR, and I heard back from them roughly 90 days later. This is unacceptable. In my experience, the city agency completely dropped the ball. I currently am in a shelter and need the advocacy of the CCHR to help me to get into a stable and safe housing. How is it possible that I have to wait for months for a callback from CCHR? With CCHR's help, I could get out of the shelter system. I need CCHR to respond to my calls promptly to get out of the shelter system. We have to do what is right and get more funding for CCHR. In the fiscal year 2023, CCHR should be funded at a baseline of 1 million. I would appreciate whatever advocacy you can provide for all services rendered and needed and necessary for this time of need. It's not just for myself. It's for all those who are in the same sort of situation that myself is in. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you for your testimony, and, yes, I will assure you that I have

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

been advocating to increase the funding to ensure

that the Source of Income unit can properly enforce

and help New Yorkers who are facing voucher

discrimination. Thank you so much for your testimony.

KECIA KEMP: Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you.

I do not see Francilia Wilkins or Frank Curbine in
our panelists. The next witness we will call will be
Kathy Wylde. Following Kathy Wylde, we will be
calling on Margaret Price and then Andrea Johnson.
Kathy, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

with the 5 borough Chambers of Commerce and many other representatives of both small business and large business to express our thanks to the Council for being willing to consider our comments, which we were not able to make during the original consideration of Local Law 32 because there just wasn't the opportunity. I think that the key to this to understanding the importance of the amendments, which we support, is to understand the conditions both post-pandemic and in general in New York City for small business at this time and also for our

for (INAUDIBLE) make sure that we're...

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

global nature of our city's workforce, which means
that we have jobs here in New York City that are very
important to protect pay parity equity, but we also
have positions that are in other jurisdictions around
the world and the clarity that businesses are looking

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I think everybody was unmuted so we need to mute everybody back. Okay.

KATHRYN WYLDE: As you know, small business, particularly, lost a lot during the pandemic. We also have very restrictive immigration policies, part of them because of the COVID-19, part of them because of the national policies that cut back on international availability of talent. Today, we have 200,000+ job opening postings every day in the city so we have a very tight talent market, and employers generally are anxious to support pay equity laws, but we think that the time to inform businesses of this law, and also this law applies to nonprofits, the time to inform just isn't there and to educate them on compliance. It's also important to note in terms of the burden on small businesses that enforcement of these laws under the Human Rights Law are complaint-driven...

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

KATHRYN WYLDE: And are subject to private rights of action and that this involves expenses that small businesses are not accustomed to. We've found that businesses with under 15 employees, many of them, in fact a large majority of them, are a combination of immigrant and M/WBE businesses so those businesses in particular, it takes time to reach out for them so we particularly appreciate the pushback in the effective date of this Local Law so there's time to educate them, and we're also looking for the opportunity for employers to be able to participate in making this law work because it's in all of our interests to have an effective law. Thank you for this opportunity and for the consideration that you're providing.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Kathy. Chair, it looks like we do have questions from
Council Member Brewer followed by Council Member
Farias. Council Member Brewer, if you'd like to go
ahead.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much. My question is what specifically in the

clarify the situation?

2.2

2.3

proposed Intro do you think would be helpful for clarity? What specifics? Is it the 15? Is it the international? What is it that you think would help

KATHRYN WYLDE: Number one, push back the date so that employers have time, especially, this is small employers, nonprofit and business, education. For big employers who follow these things and have law firms that follow them, it's more an issue of being able to figure out how they're going to communicate to their current employees what they're doing, how they're going to reevaluate what their salary ranges are, and they just need time to make sure that what they're doing in terms of their New York City employees, how that applies to their global situation and how their existing workforce sees these new job postings so that's number one.

Then, I think that the other important thing is the clarification with regard to that this applies to New York City jobs, whether they're remote or, the job definition is somebody can be working from home but they're still working in a New York City job, and I think that that was not clear in the original legislation. I think the Human Rights

2.2

2.3

Commission has attempted to make that more clear, but that's very important to us.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Council Member Brewer. Council Member Farias, you can
go ahead.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Thank you. I just have some clarifying questions around the testimony or the memorandum you sent around earlier. I understand the date and push back. I agree in order to give folks time to kind of get accommodated and actually present how the equitable salary ranges they would like to pay black and brown people and communities or low-wage workers, we should allow them time to do that, but do we feel like a competitive market isn't good for small businesses in terms of, hearing your testimony, we have like unprecedented competition for qualified black and brown folks...

Member, the point of that both on the talent shortage that we have in the city right now with a lot of jobs that are not filled because we haven't focused enough on upscaling our own people and we've cut off

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

state and pay more to get a licensed professional

because they've got a shortage of talent for a

diversity candidate that an employer is going to pay

21 more to because they're trying to meet their DEI

2.2 values so that's a question because New York is a

2.3 very litigious place. Anything you do in terms of

adding new provisions to the Human Rights Commission,

all this stuff is complaint-driven, that's

2 enforcement in this area so this is an invitation to

3 lawsuits, and that's the concern that both and large

4 and small business have.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: For me, as a Afro-Latina, a woman of color, a young person in workforce, both who has worked in the nonprofit sector, both in city government and now as someone as a boss or employer in some facet for a team of people, I think we are losing people because we're not paying black and brown people, immigrant people, women, young people, the salaries that they deserve. I personally over years of interviewing for a lot of different sectors or a lot of different titles have wasted my time going through multiple interviews and reaching to the endpoint where the salary range was not suitable for my value and my experience and so I can't fully understand how we have an issue here where we should be protecting workers and ensuring that people in our communities can actually apply for the jobs that they're qualified for. I think we're looking at outsourcing jobs because the people that we have in our neighborhoods are refusing to work for the places for low-wage work that isn't of the same value that they are willing to offer. Personally, and

I'll let you speak, I just want to wrap this thought
up, company culture matters. If you're creating an
environment that's welcoming and that's open and
that's willing to pay people for their value and
their skillset and experience, I believe that they
will work for your employment or for your company
even if it's maybe a little bit less than what
they're willing to do because they feel welcome and
they feel like it's an environment where they want to
work and be able to thrive in so, for me, salary
ranges, I'm just having a very difficult time
understanding why we are hyperfocused on 15 or less
employers, the people that are actually supposed to
be employing the people in my community to make sure
that they can actually stay here when we're fighting
gentrification, when we're looking at recovery, when
we're fighting for higher wages, we have folks in
sectors right now that are asking to increase our
minimum wage and here we are fighting to balance out
the field and be able to not have people waste their
time

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Interviewing for businesses that do not want to pay them the salary range that they deserve.

KATHRYN WYLDE: I agree with you on all those points. I don't think the law addresses those points. I think if you were consulting with employers on how to frame a law that addresses those points, it would be one that actually measured results, not one that was simply putting a salary range in a job posting. That doesn't guarantee anybody anything.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: We can agree to disagree right there. I don't have any more time left. Thank you, Chair, for letting me go over.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Council Member. Seeing no other questions, I would
like to now invite Margaret Price followed by Andrea
Johnson and then Merble Reagon. Margaret, you can go
ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

MARGARET PRICE: Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I am author of the book Single Women and Money published by Rowman and Littlefield.

I'm also co-chair of Manhattan's Community Board 8

Women and Families Committee. At our Women and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Families Committee meeting March 30th, the Committee overwhelmingly passed a resolution strongly opposing the proposed Intro 134 which would diminish the value of the upcoming salary transparency law. Women in New York state are paid a median 86 cents for every dollar a man typically earns. The salary transparency law takes a significant step toward closing this harmful, discriminatory wage gap. That the City Council would even consider diminishing a law that would help end wage discrimination is unfortunate. Moreover, the City Council should not be considering legislation that would bar employees in smaller businesses from the worker protections available to employees in larger businesses. We also believe that New York's employers by now should be well-prepared to comply with the salary transparency law by May 15th. Thus CB8's Women and Families Committee strongly opposes the amendment 134, and we urge the City Council to oppose it as well. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I just want to state that I don't think that this bill intends to erase salary equity. I understand what the concerns are and have spoken offline before this hearing and

25 SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

time.

2 ANDREA JOHNSON: Thank you. Andrea Johnson 3 with the National Women's Law Center, and I'm here to 4 express our concerns with Intro 134. The Law Center has been working for a decade with elected officials across the country to pass laws that will help close 6 gender and racial wage gaps. We're seeing right now 8 that salary range transparency is a top policy priority and a trend that we're seeing really sweep the country because research shows time and again 10 that providing applicants the salary range for 11 12 position helps narrow gender wage gaps. There is a direct correlation there. It narrows those gender 13 wage gaps that otherwise can arise in negotiation. In 14 15 just the last year, we've seen 4 states, Washington, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Nevada, pass laws 16 17 requiring employers to provide job applicants a 18 salary range for position at some point in the hiring 19 process. We're also seeing more and more businesses, 20 small and large alike, voluntarily implement salary 21 range transparency, not only because it helps 2.2 employers avoid wage gaps and litigation but because 2.3 small businesses have told us it helps them more efficiently and effectively find and match with 24 interested candidates and avoid wasting time 25

2.2

2.3

interviewing people who aren't interested. Indeed, a recent study found that the number of job postings that include salary ranges has been on the rise this year given the increasingly tight labor market.

Colorado's salary range posting requirement like New York City's applies to all size employers, understand that your original law applies to those with 4 or more employees, but Colorado's law applied to all employers because this information is important no matter where you work and it is a simple measure to implement. Employers know from their own budgeting what they are generally able to offer for a position.

This just says be transparent about that. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony, and I'm happy to answer questions.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Andrea. Seeing no questions, I will now call on Merble Reagon followed by Julia Elmaleh-Sachs and then Amelia Adams. Merble, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

MERBLE REAGON: Good morning. My name is Merble Reagon. I have worked along with many others for 50 years to help more than 25,000 New York City

information about the Women's Center for Education

crystal clear, to close the wage gap for women and

people of color by promoting transparency around

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

hiring and compensation. Today, I sit before this City Council once again to testify on behalf of NELA New York, the New York affiliate of the National Employment Lawyers Association, working with PowHer New York, and, to be frank, I am disturbed. Disturbed that this City Council is considering walking back the city's salary transparency law, a law that represents a historic win for workers in the fight against workplace discrimination before it has even taken effect. The amendments proposed today not only undermine the purpose of the law by creating exemptions for wide slots of employers across the 5 boroughs, it perpetuates systemic inequities against the very people who were meant to benefit from this law, women and people of color. As attorneys for employees, we frequently represent workers who are subjected to all kinds of discriminatory abuse by their supervisors. This misconduct sometimes includes wage discrimination. Too often, women and people of color are paid less than their colleagues who are performing substantially similar work. This is nothing new. For years, workers rights activists have used the hashtag equal payday to call attention to the wage gap. In 2022, women in the U.S. earned just

2 83 cents on the dollar compared to men on average 3 according to the National Committee on Pay Equity.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: The figures are even more bleak for women of color, 75 cents for Asian Americans, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women, 58 cents for black women, 50 cents for indigenous women, and just 49 cents for Latino women. New York City's salary transparency law aims to shrink these wage gaps by requiring employers to be more transparent around compensation, but Intro 134 threatens to set a dangerous precedent for those seeking to chip away at the anti-discrimination protection afforded by the city's Human Rights Law. First, the bill limits the definition of employer to include only those with 15 or more employees, a significant departure from the original threshold of 4 or more employees. As many today will explain in greater detail, this carve-out for certain small businesses risks opening Pandora's box for corporate interest to create additional loopholes that would help companies avoid compliance with the city's antidiscrimination law.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Julie

Elmaleh-Sachs, time's expired.

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I have a question.

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Can you, and this is for anybody that was on that panel, can you explain how this would prevent pay equity?

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: Absolutely. Many of the city's employers have 14 or less employees, and, by not being required to post salary ranges, those employees that may apply to those jobs will not know what their counterparts are making so that's one of the ways that it would not promote salary transparency and equity and another way which I was about to speak of when my time ran out is that the exception for remote work is a really big exception. Now, with the pandemic so many of us, as you know, are working remotely and an employer could say that their job posting prefers in-person work or remote work which would allow them to not post the salary range so all of those potential employees that might apply to that job will not know what the salary range, will not know what their male counterparts or

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

white counterparts might be making at work for those jobs.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Committee Counsel, if I'm wrong, please chime in, but I don't think that this bill gets to one of the roots that you're talking about in terms of knowing what, you just said white counterparts, and I don't think the bill, there's no way to know what a white person is making at a company through the salary ranges being on a job description unless we're doing something because how would you know what, unless a company is completely disclosing all of the salaries, which this bill does not do, this bill is focused on job descriptions, and I understand what you're saying and I actually think that is like the larger issue when you actually get into a company and like actually seeing what the salaries are, this bill is in reference to job descriptions so if you could share like how one would ascertain what the different salaries are within a company through this legislation because that, I don't understand that point.

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: I'm happy to respond, but I'm also happy to allow others who have their hands raised to respond.

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Sorry. You can unmute Andrea.

ANDREA JOHNSON: Thank you so much, Chair, for that question. There has been research showing that in negotiations it is common for wage gaps to arise at that point because, a few factors. One being that women tend to ask for less than men even when equally qualified, and I think there's sort of internalized bias that is at play there, but research does show that when women have the context about a negotiation, what is negotiable in the salary range for that position, that information helps close those wage gaps and I include citations to that in my written testimony to show that so this is a major tool that has been identified by the equal pay community as crucial to closing gender and racial wage gaps that otherwise arise in negotiations.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I understand that part, but the comment that was made was that we would be able to see what our counterparts are making, right, so if the focus is women, because I think the focus seems to be just women, I know people of color being tossed in and out of the conversation, but it seems the focus seems to be women, which I

2.2

2.3

believe you made.

understand, and the comment was that we would be able to see what other people are making, and I don't really understand how we would be able to see what people are making if this is specific to the job description. There's no way to see what people are making internally. That was the comment that Julie, I

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: Can I respond?
CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Sure.

JULIA ELMALEH-SACHS: Thank you, Chair
Williams. I believe the law as it stands right now
also applies to promotions and transfers so that
would, for people who are already working at a
company and would like to have a promotion or a
transfer opportunity that would apply to their
counterparts that are already at that promotion level
as well. They would at least know a salary range and
be able to know whether they're making the same
amount of...

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I get what you're saying, and we can move on because I don't want to sort of expound upon this point, but you made a statement that we would then be able to see what everybody in a company is making and this law doesn't

19

21

22

24

25

would know what everyone is making within a

particular company through this legislation, and the

person would make if they applied to a said job and

higher salary, understanding what those minimum and

maximum salaries are, but it's just the notion that

all of a sudden pay equity will be solved and we

they can use that information to negotiate for a

- 2 | legislation doesn't do that so I just wanted to make
- 3 that point, but we can go to the next person,
- 4 Jayasri.

- JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
- 6 Chair Williams. I would like to now call on Amelia
- 7 Adams to testify followed by Barbara Kushner and then
- 8 Tim Johnson. Amelia, you can go ahead when the
- 9 | Sergeant calls time.
 - SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.
- 11 AMELIA ADAMS: Hi. Good afternoon, and
- 12 | thank you, Chair Williams, for this opportunity. I
- 13 don't know if anyone can see me because I just see
- 14 | the, oh, that's my timer, so sorry. I am testifying
- 15 on behalf of me as a business owner. I run a
- 16 consulting firm, Adams Advisors, and I actually
- 17 | welcome the changes that Chair Williams has proposed.
- 18 | I think 2 of them that I kind of want to harp on is
- 19 | that in talking to other fellow business owners
- 20 around the original bit of implementation, a number
- 21 | of folks were just not aware and I think there were
- 22 some good questions that other Council Members
- 23 | brought up around like outreach, education, but I
- 24 also was just shocked that one of the comments in the
- 25 | testimony, admin, talking about advertising in

Forbes, and I just think that is so removed from
where everyday businesses are getting information
from and such things. I submitted, and I'm going to
be submitting more testimony, (INAUDIBLE) support of
these changes for small business owners who welcome
like more time to actually get their house in order
because I know that as a small, black woman-owned
business, we are often overlooked for many things,
grants, RFPs, and I think the, my time is running
out, sorry. We are often looked over in a lot of
things and having this cut off where I originally
wasn't in the original cut off so this new change of
15 employees or more, I wouldn't be covered, and I
think I pay a decent salary and benefits and things
like that but compared to larger firms, if you put
side by side positions that I'm

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

AMELIA ADAMS: Advertising and the positions that other firms are putting out, I may be seen as a non-desired workplace because my salary starting range is not as high and I yield my time.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Miss Adams. I'd like to now call on Barbara Kushner
to testify followed by Tim Johnson and then Jessica

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Walker. Barbara, you can start when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

BARBARA KUSHNER: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Williams. As a woman of color and an owner of an M/WBE business, I'm an advocate for gender and racial pay parity. I started my own company out of frustration with the discriminatory treatment of black women in the workforce so I applaud the City Council's concern with addressing this issue and seeking to achieve racial and gender equity in compensation practices. At the same time, I do not believe that a law that requires employers to list minimum and maximum salaries in a job posting is a solution to the pay parity issue. In fact, for an M/WBE company in an industry like mine, construction management, the current law would make my situation worse. I already have to pay more than majority-owned firms for qualified job candidates because competition for talent is very tight. If I publish a maximum salary for an engineer, my large majorityowned competitors can easily outbid my offer. This will push salaries up which may be good for job candidates but not for business owners like me. I

think there are far better ways to encourage pay
parity without hurting small and mid-sized employers
like myself. When I bid for a contract in New Jersey,
for example, they require that I comply with AA-302
Reporting Statute where I provide information on the
race and gender of my employees. A similar form for
the city of New York can be modified to add salary by
race and gender to such a reporting form that
companies could file annually or whenever a city
contract is awarded. This is the approach that
President Obama took in his executive order that
required companies with more than 100 employees to
submit to the EEOC. If the Council has consulted with
employers before enacting this law, I think we should
have proposed better solutions. I support the
amendments

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

BARBARA KUSHNER: But they do not go far enough to protect people in my situation. Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Barbara. I would just like to acknowledge we have Council Member Salamanca who has joined us today.

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Next, I will be calling Tim Johnson followed by Jessica Walker and then Gloria Middleton. Tim, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

TIM JOHNSON: Chair Williams and Members

of the New York City Council Committee on Civil and Human Rights, I am here representing the Greater New York Hospital Association. We represent and include in our membership all the hospitals, both public and voluntary in the city, all of our members are notfor-profit. We also work very closely with communitybased organizations, community health centers, and we are concerned that Local Law 32 as written may harm the ability for hospitals, those other healthcare organizations, and others to be able to recruit from the widest talent pool that they have available if the law is implemented as written. I agree with Barbara that some further amendments are necessary, and, right now, we are facing in the state of New York including in the city of New York a healthcare staffing crisis. The Governor of New York has put forth executive orders and declarations around healthcare staffing, and I think that it's very, very important that our safety net hospitals, the other

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

healthcare organizations are able to draw upon the widest talent pool that they can, and I think that Local Law 32 and even with Intro 134 has the potential to reduce that talent pool of available people applying for these jobs. When I hear the Deputy Commissioner earlier saying that one of the benefits of this law is that folks can look at it and decide is this a good fit, I don't necessarily want people to look at it and rule out healthcare jobs. I want more people to get in and allow those organizations to have the opportunity to really make a case that these mission-based organizations that may not pay as much as a lot of other organizations are actually a great place to work, and I would really be looking for a further amendment such as ...

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

TIM JOHNSON: To require employers to disclose salary ranges at conditional offer or something like that, but we're happy to work with the Council. I would also note in closing that most of the healthcare jobs in the city of New York are subject to collective bargaining. They have been negotiated between unions and employers, and I would just ask you to take that into consideration in

called the AA-302 with the Department of Treasury for

person's pay down there.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 the State of New Jersey, and that form allows you to 3 break down gender, ethnicity, the number of African-4 Americans, Asians, whatever, in your company, and you have to list the number and what office they're located in. It does not ask you about pay or anything 6 7 like that. I am saying that this is a typical form 8 that can be used and modified to include the pay range for the, you know, if you've got, for instance, one black person in that office, there won't really 10 11 be a pay range, you're going to have to put that

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Okay.

 $\label{eq:BARBARA KUSHNER: So there are different} % \end{substitute} % \end{substitute$

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: In New York, we do not have that same...

BARBARA KUSHNER: That's right.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Right now so regardless of maybe New Jersey should make a change for their salary ranges to be included, right now, we don't have anything like that so comparatively in New Jersey we can't say you as yourself have 3 black employees and 1 white employee and the white employee is getting paid more than 2 of the 3 black employees,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and I think that's the reason why we need the salary ranges because what we're talking about here is the inequity in salary, right, and posting a position and being able to say I have full autonomy in applying for a job with your construction company because I'm saying I could totally do whatever they're asking me for on this job description with the full list of duties and responsibilities within that range of the minimum and the maximum, I feel comfortable every single day going to work within that salary range because that's where I feel I'd be willing to get paid for so I just wanted to make sure that that in New Jersey maybe they're ahead of the game on us in being able to do that, but that's definitely not the case. Okay, I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

BARBARA KUSHNER: Just to respond to that.

A salary range will only do so much for an employer.

For instance, I just advertised for a controller on this platform called Workable, and I get people through Indeed or Monster, and I have a salary range there from 90,000 to 125,000 dollars so I'm getting resumes. I take a look at those resumes and then I evaluate that person to see if they are adequate based on their credentials for that job, and at that

time I'm not even thinking about salary. I'm thinking
about the credentials of what I need so I don't want
people to assume as the employer that if I was a
white, Asian, whatever employer, Hispanic, Latino,
that I am discriminating because I'm looking at the
person's qualification right off the bat, not what
I'm going to pay them. I want that good, qualified

absolutely, and thank you for already doing that. I, myself, as an employer make sure I have salary ranges too because I don't want people to feel like one, they cannot do the duties that are listed at a range that they're uncomfortable with for salary but also so there is a level of expectation set that there are standards or there are minimum standards that I'm looking for in a candidate and those people should be self-selecting in to apply for that so I agree with you in that sense. I'm glad you're already complying and you're doing that for folks in the community who want to work for you as an employer. I appreciate your testimony. I just wanted to get some clarifying points on why I personally feel like the salary

2.2

2.3

person.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

2 ranges on job qualifications and requirements are assential.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Council Member. Seeing no other questions, we will
now welcome testimony from Jessica Walker followed by
Gloria Middleton and then Beverly Neufeld. Jessica,
you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

JESSICA WALKER: Hi. Thank you. I'm

Jessica Walker, the President of the Manhattan

Chamber of Commerce. We are a business organization,

and, since COVID started, we have been going door-todoor to try to help as many small businesses thrive

as we can. First, I just want to say we are still

very much in COVID recovery mode. With a lot of these

small businesses, there's still a lot of pain and a

lot of debt that many of them have taken on so we are

very concerned about where they are. Let me just

start there.

I support the bill before you today even though I totally understand the aims of what you're trying to do, but I do think that these changes are needed, particularly to help small businesses right now. We have done, like I said, going door-to-door,

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

we've done hundreds of webinars during COVID to try to educate small businesses on all the different laws that have come out, the different mandates, but there is just so much confusion and so this would be another law that not only would be very confusing for a lot of businesses to implement because many small businesses do not have an HR manager. It's usually the small business owner who is implementing a lot of this, and it's a hardship and opens them up to a lot of lawsuits if they don't do it correctly so that's why I think it's really important that we do support the move, particularly to 15 employees. Honestly, it probably should be higher, but I think that is a good start, and, of course, supporting slowing down the implementation of this because we've really got to get the word out. There's laws that are already on the books that small businesses don't understand so this is just something else that could really be confusing and, like I said, open them to lawsuits. Thank you so much, and, of course, we want to be helpfully in any way that we can.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thanks, Jessica.

Can I ask you a quick question? Because I know some of the Chambers typically work with different

2 agencies. I know the Queens Chamber always works with

3 SBS. Has CCHR worked with the Chambers to support the

4 | outreach efforts around existing employment

5 practices?

2.2

2.3

webinars on different laws as they have come out, but, like I said, small businesses are busy running their businesses so they can only do so much in terms of coming to a webinar, and, again, there are so many different laws. During COVID, there were different mandates around (INAUDIBLE) and whatnot, and, of course, businesses needed information on PPP and all the other help that was available so there was just so much coming at them and there continues to be. So, yes, we have worked together in the past, but it's, again, one drip in this big ocean of all the things that small businesses owners need to know about.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: And how would you respond to concerns that large employers will use general listings to avoid salary postings? I know you work with a different range of businesses in the Chamber.

JESSICA WALKER: Yeah. I mean I think that Kathy Wylde really addressed some of that in terms of

difficult for a business to do.

2.2

2.3

that there are different, sometimes you need to be able to explain that. We're a nonprofit. I work with a lot of different nonprofits, and I know that, for example, they get different grants that have salary lines that are sort of built into those grants, and it is, it's a little hard for other staff members to see that when you really don't have full control over it. There are some legitimate reasons why that can be

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Seeing no other questions, I would like to now call on Gloria Middleton to testify followed by Beverly Neufeld and then Debipriya Chatterjee. Gloria, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

Chair Williams and Committee Members and City Council Members. My name is Gloria Middleton. I am President of Communication Workers of America Local 1180. Local 1180 represents almost 9,000 active city administrative and private sector workers and close to 6,000 retirees. One of our main objectives as a unit representing predominantly women and women of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

color has been to fight for equal salaries for all. I am hear today to speak out against all proposed amendments to Local Law 32 as they are dangerous and will fully dilute the intention of the new law that is scheduled to take effect on May 15th. By requiring all employers to include both the minimum and maximum salaries in their job postings, Local Law 32 simply does what should have been done decades ago, level the paying field for women, women of color, and all minorities. Far too many times I have heard too many women tell me she left a job interview where she was asked what salary she was expecting only to sell herself short by suggesting an amount far below her actual worth. The wage gap between white men and women and women of color earnings continues to rob a clear sector of workers of fair wages and the economic stability to support themselves and their families. In the year 2022, we should be long be past the point of even having this conversation. Yet, here we are fighting to stop any interference in the progress we are finally making to close the wage gap that has hurt so many far too long. I am strongly, strongly urging the entire City Council to vote against any changes on amendments that are creating

are a collective group of gender and racial justice

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

organizations. We agreed to work together because we want to achieve economic equality for New York women. We have a letter that I will put into testimony, but I'd like to use my time just in a different way, and that is to express some sentiments that our community feels right now. We started out as the Equal Pay Campaign in 2007 and for 16 years we have worked with leaders, workers, and with businesses to find ways to break down the problem of wage equity. Every year, we stand on the steps of City Hall. This year, as you can see, this is our picture. It was an enthusiastic gathering. Everyone called for a way to end wage inequity. It is commonly done. I have videos. You can go online and hear all the leaders of New York call for it. How do you do that though is the question? You need to take action. It doesn't happen because we want it to. So what we've done is we've worked hard together and we passed some laws. I frankly have to say the business community has never approved of any of the laws that we have passed. They have never spoken in favor of the salary history ban particularly so I'm not surprised that now they are mounting an effort to not push back but to really eviscerate Local Law 32. This law was passed, I have

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

2 (phonetic). Debipriya, you can go ahead when the 3 Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

DEBIPRIYA CHATTERJEE: Hi, everyone. Thank you, Chair Williams and Committee Members, for providing the opportunity to testify today. My name is Debipriya Chatterjee, and I'm a Senior Economist with the Community Service Society of New York, a nonprofit organization that works to promote economic opportunity for New Yorkers. We have championed workers rights and poverty alleviation for 175 years. Most recently, we worked to pass Paid Sick Leave Law statewide and in New York City secured half price transit fares and made rent relief available through (INAUDIBLE) alongside our coalition partners.

My testimony today will focus on Intro
0134 and how this bill would rend the salary range
transparency legislation that was passed already
toothless and thus undo years of work towards
achieving pay parity along racial, ethnic, and gender
lines. My fellow advocates of pay parity have already
shared information on the problem that we are hoping
to address by the salary range transparency law. This
law requires employers to post exactly that, a range,

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

a maximum and minimum level of salary compensation that an employee can be expected to receive. It's not an alien concept. Most corporations, nonprofits, most importantly the city of New York, does it. Numerous studies have shown that greater transparency reduces pay inequities, typically by empowering women and most importantly women of color to negotiate better wages. Intro 0134 wants to exclude employers with 5 to 15 employees from having to declare the salary range. In the name of helping struggling businesses, the current bill is impeding progress towards pay parity. There are about 58,000 of these businesses per data from New York State's Department of Labor. These businesses employ around half a million workers and have an average annual payroll of 550,000 dollars. By excluding these businesses, the city would imperil over 222,000 women, workers who would, once again, apply for jobs without any idea about salary. Opponents of the original salary bill have...

BEVERLY NEUFELD: Required that the businesses by having to post the range, it would be anti-competitive and might hurt employers' chances of

attracting talent, but there are ways of beefing up

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 112 2 compensation beyond the salary range by providing 3 perks, stock options, bonuses, etc., and ... 4 JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you. 5 DEBIPRIYA CHATTERJEE: I would just like to say that given that women still earn only 83 cents 6 7 on the dollar relative to men, it is more important 8 than ever to address pay parity in a tight labor market. This is the best time for workers. 10 JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you. 11 DEBIPRIYA CHATTERJEE: Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I have a quick 13 question. You said you got your data from New York 14 State, but can you explain exactly what the data says 15 and was it specific to New York City and how did they 16 define small businesses? Did they have a number of 17 employees? 18 DEBIPRIYA CHATTERJEE: Yes, so the data 19 that was made available to me by the New York City 20 Subdivision of the New York State Department of 21 Labor. They go into the quarterly census of 2.2 employment and wages, the QCW data, and filter out 2.3 all the businesses that employed from 5 to 15

employees, all the establishments that had 5 to 15

24

employees, and provided annual wages, and the total number of establishments that did that.

4 CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: They of

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: They quote data from which year?

DEBIPRIYA CHATTERJEE: This is the last 4 quarters, the last 4 quarters, so they gave me these numbers, and the gender number that I shared with you so it comes from using the American Community Service, which publishes the gender makeup for each industrial sector, so like finances 45 percent women, construction is 27 percent women, so when you take these percentages and apply those on this kind of breakup that the State Department of Labor provided, I get around 222,000 women who would be affected. I could have also generated these numbers for different races, like workers of color and so on, but we didn't have time for that before the testimony. Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you.

Seeing no other questions, I would like to now

welcome Seher Khawaja to testify followed by

Elizabeth Valez and John T. O'Malley. Seher, you can
go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

2.2

2.3

testifying today to proposed Intro 134.

2

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SEHER KHAWAJA: Thank you, and good afternoon. My name is Seher Khawaja, and I'm a Senior Attorney at Legal Momentum, the Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund. For over 5 decades, we have been at the forefront of using the law to advance gender equality, and it is with that expertise that I am

Last year, New York City enacted Local Law 32, a pay transparency law, that we believe will have a transformative impact in advancing pay equity in New York City, particularly for women of color who have been left behind. Research cited in our written testimony amply demonstrates that this approach helps tackle unconscious bias against women of color, much needed leverage, and drives employers to pay more equitably. Intro 134 and its seemingly innocuous amendments would obliterate this impact by excluding a large sector of New York City workforce from critical protections, would create loopholes that would allow a large number of employers, big and small, to avoid compliance altogether, and establish a scheme that would create inequity among employers and roll back our progressive worker-centered Human Rights Law. Intro 134 intends to expand the existing

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

small business exemption from 4 to 15 employees, taking us backwards. Recent successes to expand protections to domestic workers and to all victims of sexual harassment have brought us close to a critical truth, which is that every worker in New York City deserves the protection of our Human Rights Law. Each time we expand the employer thresholds in this way, we tell more workers that they are not entitled to antidiscrimination protection simply because of the size of their employers, and what we know is that a significant number of workers who will be excluded are exactly the people this bill was meant to support and who the Council has vowed to advocate for, women of color and low wage work. Included businesses would likely include hair salons, nail salons, daycare providers, restaurants, and retail stores where women of color are over-represented, typically make lower wages, and would benefit significantly from knowing rates of pay when applying for jobs. The claim that small businesses are competitive because they can conceal pay rates inherently suggests that small businesses succeed based on underselling workers, which I do not believe must be the case as we know of women and minority-owned businesses that already

2 disclose pay rates and are thriving. Small businesses

3 have much to gain, alternatively, from pay

4 transparency including efficiencies and retention,

5 | job satisfaction, and trust. As more businesses

6 disclose salary, this information is going to be out

7 and small businesses...

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

SEHER KHAWAJA: To be able to make this shift rather than to avoid it. If we're going to protect women of color in our workforce, we must recognize that strategies to protect small businesses can no longer be pitted against or be at the expense of a large number of women who work for these small employers, many of whom endure some of the worst forms of exploitation in our experience. In lieu of these problematic exemptions...

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

SEHER KHAWAJA: We recommend extending the enforcement date and providing training, outreach, and guidance as the Commission is already doing.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Seher. We would like to now call on Elizabeth Valez to testify followed by John T. O'Malley and then Mary

2.2

2.3

2 Luke. Elizabeth, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. I don't think that the administration is currently doing any outreach because when we spoke to them during their testimony, they mentioned like this is something that they're going to do so I just wanted to clarify a point. I don't think they're doing any outreach, which I think is a part of the problem. I'm sorry. The next person can testify.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

ELIZABETH STONE: Hi. My name is Elizabeth Stone. I'm a restaurant server and park sub and a member of the Restaurant Opportunity Centers United. I've been in the food service industry for over a year, and I've been working as a server in New York City for 6 months. As someone relatively new to the industry, I've found that one of my biggest obstacles to job security is the lack of salary transparency in job postings. At my current position, I was offered a flat rate of 10 dollars an hour with no transparency regarding a salary range or expectations for future salary growth. As a financially independent young

adult, it is extremely unsettling and difficult to feel secure within such an unstable standard. Recently, I've began searching for new positions in food service and have experienced a myriad of inconsistent, uninformative job postings. I feel stuck in my position and scared to move forward to an employee that may ultimately pay me less. On top of this, I feel that I have no bargaining power to persuade my current employer to pay me more as opposed to leaving for a different position. Most postings I have encountered state simply the minimum wage if anything at all despite the increasing demand for servers in the upcoming summer months. Especially as a waitress with New York City experience, I know my skills are valuable. Yet, I constantly feel a lack of security or bargaining power. If employers of small restaurants would simply post salary ranges, I would be able to financially plan, reduce stress, and make ends meet. At the end of the day, I believe I deserve to know how much I can make as a waitress in

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Elizabeth. We will now call on John T. O'Malley

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Brooklyn. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

followed by Mary Luke and then Linda Hartley. John,

you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

JOHN T. O'MALLEY: Thank you. John O'Malley. I'm an employee in New York City. Fairness, leveling the playing field, and prohibiting discrimination. These are the principles that we're striving to improve with this policy. Consumers get a better deal when they know the value of the vehicle before they go to the dealer to negotiate. Unions get a better contract when they know how much the employer can afford before they negotiate the contract. Defendants get a better deal when they know what evidence is against them before they conference with the prosecutors. Job applicants get a better deal when they know the wage range before they are interviewed and negotiate. In order to achieve the fairness we seek and prohibit discrimination, we must require that the part that has the information to disclose it to the party that does not have the information. In all these examples, there's a process of requesting information and requiring that it must be provided, and, currently, under the New York City Human Rights Law employers must list the wage range

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

on the job posting before the interview and in good faith. As far as I know, nobody's attempting to hide the value of vehicles and nobody's trying to roll back the regulations requiring disclosure of information on union negotiations, but prosecutors have been complaining recently about the new discovery rules that have increased their workload, but we have to inform the accused of the evidence against them, and, while there could be some pressure to roll back those advances, one attorney from legal aid cautions against this saying it cannot be the case and must not be the case that the way you solve a workload problem for the prosecutors is to diminish the rights of somebody accused of a crime. Intro 134 seeks to roll back the requirements to disclose wage range for over 90 percent of workers in New York City. That's over 4 million workers. The New York City Council established that it's discriminatory to withhold the wage range information until after the interview, that the employer should provide a good faith range that they believe to be true on the job posting. This is critical because once interviewed the employer may adjust the wage offer based on the applicant rather than the job. This is

UN Women USA, which is an NGO and also with PowHer

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

New York. I appreciate this opportunity to speak against Intro 134. New York City plays a unique role on the international stage because it is home to the United Nations, and I'm so proud of New York City's historic role as a model sister city and safe city and one of the first cities to pass the salary history law. Local Law 32 is another example of New York City's leadership position supporting gender equity. This is a step towards gender equity. It's not the whole thing. Not any law is the whole thing, but making changes to diminish this law which is the model for promoting salary transparency in hiring and promotions even before it's implemented would be an embarrassment for a progressive city like ours. I want to speak about the amendment on exempting employers with 15 or fewer employees and also the general help wanted ads which often are directed towards immigrants. I speak as a first generation Asian-American raised in a Chinese-speaking household with parents who worked in a restaurant. When I started my professional life as a nurse and a researcher, I was totally clueless about wages, workers rights, and furthermore did not even think it was appropriate to ask about such things. Many

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

immigrants now, especially those newly arrived, have limited English and education and can easily by exploited. They often start out and remain in low wage jobs such as beauty salons, restaurants, service workers, care workers...

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

MARY LUKE: And these are some of the minority women-owned businesses that would be exempt under Intro 134. It's more important than ever that workers, all workers, under Local Law 32 have access to salary range information so they can start their work life and advance in their jobs knowing they will be paid fairly and equally for work of equal value. Thank you very much.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Mary. I would like to now call on Linda Hartley to
testify followed by Solange Charas and then Nicholas.
Linda, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

LINDA HARTLEY: Thank you. President John Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law in 1963 saying the new legislation would end the unconscionable practice of paying female employees less wages than male employees for the same job. I'm

2 Linda Hartley, Principal and Business Owner of 3 H2Growth Strategies. With a team of 8 consultants, we 4 have partnered with over 100 nonprofits to raise more than 1.5 billion dollars. I serve as a board member of PowHer New York and am co-author of Big Impact, 6 7 about leadership and social change in the nonprofit 8 sector. So here we are nearly 60 years after the Equal Pay Act and still millions of dollars to women in their careers every year due to pay inequities. I 10 11 have a relevant story to share. Early in my career, I 12 joined a major New York university where I performed 13 well and was promoted several times while completing 14 an MBA at night. My boss told me many times my 15 performance was far superior to the older man who had 16 held the job before me and a female colleague risking her own job in sharing wage information told me I was 17 18 being paid 20 percent less than my male counterpart. 19 It took nearly a year to argue for and obtain a 10 20 percent increase, only halfway toward that 20 percent difference, so just looking at that year's 21 2.2 difference, if you take the initial 7,500 dollars 2.3 lost due to pay inequity and invested it at 7 percent over 40 years, the total loss is 112,000 dollars. A 24 wage transparency law back then would have enabled me 25

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

to negotiate for a higher starting salary and higher raises based on my performance. The New York City salary range law is a model for the state and the country empowering workers and leveling the paying field for all workers. I urge the Committee on Civil and Human Rights not to gut the bill with proposed amendments. It has been literally 60 years...

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

LINDA HARTLEY: Past time to end the unconscionable practice of paying women less because we can. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thanks, Linda. I have a quick question. The story that you shared about your own pay inequity issue, how do you think that pay transparency would have addressed the issue?

INDA HARTLEY: Well, when I was hired and I had known about the pay salary I would've negotiated a higher starting salary right there and knowing what the level is, it would have at least inferred that there was perhaps someone that was being paid more for that job before and for someone that's in the job already, if you're looking at ads that your employer is sending out, of course, you'll know then about where you fit in that pay range,

2.2

2.3

whether you're getting paid so it's going to be
helping anyone, even who is already employed because
they're free to look at salary ranges as well when
the employer sends out ads.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: But there's no guarantee that you would get the higher range or the lower range because they still could technically negotiate down and discriminate.

LINDA HARTLEY: Yes, and that 20 percent difference could've been right within that range.
You're right.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I do get the point, but I think that some of the testimony today is heavily skewed, which I understand because have to make this particular argument because this is the thing that is being amended, but it's heavily skewed to a particular sort of activity around disclosing salaries on job descriptions but there's really no way for us to determine whether or not women or people of color will still be discriminated against if they get the lower bottom half of the particular salary range. I was just thinking about that, and I was thinking about that I think Barbara said about the New Jersey law, which I think actually makes a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

lot of sense, because my thing is like to your story about the woman who told you and shared the salary, that to me is more of the issue because even when a person is hired, if they gave a woman the lower salary, there's no way for people within the company or the job or whatever the makeup of the business is to know who's getting the higher range or the lower range unless people are having the conversation within the office so I mean I think, again, this is a great first step, and I understand that this is important, but I do feel like it only goes to a certain limit because there's still no way to determine whether or not there is a pay equity issue just because you disclose a salary on a job description, and, again, I don't disagree with that, I'm just saying there's no way to really determine how much a person is getting paid unless you're like us in city and state government where the salaries are for public information. That is really the only way to say, okay, we've done an inventory and we see that most of the women are getting paid this or most of the black folks are getting paid this and others are getting paid that. There's no way to really compare, and so I'm making that point to say while

2 this is an important measure, I think that we are

3 focusing on one side of the table and not the full

4 scope of what actually addresses pay equity so I was

5 just wondering your thoughts.

LINDA HARTLEY: There's 2 points, and you've made some very good points, and we have to go further. This is a step in the right direction, the full law, and it allows people, especially women, if you've got the salary range and you're interviewing for a job, you can negotiate for a higher starting range. It helps you do that.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I understand that point. I think it's important, and this is just me, right, if I'm having one conversation, I want to have a comprehensive conversation and so I think a lot of the testimony is focused on like one particular aspect that will help to address pay equity, but we're not talking about the totality of the issue, and so I just wanted to bring that into the conversation, but I appreciate what you were saying, and I see all of these hands and I wish that you had would have engaged in conversation with me before the hearing instead of being on the hearing and engaging

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

in conversation with me here, but we can go to the next person who is supposed to testify.

LINDA HARTLEY: Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair Williams. I do see that Council Member Farias has her hand raised. Council Member, you can go ahead.

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: I just thought what Chair Williams was stating, I just wanted to follow up and say, yes, and it sounds like you have more bills to put in because I think Jersey definitely needs to step their game up, but it would be great for us to have some salary transparency bills come up. In the past, we've tried it, and it hasn't worked, but maybe this is the Council where we can put some of that up and see the push because I think what you're saying is critical to the larger conversation that needs to be had around salary transparency or wage equity transparency, and I think that this Intro, particularly what we're seeing with amendments, is going to exasperate some of the very issues that we're bringing up here because of all those issues. I think that's what some of the testimony is hyper-focused is because we do not want

2 it to be exacerbated and continue on, but I'm happy

3 to keep working on some bills to get more

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

4 transparency out there with you, Chair, if we...

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Yeah, and we should talk offline. I know we were supposed to chat because I want to have this dialogue and I think, I mean I'm happy that we actually are having hearings where there's dialogue because that's not something that I've seen in the past as a person who's worked in government, but I'm a person that likes to have dialogue, and hearings don't always offer the opportunity to have full dialogue because you want to get your few talking points and then it's over, right, and then we want to respect everybody's time so we don't want to go back and forth on a public hearing, and I get what you're saying and I don't disagree with what you're saying at all. I just think that we need to have a comprehensive conversation...

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: Yeah, 100 percent.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: And not to just focus on one particular thing, but I, again, I do hear all of the concerns, before the hearing heard the concerns, and I'm sure you can ask Committee Counsel the tons of things that I have asked and have

2 | expressed concerns with, but I think it's important

3 that we, at least, have the deliberation and hear

4 from all of the sides and figure out what is the best

5 | way to move forward with the existing law and making

6 amendments to the law.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER FARIAS: I just wanted to say I'm here to support, and I hear you on the additional stuff we need to do, but, yeah, I can yield time. Thank you.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you,
Council Member. We will now turn to testimony from
Solange Charas followed by Nicholas Natoli and then
Miguel Raez-Velazquez (phonetic). Solange, you can go
ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

SOLANGE CHARAS: Thank you, Chair Williams and Council Members. My name is Dr. Solange Charas, and I'm a human capital subject matter expert with a PhD in management and MBA in accounting and finance and a BA in economics and 30 years of experience as a corporate executive and expert compensation consultant. Chair Williams, as a comp expert, I'm happy to talk to you about how companies manage salary ranges, salary administration, merit increases

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that prevent substantive gaps in pay for same level jobs in a different conversation. I am here to talk to you about the benefits of Local Law 32 as passed without amendments. Many have already highlighted how any amendments will take the law off its original intended course. In the past, I have testified in support of Local Law 32 on how pay transparency benefits employees, organizations, and the community at large, but today I want to provide you information about how this happens. This issue has been studied by the academic community for decades and research proves that there is a positive correlation between human capital transparency and profitability for all businesses, large and small. Transparency is the solution to address the negative effect of information asymmetry. This is a theory that was posited by Joseph Stiglitz who won a Nobel Prize for this topic. What information asymmetry is, it occurs when one party has more information than another that generates inefficiencies in decision-making to the detriment of the party with less information, in this instance, the employee, and in the aggregate, the overall impact is gross economic inefficiencies.

Decades of research, the most research from Harvard,

researcher in the area of compensation. I'm a

Laura, Laura Adler. She's getting her PhD from

ı	
1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 135
2	Harvard, and her whole dissertation is on pay
3	transparency.
4	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Oh, she's not
5	published yet? Her current existing research is, her
6	dissertation is going to be on that?
7	SOLANGE CHARAS: She's finding her PhD on
8	this research so, in fact, it has higher level of
9	scrutiny than any academic article.
10	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Hold up. I'm in a
11	PhD program so I understand the scrutiny. That's all
12	I was asking. She didn't publish her article yet? It
13	is a part of her dissertation research?
14	SOLANGE CHARAS: Yes, which she's
15	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay.
16	SOLANGE CHARAS: Printing this month.
17	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay.
18	SOLANGE CHARAS: And she promised to share
19	her dissertation with me. With her consent, I'm happy
20	to share it with you or I'm happy to put you in touch
21	with her.
22	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Sure.
23	SOLANGE CHARAS: You can get it from the
24	horse's mouth.

to talk to her, and you said something else. I'm not fooled by anybody. I genuinely am listening to all of the concerns from the people that both oppose and support the legislation so I don't have one sway over the other, it is my bill, and so, of course, I have the obligation to defend the bill, but that does not mean that I am not flexible and that does not mean that I am not listening to the many concerns that were raised today and thinking very intently about how we address the concerns that were made so I just also wanted to note that.

SOLANGE CHARAS: Thank you. I appreciate that. I'm sure you, as an academic and has a PhD candidate, you understand how critical prior research is in terms of understanding and supporting an outcome and there is an overabundance of research that shows that transparency is a much better approach than trade secrecy so, you know, what we find in the academic community helps inform the decisions that business people should make and they often don't look at the academic community because, you know, Ivory Tower versus everyday business.

2.2

2.3

2	CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: When I wrote my
3	essay to get into the PhD program, what I
4	specifically spoke about was the fact that the
5	academic world often doesn't work in conjunction with
6	the government and policy world to be more
7	intentional and thoughtful and so this is why I asked
8	for the research because I really do want to look at
9	the research and, if there's any other articles or
10	books or studies that you want to share, I'm open to
11	that. A lot of the stuff that I saw that came out
12	from PowHer really, there wasn't anything that was
13	attached to research. It was just sort of bullet
14	points, not that you don't have research, but I
15	didn't see the research attached to a lot of the
16	advocacy that was being put forth and so I would love
17	to receive that and read about it. I'm totally open
18	to that.

SOLANGE CHARAS: Hopefully, somebody at PowHer will help me figure out how to get you the documents or I'll send it through PowHer to you so, Chairperson Williams, if I can't reach out to you directly it'll come through PowHer.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 SOLANGE CHARAS: It's worth it.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Solange. I would like to now call on Nicholas Natoli followed by Miguel Raez-Velazqez and then Miriam Clark. Nicholas, you can go ahead when the Sergeant calls time.

SERGEANT HOPE: Time starts now.

NICHOLAS NATOLI: Hi. I'm testifying today as an individual resident. I come from District 3 in Manhattan. Last October, I was the victim of a violent hate crime in which the attacker who performed this act is now charged with a felony. I think we can all see that the crime rates in the city are abundant and petrifying, detrimental to the overall well-being of everyone. Last year, terrorists opened fire on Israel sparking a rise in anti-Semitic crime, and, last week, Israel found 11 innocent civilians murdered by Palestinian terrorists. A CUNY student led group came together to call for a globalized intifada. This is very concerning for me as a human but also as a Jewish constituent of New York, and she had lists of Zionist organizations that she was handing out, again, violence against Jewish people continues to rise. I was just wondering what

firm, the Legislative Committee Chair of NELA New

and I just wanted to speak briefly about the

York, which is an organization of employee lawyers,

2.3

24

when there is a lack of transparency. That's why we

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

2.3

deliberate...

have these huge salary gaps that others have
reference so transparency around salary ranges has a
profound effect on women, people of color, others who
have less bargaining power to start with, or who have
been the victims of either deliberate or not

SERGEANT HOPE: Time expired.

that the CCHR FAQs which I've read are very clear and helpful that my understanding is that the CCHR does trainings multiple times a month, both virtually and live in every single borough, and these are directed towards small businesses, and I have to say the small businesses of the city of New York have stepped up incredibly well when it comes to complying with the Human Rights Law, and I'm confident that they can step up and comply with this as well.

JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Miriam. Council Member, we do not have any other witnesses. Do you have any questions you would like to ask?

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: No. I just look forward to working with all sides of this argument to ensure that we continue to protect all workers but

also keep in mind some of the concerns that have been expressed by the business community, and I am very thankful to have so many people come on and express their thoughts, concerns, support, opposition of Intro 134. I also just want to again thank the Speaker and her leadership for, again, allowing us the time to have these conversations, and I, as a new Council Member, sort of seeing a lot of the advocacy around this particular bill, the first thing that came to mind was as advocates we're so used to sort of having to call Hail Mary's because oftentimes our voices are not heard within the space and that is not the intent here. It is also not the intent of this legislation to gut or eviscerate any of the wins we saw during last year when it was originally passed, and I just welcome continued deliberations and conversations around this so we can make sure we get to a place that everyone's okay with, maybe won't love, but everyone is okay, and I think that's what's most important. Beverly, I do see your hand is raised. I welcome the opportunity to talk with you offline. I did try to reach you the other day, and so, again, looking forward to chatting with you. I

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS thank you for your advocacy in organizing everyone to join today. JAYASRI GANAPATHY, MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair Williams. If we have inadvertently missed anyone that had registered to testify today, please use the Zoom raise hand function and let us know. Seeing no raised hands, Chair, I think we are all set to close out this hearing. CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you so much. I just gavel out, correct? [GAVEL]

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



Date May 30, 2022 _____