| 1 | COMMITTEE | ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS |
|----|------------------|---|
| 2 | CITY COUNCIL | , |
| 3 | CITY OF NEW YORK | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | TRANSCRIPT OF TH | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | /IL AND HUMAN RIGHTS X |
| 8 | | December 8, 2022 Start: 10:18 a.m. |
| 9 | | Recess: 3:36 p.m. |
| 10 | HELD AT: | Council Chambers-City Hall |
| 11 | HEDD AI. | council chambers city harr |
| 12 | BEFORE: | Nantasha M. Williams, Chairperson |
| 13 | | Charperson |
| 14 | COUNCIL MEMBERS: | : Rita C. Joseph |
| 15 | | Christopher Marte Kristin Richardson Jordan |
| 16 | | Rafael Salamanca, Jr. Inna Vernikov |
| 17 | | Joann Ariola Vickie Paladino |
| 18 | | Shahana Hanif Eric Dinowitz |
| 19 | | Kamillah Hanks Gale A. Brewer |
| 20 | | Robert Holden Shekar Krishnan |
| 21 | | Sandy Nurse Oswald Feliz |
| 22 | | Carmen N. De La Rosa Alexa Avilès |
| 23 | | VIEVO VATTER |

| 1 | COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 2 |
|----|--|
| 2 | APPEARANCES |
| 3 | |
| 4 | Annabel Palma Chair and Commissioner of the New York City |
| 5 | Commission on Human Rights |
| 6 | JoAnn Kamuf Ward |
| 7 | Deputy Commissioner of Policy and External Affairs at CCHR |
| 8 | Yusuf Dahl |
| 9 | Formerly incarcerated |
| 10 | Lizzy Couret |
| 11 | Struggling to find safe, stable housing because of criminal record |
| 12 | Leah Faria |
| 13 | Senior Community Organizer for the Women's |
| 14 | Community Justice Association |
| 15 | Andre Ward |
| 16 | Associate Vice President of The David Rothenberg Center for Public Policy at the Fortune Society |
| 17 | Mary Ann Rothman |
| 18 | Executive Director of the Council of New York |
| 19 | Cooperatives and Condominiums |
| 20 | Melissa Gomez Real Estate Broker located in Queens Village |
| 21 | Wear Escace prover rocated in Queens village |
| | Ryan Monell |

Real Estate Board of New York, REBNY

| 1 | COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 3 | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | APPEARANCES (CONT.) | | | |
| 3 | Geoffrey Davis | | | |
| 4 | James E. Davis Stop Violence Foundation | | | |
| 5 | Logan Phares | | | |
| 6 | Political Director of Open New York | | | |
| 7 | Jacquelyn Samone Policy Director at the Coalition for the Homeless | | | |
| 8 | | | | |
| 9 | Nancy Sicardo Community Leader with WCJA Women's Community | | | |
| 10 | Justice Association of Special Projects | | | |
| 11 | Juanita Lewis | | | |
| 12 | Executive Director of Community Voices Heard | | | |
| 13 | Nick Peters Policy Associate for the Housing Watchdog Group | | | |
| 14 | Housing Rights Initiative | | | |
| 15 | Rachel Miller-Bradshaw | | | |
| 16 | State Committee woman of the 78th Assembly District | | | |
| 17 | Murana Caldonon | | | |
| 18 | Myrna Calderon Board President of Fordham Hill Owners | | | |
| 19 | Corporation | | | |
| 20 | Hong Chen In opposition of 632 | | | |
| 21 | in opposition of 032 | | | |
| 22 | Yanling Wagner Community Translator and Interpreter | | | |
| 23 | | | | |

| 1 | COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 4 |
|--------|---|
| 2 | APPEARANCES (CONT.) |
| 3 | Jorge Renaud |
| 4 | National Criminal Justice Director at Latino Justice PRLDEF |
| 5 | JUSCICE PREDER |
| 6 7 | Sebastian Solomon Associate Director for Policy for Greater Justice New York at the Vera Institute of Justice |
| | T 3' W 3 |
| 8 | Julian Morales New York Civil Liberties Union, NYCLU |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Melinda Thaler Board Member of the West Side Community |
| 11 | Organization |
| 12 | Yiatin Chu |
| 13 | President of Asian Wave Alliance |
| 14 | Susan Lee |
| 15 | Founding President of the Alliance for Community Preservation and Betterment |
| 16 | Wendell Walters |
| 17 | Manager of Policy and Advocacy with the Osborne Association |
| 18 | ASSOCIACION |
| 19 | Shameeka France Women Prison Association |
| 20 | Douglas Powell |
| 21 | Brooklyn New York Leader of the Homelessness and |
| 22 | the Civil Rights Union |
| 23 | |

| 1 | COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 5 | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | APPEARANCES (CONT.) | | | |
| 3 | Anna Shpakovshaya | | | |
| 4 | Advocate for the Child Victims Act | | | |
| 5 | Carl Garrison | | | |
| 6 | Minister of Homeless Outreach at the Manhattan Church | | | |
| 7 | Christopher Leon Johnson | | | |
| 8 | In opposition of 632 | | | |
| 9 | Maria Danzilo | | | |
| 10 | Executive Director of One City Rising | | | |
| 11 | Alexandra Dougherty Senior Staff Attorney and Policy Council of the | | | |
| 12 | Civil Justice Practice at Brooklyn Defender | | | |
| 13 | Services | | | |
| 14 | Lauren Velez Associate Director for New York at the | | | |
| 15 | Corporation for Supportive Housing or CSH | | | |
| 16 | Annette Tomlin | | | |
| 17 | Vocal Leader | | | |
| 18 | Edward Kline Managing Member of a Law Firm at Offices in | | | |
| 19 | Manhattan and Brooklyn | | | |
| 20 | Blandon Kasnana | | | |
| 21 | Robert Altman | | | |
| 22 | Oucons and Brony Building Association | | | |

Queens and Bronx Building Association

| COMMITTEE | ON | CIVIL | AND | HUMAN | RIGHTS |
|-----------|----|-------|-----|-------|--------|
| | | | | | |

3 Terry Davis Merchant

Program Director of Housing and Homelessness at Trinity Church Wall Street

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

5

Hilton Web Jr.
In support of Intro. Number 632

7

8

6

1

2

4

Darren Mac

Co-Director at Freedom Agenda

9

Jacob Shrader

10

Landlord for 44 years

11

Shen Quack

New York City voter and a father of two public school children

13

12

Ann Corchec

Small housing provider

15

14

Eric Dillon Berger

Small property owner in New York, in opposition

16

17

Sara Newman

Director of Organizing for the Open Hearts

18 Initiative

19

Jacob Malafsky

20

Supervising Attorney at Queens Legal Services

21

Rocaman Cooper

In opposition of 632

2.2

23

24

| 1 | COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 7 |
|----|---|
| 2 | APPEARANCES (CONT.) |
| 3 | Bernadette Ferrara |
| 4 | In opposition of 632 |
| 5 | Ramon Bergen |
| 6 | Robert Lee |
| 7 | Small housing provider of two to four families in Brooklyn |
| 8 | |
| 9 | Sonya |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SERGEANT AT ARMS: This is a microphone check.

Today's date is December 8, 2022, on the Committee on

Civil and Human Rights located in Council Chambers

recorded by Steven Sadowsky.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Alright everyone, can you please find seats at this time. Once again, if you just came in and you are here to testify on Civil and Human Rights, we need you to come up to the Sergeant at Arms desk, fill out a witness slip. Even if you did register online, please fill out a witness slip at the Sergeant at Arms desk. If you're here for Civil Service and Labor, you need to be next door in the Committee Room. We're going to ask everyone to please silence electronic devices. Private conversations for the hearing, please take outside to the rotunda. No cheering or booing please. want to boo, thumbs down. If you want to cheer, wave Thank you very much. your hands.

For those on Zoom, if you'd like to submit testimony, you may do so at testimony@council.nyc.gov. Again, that is testimony@council.nyc.gov. Thank you for your cooperation. Chair Williams, we are ready to begin.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Good morning everyone. My name is Nantasha Williams and I serve as the Chair to the Committee on Civil and Human Rights. Today, we will be hearing Intro. 632 sponsored by my colleague Majority Leader Keith Powers. If passed, this bill would prohibit housing discrimination on the basis of arrest record or criminal history.

We are all aware that there is an ongoing housing crisis in our city. Source of income is something that I just want to like uplift and highlight here as well because that is another component of fair housing.

We know that the process of finding a new home can be long, stressful, and financially draining.

When vacancies are limited, it can often feel like a competition just to schedule a viewing and have a chance at signing a lease. Those with arrest records or criminal history had the added hardship of not knowing whether a potential landlord will even allow them to live on their property.

As of this year, over 1.5 million people are incarcerated in federal or state prisons in the United States. Four times the number since 1980.

Members of marginalized communities, such as

2.2

2.3

communities of color, LGBTQIA plus and those of histories of mental illnesses are disproportionately incarcerated. Furthermore, one in three people in the United States has a criminal record. In New York, 2.3 million people have a criminal record of some kind and approximately 750,000 New York City residents have a criminal conviction.

Many formerly incarcerated people have loved ones that they need to help provide for. A recent survey of formerly incarcerated people and their families found that 79 percent of participants were denied housing due to either their own or a loved one's criminal record. The lack of availability of housing for formerly incarcerated people is a barrier to reintegration and can perpetuate the cycle of criminality of not addressed. For example, a study by the Urban Institute found that 61 percent of formerly incarcerated individuals were less likely to be reincarcerated if they receive supportive housing.

While housing for formerly incarcerated people is necessary, it is necessary and important. We also know it is important for people to feel safe in their homes. This bill balances those needs by establishing exceptions for people who commit violent

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

acts while in housing for those who are on New York

Sex Offense Registry. This bill is a crucial step to

reintegrating people into our society that have

justly or unjustly been involved in our justice

system and are seeking to build their lives and

7 support their families.

I'd like to thank all of my colleagues joining me here today, as well as all of the wonderful staffers that work hard to put this hearing together. Lastly, I'd like to thank everyone providing testimony and feedback today. We appreciate the time and effort that you have taken to have your voices heard. Now, I'll be turning it over to Majority Leader Powers for some remarks on his bill and just wanted to acknowledge that I've been joined by my colleagues, Council Member Marte, Hanif, Joseph, Paladino, Ariola, Vernikov, and I think that is it. And I just want to say I know this is a spicy bill, as I've been calling it but I hope that we all can execute our opinions and our testimonies in a manner that is respectful, as I plan to lead a very respectful and orderly hearing and I really do look forward to hearing everyone's concerns for the bill and also the

2.

testimonies of people who are in support of the bill thank you so much and over to you Majority Leader.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you Chair Williams and thank you everyone for being here today. My name is Council Member Keith Powers, Majority Leader of the City Council. Thank you for allowing me an opportunity to speak about my bill Intro. 632, the Fair Chance Housing Act, which of course by its name is clear. It's about giving people a fair chance.

I am very grateful for the 30 colleagues of mine who signed on as a sponsor and hope that many more will join us. It is clear and every New Yorker knows we are facing a devasting affordable housing crisis that impacts every single community across the five boroughs. Thousands of our fellow New Yorkers are sleeping on the streets, in our shelters every night and it is incumbent upon our city leaders to use every tool we have to tackle that crisis. We have the opportunity to advance a solution to one of the biggest challenges facing our city and help lift people out of homelessness and into permanent housing.

As of 2019, nearly 750,000 had a prior conviction. That is ten percent of the adult

2.2

2.3

population of New York City. When you add in their families and our loved ones and the people that rely on them for support, you get into the millions of New Yorkers who are facing a barrier to housing. We know that four million incarcerated individuals are ten times more likely to be homeless in the general public and frequently end up in our shelter system. Public safety as we talk about everyday is a top priority and access to safe, stable housing is s foundational element of public safety. I want to say that again. Access to safe and stable housing is foundation to public safety.

New Yorkers overwhelmingly agree with that. A survey of 62,000 residents found that affordable housing and reducing homelessness were the two top public safety priorities. 62,000 residents found that affordable housing and reducing homelessness were the two top public safety priorities. Just two weeks ago, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found that background check reports are full of inaccuracies. Renters pay for but rarely get to see the contents of the background check and inaccuracies are nearly impossible to get corrected. How can we

continue to support a system that is filled with so many mistakes and errors.

Over the past several months I've spoken to countless tenants, landlords and housing providers and organizations on both sides of this issue. I want to be clear; this legislation does not preclude landlords from screening potential tenants to the Sex Offender Registry. It does not preclude them from trying to check if they have a good credit score and can pay the rent. It does not mean they cannot do an evaluation of the tenant to be a good tenant.

I think we all agree that New Yorkers deserve access to safe and secure housing and what I hope to take away from testimony today, including the stories of people that you will hear from today who continue to face those barriers to housing, is that denying people housing does not make us any safer. Instead, it means more people are living on the streets and in the shelters. People have paid their dues and their families will struggle to find stability and the vicious cycle of incarceration and homelessness will continue. And yes, there are children and families that are suffering because they have a loved one who is subject to this discrimination.

So, today's about a choice for New York City.

Will we be the city that extends a hand to people
that are ready to rehabilitate their lives and offer
second chances or will we continue to tell people
that discrimination is allowed on the greatest city
on earth.

I want to say one more thing. We have heard for weeks now, people trying to use this as a political opportunity. We have heard from people that are trying to make this into a political conversation.

This is an opportunity to have a serious conversation about housing in our city on the same day that the Mayor is giving a speech about housing as well. I hope to hear from the Administration their support of this legislation and I continue to ask my colleagues to support this and to give New Yorkers access to safe and stable housing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I just wanted to make a quick announcement that if you registered online, please also fill out a witness sheet here in person. So, if you've registered online, please also come and fill out one of the witness sheets in the front.

2.

2.2

Alright, and now I'll turn it over to Committee

Counsel to swear in my favorite agency. I guess I'm

biased. The Commission for Human Rights.

Good morning and welcome. My name is Jayasri

Ganapathy, I'm Counsel to the Committee on Civil and

Human Rights. Before we begin testimony today, we'd

like to acknowledge Council Member — yeah sorry, also

my colleague Council Member Dinowitz is here. Oh,

and oh and Council Member Hanks. So, I would like to

remind everyone that is joining us via Zoom that you

will be on mute until you are called on to testify.

I'll be calling on public witnesses to testify after

the conclusion of the Administrations testimony and

Council Member questions. So, please listened

carefully for your names to be called at that time.

Council Members, you will be called on questions after the full panel has completed their testimony. Please note for the purposes of this hearing, we will be allowing for a second round of questioning and Council Members have three minutes for their questions. For public witnesses, once your name is called, you will have two minutes and if you are joining us via Zoom, a member of our staff will

,

unmute you and the Sergeant will give you the queue to begin, so please listen for that.

I will now swear in the Administration. Today we will be hearing testimony from the Commission on Human Rights. At this time, I will administer the affirmation. Can you please raise your right hands? Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Committee and respond honestly to Council Member questions? Commissioner Palma?

ANNABEL PALMA: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: And Director Ward, Deputy
Commissioner Ward. Commissioner Ward.

JOANN WARD: You got it. Yes, I do. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. You may begin Commissioner.

ANNABEL PALMA: Good morning Chair Williams and members of the Committee on Civil and Human Rights.

Thank you for convening today's hearing. I'm Annabel Palma, Chair and Commissioner of the New York City Commission on Human Rights. Joining me today for questions and answers is JoAnn Kamuf Ward, Deputy Commissioner of Policy and External Affairs at CCHR.

2.2

2.3

I will speak about Intro. 632, which would amend the New York City Human Rights Law to expand access to housing and address discrimination based on prior arrests or conviction, which has a disproportionate

impact on Black and Latinx New Yorkers.

The New York City Commission on Human Rights is the agency that enforces the New York City Human Rights Law. One of the broadest and most protective antidiscrimination laws in the country. To fulfill our dual mandate of enforcement and fostering intergroup relations, the Commissions two largest units are community relations and law enforcement. The Community Relations Bureau is responsible for outreach and education and partners with a wide array of community groups, sibling agencies and stakeholders across New York City.

We have an array of community liaisons and advisors including in the area of reentry following incarceration. The Law Enforcement Bureau conducts testing, allegations of discrimination, initiates complaints and answers settlements that addresses individual and structure discrimination. The Human Rights Law prohibits discrimination in housing, employment and public accommodations and includes 27

2.2

2.3

protected categories including age, gender,
disability, race and national origin. The law has
been amended and expanded many times over the years
to address the multiple forms of discrimination that
impact New Yorkers. The Human Rights Law already
prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis
of criminal history but that protection does not
currently extend to housing. The Commission has a
track record of enforcing protections for New Yorkers
with a history of criminal system involvement.

Since the 1970's when the Commission was given joint enforcement authority with the New York State division of human rights over correction law Article 23A. Which addresses the use of criminal history and employment decisions. Additional protections in employment have since been added to the New York City Human Rights Law.

In 2015, the Fair Chance Act was passed, which prohibits most employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies from inquiring about or considering a job applicants criminal history into asked a conditional offer employment has been made. However, the Fair Chance Act does allow an individuals criminal history to take into account in

2.2

2.3

limited circumstances. As a result, the Human Rights
Law prohibits advertisements and inquiries about
criminal history and guarantees that job applicants
receive proper notice and opportunity to be heard as
part of an employers individualized assessment of the
prior arrests and convictions before an employer can
reject a candidate.

Employers must also indicate the specific connections between a background check and the specific position for which an applicant is being considered. Since 2015, to enforce these provisions, the Commission has filed complaints from individuals alleging employment discrimination based on past involvement with the criminal legal system and conducted testing, which has resulted in commission-initiated complaints that address systematic employment discrimination based on criminal history, with a focus on restorative justice remedies.

Commission settlements in this area have resulted in employee partnership with reentry organizations that invite people with criminal histories in the job applicant pool and incorporation of the New York City Fair Chance and Employment Protection and the job applicant for offices nationwide.

In our outreach and education, we work closely with sibling agencies and employers. The Commission is also grateful for its close partnerships with many advocates and community groups that have worked with us over the years to educate New Yorkers about Fair Chance Employment Protections, including the Legal Aid Society, Vocal New York, the Community Service Society, Cases, the Fortune Society, the Oswald Association, Women Prisons Association, Black Vests for Social Justice and the Youth Justice Network.

Turning to Intro. 632, the Administration supports the intent of the bill. Fair Chance Housing Legislation aligned the Commissions longstanding commitment to advancing equity for all New Yorkers and we support the goal of removing barriers to housing. The Administration is also committed to public safety and wants to ensure that legislation is aligned with the administrations priority.

Intro. 632 will prohibit discrimination against individuals who have been arrested or convicted by making it unlawful, discriminatory practice for a property owner, real estate broker, landlord or their employee or agents who inquire about or take adverse

3

4

5

6

7

8

)

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

action based on a housing applicants arrest or conviction history with some narrow exceptions.

Adverse actions would include denial of rental application, higher application fees, failure to review an application or the imposition of additional requirements or less favorable lease term. The bill will also prohibit housing providers from directly or indirectly expressing a limitation based on rental applicants arrests or conviction history. For example, by stating in ads and application materials that they will not approve tenants with arrests or conviction records. The Administration supports the aim of ensuring that New Yorkers can access housing and the criminal history should not disqualify someone from housing opportunities. The current bill, some limited background checks is mandatory exclusion based on particular conviction or where federal, state or local law requires the consideration of criminal history.

It also permits review of the States Sex Offender Registry. The bill also contains notice provisions and requires housing providers to conduct individuals testament and requires landlords to review mitigating evidence before taking an adverse action.

2.2

2.3

The current bills provisions do not apply to those renting out a unit or a room in their families home if the home is two families or smaller, or to people seeking a roommate. The Administration is continuing to review the bill and looks forward to hearing from stakeholders and working with the City Council to identify the best approach to meeting the objective of expanding access to housing for all New Yorkers.

City and states across the country have enacted of similar bills to Intro. 632, including Seattle,
Oakland, the District of Columbia, Los Angeles,
Detroit, County Illinois, New Jersey and Oregon,
among others. The loss of these jurisdictions limit
the review of criminal history by housing providers.
These laws recognize the impact of longstanding
discrimination in the criminal legal system and they
recognize that contact with the criminal legal system
alone should not bar people from assessing housing
for themselves and their families.

The Commission believes housing is a basic need and a fundamental right to building a stable life.

Removing barriers to obtaining housing can pave a vital pathway for thousands of New Yorkers and their

2.2

2.3

families to thrive. This includes individuals
recently returning to their communities from custody
and those with older records who have previously been
denied housing. It can also address a pervasive
housing practice that has a disproportionate impact
on Black and Latinx individuals.

In recent years, more than 20 percent of adults who enter New York City shelters have come from prisons and research shows that jail and prison stays tend to increase the risk of homelessness. A stable home is a foundation of a persons wellbeing. It also enhances the wellbeing of their families and communities. A stable home enables people to find and maintain employment and promotes better health outcomes since a stable home enables people to access health treatments and care for children and other dependents. Increasing access to housing also significantly reduces rates of child poverty and rates of recidivism.

In conclusion, amending the Human Rights Law to ensure more pathways to stable housing is a means to strengthening individuals and family health safety, education and wellbeing.

2.2

2.3

For all the reasons I have discussed, the

Administration supports the intent of this bill and
the Administration looks forward to working with the

Council to ensure that we come to a measure where
everyone can agree on a bill. Thank you so much. We
now welcome your questions.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you Commissioner.

We are happy to hear that the Administration supports the intent of this bill. So, the purpose of this bill as has been stated is of course to prohibit housing discrimination. So, how often do you think people are denied housing as a result of having a criminal record?

ANNABEL PALMA: Thank you or the question. The Commission as you know, our law currently prohibits discrimination on the basis of race and national origin and disability in housing. There's no protected category currently related to arresting conviction records, so we don't collect complaints data on that front because it's not something that we have jurisdiction over. What I can say and the Commissioner has talked about some of the outreach and partnerships that we've developed in the context of Fair Chance employment, is that we hear quite

| often and this is anecdotal but that individuals have |
|---|
| been denied housing because of an arrest or |
| conviction record. We also have seen and heard from |
| other jurisdictions about individuals who are |
| deterred from ads that reference arrests or |
| conviction records because many people don't want to |
| go through the process of looking for housing to your |
| point Chair Williams. It's lengthy and tiresome only |
| to then be rejected. So, we've heard about denials |
| both at you know because people put it in ads or |
| applications. We've heard people go through a |
| process not to have a disclosed reason that they've |
| been discriminated against but feel that it is |
| because of arrest or conviction and there are studies |
| from other jurisdictions that indicate that when |
| there is testing done in this arena, people with a |
| criminal history are more likely to be denied, even |
| if that's not the formal policy, a blanket |
| prohibition on arrest and criminal histories. But I |
| think to the Commissioners point, we are very happy |
| to be here today to both hear from all of the |
| stakeholders in the room about — and I think some |
| will come with direct experience to your question |

about what it is like to go through the housing process with arrest or conviction history.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you and so, I know you said you are not collecting data specifically on denial for housing but you are collecting data on employment complaints, Fair Chance Act related employment complaints. So, can you give us an estimate of how many of those complaints you normally receive? And while you find that information, I just want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Council Member Holden via Zoom and also Council Member Brewer.

ANNABEL PALMA: Sure, thank you. Uhm, yeah, so we have been as the Commissioner said in her testimony looking at the use and prohibition of using criminal arrests and conviction records in employment since the 70's. We have numbers with us from 2015 to today, so it is an area where we get a very, very high number of inquiries. I would say it's the area where we get the highest number of inquiries most likely. We've had about 800 claims filed with our agency since 2015 and approximately 30 claims filed per year in that space. We do hundreds of trainings a year on employment protections and about half of

2.2

2.3

those are specifically about Fair Chance in employment. And I would say just as a caveat to those numbers, we only see the discrimination that is brought to us right? So, if an individual faces discrimination, they don't file a complaint. That's not part of the landscape of numbers that we're presenting.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you, so as stated in my opening statement, housing access is a longstanding problem in New York City with many people in shelters due to inability to access housing. Could you share I guess maybe anecdotally or any information you have on how criminal background checks impact housing access? Are you able to share?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes. Uhm, so I think I mean, one thing like a starting point for this is that currently private landlords are not required to do background checks, right? We understand that 80 to 90 percent of private landlords do do background checks and they're the protections in our law against discrimination would apply but the challenge and I think uhm Councilman Powers referenced this a little bit is that there is data that criminal background

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

checks can be inaccurate. There's also data not from New York or there may be data from New York but I have not seen that. I have looked at data from other jurisdictions that say even when there's a policy, say we would not consider someone with a felony record right? A slice of conviction history, that that's often applied unevenly to applicants. think there's a few places where it would be very helpful if Fair Chance legislation does pass in New York City. Education and outreach are essential, ensuring that all the stakeholders know what the protections are. What rights and obligations are. That includes landlords and it includes applicants and that's why a second piece of Fair Chance Housing Legislation that we feel very strongly about is that the legislation is very clear and understandable by all the stakeholders in this process.

JOANN WARD: Can I actually — I want to just say one thing because there's federal law here too. So, I talked a little bit about city law, where there's federally subsidized housing, there are a set of rules and regulations that would apply. There are under uhm, for HUD funded housing, there are two instances where there's a mandatory exclusion of

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ANNABEL PALMA: Thank you Madam Chair for the question and Deputy Commissioner coming forward will

This was referenced in our testimony individuals. and that was included as a carve out in the Intro. 632 that we're talking about today and then there's other requirements that Public Housing Authorities have particular policies in place.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. One more question for now before I turn it over to the bill sponsor and then to Council Member Vernikov. I just wanted to talk a little bit about source of income discrimination. You know that's my baby and contributes to this unhoused population with again, many people who are in shelters that actually have housing vouchers unable to get an apartment for the same similar type of discriminatory practices. year, CCHR received additional funding to staff the source of income unit. And so, I just wanted to know if you have any updates on how this has impacted your enforcement and would the source of income unit be charged with also enforcing the provisions of Intro. 632 if it were to pass or is it just - does it go into your overall enforcement bureau that you have, the cadre of attorney's and?

4

5

6

/

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

share the numbers we have in terms of source of income. I will tell you that our LEB unit is charged with enforcing the law and that will continue. So, should Intro. 632 be passed, it will be under the jurisdiction of our law enforcement bureau, which handles all claims and investigations for the agency.

JOANN WARD: Yeah, I think I mean the numbers

that we have again are reflective of who brings complaints to us. We have done a lot of testing in this area and we also in the past two years have had between 20 and 40 claims. Now, there's also cases that get resolved for a complaint is filed and that happens in this instance, where sometimes it's uh, you know we're reaching out to a landlord and we are indicated there is a potential violation of our law and someone is then accepted into an apartment. that a direct result, we can't always say but I think to the Commissioners point, having a dedicated unit has some strengths right. There are people who are focused on one area but often times it's useful to have it spread across the Law Enforcement Bureau because a complaint doesn't necessarily come to us with just one issue, it might have multiple layers. And so, there's a benefit to having our entire Law

2.2

2.3

Enforcement Bureau addressing these claims and I
think it will depend what ultimately the legislation
looks like and where we are, how it's housed and
staffed.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Were you able to hire additional people? Because I know last time we spoke about the source of income unit, it was significantly understaffed and I just looked at the Comptrollers report and your agency was second on the list for being understaffed.

ANNABEL PALMA: We have hired individuals to the source of income unit and we have individuals in the pipeline. We're working with OMB to onboard those individuals to make sure we have a complete source of income unit.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'll turn it over to Majority Leader Keith Powers for a few questions.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. Thank you

Chair. I'm just going to move quickly here. Last

month, two weeks ago actually, on November 15th, the

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau issued two

reports on the tenant background check industry. Are

you familiar with those reports?

2.2

ANNABEL PALMA: I am not.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, so they revealed in two reports that people are denied rental housing because negative information report that belonged to someone else. Outdated information remains on reports and any inaccurate or misleading details by arrests, criminal records and eviction records are not corrected or removed from reports.

Renters pay for background check reports but often do not see them and struggle to get hours fixed. Renters often do not receive adverse action notices, a legal right for renters, and are not able to dispute errors or misleading information quickly enough to avoid a denial from housing of their choice.

There are well stated issues and documents. This is from a federal agency that for consumer protection about the problems with reports. So, here's my first question. Are you familiar with the background checks and as I understand it, in my experience, and tenants never have access to those background reports. Is that fair to say?

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ANNABEL PALMA: I would not say never, I think, often what is in the background checks is not known to an individual applying to housing.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, thanks for that.

And so, if you are one of the individuals here whose name incorrectly appears on a background report and you're paying for it and you have no visibility to it, how do you correct that error?

ANNABEL PALMA: So, I do not know the answer to that question but what I will say about the bill, uhm and Fair Chance legislation is something that we think is important, as is to the extent there are carve outs or exemptions, uhm the current version of the bill and also the bills that have passed in other jurisdictions create a process so that individuals can learn if there is an adverse action taken. was the basis for that adverse action? And I think the second important piece of that is an opportunity to provide mitigating or rehabilitation evidence. So, it might not come in the background report itself but that's something that exists in our Fair Chance Employment Law and something that I think can help address to a point some of the concerns that you are raising.

2.2

2.3

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay and under current practice right now, it's fair to say that potentially there are individuals whose name is being matched to somebody else's criminal record or there's potentially, and this is what the report finds, so I'm just confirming that that's what you believe is potentially experienced here in New York City. There is potential for people to be in a background report where that information is incorrect or it belongs to somebody else. Is that fair to say?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes, I think there is that potential.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, thanks for that.

So, uhm, I think that's a starting point of a concern for me, is that we are utilizing which two weeks ago, we have federal aid consumer protection agencies coming out and saying that there are you know, inaccuracies, misinformation, mismatching happening here and yet, we are continuing to rely on them to match people to housing here in New York City.

When you talk about the fees that we're talking about here, which can be sometimes up to \$100, \$95, \$50. An individual who is going through that experience is paying fees every single time. We

2.2

2.3

heard from somebody earlier who I think had to apply for 20 apartments for finding one because of this issue. And those fees add up and it becomes another barrier in addition to the criminal history where you are now ending up paying money you know endlessly to try to find an apartment. In my district for instance but in many districts here as well, the process for finding an apartment in New York City is extremely complex and you will never have the opportunity to either in many cases, to even meet the landlord and be able to provide information to them to document that that's either not you or that you've gone through the rehabilitation process and that you deserve it.

So, I guess my question is, are you concerned with the notion that there are individuals here in the city who are looking for housing who may not ever have the opportunity today to provide documentation or evidence to their landlord that they have — they are a good tenant?

ANNABEL PALMA: The Administration I think supports the intent of this bill because we recognize that there are many barriers to accessing housing and that arrest and conviction history historically and

2.2

2.3

today has been one of those barriers. And we believe that getting more people into housing enhances the wellbeing of those individuals, their communities and the city as a whole.

I think we are looking at how to balance that priority with the priority of public safety and what that looks like in Fair Chance Housing operationalizing Fair Chance Housing. Uhm and I think may be responsive to some of your points, in other jurisdictions, the background check is delayed in the process in some instances. So, a landlord can't collect fees until they give someone notice of the background check and then there's a process that kicks in. There's a lot of different versions of what this could look like and I think we are interested in hearing today and reviewing these reports and hearing from other experts to identify what is the best approach for our city.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay and just a few more questions. Would you agree that the more discretion and more caveats involved in this legislation, the more potential for this to be used in a discriminatory fashion?

J

2.3

_ 1

ANNABEL PALMA: I think it will depend what the caveats are and what the process is. I think hypothetically, I can't speak to that.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Would you be concerned that the continued use of the background check reports could adverse or potential still use of that information to discriminate against a tenant?

ANNABEL PALMA: Sorry, can you say that again? Sorry.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Do you believe that continuing to provide with some caveats, which you're advocating for caveats and continued discretion, could potentially reverse and continued adverse discrimination against individuals, even if the law states otherwise?

ANNABEL PALMA: I think there's always the potential for discrimination, regardless of what the law says or doesn't say and I am not prepared to say what a law would do without having a clear sense of the exact provisions.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, you had made a statement -

JOANN WARD: Council Member, I would just add that I think you know this is where we see the

2.2

2.3

doing.

potential of outreach and education being pivotal to the communities. Through our Community Relations

Bureau we have the means to make sure that communities are educated. That landlords are educated and that we're working with community partners to ensure again that they understand what the law covers and that landlords understand what the law covers and what they should and shouldn't be

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: I understand that but I think the concern from individuals who face this barrier to housing is that, when you continue to provide information, even if we're telling them they can't use it or can't utilize it, that by seeing it, it will still reverse into adverse action against them to be able to find housing. Is that a concern of the Administration?

JOANN WARD: Again, you know the Administration believes in the intent of the bill and believes in making sure that the barriers to housing are eliminated. And so, we look forward to working with the Council and with the stakeholders to ensure that we can get to a place where the bill addresses those concerns.

2.2

2.3

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, I was hoping for a simple yes because that should be the answer to that question, to be honest. That continuing to utilize the information when you are prohibited, the answer should be yes. Not based on how the legislation is written.

There are a number of - oh, I wanted to pick up on a statement you said earlier. There was something about uneven application of this even when there are laws in place. Can you describe what you mean by that?

ANNABEL PALMA: Sure, so I did want to just also build on what the Commissioner was saying and like, the Administration does not believe that a criminal record or arrest or conviction history should disqualify someone from housing.

So, the things that we are — the things that the Administration is looking at is to the points we made earlier, clear, potential look backs in some circumstances. What that looks like is going to be informed by what everyone says here today.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: I understand that but your first sentence and your second sentence disagree with each other and what I was asking is, the

Э

2.2

question I have is you send me a statement about the law being applied still unevenly even when there are caveats in other city's and other jurisdictions. I just wanted to understand what you meant by when you said it was applied unevenly.

ANNABEL PALMA: So, an example and I think this is from a report from Louisiana but we can get that to Council afterwards, is that a housing provider might have a policy that says, we do not accept people with felonies, right? And two people might walk into that building separate hours or separate days and one might say, well, I have a felony and that person might hear a message that says, that one, that might be okay. Go through the process. And another person might hear, you just shouldn't apply. So, I think like any law or policy, it can be applied differently in different circumstances and that is —

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Which could be an argument against what the position you guys are advocating for is, is to create additional discretion, which then would be applied unfairly to people who might be in the same circumstance.

ANNABEL PALMA: I think that's a potential challenge with any law or protection but the

2.2

2.3

Administrations goal is to achieve the aims of reducing barriers to housing and that will be steadfast in the review of what the process looks like in New York City taking account for our housing market and the needs of residents.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, and just one last question. Thank you to the Chair for my time.

You're advocating for some changes to the bill. Can you delineate them more specifically for me. This bill has been introduced for a couple months now.

You guys have had a lot of time to think about this and to have a clear position on it. You've had the opportunity to look at other jurisdictions. I've looked at them as well.

So, I just wanted to have more clarity on what exactly are the caveats you guys are asking for?

ANNABEL PALMA: So, I think we are taking very seriously our duty of listening to the public and hearing from people to your point, who have lived experience and who are in the room today and also those who can't be here in the room today. I think what I can is that the Administration is considering some look backs and some limited circumstances but I can't give any more details than that.

2.2

2.3

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: And just to pick up on that. Look, you do agree that a look back period could be applied unevenly and could lead to continued discrimination even with the law being on the books, is that fair to say?

ANNABEL PALMA: I think there's always the potential for error.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay. I would say greater than that but the — do you have the resources if somebody calls you to complain about uneven of application right now to do enforcement against that.

ANNABEL PALMA: Yeah, so that is where if someone calls us and they have stated something, that would be a claim, colorable claim under the Human Rights

Law. We would look at that and that's what we do and we do have the resources to do that and we've effectively been doing that in employment.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. I got my look from my Chair to stop talking, so I'm going to listen to her and I'll head it back over to her. Thanks so much.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'll turn it over to Council Member Vernikov.

2.

_

3

4

J

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you Chair Williams. Thank you everybody for being here. I'm just going to use some of my time for questioning to do an opening and then I'll come back to you for questions after.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Council Member Vernikov,

I'm sorry, we just want to encourage members to stay

because Council Member Holden has a question, so we

need to maintain quorum, so he can ask his question.

I just wanted to flag that sorry.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you. The Fair Chance for Housing Act, this is the narrative that was sold to the public when this bill was introduced. But in reality there is nothing fair about this bill. This bill is passed in its current form which strip a property owners right to conduct a criminal background check on potential tenants. That means a landlord would not be able to stop those who committed or are still committing serious crimes from moving onto their property, to live next door to families with children and seniors because the landlord would have no idea who is a serious criminal and who has committed a minor offense five or ten That would make it possible for years ago.

murderers, burglars and drug dealers to move to the apartment next door. Why does this body continuously abandoning the law-abiding citizen while constantly descending those who break the law?

While crime is at all time high in our city, this body continues to pass legislation that encourages criminal behavior by constantly rewarding it. Of course, we should give second chances to those who have made mistakes in the past. But as a society, we can never do that at the expense of the safety of children, seniors and innocent civilians. This is why this bill cannot pass in its current form.

Since I've made my apposition against this bill known, I have taken dozens of calls from New Yorkers from various communities opposing this bill. From Asian American communities, from immigrant communities, from Black and Brown communities and many others. I'm not talking about rich landlords. I'm talking about middle class tenants. I'm talking about a single mom, trying to make ends meet who happens to own a two-family home which she does not occupy and would now be prevented from knowing if a violent criminal will move into her house.

2.2

I am talking about tenants from a residential complex, which houses communities of color and prides itself on safety and the ability to maintain that safety only because they're able to conduct criminal background checks.

I am talking about an 85-year-old grandmother who lives on her own in an apartment building. I appreciate some of the work that organizations like Fortune Society do to rehabilitate individuals who have committed crimes in the past, to integrate them into society. I think that both opponents and proponents of the bill agree on one thing. Individuals who have in the past committed minor offenses or those who have been completely rehabilitated from their criminal past should not be shunned from society. Can I just have 30 seconds? Thank you.

But with this well-intentioned purpose, comes a dangerous outcome. Stripping a property owner of his or her legal right to conduct a criminal background check will also undoubtedly endanger law abiding New Yorkers. It also comes with hypocrisy, a steady regulation allows and requires the New York City Housing Authority to reject potential tenants based

on criminal history, while private property owners would be required to house criminals.

There's also married to the argument that proposed Fair Chance Housing Act, which intends to prohibit housing discrimination will in fact cause more housing discrimination. As landlords will not be legally allowed to conduct a criminal background check, some may and will profile based on other factors such as skin color. It is my hope that we come to a reasonable compromise that will assure that those with a negative past are given the proper chance to be meaningfully integrated into society, while at the same time, protecting law abiding citizens. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. We're going to go to Council Member Holden because he's on Zoom and then to Council Member Ariola.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Yes, thank you Chair and I appreciate the consideration because I'm on Zoom.

I have a question. The Department of Education has regulations that prohibits anyone with a felony from working in a school. So, why would the same city then force property owners to have felons live in the same building with children? Anyone?

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: So, we're not here to speak about the Department of Education rules. Thank you. Uhm, what I can say is that housing is essential to meet almost every other basic need. If you don't have

housing, you don't have often a shot at employment.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: The answer to that would be that the city could get more supportive housing.

They can get more transitional housing if a person is having that much difficulty and you know finding a location to live but as a property owner and again, I have several three family homes. In fact, that's probably predominant housing that I have in my district, yet the landlord can't decide you know that this person might be a risk to their families and our families are the most important to us, our children.

So, there's another side to this and you mentioned I think — you mentioned that some municipalities have carve outs. Can you — you mentioned one or two of them. Do you have another carve outs that they had exemptions for other cities?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes, I just want to restate the administration's position, which is that we see Fair Chance Legislation as an opportunity to balance some of the things you're talking about. Safety for all

2.2

2.3

New Yorkers with enhancing access to housing for all New Yorkers.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Well, this is a hearing,

I'd like to hear some of them because we're going to

paint with a broad brush here and we're taking the

rights away from property owners but yet it doesn't

hold true with public housing. You know this

wouldn't hold to public housing, am I correct?

ANNABEL PALMA: So, there are federal rules and regulations and we referenced some of those. There's two areas where there's a mandatory exclusion, which as you know is carved out in the current version of the bill. And there are also some permissive areas where housing providers who receive federal funding can have screening tests, screening processes. We also know that in New York City, our own public housing authorities are constantly revisiting these policies. But I do want to go to the question of other juris—

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: So, the public housing can discriminate but private, they have to take felons, mass murderers or anything, you know serial killers but public doesn't.

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: Well, no one is allowed to discriminate because the Human Rights Law protects everyone against discrimination based on their identity characteristics and there's 27 protected categories. I'd be happy to talk about the other jurisdictions or provide that information at a separate time.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: I think now is the time but alright we'll go beyond that. One more question or at least I'll try to get if I have enough time.

Is there a possibility that without exemptions to this bill that the landlord and you know also tenants in the building who couldn't do a background check could be physically harmed by this bill?

ANNABEL PALMA: Landlords will retain most if not all of their current ability to deal with individuals who are threatening people or property that are tenants and to handle violations of lease terms.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: That's really — you didn't answer the question. If you're not going to answer the question, why be here?

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you Council Member Holden. We'll try to do -

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Is my time up?

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Yeah, your time was up
3 like a minute ago but it's okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Okay, I'm sorry. Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: It's okay. No problem, we'll try to do another round of questions. We want to get to all Council Members and so, if Council Member can respect the time limit so we can do another round, uhm, that would be awesome. Over to you Council Member Ariola.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Thank you Chair. Thank you for coming to testify today. On the surface, Intro. 632 sounds like a great idea. Preventing housing discrimination is a goal we should all strive for. However, as it's currently written, it is unrealistic and puts landlords and tenants at risk. Unilaterally prohibiting landlords from looking into criminal background of potential tenants opens the door to tragedy. It removes vital discretionary abilities from landlords, abilities that allow them to rent to those they feel are comfortable sharing their homes with, who they feel comfortable allowing their tenants to share their hallways with. Those tenants are often times children and seniors. This

2.2

2.3

bill as it's being presented today would allow violent offenders to share the floor space with unknowing residents who may very well become victims as a result and once someone does get attacked by a violent new tenant, why should we wait for that moment to the invoke the laws that protect landlords and the rules and regulations of their lease agreement? Because we all know how difficult it is to remove someone whose becoming problematic once they're inside of your apartment.

We need to focus on all of those law-abiding New Yorkers who are just trying to go about their lives to live in peace. Instead of focusing on these law-abiding citizens, this bill creates a new protected class called criminals and further erodes the public safety by potentially bringing crime from our streets into our homes.

I look forward to hearing those who will testify today and being part of the conversation. I believe in second chances and there is a way for this legislation to be beneficial to those who deserve one but we need to be reasonable and acknowledge that Intro. 632 is to broaden its scope and needs further definition. We need to stop bending over backwards

2.2

2.3

to those who break the law. There are consequences for breaking the law and we need to make public safety a priority once again in this city. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Quiet please.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Yeah, if you can practice this, that would be awesome. Thank you, thank you. So, the next Council Member I'll go to is Council Member Paladino.

and thank you very much for being here. Appreciate listening to you. I, like my colleagues agree completely. This is lopsided. This is off balance. What we are talking about here is not about discrimination. It's about not allowing the transparency that the property owners and the landlords and the tenants deserve. The very idea that you are stripping away the rights of these property owners, by not doing a simple task such as a background check, a criminal background check. That allows anybody to walk into your door and you just

2.2

2.3

have to accept them as it is or her as it is. That is not fair.

Real estate's extremely expensive here in the city and these people have put everything they've earned and worked for on the line in order to make an investment in the homes that they own. And the idea, the real cusp of this is that is that you are taking away the rights of the landlords to do what is rightfully their right. And that is to perform the background checks. We're talking about murderers and rapists and pedophiles that are going to come and live next door to us.

Look, this is not discrimination, this is reality and as it was stated before, we are now allowing felonies, convicted felons to come and live into our homes. I'm all about second chances also. Life is about second chances but at some point and what point do we draw the line? And to strip landlords of their right is wrong. Rewrite 632 and let's revisit it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I will now turn it to Council Member Krishnan and I just want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Council Member

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 Krishnan, Council Member Nurse and Council Member 3 Feliz.

COUNCIL MEMBER KRISHNAN: Thank you so much Council Member Williams, Chair Williams for today's I first want to start by saying and I would hearing. hope everyone would agree, that everyone deserves to have a roof over their head and a bed to sleep on at night. We're in the middle of a housing crisis right now, and we're not going to solve that crisis by making it more difficult for people to find a home. Every one and every New Yorker also deserves to feel safe too and we have to invest in strategies that truly keep people safe. I know it is utterly destabilizing and devasting when you lose a home or you're boxed out of housing. As a lawyer for lowincome tenants for many years, I have represented clients in exactly this situation who have been homeless, who have been forced out of their homes, who are forced to live in shelter and I have seen their lives upended overnight and I have seen their struggle when they are discriminated against and cannot find housing. People in homes equal safer communities.

2.2

2.3

And so, my first question for you and thank you so much for testifying today. Is you would agree correct, that race discrimination is prohibited under our Fair Housing Laws right?

ANNABEL PALMA: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER KRISHNAN: You would also agree that source of income discrimination is prohibited under our Fair Housing Laws?

ANNABEL PALMA: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER KRISHNAN: Would you agree that the two of the top forms of housing discrimination in this city are race discrimination and source of income discrimination?

ANNABEL PALMA: I would agree with the caveat that disability discrimination is also quite rampant.

COUNCIL MEMBER KRISHNAN: Correct, as I said, two of the top three. The top three according to the Human Rights Commissioner Reports, race discrimination, disability discrimination and source of income. Or source of income discrimination first, disability discrimination and race discrimination.

So, source of income discrimination, race discrimination are two of the top three forms of housing discrimination in this city and I would

2.2

2.3

venture to say, two of the top three forms of housing discrimination nationwide. Would you also agree that those who are trapped in our criminal system and coming out of criminal custody are overwhelmingly people of color?

ANNABEL PALMA: I think the data indicates that is true.

COUNCIL MEMBER KRISHNAN: Would you also agree that those who are trapped in our criminal system or coming out of our criminal system can or will likely require the assistance of public benefits?

ANNABEL PALMA: I can't speak to that.

a lawyer who has represented many clients in these situations that often times because they've been incarcerated for a long time, because it's often very difficult to find housing, many of them will depend or require public assistance or public benefits and discrimination based on public benefits is otherwise known as source of income discrimination. So, I would say, if we know that race discrimination and source discrimination are both illegal under our fair housing laws, if we know that they are two of the top forms of how discrimination in this city and they are

2.2

2.3

prohibited practices under our Fair Housing Laws.

Then I think we must also agree as a city that

discrimination based on your criminal history, which

implicates those two forms of prohibited housing

discrimination is a proxy for those forms in housing

discrimination and if we want to actually end housing

discrimination in this city, we have to stop those

proxy's as well.

Again, people in homes equal safer communities. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you Council Member Krishnan. I'll turn it over to Council Member Joseph for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you so much. My first question, in New York City, there's nearly about 750,000 that have conviction records. That's almost 11 percent of the adult population. Do you know how many of those are currently unhoused?

ANNABEL PALMA: Uhm, I, I do not.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: I would love, since I sit on this Committee, maybe you can get that data back to us. That would be very helpful, thank you.

As a general rule, I'm not even talking about the bill specifically. How does the nine people from

2.2

2.3

housing make our city safer? Colleagues? It sounds like -

ANNABEL PALMA: No, the Administration is committed to removing barriers to housing. We see that as a critical piece of Fair Chance legislation. What we are here to do today is to listen to all the stakeholders and to identify what is the best pathway forward. So, as several people have referenced, there are other jurisdictions with these protections. Fair Chance Housing Legislation. In some of those jurisdictions there's limited time look back. So, landlords can look back three years and that's it. In some of the jurisdictions, they mirror what is under federal law, the two mandatory exclusions from housing.

So, being on the lifetime Sex Offender Registry and manufacturing methamphetamines in the homes and those are the restrictions. So, there's a wide array of approaches. There are jurisdictions like New Jersey where there's time married with certain types of arrests or conviction records.

There is a lot of versions of how to do this. I think this Administration want's to do it correctly for our city and we want to balance what have been

2.2

2.3

the predominant themes of this hearing which are safety for all New Yorkers and reducing barriers to housing for everyone.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: So, you would agree that getting people housed make our city safer rather than less safe, because I'm hearing it's about safety. We understand that but as you mentioned earlier, there's certain criteria's.

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes and there is clear data that shows that stable housing is linked with lowering recidivism and we do believe that getting people into housing is a cornerstone of wellbeing both for individuals and families.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Well, thank you for that.

So, housing does make people more safe, I got it.

Okay. If people can't access housing because of a crime they did many years, to me that's perpetual punishment. It's almost equivalent to a lifetime sentence because even if you get convicted of a minor crime, you have a record that carried with you forever. What's the current justification for legalizing housing discrimination? I'm a former teacher so I always ask questions like that because as I was teaching, I saw a lot of my students into

the shelter system because some of their parents

served time. They deserve a second chance, so that's

why I'm asking these questions, I also have the Ed

Chair, I'm going to ask these questions because

they're important. I saw for the past ten years how

many of our students if you look at the data that has

entered the shelter system because their parents came

home from prison and they could not find a home to

10 live in.

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: So, I will respond to say that we, and we said in our testimony. This

Administration and the Commission see's housing as a human right and our goal is to reduce barriers to housing and the Administrations position is that a criminal history, which here we're talking about arrests and convictions, which are very different; should not disqualify someone from housing. But how we balance some of the priorities is the question on the table in which many people in this room have expertise and opinions that we would like to hear and learn from and use to make this Strong, Fair Chance Housing legislation for New York City.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you. Thank you Madam Chair.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: No problem. Uhm, I just also wanted to sort of center this on like facts and not fear, and so I just want to just state that this law does not apply to New York State Offender Register. I've been hearing a lot about sex offenders. This law does not apply to them. This law also does not apply to two family owner occupy housing or rooms in owner occupy housing. And all of this must comply with laws protecting victims of domestic violence, sex offenses or stalking. So, let's sort of center facts when we're talking about this legislation and I just wanted to make that. And with that, I'll turn it over to Council Member Nurse for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER NURSE: Thank you Chair. I guess

I just have some questions that — around even the practice of people going to look at an apartment.

Can you confirm there's a pretty wide spread practice of when you reach out to a broker, the broker will ask you what's your credit score and how much income you make before even, even their willing to respond to you or show you to an apartment?

ANNABEL PALMA: Council Member Nurse, I thank you for your question and I respect the question,

_

2.3

however, the New York City Commission on Human Rights focuses on enforcing the New York Human Rights Law.

COUNCIL MEMBER NURSE: Sure, but I'm saying anecdotally.

ANNABEL PALMA: We don't have the expertise to speak on what that process is like. We do have the knowledge of speaking of when someone goes through a discrimination process and they bring a complaint to us.

COUNCIL MEMBER NURSE: Right, okay, well, I would just say in my experience and what we hear anecdotally, is that from our office is that most people won't even get the opportunity to go look at an apartment.

Based on the income levels in my district and the fact that brokers are requiring you know four or five, you know ten times the actual rent for them to even get a response back. So, it's fair to say I would think that most people who are coming out or coming home from prison or incarceration who don't have credit or who aren't earning \$100,000 or more in income, probably won't even have the opportunity to look at most things being rented right?

| ANNABEL PALMA: So, I just wanted to use this as |
|---|
| an opportunity just to continue to highlight and |
| amplify already the so many barriers that exist for |
| anyone to even look at an apartment. To even look at |
| a room. There's so much filtering out based on race, |
| based on credit, based on basic questions. If right |
| now, any of us looked at Craig's List and said - |
| reached out the phone number listed and said, I'd |
| like to look at this room, the chances are you |
| probably won't. At least not in the district where |
| East New York and Brownsville and Bushwick and folks |
| are coming from 11207, 11028. Those zip codes that I |
| represent who send a lot of folks upstate or who have |
| a lot of folks upstate in prison systems coming home, |
| they're not ever going to look at the apartments that |
| are going up in my district. They're not going to |
| ever look at the homes that are being purchased by |
| some random LLC. We don't know who the owner is. |
| They're never, ever going to even get a chance to |
| communicate again to those brokers. |

So, there are already so many barriers and this narrative that people are going to be forced into the homes of these good landlords is absolutely absurd.

2.2

2.3

Because they probably won't ever even get a chance to

look at the actual house. Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. The next

Council Member I'll go to is Council Member Restler

followed by Brewer.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you so much Chair Williams and to Majority Leader Powers for your leadership on this issue. Proud to be one of the 31 co-sponsors on this bill and I will say it's always good to see you Chair Palma and have you back in the Council Chambers. Thank you for being here and thank you for the great work that you do. Uhm, this bill is a moral imperative and I'd like to just build on something that Council Member Joseph was saying a moment ago. Over the last decade we've seen the single adult homeless population in New York City grow by 1,000 a year.

Chair Palma, as a recent DSS leader, you know this well. And the primary driver on the single adult side of our homelessness population are formerly incarcerated individuals. It is a great thing that we've seen the state prison population shrink from 60,000 people to 30,000 people over the last decade or so. However, we are not providing

2.2

2.3

housing in any way for the people who are exiting our state prisons. Our jail population in New York City has shrunk by about 30,000 to 6,000 over the last 30 years but we have failed to provide transitional housing and long-term housing for people that are exiting incarceration and the existence, the perpetuation of discrimination against formerly incarcerated individuals in housing. That is tragically perfectly legal in the City of New York is a disgrace. It has to end and I'm gravely disappointed by the testimony of the Administration today.

You know I was reading a HUD report from just

June of this year that noted private housing

providers should consider not using criminal history

to screen tenants for housing. Criminal history is

not a good predictor of housing success. Why is Eric

Adams in conflict with our democratic president Joe

Biden on this issue?

JOANN WARD: Thank you Council Member Restler. I would say that the Administration supports the intent of this bill. That's why we're here today. We want to continue to work and partner with the Council to ensure that we can strike that balance of breaking

2.2

2.3

down barriers to housing while also keeping our city safe and you know the Commission has had — has and will continue right, to always support removing

barriers to housing for all New Yorkers.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I just have to ask for brief answers because I'm unfortunately going to get kicked off in 58 seconds. So, do you believe in the accuracy of the background checks that are provided to landlords? Just yes or no.

ANNABEL PALMA: Some are accurate and there is data that strongly indicates that some are not.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: So, many background checks are inaccurate, yet you're asking landlords to rely on inaccurate information. When they come back and they find that an individual does have previous convictions, which of those convictions do you expect the landlord to ignore and which do you expect to take into consideration?

ANNABEL PALMA: Under the City Human Rights Law, no one is required to do a background check and we are not asking -

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: But you're encouraging it. By failing to support our legislation, that we are insisting on today, you are saying that we should

2.2

2.3

2 not prevent discrimination against formerly
3 incarcerated.

ANNABEL PALMA: No, the Administration position is that we want to talk about what look backs could look like. This bill has exemptions as the Chair mentioned.

rightly so and that law is absolutely protected in state law. However, you are insisting that landlords look at people's previous criminal convictions and whatever they may be and you expect them to ignore some and embrace others and discriminate for some but not for others. It is not a sensible policy. This is the right approach. This is the bill we need to pass and I really hope the Administration will come to its senses and start protecting the rights of formerly incarcerated individuals.

ANNABEL PALMA: We do strongly believe in the rights of all New Yorkers and that includes people with arresting conviction histories. That is part of our law in multiple places.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much. I'm Gale Brewer representing the upper west side and I'm also the author of the Fair Chance Act, which

2.2

2.3

increased access to employment opportunities for those with criminal records and also, a foster mom with kids who have had records. So, I'm very familiar with this issue. My question to you is, I don't disagree with my friend Chair, Commissioner Annabel Palma and with the Human Rights but the question I have is and no, you have not been specific with some of the other localities that have passed such laws. Do you have a sense of what's worked, what hasn't worked and are there places specifically that we could learn from? Are there policies that we could learn from? I read your testimony but I didn't see it listed.

ANNABEL PALMA: Sure, so uhm, the Commission as part of our efforts to support Fair Chance Housing Legislation has been in touch with our counterparts and a number of jurisdictions, so as I mentioned, Seattle is one jurisdiction where the Fair Chance Housing Legislation simply mirrors the exclusion in federal law. So, there is the ability of landlords and I am pretty sure it's after a conditional offer that housing is available can look at those two particular crimes and that's the scope of what is permitted in background checks. So, that's Seattle.

2.2

2.3

In Cook County Illinois, after someone is

determined to be prequalified by looking at a number

of the things that Councilman Powers mentioned at the

top, reference checks, credit history, someone is

determined to be prequalified and before anyone pays

for a background check, there is, the, that is when a

housing provider would give someone notice that they

will run a background check and there's an

opportunity to withdraw or there's a process if a

criminal background check is reviewed.

There are also jurisdictions like Washington DC and the State of New Jersey that have certain look back periods by a number of years depending on what the particular underlying offense would be.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay.

ANNABEL PALMA: And can I just one piece from that, as an enforcement agency whose been looking at Fair Chance employment and our conversations with some of jurisdictions is that the education and outreach is always pivotal but in the places where the guidelines are confusing and not very clear and easy to understand for both landlords and applicants, that is a struggle to foster compliance.

2.2

2.3

council Member Brewer: Okay. With the employment as you know, it's the same issue. Offer me the job and if I get it, then you can ask if I have a criminal history but you can't discriminate before I'm offered the job. So, there are some similarities to what you're describing here. And I guess my other question would be, have you done any kind of or has somebody done an evaluation to see if these different policies work? In other words, are people getting housing? Is there a reduction in those recidivism etc.? Is that also part of the policy analysis?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes and so, part of the conversations with jurisdictions that we've talked to or that these policies are having the intended positive impact of increasing access to housing and people have said, landlords appreciate the clarity where the law is very clear and so do applicants.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay, so there will be some analysis that some academic is doing of these different policies to the best of your knowledge to see if they're actually working, not just anecdotal?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes, and there is a lot of literature in the employment space and increasingly,

2.2

2.3

there is literature from other jurisdictions on the housing space as well and that will definitely inform the conversation.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay, thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. Next, I'll go to Council Member Marte followed by Council Member Hanks.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTE: Hi everyone. My name is Christopher Marte. I am also happy to be a sponsor in this bill. Everyone deserves to be housed here in New York City. My question is about how do we actually enforce this legislation. There's a lot of third-party providers that offer this as a suite of services, where you get your credit rating, historical background, and they also add in criminal background checks. What can the city do to make sure that those third-party providers are not even offering that service to property owners and to other LLC's?

ANNABEL PALMA: I think what the Human Rights

Commission can do is articulate in our law and in our guidance and rules what is required under any law that City Council would pass and that would

2.2

2.3

ultimately be signed by the Administration. In our conversations with other jurisdictions, one of the things that has come up is partnerships with some of the vendor organizations who likely have to change their product to fit. Which is the product is the screening tool but we know from other jurisdictions, Seattle and Cook County Illinois that those changes are possible.

We don't have expertise in the kind of vendor litigation, I mean, vendor legislation and what governs those pieces but that is definitely an important part of the picture.

applies to be a part of a co-op or to live in an apartment, many don't have to explain why they rechecked the applicant. How can we enforce this law to make sure that people understand that they're actually being discriminated against? Because sometimes it's almost impossible to find out whether it was because of your criminal background or because it was something else listed on your background check.

ANNABEL PALMA: So, under this law as currently written, it covers sales as well. So, the same

2.2

2.3

process would be in place. I am also not an expert in state law but I know there is a state bill that is pending to improve transparency in co-op sales but I can't say anything about the details of that.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Are you done Council
Member? You good? Okay. Next, I'll turn it over to
Council Member Hanks.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANKS: Thank you Chair Williams.

Thank you very much. So, I kind of wanted to dig

into a little bit of the questioning my colleague

Council Member Brewer had started, which is really

talking about other jurisdictions that have

prohibited criminal background checks on housing.

So, in New Jersey in particular, do we have any insights on how that law is being enforced in New Jersey? What about like, have we reached out and looked at other you know uhm, our counterparts and is there a way to better understand the challenges, the complexities involved in enforcing this and what can we use at take aways to kind of make sure that we're using the best practices to get this done?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes, thank you for, for the question and again, one of the goals of being here to

2.2

2.3

listen for this Administration is to make sure that we are getting it right. Some of these laws have been on the books since 2017. Maybe a few a little bit earlier. Most of our counterparts report on the complaints they receive, so that's an important way for us to track kind of what is happening. We also do have relationships with the enforcing agency in New Jersey. I mean, I have had conversations with New Jersey and Seattle, Cook County and others about how things are going.

One of the challenges is that if there's an open investigation or complaint, people can't talk about it right? So, they can only tell us what is closed or something that they've already resolved. We understand that in New Jersey, a lot of the initial violations and there were I'm going to say dozens. I want to say in the 30's as publicly reported in the first year or two.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANKS: Violations in?

ANNABEL PALMA: Of the provisions that say you cannot advertise or ask about criminal history. The majority of those were in the advertisement arena. That's partly because a, they couldn't disclose a more complex investigation but also, because there is

2.2

2.3

a lack of awareness of the law. That translates also into our Fair Chance employment. We see a lot of violations at the like, at the first step in the process. Which would be, we have an application or we have an ad that deters someone from applying because of it references arrest or conviction history.

Would you think it would be important to have a standardized sort of background check that was universal that everyone used so there wouldn't be an interpretation? Is that something that other jurisdictions and states have been using? I'm really trying to get to a point where we're all looking at the same information, interpreting the same information and then making sure that we're using it to get people in housing.

ANNABEL PALMA: I think this goes also to

Councilman Marte's question. As I understand it and

I am not an expert in these background checks. There

sort of regional versions of companies running, third

party companies that run a suit of screens, which

include credit history, rental history and conviction

history. But there's also ways to limit what is part

2.2

2.3

of a screen. So, that would be whether companies would adopt a uniform one I don't know and I think I would withhold judgement until we knew what it was.

I think in our Fair Chance employment arena, we have — and many of the protections of our law, we create a sort of notice and uh, model or a sample document that people can use because we understand resources are limited. So, there are things that we can do like that but that wouldn't be a background check.

That would more be things for landlords or tenants.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANKS: Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I just wanted to acknowledge that we've been joined by Council Member Salamanca and we are entering our second round of questions. So, Council Members if you have a second round of questions, let me know and let's try to be as synced as possible.

I just wanted to ask a few questions about public housing. So, currently public housing has been mentioned today, is not contemplated as subject to this law. Earlier this year as he, as President Biden, declared April 2nd Chance Month. He emphasized the importance of helping justice involved people reenter society and find safe and stable homes. As

2.2

2.3

a part of that effort, Secretary Fudge directed an agencywide review of HUD's program to be more inclusive of justice involved people. And in October, the HUD offices were to propose updates and amendments to agency guidance that improve inclusivity. Taking this into account, do you see any role for CCHR in extending this non-discrimination policy to people residing in NYCHA? And I know there's some jurisdictional issues but it would be interesting to hear your opinion on what is happening on the federal level. I know other Council Members mentioned that NYCHA has more strenuous regulations than this bill would allow, so just wanted to know how you've been reconciling this.

ANNABEL PALMA: I think this goes to the collaboration at the Administration level, so that agencies just like Councilwoman Hanks was mentioning, where can we gather data? Internally understanding how these processes are working where they are used by our own agencies is one step of that process and there are a number of different pieces of that that we are still evaluating to identify again, where are the look back periods helpful? Where are they not helpful? What are we seeing as reasons that people

2.2

2.3

are being denied and how does that play into this legislation? And just to your point about the HUD guidance. That has not been — in October, there was a deadline to release some information that has not come to pass, so there are some memos out there but we await seeing what HUD has to say and for that to be part of our considerations whether or not Fair Chance legislation comes to pass because it will have an impact on the federally subsidized housing in New York regardless.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Have you been coordinating or working at all with HUD and NYCHA regarding this at all or is it just your own research, paying attention to what's happening?

ANNABEL PALMA: I turned myself off. Uhm, no, I mean we speak with NYCHA and with HPD. We have been following very closely. HUD regulations on this score and that's also been a point of discussion when we talk with other jurisdictions who face a similar framework. Where the Local Law might say one thing and then federal regulations say something different. So, trying to figure out how to reconcile that and if there will be further federal guidance on that as well.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I will come back for some other questions but wanted to turn it back over to the bill sponsor Majority Leader Keith Powers for additional questions.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. I'll be brief because I know we have a lot of people here. The Mayor is giving a housing speech right now and according to New York Post, oh, I think the opening line or one of the opening lines was there's nowhere for people to go.

Under the recommendations that you're asking for where there would be levels of discretion involved or look back there. Look, where do people go in the meantime?

ANNABEL PALMA: I think this is a question that is outside the scope of the Commission on Human Rights but we're happy to further discuss this —

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Well, I can ask the Chair then. She's worked at — you worked at the homeless services, so where do individuals go in this case?

JOANN WARD: Council Member Powers, I respect your question and you know today the focus is talking through Intro. 632 and the intent of the bill. And

2.2

2.3

you know the Commission has always supported making sure that there aren't any barriers for any New Yorker to access housing. And so, for today, we want to continue to work with you, to work with the Council to ensure that 632, that Intro. 632 can come to fruition with a host of — you know with an agreement where everyone can feel comfortable. Where people are not denied housing but we also have a focus on keeping New Yorkers safe.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Understood and I appreciate your work and you've always been a good partner but I will say, there is an ability under your position to deny people housing, which undercuts the argument of people have nowhere to go that the Mayor is talking about right now. So, I think there needs to be a little bit of reconciliation between the broad housing goals the Administration is talking about.

By the way, I am with you guys on so much of this. We need to build more housing. We need to create more opportunities, more affordable housing.

I have been — in my district we support housing. We support places for people who are homeless to go. We do not vilify people who are struggling and need a

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

helping hand and I've been outspoken about that from the day I walked into office until recently. We did a great new Project Renewal. Supported a housing project in my district and it was a great project and is the type of housing we also need to build in New York City. It is the type of principles we need to uphold and you know, for many of us who are up here, we are the one's who are often saying yes to giving people housing opportunities and understand the big goals here. We're not standing in the way of those things while advocating for this legislation but I quess the critical question here that we do have to ask is, where do people go? And if we're not - as the Mayor rightfully says, not building affordable housing. We're not creating the pathways to housing but we are putting in barriers or keeping some barriers in the way. The question is, what happens to those individuals?

And as you guys have noted in your testimony, the stability in housing does decrease recidivism. It does increase the ability for public safety in this city.

And so, I'm going to end at that note, but I think that what the Mayor is talking about right now

2.2

2.3

and what we're hearing do have some conflict with
each other or at least we have to answer that
question of where do people go? If we're talking
about look back periods and things like that. People
who have paid their sentence are being asked to
continue to pay that sentence in housing but not in
the criminal justice system anymore. And I think
that has major repercussions for peoples ability to

rebuild their lives.

So, I look forward for anybody who's speaking up about this legislation today to also work with us to find places to house those folks who are not going to be able to find an apartment. That will mean requiring to build more homeless shelters in the city. Find and build more supportive housing and I anticipate that if those folks are going to oppose this bill, they in that time period will start to help us solve that other crisis that we are creating, which is a crisis of homelessness. And I will look forward to working with them to do that and do that. And I will tell you this, I know I will be doing that. I will be supporting affordable housing and housing my products in shelters and things like that

2.2

2.3

2 to help my fellow New Yorkers and I hope others will 3 join me in that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Just reminding people to practice this. So, the next Council Member I'll turn it over to is Council Member Vernikov for a second round of questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you. I believe you testified earlier that there isn't any specific data or evidence to support that individuals who are denied housing based on criminal records. Is that correct?

ANNABEL PALMA: Can you say that again please?

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: I think you testified earlier that you don't have any data or evidence to support that individuals who are denied housing based on criminal records. Is that correct?

ANNABEL PALMA: I said, at the Commission we don't collect that information because it's not something that's within our jurisdiction. There are studies and data by other people that point in that direction but I said, we as the Commission, don't collect that information.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: But the information that you have is that it's based on opinions and anecdotal

4 | information, correct?

ANNABEL PALMA: I think there's a wealth of both academic and think tank studies that point to the fact that stable housing is a factor in reducing recidivism and ultimately enhances wellbeing and safety.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: But right now, you don't have in your hands evidence that there has been housing discrimination based on criminal records.

It's just based on opinions right?

ANNABEL PALMA: It's not based on opinions; it's based on studies but I don't have those studies with me today. That is correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: You don't have the studies, so we're proposing a bill to ban background checks, criminal background checks. To prohibit housing discrimination based on anecdotal information and opinions that there has been housing discrimination based on criminal arrest records.

Uhm, so, I understand some of your testimony that you don't fully support the bill as it stands right now, is that correct?

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: Yeah, we support the intent of the bill but want to work with Council and other stakeholders to ensure that — and the Administration as well that I mentioned, that the bill is the best bill it can be for all New Yorkers.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Are there specific parts of the bill that — well, let me rephrase. What are the specific parts of the bill that you don't support?

ANNABEL PALMA: Uh, the pieces that the Administration is reviewing and thinking about is the potential for look back periods for certain offenses.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you. So, uhm, I understand that you understand the bill very well.

So, let me ask you a question. If this bill passes, will a property owner be allowed to check whether or not a potential tenant has committed robbery, burglary or arson in the past? If it passes the way it is right now.

ANNABEL PALMA: Private landlords would not be looking at past behavior as a predictor of tenancy though as we said, there's different rules under federal law for federally subsidized providers.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, so somehow the landlord does find out that potential tenant has committed robbery, burglary or arson in the past, would that landlord be able to reject the tenant, the application based on that knowledge?

ANNABEL PALMA: On that basis alone?

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Yes, on that basis alone.

ANNABEL PALMA: No.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: And if a potential tenant applies to rent an apartment and the landlord learns through a friend that there's a warrant out for that persons arrest, can the landlord then deny that application based on that knowledge?

ANNABEL PALMA: Based on an outstanding warrant?
That's the question right?

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Yes.

ANNABEL PALMA: I'd have to get back to you on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, so if a potential tenant who is applying to rent an apartment say murdered a child in the past. Would a landlord be able to check that information in order to consider if the tenant can move in should this bill pass?

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: Should the current version of the bill pass, a landlord, private landlord would not look back at arrest or conviction history.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: So, he wouldn't be able to check if a tenant murdered a child in the past?

Yes or no?

ANNABEL PALMA: They would rely on the other tools that landlords have to review individuals for tenancy.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: So, no, right?

ANNABEL PALMA: Yes, I said that.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay. Does the uhm,

CCHR receive housing discrimination complaints based
on criminal history?

ANNABEL PALMA: That is not something that is within our jurisdiction, so it's not again something that we count. We do have at least one case though where under a theory of disparate impact, there was a settlement with a landlord. A larger landlord who was uhm, had a blanket prohibition on tenants with arrest or conviction history and that was found to have a disparate impact based on race and national origin.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: So, we're talking about one case, yes?

ANNABEL PALMA: There's currently one case that the Commission has handled. There's also a larger universe and body of law but we have one case that I can speak to, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, one case. Uhm, do you know approximately how many complaints there are per year based on you know discrimination — discrimination complaints based on criminal arrest records?

ANNABEL PALMA: In employment?

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: No, in housing.

ANNABEL PALMA: At the Commission, we don't track those because it's not a protective category in our law.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you Council Member Vernikov. You have, how many more questions do you have? One more?

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: 30 seconds. I got to pick my best question then. Would you agree that if this bill actually passes the way it is that it will create more housing discrimination?

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: The Administration is supporting the intent of the bill but not the current version.

I have not seen evidence in the jurisdictions that we have looked at and talked to, that fair chance legislation has led to more discrimination.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Just one thing, I want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Council Member Carmen De La Rosa and I see Council Member Holden has his hand up for a second round of questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you Chair again for the second round. I appreciate it. So, there are already protections for tenants when landlords do background checks right? It's within the fair credit reporting Act. It restricts the type of information that landlords can access and requires them to inform perspective tenants that they'll be conducting a background check.

So, the city you know has many programs to help you know ex-cons to find housing. Like, the New York City Rent Frees Program or you know alternative enforcement programs, tenant protection units, Right to Counsel. So, are these programs not working?

2.2

2.3

safety?

ANNABEL PALMA: I'm unable to speak to the breathe of these programs but I think a lot of them are only tangentially related to the question at hand, which is how do we improve access to housing for New Yorkers, while also considering public

agree with my colleague Keith Powers that uh why isn't the city building more affordable and transitional housing and supportive housing to give you know ex-cons you know a second chance. This is what I think should be done. If we're going to restrict homeowners and again, I have a lot of three family homes. The landlord lives in the homes. They're going to have rent. They don't have to rent to sex offenders right according to bill?

ANNABEL PALMA: The bill doesn't talk about who you can rent to or not. It talks about what's permissible to look at as part of the application process.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: So, it doesn't permit you to or it does permit you to look at sex offenders correct?

2.2

2.3

ANNABEL PALMA: The current version of the bill does allow housing providers to look at the State Sex

4 Offender Registry.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: But like my colleague

Vernikov just said, what about a person that murdered
a child?

ANNABEL PALMA: Currently, a private landlord would not use a criminal background check, so that information might not be known through that channel.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: Right, so you see the problems here. And you see that, and I know it what would happen because I've heard from a lot of residents who own the three-family home or the homes in my district, that they'd just leave the apartment empty rather than go through this. So, that's the danger here when you paint with a broad brush and you have some things that don't make sense. Like, uhm, you can't somebody, let's say an arsonist and he's a serial arsonist. The persons had 12 convictions; you still cannot find out? You still can't do a background check on that part of it. And so, you're putting your family in danger. Nobody in his right mind would do that who owns a three-family home.

25 Believe me. Nobody would do that.

2 SERGEANT A

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired.

J

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER HOLDEN: So, there's the problem.

Thank you so much. Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: You're welcome. Now, I will turn it over to Council Member Ariola.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Thank you Chair. Has

CCHR considered that if a landlord can no longer

check a criminal record of a potential tenant,

there'll be some landlords that may look at the

person applying to rent a property and judge them

based on the color of their skin and assume that they

have committed crimes and won't accept their

application opening up more doors for discrimination?

ANNABEL PALMA: So, as I think it was Councilman Marte identified. Race discrimination is one of the most prevalent forms of discrimination that we see at the Commission. It is prohibited. It still happens. The evidence that we've looked at from the employment sector and from other jurisdictions do not point to the fact that there are — there's increased racial discrimination as a result of this law.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: That doesn't exactly answer the question but because I think since they're not able to do a criminal background check no matter

what the color. If they feel intimidated by that person, they may or may not approve an application.

So, uhm, my next question is, does CCHR believe it's fair that the NYCHA New York City Housing Authority is exempt from this and can still conduct background checks, yet and reject people based on their arrest record but not private property owners or condos and co-ops and people who are shareholders and real property owners do have to do that.

ANNABEL PALMA: So, the bill as written has a carveout for the fact that federal rules currently put different obligations and requirements on federally subsidized housing than on private landlords.

So, not all private landlords do background checks. They're not required to do background checks and as we discussed in response to Councilwoman Williams questions, we are in touch with our colleagues at NYCHA and HPD, who are also constantly revisiting to ensure that their policies are reaching the right balance of the priorities we've been talking about, which is getting people into housing and safety.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: But if this bill were to pass in its form now, then there would be a complete inequity when you own the building privately or you're a co-op owner or a condo owner, then if you are running a federally funded NYCHA housing project, is that correct?

ANNABEL PALMA: There would be a different set of rules and regulations and that mirrors how it is now. Private landlords are not bound by the same rules and regulations as federally subsidized housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Thank you. In 2015, the City Council passed Fair Change Act I'm sorry, Fair Chance Act banning criminal background checks for uhm, by an employer. Do you have data that shows that it helped formerly incarcerated people get jobs?

So, as I referenced before, there are a number of studies out there on Fair Chance employment both in New York City and other jurisdictions that indicate that Fair Chance Laws have overarchingly increased call backs and employment for people with arrest or conviction histories.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Thank you. Thank you for the second round.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: No problem. Just some final questions about funding. I know we have an upcoming November MOD hearing today as well. How will expected citywide budget cuts effect CCHR's operations? How does this impact housing discrimination enforcement in particular? It's one thing to have a law but it's another thing for the law to be enforced and that tends to be a problem across many agencies. So, if you could share your thoughts on the funding impacts.

JOANN WARD: Thank you for your question Madam

Chair and as you and I have previously spoken on many occasions, while we have to uhm, in the

Administration strike a balance in terms of budget,

CCHR has a great dynamic team that continues to do the work day in and day out. We continue to work with OMB to you know raise our agency needs and OMB — and we're in constant communication with them.

Should this bill be passed, our team is prepared to ensure that we are able to enforce the law.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: On November 21st, OMB

Director Jacques Jiha released a vacancy reduction

letter, stating all agencies must reduce city funding

full time civilian positions that were vacant as of October 31, 2022, by 50 percent.

As I mentioned earlier, I was quite alarmed that your agency was second on the Comptrollers report and so, I'm quite concerned and would love to know what is the total number of positions CCHR is currently budgeted for? And how many of these positions are currently vacant?

JOANN WARD: CCHR is currently budgeted for 140 positions.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: And how many are vacant?

JOANN WARD: We currently have 109 staffed individuals.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: So, you have 140 budgeted and you have currently 109 people on staff?

JOANN WARD: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay. Uhm, why were there no vacancy reductions listed within the November plan for CCHR? Should we expect these vacancy reductions or has the administration exempted your agency?

JOANN WARD: We have not been exempted. We're working with OMB. We're working through our budget needs with OMB as we speak.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, is it fair to say that you currently have the necessary staff to enforce existing laws?

JOANN WARD: We continue on a daily basis to enforce the human rights law.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, I just wanted to make a statement that I do hope the Administration prioritizes CCHR and the work that they're doing, especially considering the proposed reduction plan and of course looming intricacies for next years budget. And Council Member De La Rosa has a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Thank you. Sorry, I was Chairing next door, so thank you for the opportunity Chair Williams. Since some of my colleagues are interested in data, I wanted to ask uhm, is there any data or any proof that a person who has been formerly incarcerated is unable to pay their rent?

ANNABEL PALMA: We don't have data on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Okay. Is there any data that a person who is formerly incarcerated or any complaints of a person who is formerly

2.2

2.3

2 incarcerated that has not been able to adhere to the 3 terms of their lease?

ANNABEL PALMA: That type of complaint would not come to us.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Uhm, is there any information that you have in terms of folks who have put in complaints for discrimination based on being formerly incarcerated or the inability to find housing due to that circumstance?

ANNABEL PALMA: I did mention the one case that was I believe it was a commission-initiated case though, so it was not based on a complaint that came to us. Because we don't have jurisdiction over that, we don't track that and we don't receive complaints on that basis.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: To your knowledge, if a person were to be uhm, we've heard this talking point on the sexual registry, sexual offenders registry. Would anything in this bill preclude a landlord from searching on that registry?

ANNABEL PALMA: So, as drafted, 632 permits review of the registry and puts in place notice requirements and then the ability of individuals to either provide information that it was inaccurate or

that they have rehabilitated or to present other mitigating factors.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Is there any information that the agency may have or the Commission may have around the warehousing of 60,000 apartments in New York City?

ANNABEL PALMA: That is outside the scope of the Human Rights Law and our jurisdiction.

COUNCIL MEMBER DE LA ROSA: Thank you. I just want to say for the record that it is an impossible situation to try and find housing when you're trying to rehabilitate your life. If at every turn there is an obstacle and it is not sufficient for us to try and hide street homelessness by creating larger obstacles for people to find housing.

So, we cannot continue to talk through both sides of our mouths when it comes to the rehabilitation of people that have paid their debts to society.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, thank you to my colleagues for asking such thoughtful questions and thank you to the Administration for your testimony. We do encourage you to stay and listen to the testimonies today. I know you said that's one of the things you want to do as you work with us to pass a

| bill that you feel is most suitable to combatting |
|---|
| housing discrimination and I appreciate your |
| preliminary support of the intent of this bill. And |
| I just want to again reiterate to the Administration, |
| I know you all have to say what you have to say here |
| at the testimony that CCHR is prioritizing the budget |
| because we have many wonderful laws that really |
| support the most marginalized New Yorkers but if your |
| agency is unable to enforce existing laws, I'm |
| concerned about your ability to enforce future laws. |
| So, I do hope that that is prioritized. Thank you |
| and we'll turn it over to the public in a minute and |
| I'll turn it over to Jayasri for some housekeeping |
| things. |

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you Chair. We'll give the Administration a few minutes to gather their things and we will turn to public testimony next.

I'd like to remind everyone that unlike our typical Council hearings, we will be calling individuals one by one to testify if they are online. If you are here in person, when you are called, please take a seat at the table and you can begin once the Sergeant starts the timer.

10

8

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

2.2

2.3

24

YUSUF DAHL: We defer to her first if that would be fine if we could start in that order. Thank you.

Council Members who have questions for a particular panelist should let me know and I will call on you after the panelist has completed their testimony. For panelists, once your name is called, a member of our staff, if you are online will unmute you and the Sergeant at Arms will give you the go ahead to begin. If you are here in person, please make sure you push the button on the mic and the red light goes on, so we can hear your testimony. please wait for the Sergeant to announce that you may begin before delivering your testimony.

We will be starting in a few minutes, so if you don't mind sitting tight, we'll actually just call the first panel so you can get situated. Yusuf Dahl, Lizzy Couret, Leah Faria and Andre Ward.

Thank you. We will be starting shortly and just a reminder that you will have two minutes to deliver your testimony.

Thank you. So, on this panel we have Yusuf Dahl, Lizzy Couret, Leah Faria and Andre Ward. You can all begin when you are ready.

2.2

2.3

LIZZY COURET: My name is Lizzy Couret and I live in Brownsville Brooklyn. I struggle with finding safe, stable housing because of criminal record. I support this bill because it will help women and families like mine to get home. They deserve a successful life.

Before I went to prison, I was 21-years-old living on the street and dealing with mental illness. I've been home from prison since 2008 and have never been in trouble again yet securing housing has been a real challenge. For example, last year my boss introduced me to a real estate broker who showed me an apartment complex in Manhattan. It was perfect within my price range but because of my criminal record, I was rejected. I was on the waiting list for NYCHA for eight years and I'm pretty sure I'm not getting anything because of my history.

I rebuilt my life after prison. I was employed in different fields, most recently as a cleaner at corporate building. For several years, I was connected to housing through Housing Plus. A nonprofit that provides affordable housing to women who are justice impacted. I was also a good tenant who paid rent on time.

2.2

2.3

Right now, I'm living with friends. It's not my own place and I'm tired of not having something that's not my own. My whole life I wanted a home to call my own. For those who say this bill would threaten public safety, I say that's unfair. I am 53, sorry. I am 53 years old and disabled after having a stroke. What can I do to hurt anyone and I'm still being excluded from housing because of something that happened decades ago. I'm sorry.

For women home is a foundation to build on. A place for our children and families for those of us who have served our time. It is unfair to let past criminal records continue to haunt us. Let us move on and be productive. We deserve fair access to housing. I urge the City Council to support this bill. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you for your testimony.

LEAH FARIA: Good afternoon Chair Williams and the rest of the Council. My name is Leah Faria and I am the Senior Community Organizer for the Women's Community Justice Association, which works to end mass incarceration for women, families and gender-expansive people.

2.2

2.3

Women are especially vulnerable to housing discrimination based on a criminal record. When I was released in 2019, getting a home to call my own was a real struggle. I applied to at least three apartments but having to check that box asking if I had a conviction, resulted in me never hearing back from those landlords.

Checking the box was like going through the trauma of the court system all over again. I served 22 years in prison without a single disciplinary infraction, proving that I was fit to return to the community. Within 30 days of my release, I had a job. I had the means to pay the rent, I did the time without getting into trouble, yet I was still not being given a second chance. No one wanted to rent to me. My choices was to live in a shelter or live with my mom. I lived with my mother and it was not a good situation. It was difficult for me to get the remote work parts of my job done and to get sleep because there was constant disruption.

I refused to give up and finally connected with Providence House, which provided me supportive housing and which provides supportive housing to justice-impacted people and others in need. It's

2.2

2.3

been two years of living there and having a place to call my own feels great. It is freedom, it is my safe place. Turning the key to my apartment and having somewhere to rest my head at night gives me a sense of peace. I pay my rent-on time every month, and probably have one of the cleanest apartments there. But Providence House can't be the solution for everyone with a criminal record. There is not enough space. The bill to Fair Chance for Housing is a big part of the solution.

Housing is a human right. Please pass this measure so that other women like myself, get the opportunities they deserve. All I wanted was an opportunity to be treated fairly yet I was denied.

ANDRE WARD: Good afternoon Madam Chair. Thank you for hosting this and to the other Council Members, thank you for being present.

My name is Andre Ward. I am the Associate Vice President of The David Rothenberg Center for Public Policy at the Fortune Society. The Fortune Society has been around for over 55-years offering supports reentry services for people who have been convicted of different crimes. You know we do this by believing in the power of peoples capacity to change

2.

2.2

and changing minds through education and advocacy to promote the creation of a fair, humane and truly rehabilitative justice system.

One of the things that's more than a quarter of our new clients says that homelessness or being homeless is an unstable situation. This is a constant plea from the individuals walking through our doors and many times, participants meet all of the requirements to have a housing application accepted. However, in far too many instances, acquiring a place to call home is an uphill battle because of their past criminal system involvement.

Comments are like, they were the driving force behind the development of the Fortunes Castle Gardens Apartment building, which is a mixed, affordable and supportive housing development in West Harlem.

Approximately 90,000 square feet of residential space. It's composed of 113 units. 50 supportive housing apartments for homeless individuals with a history of criminal, legal system involvement.

And next door to the castle is the Fortune

Academy, which provides emergency short term and

long-term supportive housing for homeless formerly

incarcerated people. And what I want to highlight is

2.2

2.3

that you know it's important to really consider this bill 632. In the following context: There's an ongoing housing crisis that we all know about it.

It's well documented that people with criminal system

histories face barriers in obtaining housing.

Now, I've been to different institutions in this country and in this city. I've taught at many college institutions. Taught at Harvard, at Yale. I've lectured at different institutions to empower people. I'm someone who has a five-year-old daughter. I'm someone who's went to the highest levels of academia. Schedule to graduate my doctorate degree in 2024 and yet, would you deny me housing if I applied for housing? Maybe so because I have a conviction history.

And so, it's important to note that this legislation is important and I'm not the exception, right. We're talking about anybody that has a conviction history, had the capacity to live a life of contribution.

I've counseled thousands of families and individuals about how to navigate this system. I facilitated restorative justice circles between people who have been harmed and people responsible

2.2

2.3

for causing the harm on many occasions. And
invariably, those who have been harmed said
unequivocally, they were rather something different
to happen to people who may have harmed them rather
than being put in prison and jail.

I'm speaking based on experience as a professional. So, Intro. 632 is an important bill to pass and we thank you Madam Chair and certainly Majority Leader for putting this on and we thank the Council Members who may have given them opposing feedback because it's helpful for us to understand what those who are opponents of the bill have to say because we lead with facts rather than fear. Thank you.

YUSUF DAHL: Good afternoon. Thank you
Chairwoman Williams, the Council and to my fellow
panelists for sharing really tremendous and brave
testimony.

My name is Yusuf Dahl and at 18-years-old, I was sentenced to prison for ten years for the distribution of drugs. In the ensuing 25 years, I have built a successful property management business, served as president of Wisconsin's largest trade

2.2

2.3

association, graduated from Princeton University and now have a teenage daughter.

The challenge in front of this Committee is to determine whether the private problems of folks like us warrant definition of a public problem enhance your intervention. Some folks will argue no. They will say that the market is working and that landlords are making rational decisions that secure the safety of their properties and the wellbeing of their tenants. As a landlord that has operated 200 affordable housing units, I can sympathize with that perspective. I've spent much of my mid-20's and late 20's acquiring buildings, pouring gallons of sweat equity into them and pouring all of my hard-earned dollars into those investments.

Instinctively, like many of the opponents of this bill, I would resist any effort to constrain my ability to determine who I could rent to. However, instincts are not the best way to manage a critical resource in our communities that is foundational for all of our hierarchy of needs.

I have directly signed hundreds of leases and have oversaw the execution of well over 1,000. The most important predictor of success in housing is

2.2

2.3

income and credit history. Inquiring about someone's

criminal history denies folks access to housing for

debts that have been paid and for factors that have

5 nothing to do with their ability to be successful as

6 a tenant.

I know this first hand. I was recently recruited to lead an education nonprofit and was denied access to neighborhoods that offered my daughter access to high quality schools. My income and rental history were irrelevant. Could that landlord make a credible case that I would stiff him or harm his existing tenants? Absolutely not and I don't even think that that landlord would try to, yet they would likely oppose this bill because of the perception that they are going to lose control.

And as I say to landlords across the country, this is really just a perception because this legislation and I want to be clear to the members of this Council, this legislation will not harm the business or safety of this community. It will simply correct the market failure that is constantly judging folks perpetually for the worst thing they've every done. Thank you.

)

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I just want to remind the panelists and future panelist to please stick to the time. I really don't want to cut you off. That also goes for my colleagues, so if you could please stick to the time, that would be most appreciated so we can hear everybody. Do any of my colleagues have any questions?

Okay, I just want to acknowledge that we have been joined by Council Members Velazquez and Kagan and also Minority Leader Borelli and the bill sponsor has a question.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you for testifying your stories and your advocacy and your grace here as well. There's 750,000; this is for anyone but this is 750,000 New Yorkers, almost 10 percent of the adult population in New York City who have a prior conviction and could be barred from housing because of background checks but certainly, that's not the amount of people that are committing crime in the city that are not part of the numbers that we see. We talk about public safety, yet you hear in the last couple of weeks, a broad brush being painted about people who have records and a broad, when we talk about broad things on my bill, we actually hear the

2.2

2.3

opposite on the other side, which is a broad intent to tell everyone who has ever had what you said, the worse day of their life that they should live with that forever, for a period of time, you name it. And that's clearly not true. The facts are on our side on that one. 750,000 people and when you look at the numbers of who is committing crimes, yeah, that's not what we hear every day.

So, I just want to reiterate that and maybe ask
Andre if you can speak more to the people you're
working with and their efforts to rehabilitate their
lives and how housing can be essential to that. And
also, I want to just, we ask you to speak to the
Mayor's point about a time period and how that might
be destabilizing somebody at the exact moment when
they need stabilization.

ANDRE WARD: Yes Council Member, the Fortune

Society serves over 9,000 people annually that have
had some contact with the criminal legal system. And
we have had proven concept of success based on people
going on to live a life of contribution once they go
through our various programs. We have a suite of
different services for which we offer to people.

Ranging from behavioral health to substance use

2.2

2.3

treatment to employment readiness, to education etc..

And one of things that essential in all of that is housing. In our housing portfolio, we've been able to provide housing for thousands of people throughout the 20 plus years that we have been servicing the people that we care about. We don't throw them away. We don't look at them as things or objects to be placed somewhere or not by us. We embrace their humanity because we know that they have the capacity to contribute to society just like anybody else.

The Mayor in effect has made statements relative to why people should you know or why we should look at aspects of the bill in a way that we should focus on heinous crimes in some way and what we're suggesting and what we maintain and believe is that someone who has a conviction, irrespective of what it may be, should also be dealt with fairly and treated humanely. And in the bill itself, it has the carveout specific to what people have asserted on the opponent side, the sexual offense registry etc. So, that's a short answer Council Member.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thanks, and just one more question and I'll hand it back. This for Yusuf, who has experience obviously in this field. When a

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

landlord or property manager or anyone who's in this field receives a background check and is particularly in a really high demand market; my district being one of the highest demands in the entire world in the country. And the sort of rapid nature of how the apartment process goes in New York City and other jurisdictions as well, the landlord or progenitor is going to receive a document that basically says whether there's a criminal offense or not. Is that fair to say? But it's not going to have any evidence or information about what the status is of rehabilitation. The landlords unlikely didn't ever in New York City meet the actual tenant that they're going to rent to because we have a robust system with brokers and other ways, property managers and things like that.

So, I guess that's two questions in one. One is, how do we know if you're giving broad discretion that had to compare one individual versus another anyway when you talk about rehabilitation. We talked about giving discretions as other people here have said. How do we know, how would a landlord ever know the status of an individual anyway if they're being asked to continue to be able to judge them based on using a

2.2

2.3

criminal record? Well, let me start there. Let me
ask that question.

YUSUF DAHL: So, contextualizing it in what you had mentioned, which is a particularly robust market. What most landlords will do is they're just going to take the applicant that has a perfect record right. So, if you have any type of blemish on your record, so a past conviction, that conviction can be 25 years ago. It doesn't matter in a tough rental market like this, that person will be discriminated against.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. Enough said.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Uhm, I think uhm Minority

Leader Borelli has some questions.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: Uhm, I appreciate all your comments and I guess, I just want to hear your perspective on how to answer some questions that people who are concerned have asked us.

Uhm, the recidivism rate of violent crimes, 65 percent of people are rearrested within five years.

That's two-thirds of people. With property crime, 78 percent. So, four out of every five. What is the reaction to that when people say that given the recidivism rate excuse me, aren't people taking reasonable precautions when not renting to someone

with a specific criminal conviction? I'll ask the panel. I don't who wants to answer.

ANDRE WARD: I think one of the things to consider and thank you for that Council for that question. One of the things to consider is that there's no scientific evidence that determines whether or not someone that has a conviction history is going to be a problematic tenant. That's a fact. And in no way am I trivializing the data that you shared. We know in New York State that data is accurate. However, again, there's no evidence at all Council Member that even though there's property crime that happens, it's still not a determining factor in whether or not a person will be a good tenant because they have a conviction history. It's just not.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: But the bill doesn't bar a landlord or owner or co-op or etc. from still renting to someone who fits in the statistical category potentially but can otherwise prove that they are a good fit for a particular housing unit. We just had a conversation with all four of you and you all made very compelling cases as to why you should be housed in some particular location or why

you'd be a good fit for any building. The bill prevents this conversation from happening. Why is that a bad thing?

ANDRE WARD: I think a part of it is that it's irrelevant. I think the fact of the matter is that if someone is able to pay their rent, if they have proof in terms of being a person that is otherwise fit to be living somewhere because they're a human being, they're a good person and they have character references to prove that; I think that should suffice. And we maintain that a human being should have access to housing irrespective of like what they have done in the past in their lives.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: But a criminal conviction of say a hate crime wouldn't be an indicator of someone's character?

ANDRE WARD: You know I think when we talk about

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: I'm not trying to be $\label{eq:control} \mbox{gotcha} \ -$

ANDRE WARD: No, no, no, I don't take umbrage to that Council Member at all. I welcome it. I think when you talk about a hate crime right, that's something else categorically right that may fall

2.2

2.3

outside of the purview of what we're talking about here. You talk about a hate crime right. We're still saying that a person should have access to apply for housing regardless of their convictions and not being discriminated against because it. So, whether it's a hate crime, whether it's someone who unfortunately has taken someone's life, someone who has stole a candy bar. We're saying that people should have the opportunity to be able to apply for housing and not be discriminated against because of their conviction history.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: Thank you. I agree with you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Council Member Borelli.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: I'm just going to wrap

up.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: I agree with everything that was said and I guess my point is that the conversations around these issues and the conversations around what mitigating life choices one has made that you brought up, there are plenty of things people have done post incarceration that make them great people. The bill bans the questioning of

2.2

2.3

that or the conversation about that and that's why I have some opposition. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: No problem. Council Member Vernikov.

just want to thank you for some of the work that you are doing. I think it's incredibly important.

Supporting the four million incarcerated. Helping them with finding housing and jobs, adjusting to civilian life and educational opportunities. Those are all good things but some of these individuals are still dangerous offenders and we can't help them by placing the lives of civilians in danger.

So, my question for you, my first question for you is, if the bill passes, can someone who committed murder in the past end up living in an apartment building with seniors and children, specifically because the landlord was not allowed to check their criminal record?

ANDRE WARD: First, I just want to say for the record, we don't refer to people as offenders at the Fortune Society. We don't use language like excon's, convicts, etc. Because in that term alone, it's dehumanizing and it denotes a certain kind of

2.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: And a murder?

interpretation that perpetuates right, this kind of like idea of who's worthy and who's not. That's one.

If a housing development has an application and that application is accessible to the public for someone to apply, then anyone should be able to apply irresectable of what they've been convicted of and they should not be discriminated against because of their conviction history.

So, if that housing development has seniors that are living there, the children are living there or a mixture of both in some ways, people should still have the opportunity to apply for housing and not be discriminated against because of their conviction history.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Would the Fortune

Society support a bill that would prohibit housing

discrimination against those who have committed minor

offenses but not exempt those who have committed

serious crimes such as murder?

ANDRE WARD: We don't prohibit anyone from accessing our housing. Even people that have been convicted of sex offenses, we don't do that.

ANDRE WARD: And murder. If someone who has a conviction, whatever it may be, we don't look at a person based on their conviction.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: It doesn't matter if they murdered someone?

ANDRE WARD: It doesn't matter to us because they're human beings who served their time, paid their debt to society and ultimately like any other human being, coming back into the world or living in the world should have access to the same rights as anyone else. So, no, we don't.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, so I understand it's your prerogative to protect murderers. The Fortune Society is also a landlord, correct?

ANDRE WARD: Yes, the Fortune Society is a landlord and we don't protect murderers, we honor the humanity in someone who has committed harm to someone else. So, as they can begin to inspire other people to not cause harm to someone else. So, we're not protecting anyone Council Member. We're simply, we're simply holding them in a way that they can feel cared for. Because the people that we serve, those who among that 80 percent of Black and Latinx people who are obviously impacted by systems in this country

2.2

2.3

and racism. We know that many of them never had a first chance to begin with. And therefore, we showed them what first chances look like and new opportunities look like by bringing out the best in them, so that when they go in the world, they show other people what potential looks like. What living a life of contribution can look like and how that can show up in the communities that they go into and they will live in.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, so I'll rephrase, you don't protect murderers, you honor them.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Council Member Vernikov.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Just one.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, 20 seconds and if you could — everyone could be synced. We have over 50 people registered to testify and I want to respect everybody's time. I would love to stay here and listen to all of the questions and all the responses but we just simply don't have that time. So, just reminding everybody to be uhm intentional about the time you're using. To respect the time clock and also reminding our wonderful guests to please use sign language when you're applauding as to not disturb the testimonies. Thank you so much.

J

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you. So, as a landlord, do you conduct criminal background checks?

ANDRE WARD: No, I don't. I don't.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: I meant the Fortune Society.

ANDRE WARD: The Fortune Society does not conduct criminal background checks, right. And you know, I'm thankful for your questions Council Members but I have to obviously and I'll say this quickly out of respect for Madam Chairs that I honor all human beings, even you Council Member. Because it's the right thing to do as a human being and this is what the Fortune Society teaches the people that we serve to honor all human beings irrespective of what they've done, who they support, the things they're involved in. We know that human beings have the capacity to do good and to change.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: It says in your website that some programs in the Fortune Society require a background check and/or additional training.

ANDRE WARD: What? Where there are certain positions right? If they need to be filled by employers, that could be a possibility and I'm

qualifying this for the record. That could be a possibility.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: So, you do sometimes conduct criminal background checks?

ANDRE WARD: No, we don't conduct them specifically.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: What does that mean?

ANDRE WARD: What I mean by that is, if they're employers that are looking for candidates, we will speak with the people that we serve and we will manage the relationship with the employers relative to background checks in that way.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you Council Member Vernikov and now, I'll go to Council Member Kagan.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: Thank you Madam Chair.

Thank you. So, first of all, I would like to say that all of you are admirable examples and nobody will judge our anything like this. So, thank you for being here. Thank you for testifying.

Also, I'm definitely for a second chance and as Council Member is finding programs for formerly incarcerated. My question is, in the current form, so we have zero objections to the current form of

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 this bill, no objections. Not a single chance,
3 everything is okay?

YUSUF DAHL: Well, I'll respond to the spirit of the bill and I think just to reiterate what I said, what determines the success of a tenant and you know I respect so much the work of Andre and the Fortune Society, I'm not coming at this from a social service perspective. I am a landlord. I own a property management company. What determines the success of a tenant is their ability to pay rent and their history of being able to pay those bills in a responsible That is what determines the success of a manner. tenant. When we start to factor in some of these other things and I appreciate you believing in second chances but everyone does not think the way you do. And literally, I have just been denied access to an apartment because of a conviction that's over 25 years ago. This stuff is real and it happens to folks every single day.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: And it's terrible. I agree with you, it's terrible, so I believe this bill should be amended to the situations like you just described. For example, this bill specifically right now saying that sex offenders could be prohibited

2.2

2.3

from living in certain apartments. You know like so sex offenders are already like not humans, not second chance, how about this? So, why not any other categories of convictions of situations like repeat [inaudible 2:27:05] etc.

So, that's my point, why not amend this bill to make like I would say, easier and safer for everyone?

ANDRE WARD: Thank you Council Member for that.

To amend the bill to begin to expand the categories will diminish the impact of the bill itself and the purpose and aim of it.

Individuals who are designated to be on the sex offense registry, that outcome came about as something based on what we discussed. But to broaden those categories will diminish it, so the next thing people will say, they stole a candy bar. We should be able to know, right?

And I'm not trivializing. I really believe that there's people out there that think that because the broadness of people's perception on crime etc., doesn't discriminate in terms of what it is right?

If you are convicted of something, you are criminal, right? We've heard someone say you know these are criminals, irrespective of like what they've done,

2.2

2.3

2 how minimal it has been but to broaden that category
3 as far reaching and it will obviously diminish to

5 COUNCIL MEMBER KAGA

impact the bill itself.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: What about most violent offender, would you consider this exception for this bill?

ANDRE WARD: I don't know what you mean necessarily Council Member by the most violent offender. If you're able to describe that, I'm happy to hear it but I don't know what you like mean by the most violent offender.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: Several violent crimes is like, released from jail, committed again and released from jail, committed again several times.

Would you consider this as exemption from this?

ANDRE WARD: I believe that if someone has committed an offense, they've served their time, they're released. Ultimately they should have the opportunity to be able to apply for housing and not discriminated against because of their conviction history.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: So, even if they're released three times for example, so no exemptions what so ever?

2.2

2.3

ANDRE WARD: We believe in human beings capacity to change Council Member. Two, three times, many of us have made poor decisions two, three times and have been given opportunities to be able to still move forward in our lives. We may not have been convicted of a crime Council Member but certainly, we have been given opportunities because of grace and understanding and support and resources. We have been able to move forward in our lives. We believe the same thing, that people have the capacity to change.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. Uhm, I just have one question. I know CCRH said they were not collecting this data but I know you guys do a lot of extensive research and so, I wanted to know if you all have collected data on how often people are denied housing as a result of having a criminal record. Do you have any anecdotal data or anything you could share around the discriminatory practices to sort of substantiate the need for such a bill outside of it being a fair human rights thing to do?

ANDRE WARD: We have done some research Madam

Chair in the white paper and there's some data that

2 v

2.2

2.3

we could pull that seeks to respond to what you're asking.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, yes, I would love to receive that data. I know you said you own a management company. So, just in terms of your industry, are you able to kind of share how common a practice is for folks who ask for criminal background checks by management companies and/or landlords? Are you aware of how often that happens percentagewise?

YUSUF DAHL: It's a well published fact that approximately 90 percent of landlords utilize background check services to determine the fit of a tenant.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I don't think

I see any other questions. I want to thank the panel

for your testimony and look forward to working with

you. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We'll next call Mary Ann Rothman, Melissa Gomez, Ryan Monell, and Geoffrey Davis.

You can go ahead and start when you're ready.

Just the Administration gets sworn in.

MARY ANN ROTHMAN: Good afternoon Chair Williams and members of the Committee. My name is Mary Ann

2.2

2.3

Rothman and I'm the Executive Director of the Council of New York Cooperatives and Condominiums, which is a membership organization providing information, education and advocacy for housing, co-ops and condos located throughout the five boroughs of New York City and beyond. More than 170,000 New York families make their homes in our member buildings which span the full economic spectrum from very modest income restricted housing to solid middle class apartment complexes and upscale dwellings. The people who live in New York co-ops and condo's are not only the owners of their buildings, they're also the electors of their communities governing boards and the neighbors who share the dealing units and its common space.

As homeowners, they often remain in place for decades, stabilizing and contributing to their neighbors. The safety and security of every member of a co-op or condo community are of upmost importance to any board who are making management decisions, including the review of new resident applicants.

Intro. 632 would restrict the ability of co-ops and condo's to examine criminal history in such

2.2

2.3

instances. While we appreciate the Council's commitment to criminal, legal reform and protecting the rights of disenfranchised New Yorkers, we must oppose this overly broad legislation as antithetical to sound management and resident safety. With every admissions application board seek assurance that the candidate understands all responsibilities associated with cooperative living that they'll be contributing members of the community and will not harm or jeopardize the safety of the community in anyway.

We do not take the -

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MARY ANN ROTHMAN: Can I do one more paragraph?

One more paragraph? We do not take the position that prior involvement with the criminal justice system should automatically disqualify applicants for housing. Our concern is that cooperative ownership communities must continue to have the ability to manage and regulate their operations and finances including making thoughtful admissions decisions within the parameters of the existing human rights law.

We therefore urge the City Council to seek a better balance between the rights of persons with a

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

2324

Z 4

25

criminal history and property owners ability to provide safe housing to tenants. Thank you.

MELISSA GOMEZ: Good morning all. My name is

Melissa Gomez, I am a Real Estate Broker located in

Queens Village. I am here as 2022 Vice Chair for I'm

sorry, no Chair, for New York City Working Issues

Group for New York State Association of Realtors,

which has 13,000 realtor members in the five

boroughs, along with 64,000 members statewide.

You have my speaking points, so it gives you a little bit of my history. I'm not going to go into that. We hear speaking against Introduction Number 632. We understand the housing crisis. Obviously, I'm in real estate, I get it. There is a big problem all across the board on many different fronts. However, this bill does not address certain issues that we think are - we would hope that the Council Members will look at other jurisdictions to look and see and hopefully enact something that would be more fair or just kind of look at things from different perspectives. We feel that if, I feel if all short in addressing the root of the problem. There are violent criminals. There are criminals that are career criminals. Unfortunately, the reality is that

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

for some people, they do not know another way of life outside of criminal activity because that is what they were taught.

I can say this because I have friends that have been rehabbed and it is different if you committed a crime ten years ago versus committing something six months ago and then going back into it and committing it again. I am fearful for the 80-year-old lady that is living in a two family, that is not owner occupied and the tenant that is coming in is an identity theft I am fearful for the person that has had a meth lab in prior properties and now this property is no longer deemed viable. I am fearful for the person that has the property has brothel and the FBI has come in and broken down. There's a lot of things I think it does not take into consideration and I would hope it does. My biggest fear in this or my two big issues, one, NYCHA is federally funded. I am selffunded as an owner and it's not fair that a federally funded organization has a right to check it and I do not.

Also, my biggest fear honestly as a minority, my family is from the Dominican Republic. I am Brown.

People will now look at us and instead say, you know

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, you probably have a criminal background because you're Black or Brown and instead, and if we think that racism does not exist; we've heard it all morning and the reality is that as a person that is minority, I can tell you, racism is very much alive and well. And my fear is that people will use this as a reason, their preconceived notion as the reason as to why they will deny housing and we're actually going to create a bigger problem of housing access for people where they could honestly show, you know I am not a criminal. Please don't assume that about me and I think it's the travesty not to take other things into consideration. So, I really would hope that we look at other jurisdictions as other areas across the country that have looked at fair chance and just say okay, what's working. blanket area of this bill is not.

RYAN MONELL: Well, thanks Chair Williams and it's really great to be able to speak on this really important issue. I also want to thanks to the sponsor of the bill. I know Majority Leader; I'm looking at Joe Borelli over here. Majority Leader Keith Powers for the continued dialogue on you know this conversation and you know I want to say I'm now

2.2

2.3

on Vice President for Government Affairs for the Real Estate Board of New York. Over recent years, we've really been focused on making sure that we also further the shared goal that we have of housing access. But I do want to say that we do have some concerns in terms of balancing that priority with that of building security and building safety, public safety.

You know one of the models, it wasn't presented today I think is what Detroit has done, which is a much more nuanced approach in regards to ensuring that there is an appropriate look back period provided for consideration. As well as something that would be taken into consideration I think hopefully by this Committee as well, which would be a process through which CCHR could look at potential erroneous denials of applicants if it has been found that they've been discriminated upon.

Also, we appreciate that the bill includes identification language. We look forward to continuing the conversation around that to ensure that it's also strengthened. And finally, to Mary Ann's point earlier, you know sales and rental processes are very different. We want to make sure

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

17

25

that there is some continued conversation around that as well to ensure that those processes are both taken into consideration in regards to how this processes are different. So, with that said, happy to take any questions. Appreciate the opportunity to testify today.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I believe we have one person online.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We have Geoffrey Davis who is on Zoom.

GEOFFREY DAVIS: Hello, can you hear me?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

14 GEOFFREY DAVIS: Can you hear me?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes, we can hear you.

16 GEOFFREY DAVIS: Alright beautiful, alright.

Hello everyone, I'm Geoffrey Davis from the James E.

18 Davis Stop Violence Foundation. I wanted to make a

19 point that this subject of public safety and housing;

20 | of course, housing is a human right. Housing is very

21 | important. Housing is a human right but it can't go

22 up against public safety. Right there in the Chamber

23 | in City Hall, every City Council Member had to go

24 | through a metal detector. You had to go through a

metal detector because of public safety. 19 ½ years

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ago there was a shooting right there in that building and the laws haven't changed where a human being died. My brother, Councilman Geoffrey Davis, your colleague and then they changed the law Mayor Bloomberg to say everyone has to go through a metal detector and their quests. Public safety two years prior to that, two blocks away, there was a tragedy where 3,000 people were killed in the World Trade Center. And then they changed the laws, now it's tougher to get through at the airports. Public safety let's not wait till a tragedy. Yes, we believe in second chances, third changes, fourth chances etc., etc., but property owners have the responsibility and the obligation to provide safety to the tenants. To their family first, to the tenants that live in the building and to a community. Now, if the bill is amended, if you haven't been in prison in 20 years, okay, we understand that you've been rehabilitated. But if you continue over and over and over to get arrested, how does the landlord know that? How does the landlord know that you got arrested over and over again? landlord won't know that. How does the landlord know that you're a pedophile?

2.2

2.3

In terms of the rate, the registry, the registry is only for New York. That means somebody from Ohio could have did a valid crime and raped and hurt someone and then come to New York and you wouldn't know because you couldn't do a criminal background check. We do background checks to save — take away background checks for day care centers.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Your time's expired.

GEOFFREY DAVIS: Take away background checks for banks. You can't take away — thank you. I appreciate it.

In conclusion, I want to acknowledge my brother, the honorable Council Member James E. Davis, law enforcement officer, district leader, a reverend and of course the City Councilman and thank you. Amend it and let's get it right but please don't put the two against each other. Thank you, God Bless.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. Before we turn to Council Member questions, I just want to reiterate that currently as the bill stands it exempts two family houses, so I just want to reiterate that again, facts. So, it is exempted.

UNIDENTIFIED: If they're owner occupied. If it's not owner occupied, it's not exempt. I just

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

want to make sure that we have the correction on that.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, so the bill sponsor

will clarify that but like I said, it is exempt

because I know you said if it's owner occupied but

when you say that it's not, it creates this narrative

that it has nothing to do with the bill. So, it's

still two-family households even if it's owner

occupied if you want to be specific is exempt. So, I

just wanted to reiterate that.

You can, I'm sure people will ask you questions and you can clarify, I just wanted to continue to like talk about the facts of the bill versus some things that I've heard during the hearing and I'll turn it over to Council Member Velazquez for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER VELAZQUEZ: Thank you Chair. I have a quick question for REBNY. Does REBNY and its members have experience with similar laws outside of New York? And what have you found to be the best practices?

RYAN MONELL: Yeah, so thank you Council Member for the question. A number of our members have a national presence and so, we've done a lot of

2.2

2.3

conversation over the previous couple of months since
the bill was introduced in regards to looking to see
which municipalities, which states have done things
similar and what has worked, what has not. I
mentioned Detroit earlier in my brief remarks. We
found that the Detroit model is a model that you know
we should consider replicating due to the fact that
it does create a fairly good balance from the
perspective of our membership in regards to ensuring
that we have housing access as well as public safety

and building security taken into account.

And so, that process again in Detroit, which of course is a fairly progressive city. Basically, it would allow for a preliminary process to occur without looking at criminal backgrounds. After that process is facilitated and someone gets through that process effectively, they would be able to — the criminal history would be able at that point to be considered. However, that criminal history that is able to be considered is somewhat scaled back to account for only the most significant convictions against person or property as well as those convictions that occurred in most recent years.

2.

There's also as I mentioned earlier, the opportunity to essentially go through a process to rebut as a tenant or perspective tenant, if you feel like you've been wrongly discriminated against. To which the equivalent of CCHR and Detroit would deliberate that process and make that a determination if you were discriminated against. So, we believe that would be a process being we would encourage the Council considering. We're happy to talk about the models as well at a future time.

COUNCIL MEMBER VELAZQUEZ: Next question, have you heard that the criminal history is a significant prohibitor to housing access here in New York City?

RYAN MONELL: So, I think one thing that we really have heard from our membership is that it's not necessarily about ensuring you have the opportunity to reject someone from entering into one of your buildings. It's more about ensuring that you have the ability to abide by the obligation that all landlords have in New York, which is warrant of having ability to ensure that you're accommodating all persons in a building.

So, it's not necessarily about denying someone. There's very rarely in LEC membership that I

2.2

2.3

represent, have their been folks who have been denied based off of criminal history. But with that said, we don't — we do not acknowledge that this is a real issue that we want to make sure we're solving for. But by and large, ensuring that you know we're accommodating all tenants, whether they're existing or perspective is very important.

COUNCIL MEMBER VELAZQUEZ: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Council Member Brewer for questions.

question is obviously, we're all trying to address this housing situation and I am convinced that recidivism is reduced if people have housing. I think we can all agree with that. So, then the question is, if uhm, you are agreeing with that and I think you do, then are there ways that you think; I know you mentioned Detroit but here in New York, that you could both understand that there are a need for these individuals? Some today; I know many people will have records and I know that they are hard working. Obviously we have individuals who have no record and don't pay their rent and don't you know

pay their mortgage. It's not just those who have a record.

So, my question is, can you see some ways in which this bill could make sense, both for you as property owners, co-op representatives, realtors and at the same, give the opportunity for those who need—Detroit sounds good. It sounds a little complicated. We're a very big city. We don't have a lot of inspectors, so I don't know the specifics of it but are there ways that you think we could have some kind of a way of seeing this bill forward or some opportunity for those who need the housing? There is a need for these individuals to get housing?

RYAN MONELL: Yeah, I think you know, speaking for REBNY at least, we certainly agree that housing access is an issue in New York City and looking at the most nuance perspective in terms of how to balance that priority, an important issue with that of building security and public safety, it's something that I think we believe can be met.

In looking at other models, yes, we're different than Detroit but I think there is significant evidence based off of what other progressive, large American cities have done to help combat against

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

those who have gone through the criminal justice system or justice involved would have no threats in the cells or others. And how we can ensure that those individuals receive access to housing, while also ensuring that as I mentioned, we're abiding by the warrant of habitability and ensuring that building safety and security is secure, is ensured.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Council Member Borelli.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: Thank you. My question was nearly identical to Councilwoman Velazquez's to Mr. Monell, so I'll just make a brief statement. seems as though the real estate industry and different organizations and entities has been proactive in looking at places like Detroit. Jersey has a bill which sets up significant restrictions as to who and when a landlord or co-op can do background checks on a potential renter. there are opportunities to make a compromise and I think the industry in this case has been the one, whether it's this iteration of the bill or previous iterations of the bill in the last Council who have repeatedly made attempts to compromise and find common ground. And I think that needs to be stated

2.2

2.3

on the record and I think that needs to be reminded that this is an industry that's acted in good faith on this particular issue and hasn't been just a brick wall. So, it needed to be said and I said it. Thank you.

CHAIPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. The next Council Member I'll turn it to is Council Member Kagan.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: Thank you. My question is like, first of all, do you support the intent of this legislation? The intent?

MARY ANN ROTHMAN: Much as the City Commission on Human Rights has said, uhm, I support a balance of fair housing or housing availability for people who paid their debt to society. But as a representative of co-ops and condo's, where we're talking about ownership and we're talking about incoming owners having in essence, potential access to funds of the organization and so on, I think that some level of access for the screening of applicants for co-ops and condo's is an absolute necessity.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: So, you're not against the intent of the legislation but you're seeking significant amendments to the proposed bill correct?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

13

12

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

2.2

23

24

25

MARY ANN ROTHMAN: I'm seeking to absolutely protect the safety, the finances and the well-being of all tenants in a building while not opposing fairness in housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAGAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Majority Leader Keith Powers.

MAJORITY LEADER KEITH POWERS: Thank you. of all, thank you all three of you for your testimony and thank you just for being thoughtful and I know that we may have some disagreements at this point. That's the exact point of the bill but I think all of you are coming at this with a spirit of collaboration and trying to find something that does hold up all the intents and purposes. And I want to say and I just want to respond to something that was just said. All three people sitting on this panel now are people I've had a dialogue and a conversation with around this bill and whether we agree or disagree at the end game or at this point and time, we all haven't been acting in the spirit of trying to see if there's a way to move forward with the bill and that has been the spirit from the beginning. From the bill introduced to today.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

It's been always the way I work and the ways I operate and I have pretty strong convictions about the need to tackle housing discrimination in the city and that's why I'm sitting here today but I just want to say that the spirit in the last few weeks has not been about compromise and so, being told today that there are folks who are compromising and willing to compromise with an allegation that others are not willing to do that, I find to be disingenuous. will say that we have - do have plenty of dialogue and opportunities to talk about ways to do this and I'm glad that other folks are coming around to the spirit of compromise today and talking about collegiality, in a way that hasn't been the spirit in the last few weeks. But I thank the three of you because I think you really have upheld that spirit.

To Ryan, I had a quick question for you on the Detroit law. You're saying it's effective and I've heard a lot about the Jersey law and the Detroit law as being effective in their things but I think that one concern I have is that they're effective from the standpoint of the people who own the apartments and other property managers. Meaning they continue to have an opportunity to screen and to filter.

2.

J

2.2

The other side of that equation is housing opportunity and giving people an opportunity to house. Do you have any data about increased access to housing for people with criminal prior conviction or any other data to say it's been successful in terms of offer and access to opportunity?

RYAN MONELL: Yeah, we can provide that to you I think. I mean, obviously we're a trade association, we represent owners and managers. Uhm, and so our perspective is in the guides of making sure that you know, we understand where they're coming from. But by and large, the folks that we represent, you have a national presence I think you know share the same goal that we're talking about today, which is housing access right?

And by and large have looked at the models across the country to best engage here in New York City and I think from that perspective, they have told us that models like Detroit have found the best balance in regards to ensuring that folks who need access might be justice involved in the past. But therefore, have eventually been able to get that housing they needed, has best been demonstrated in Detroit.

2.

2.3

But to your point, we can be much more facts based and data driven in future conversations and talk further about what we think would be best.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: I appreciate that and I'd be remised not to ask my high school classmate Melissa a question. Nice to see you again.

MELISSA GOMEZ: Oh, it's a pleasure.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: We find ourselves on the other side sometimes but I appreciate your spirit. I just wanted to ask a quick question because I know that REBNY's talking about the Detroit model. Do you want to speak a little bit about what because I didn't hear specifics about what you guys might be — I know your intent and purposes but what are things that you are seeking?

MELISSA GOMEZ: So, REBNY speaks I think a lot of times maybe for the big guy. I speak for the little guy. This does include two families that are not owner occupied. I just want to make sure that's on the record.

And I think that just for a landlord, it's more about maintaining the property. You know like, if you don't want to — like I said, you're not looking to rent to somebody that has had a history of damage

2.2

to a property or you don't want to put your tenants in a situation where they could have some type of damage.

So, I think it's you know, I looked a little bit at Detroit. I've looked at New Jersey. I think it's a great idea to have a look back period. I think it's a great idea to maybe have just different types of categories and I mean, there's a lot of issues to this problem or a lot of issues that cause this problem that have not really so much to do with housing but maybe other things that we could do as far as funding for other programs and looking at more transitional housing and things like that as well.

But I think just more from an owner perspective, a small owners perspective, it's just more of, I don't want to rent to a meth lab. I don't want to rent to somebody that has had you know issues with regards to people that they've lived with in the past or something like that. Somebody that's been charged with multiple gun charges in the past and so on.

Like, there are concerns with that.

RYAN MONELL: And just really quickly, I mean the one thing that's different amongst the Detroit model compared to other, what other cities have done is the

2.2

2.3

appeals process, which I mentioned earlier. Which I think really would help solve for some of the problems and challenges we've heard from the Council today including erroneous criminal background reporting as well as to your point Majority Leader. You know ensuring there's somewhat of a balance based off of the rights to ensure that discrimination does not happen for those who are trying to find housing while also creating an appeals process for you know a landlord to really demonstrate specifically why someone was denied. If they really do find it to be important to do so.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you guys. Thanks for testifying.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We'll now move on to the next panel. We have Kandra Clark, Robert O'Connor, Logan Phares and Jacquelyn Samone.

It looks like we don't have a couple of our panelists but you can go ahead.

LOGAN PHARES: Thank you Chair Williams, Council Member Powers and members of the Committee for the opportunity to share testimony in support of this legislation.

2.2

2.3

My name is Logan Phares and I serve as the Political Director of Open New York. Open New York is an independent grassroots, pro housing, nonprofit. New York is in a housing crisis. government created the patterns of exclusion and segregation we see today through policies that protect powerful property interests and wealthy homeowners, rather than getting tenants more options and power.

To create more renter power and combat the exclusionary nature of New York's housing market, we must build more housing specially in neighborhoods that have failed to do their fair share to welcome new neighbors. While also protecting potential tenants from discrimination, including justice impacted individuals.

We know that New York's housing crisis
disproportionately impacts our most vulnerable
neighbors. Unfortunately, formerly incarcerated
individuals experience some of the highest barriers
to acquiring stable housing and the competitive
nature of our housing market means that landlords can
deny housing without consequences.

Without housing opportunities many justice impacted New Yorkers are forced into our overcrowded shelter system. The Fair Chance for Housing Act is essential to successfully reintegrating these individuals and reducing the number of New Yorkers experiencing homelessness.

Housing or the lack there of is at the root of many issues, including recidivism and poor health conditions. Passing the Fair Chance for Housing Act would create a safer and healthier New York. In all, tackling our challenges requires an ambitious, progressive and holistic approach that both removes barriers to housing growth and protecting tenants from discrimination. If the City Council truly believes that housing is a human right, they will work to quickly pass Introduction 632. Thank you for your time and consideration.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: One quick question since the Chair is busy. Thank you for your testimony and thank you guys for your support and obviously, you guys, as Open New York has been a stanch advocate of building new housing and opening opportunities to that. And you know, what I've said all along is that in addition to building new housing and creating

_

2.2

opportunities for more people to live here, they also have to take down those barriers.

Are there other barriers that you see today in existence that are standing in the way when it comes to housing opportunities for New Yorkers?

LOGAN PHARES: Uhm, yeah, so we are taking a holistic approach to the housing crisis in New York City and antidiscrimination protections are one of those that we're thinking about a lot more, specifically I wanted to mention today is source of income discrimination and co-op discrimination.

And so those are some things that we're also thinking about as well. We also need tenant protections and it's important to build a lot more supply in the city to give renters more power.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. Thanks for your testimony. I think Council Member Borelli has asked for an up zoning in his district last I heard, so you guys might want to focus on that.

LOGAN PHARES: Oh, great.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: It took me three years to get 60 houses built. I'm trying.

LOGAN PHARES: Well, we'd love to talk to you about that.

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Sorry Council Members but before we jump into questions further, we do have one more panelist on this panel who is on Zoom, Jacquelyn Simone.

JACQUELYN SIMONE: Hi, may I begin?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: You can begin.

JACQUELYN SIMONE: Thank you for holding this important hearing. My name is Jacquelyn Simone and I am the Policy Director at the Coalition for the Homeless. We've also submitted written testimony with the Legal Aid Society. We support prohibiting housing discrimination on the basis of arrest or criminal record and we strongly urge the Council to pass Intro. 632 as soon as possible.

Homelessness is the tragic outcome for too many
New Yorkers in prisons and jails. Even though stable
housing is vital to a successful reentry. The
disproportionate impact of over policing and
incarceration on communities of color is one driver
of homelessness among impacted Black and Latinx New
Yorkers and this bill would advance racial justice by
reducing barriers to permanent housing for a large
subset of people currently languishing in shelters
and on the streets.

With an all-time record number of people sleeping in municipal shelters each night, the city must utilize all available tools to help New Yorkers move into permanent housing quickly starting with this bill. Discrimination on the basis of arrest or criminal record takes a disproportionate toll on New Yorkers of color because of systemic racism in the criminal legal system.

When landlords use background checks, they are overwhelmingly denied the benefits of secure housing, safety, stability and health benefits to Black and Latinx New Yorkers. This discrimination makes it more difficult for individuals leaving jail or prison to find housing and avoid long-term homelessness.

Each year, since 2015, more than 40 percent of people released from state prisons to New York City were released directly to shelters. The connection between incarceration and homelessness is long standing. Law enforcement that criminalizes homelessness including encampment sweeps, further fuels the cycle of homelessness and involvement with the criminal legal system.

When landlords are permitted to discriminate on the basis of arrest or criminal records, they

)

exacerbate the homelessness crisis at a time when we must make it easier for New Yorkers to find housing, not harder.

Intro. 632 is an urgently needed tool that helps tackle homelessness and improve public safety without involving new public expenditures. In fact, this bill will save tax dollars by ending the prison to shelter pipeline and reducing the need for shelters. If opponents are worried about the safety of children, what about the children whose parents have an arrest or conviction record? Should their entire families be stuck in shelters indefinitely? Shelters that notably, the same Council Members who oppose this bill also oppose when they were cited in their district.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired.

JACQUELYN SIMONE: It is time for the city to finally ban discrimination that deprives people of the stable housing and dignity to thrive. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Council Members, do you have any questions? I'm sorry, I interrupted you earlier. Seeing none, we'll move onto the next

panel. We have Katherine Gerald, Nancy Sicardo,

Juanita Lewis and Nick Peters. You can go ahead.

NANCY SICARDO: Good afternoon. My name is Nancy Sicardo. I am a Community Leader with WCJA Women's Community Justice Association of Special Projects.

Women are the nurtures and caregivers in our society and we need fair access to housing. Fair Chance Housing is such an important law that it would have made a high difference in my life as I reentered society.

I spent two years on Rikers and two years in prison and when I got home, it took me a couple of more years to own my own apartment. Looking for a place to live throughout the whole city was extremely frustrating. Landlords told me straight up that they did not want to take a chance on ex-cons. And let me correct that, formerly incarcerated or call me by my name Nancy Sicardo.

I used to beg landlords to give me a chance but it didn't matter. I was demonized because of my conviction. Because I couldn't find my own place, I ended up living with my mother for a couple of more years. It was not a good situation. It was horrible for me. I couldn't think, I couldn't function. It

2.2

2.3

handcuffs. I had to be home at a certain time. I had to let her know where I was going. My mental health and substance use issues is what led me to prison and not being able to get a home of my own was very damaging for me. I finally found a nice landlord and he gave me a chance and I got the first apartment that was my own. I showed and proved I was a good tenant. I made my own repairs. Took care of my own place and paid my rent on time. Because after all, it's all about landlord and tenant disputes in order to maintain an apartment in New York City.

I needed a chance. Everyone with a record who served their time deserves that chance, especially the mothers, the daughters, and the sisters who are the anchors of our families and of our communities. My apartment is my home. My apartment is my number one love. My apartment means stability and sanity to me. My home is my kingdom. It is the throne to the Queen that I am. My peaceful place where I feel safe and secure. If you want a woman to be successful in reentering society, please pass this legislation. Women are coming home from prison wanting to do the right thing but they don't have a roof over their

heads. Housing is a human right and no one should be discriminated against because of past conviction.

I urge the City Council to support this bill to empower the women and the families and to represent the unrepresented is a representation of how solid our souls are. Thank you.

JUANITA LEWIS: Thank you to the Committee on Civil and Human Rights. Chair Williams, Majority Leader Powers and other Council Members for this opportunity to testify in support of a Fair Chance for Housing Act, a Fair Chance for Housing.

My name is Juanita Lewis and I'm the Executive
Director of Community Voices Heard. We are the
largest Black led multi racial organization in New
York State and our members are in support of passing
this legislation. The Fair Chance for Housing Act is
a tremendous opportunity for the New York City
Council to redress decades of state sanctioned
discrimination and racism. I've been organizing in
Black and Brown communities in New York State for
over 13 years and let me tell you from my experience,
racism is deeply engrained in our housing systems.
Even though it's changed forms and it certainly
didn't end in 1968 with the Fair Housing Act. There

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are two parallel tales that we know of but we don't always see how they still are connected. The tale of redlining and the tale of mass incarceration.

Beginning in the 1930's, redlining made it nearly impossible for Black families and other redlined residents to purchase homes and build wealth. redlining was prohibited with the passage of the 1968 Fair Housing Act, we began to see the rise of mass incarceration. On surprisingly redlined neighborhoods, were the first to be policed and incarcerated. It's clear there are mass policing, arrests and incarceration policies have disproportionately targeted communities of color without actually making us any safer. Let me just say that again, it's clear that our mass policing arrests and incarceration policies have disproportionately targeted communities of color without actually making us any safer and as a result of that, 80 percent of New York City residents with a conviction today are Black and Brown.

Today, landlords can no longer discriminate against people based on their race but they can discriminate based on past convictions, which continues to push our Black and Brown community

2.2

| members out of safe and stable housing. They do this |
|--|
| under the guides of safety but we have to ask |
| ourselves, does denying anybody access to housing |
| make us any safer? Landlords or real estate |
| developers have pushed against Fair Chance Housing, |
| saying that it will have a negative impact on our |
| rental properties and that they are concerned about |
| liability. Or even though the bill explicitly states |
| landlords will not be liable for provisions. |

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

JUANITA LEWIS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Of course, please uhm, if you are unable to complete your testimony, please know you can submit written testimony through the Council website. We accept written testimony up to 72 hours after the hearing.

Yes, I believe we have Nick Peters on this panel.
CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Is that person online?

NICK PETERS: Yup, hey, can everyone hear me?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

NICK PETERS: Okay, great. Hey good afternoon everyone. I would like to thank the Committee for letting me provide this testimony today. My name is

Nick Peters, I am the Policy Associate for the Housing Watchdog Group Housing Rights Initiative.

Over two years ago, HRI began diverting some of our time and resources to combating housing discrimination. Our organization has educated tens of thousands of people on this issue and our investigations led to a lawsuit in 2021 against 88 real estate companies for discriminating against Section 8 voucher holders, as well as one this year against 124 companies for discriminating against City FHEPS voucher holders. The largest fair housing lawsuits by defendant size in New York City's history.

The Fair Chance for Housing Act will ensure support for a population that deeply lacks any protections in finding housing, which has led to rampant discrimination against people who have served time. This bill is essential for the moral fabric of our city. Those who are formerly incarcerated face too many roadblocks in order to find safe and secure housing, with many ending up in shelters or back in prison. If New York City wants to be tough on crime, it should seek to prevent crime from happening in the first place by ensuring a roof over people's heads.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Over 40 percent of individuals released from State prisons to New York City have gone right into our shelter systems since 2015. Homelessness is not just morally reprehensible; it is fiscally irresponsible. Homelessness increases shelter costs, court costs, law enforcement costs, hospital costs, sanitation costs, unemployment costs, all costs. York City passing the Fair Chance for Housing Act is a moral necessity. Where do we want the formerly incarcerated to go? These individuals won't disappear, and they urgently need homes just like any other New Yorker. These are New Yorkers who have served their time and should now be integrated back into society. That integration is made much more difficult when the entire housing industry is actively barring these individuals from having a place to call home.

This legislation is not just pivotal to reducing crime and the cost of homelessness, it is beneficial to the countless tenants who are being discriminated against, taxpayers, and society as a whole. With this all being said, Housing Rights Initiative would like to voice its unequivocal support for the City Council

to pass Intro 632. I thank the Committee for their time today.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'll turn it over to Minority Leader Borelli for questions.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: Thank you. I have a question for Executive Director Lewis because she is of Bureau of the Fair Housing Act. Uhm, and again, this is not a gotcha question. I don't mean it to be. The latest guidance from HUD on applying the Fair Housing Act from 2016 on criminal convictions, a provider must show that there is a demonstrable risk to safety and/or property in order to discriminate based on a previous criminal conviction.

Therefore, anyone who's merely convicted of a crime but does not pose or can't be shown to pose a risk of resident safety or property. They already have protections under federal law against discrimination. So, in theory this policy that we're voting on potentially, would extend new benefits and the only class of people right now that are not protected under federal law are those people with criminal convictions and who do or can demonstrably show that they pose a risk of resident safety or property.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Why is it and I'm only asking this because this is the question that people have to us. Why is it good policy to add this class of people to those we are not allowed to discriminate against?

JUANITA LEWIS: So, I wouldn't say this is about carving out and protecting a different class of people. You're protecting human beings. And so, this is an opportunity for this policy to right wrongs that we have already seen that historically happened in our city. And so, when we've already talked about the housing crisis that we are currently in, we're already talking about the fact that you have individuals coming home from being incarcerated that are in need of housing. This is just to me, right as an organizer and as an executive director, this is a no brainer. To be able to pass this legislation to protect all New Yorkers regardless of their - whether or not they were incarcerated or not. This is about protecting human beings and allowing individuals to have housing that they have the right to.

MINORITY LEADER BORELLI: Again, I think, I think if someone can be demonstrably shown to be a threat to property or resident safety, I think perhaps the

2.2

2.3

protecting New Yorkers might be on the side of

preventing them from renting an apartment and I think

that's where we disagree but I have no more questions

for you and thank you for your time and your

6 testimony.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. Are there anymore questions? Thank you so much for your testimony.

NANCY SICARDO: Thank you.

JUANITA LEWIS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will call Rachel Miller-Bradshaw, Myrna Calderon, Hong Chen and Yanling Wagner.

RACHEL MILLER-BRADSHAW: So, good morning Civil and Human Rights Committee and all my fellow elected officials. I am Rachel Miller-Bradshaw, the State Committee woman of the 78th Assembly District. I oppose Intro 632, widely known as the Fair Chance for Housing Act. In fact, even the title of the bill is deceptive in this case. The federal governments Fair Housing Act of 1968 was designed to protect individuals from racial and social discrimination rather than their own behavior, the opposite of this bills intentions.

2.2

2.3

The New York City Council I feel are supporting controversial legislations like Intro. 632 without our opinion essentially taking our voice from us. As the bill stands, it's reckless. It needs a lot of work. It jeopardizes the safety of New Yorkers in their own homes under the guides of equity. Most violent criminals in New York City looking at the data happen to be African American. And landlords will easily conflate this with the fallacy that the majority of Black New Yorkers are criminals, which they are not.

The majority of Black and Latino residents are law abiding. Absent a criminal background check, landlords around the city are bound to revert into a pattern of racial profiling under the façade of protecting their current tenants and property. We have many high profile Black elected officials in this city. I see one cheering but nearly 60 percent of the homeless households are also Black. Our officials believe homelessness is a result of housing discrimination, ignoring the effects of lopsided economic development.

Here's some statistics from our own Mayor Adams in 2022, shows that 25 percent of approximately 1,500

people arrested for burglary committed another felony
within 60 days and according to the National
Institute of Justice, almost 44 percent of criminals

released from prison returned within their first

g year.

2.2

So, to be clear, I wholeheartedly believe in redemption of rehabilitation but there must be accountability and extended proven history of model behavior for this to occur. I really think that we should stop making Black and Brown neighborhoods social experiments and we even take the sponsor of the bill Keith Powers, who lives in a high earning neighborhood where the rent in his own building, you have to be able to pay \$9,000 monthly. It seems a little hypocritical because 99 percent of them won't be able to even afford ex-offenders to even live in

So, I appeal to this Committee, Speaker Adrienne
Adams and those within the Black, Latino and Asian
Caucus, to stand with me in voting against this bill
in its current state. It needs a lot of work. Thank

his neighborhood or his building.

you.

2.

_

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: It doesn't look like the other two panelists are here. Are they? Oh, go ahead.

MYRNA CALDERON: Thank you. Is this on? Okay, thank you esteemed members of the New York City Council. I appreciate the opportunity to address my concerns over the Fair Chance Housing Act Bill number 632, proposed by Council Member Keith Powers and supported by many of you.

My name is Myrna Calderon. I am the Board

President of one of the largest privately owned and

funded cooperatives in the City of New York located

in the Bronx, Fordham Hill Owners Corporation. We

just proudly celebrated our 40th Anniversary of

turning renters into owners, people who look just

like me.

We are proud, we are proud to say we are diverse multicultural, intergenerational working-class community of various financial means. Our nine buildings plus one rental building campus prides itself in the safety and security we provide to our shareholders and residents. In fact, it is one of our major selling points. When residents and visitors enter our complex, including the Mayor

2.

recently, they can exhale and let their guards down.

Yes, we have been called the oasis in the Bronx.

This bill in its present form will shatter that assurance. Our main job as a cooperative board as has been stated before, is to ensure the financial stability of our corporation and the safety of our residents. This bill will prevent this board and other cooperative boards from doing the jobs we were elected to do. We currently rely on criminal and terrorist background checks. Not to exclude potential residents but to make a better-informed decision. We owe that to our retired seniors to ensure that the person who lives next door to them, will be vetted to the best of our ability.

We have many single women. Nurses who work crazy hours that deserve to feel safe when they get home.

I have one, two more lines. Three more lines.

When the city talks about affordable housing, we are the definition of that. Indeed, when families are being forced out of Inwood and Washington

Heights, they find a safe, affordable place to land at Fordham Hill. We deeply ask you to reconsider your support for this egregious bill that will hurt the very communities, the Black and Brown, Latino

2.2

2.3

communities you claim to want to help. Thank you
very much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. You can go ahead. You can both sit at the table if you'd like.

HONG CHEN: Hi, good afternoon everyone. So, thank you to giving me this chance to explain myself. So, I'm from Queens. I have been there for almost ten years. So, in the last ten years, I never check any backgrounds. Three years ago, we get a new tenant without checking background again but those tenants bring a nightmare to my neighborhood. They partied day and night and they become very aggressive, nasty to my neighbors. Every day at one o'clock, two o'clock, three o'clock in the morning. I get a phone call from my old neighbors complaining about them and meanwhile, I still have to be 24 hour and on call for emergency call from the hospitals.

I was guilty. I tried to help them to keep them out but there's nothing I can do. I complained to my district attorney to complain to the police office but nothing can help me out and recently, I find my tenants on the news. They searched by policed. They have an open case from Kansas for [INAUDIBLE 3:24:05] State of Illinois and that was eight years ago, they

2.2

2.3

arrest. So, it was my mistake. I feel so guilty.

During that period of time, I wanted to kill myself.

I bang my head to the wall. I cry, I cry in the car

because I bring this nightmare into this neighborhood

and there's nothing I can do. I beg to God. I

worked through this whole pandemic as a healthcare

professional. I never be so afraid. I try my best

to save life because this is my job and this is the

job I'm supposed to do because they paid me for this

job but these tenants destroyed my life. Almost

So, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to consider this bill seriously. Please, I'm here today. I'm strongly opposing this bill because as a human being, we are responsible for what we're doing. We are responsible for what we're taking. As a human being, the God tell us that God always help somebody who help themselves first. So, please, stop using housing as human as an excuse because we deserve our human right. Thank you so much everybody.

destroyed the belief of God.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you and thank you for sharing your testimony. I think Council Member Ariola will ask a question. Are you testifying as well?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 YANLING WAGNER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Oh.

YANLING WAGNER: Okay, sorry, hi, thank you very much. My name is Yanling Wagner. I'm just coming here as a community translator and interpreter. I work with the community a lot. I work with Mayor Bloomberg before and also, work with the local community whoever has a problem.

I recently experienced a couple, an older Chinese couple who were beaten up by their tenants and they were in their 80's and they had no place to go after they got hits and got hurt in the hospital. are the information that we constantly encounter in the community. So, it's important for us to know who is coming to our house. Like, uhm, I just heard from another Council Member who just mentioned that we don't want to bring the street crimes to our homes and we need to protect our seniors and our children and certainly, it's important for the community. I'm not a landlord but I'm a neighbor and my neighbors children are going to the marijuana stores on the same street and they're constantly having the ambulance coming to the safety, to the neighborhood.

2.2

2.3

So, this is very important. It's not just

protecting the landlords or the real estate business,

it's protecting everyone else. And I'm certainly

very sympathetic to the people who don't have access

to housing. But we should be able to have other ways

of solving this problem but I certainly don't think

this bill 632 is going to solve this problem.

And we also, as a home owner, I think we deserve to have our human rights also. Like I just see this is the government, the people, by the people and for the people. It should be for all the people. That's what I would like to hear and like to see and I'm strongly opposing this 632 bill. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. The couple that you mentioned, did they own the home?

YANLING WAGNER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Okay, so I know there was a little back and forth, but just wanted to reiterate that currently, it is if you are owner occupied, homeowner, you would be exempt. So, thankfully that couple who unfortunately was beaten up, you know they would have the opportunity to run background checks because they are owners of the home. I know there

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

are concerns that were raised here and I know that we are really taking those concerns as a consideration but I just want to continue to reiterate you know the

5 current components of the bill. And with that, I'll

6 turn it over to Council Member Ariola for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: I just want to make a statement. I really do appreciate all of you that Why? One, because you have other jobs and came in. you took the time to come today. You're not a paid advocate. You are residents of New Yor City and you are small landlords who have other jobs that help supplement your income by renting out properties. You are the majority of people who will not benefit from this bill as it is written and you're the people that we need to listen to. You're not part of a larger co-op and condo board or a real estate board. You are a mom-and-pop shop that runs affordable housing for its tenants safe, affordable housing. That's what we look for in this city and that is what you're providing. I want to really thank you for that. And that's why this bill cannot be passed in its current way that is being proposed.

And you're also not saying don't pass the bill.

You're saying pass a bill that protects us more as

2.2

2.3

small business owners. So, thank you again for coming out. For saying what you've been through and sir, certainly, we can really empathize with what you've been through and I said earlier, if, if we pass a bill that protects all people, not just those who need housing but those who are providing the housing, then we would never have to resort to what you've had to go through and that's what we're here. We're listening and we're going to work with Council Member and Majority Leader Powers to make sure that all aspects from all people, from all walks of life are being heard. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. Hold on, more questions. Majority Leader Keith Powers has a question.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: No, you know what in the spirit of time, I'll give up my questions but thank you guys for this time.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Give us one second. I know Council Member Holden has a question but we don't have quorum, so Council Member Holden, if you could just text me your question please, so I can read it out loud for you. I have my phone in my hand. He doesn't have a question?

J

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: I'll just ask, could we give a second because Council Member Holden's at home and if he can have an opportunity to ask questions.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Give us one second.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you for your patients if you just give us a couple of minutes. [3:32:52-3:33:55]. If this panel — we'll move on to the next panel but if you could — some of you could stay while we try to reconcile what's happening right now, that would be awesome. Thank you so much for your testimony. If you can try to stay for a little bit longer to see if we can reconcile, so Council Member Holden can participate. If not, I'll come and talk to you, release you to go about your life but if you could stay just a little bit longer, that would be great. Thank you so much.

Thank you. Next, we'll be calling on Antonio

Jorge Renaud, Sebastian Solomon, Julian Morales and

Jorge.

ANTONIO JORGE RENAUD: Chair, Council Members, thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to come and testify in support of this measure. My name is Jorge Renaud, I am the National Criminal Justice

2.2

2.3

Director at Latino Justice PRLDEF. I don't live in

New York; I live in Austin Texas.

I've been out of prison for 15-years now and I
make over \$100,000 a year in salary, yet I am
homeless. I don't mean to say that I'm unhoused. I
don't live in the streets. I am without a home.

Denied what used to be the American dream of home
ownership or even renting an apartment in my own name
because of a conviction in 1991 for robbery in Texas.

I've been employed since the day I was released in 2008. I graduated from the University of Texas with a Master of Science in 2012. I have not had an issue with the CJ in over 30-years. But because the way our society discriminates against individuals convicted of committing crimes, no matter how distant their history, my salary, position in my community don't matter when it comes to my ability to purchase a home where I could live securely.

I can't even be sure of securing rental housing and I could end up on the streets at given moment.

But it's not just a New York problem. This is an American crisis. The [INAUDIBLE 3:36:15] Project estimates that between 70 million and 100 million individuals in this country have criminal records and

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

)

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all are subject to discrimination rooted in the idea of once a criminal, always a criminal.

The folks here have made a connection between being unable to rent or buy a home and the worst thing mental health and substance abuse issues. Other people have spoken eloquently to the overwhelming evidence that this policy is rooted in What others may not do here today is plead racism. with you to please set a national example. city's homelessness crisis worsened when our Governor decided to score political points by shipping buses full of innocent migrants to this city. He knew full well that the hearts of New York would not allow these individuals to be left without resources. Texas, and in fact, this country looks to you for humane leadership. I ask that you please make the right choice here today. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN SOLOMON: Hello, my name is Sebastian Solomon and I am the Associate Director for Policy for Greater Justice New York at the Vera Institute of Justice. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony today.

Denying people housing makes communities less safe. When individuals with criminal legal system

2.2

2.3

involvement are unable to access housing, they do not disappear. Instead, they face uncertainty and with

4 | limited options turn to overcrowded, unsafe homeless

5 | shelters or life on the street.

Despite arguments that admitting people with conviction histories would put other tenants at risk, no evidence connects having a conviction with being a bad tenant. As others have mentioned, United States Housing and Department of Housing and Urban Development, recently declared that criminal history is not a good predictor of housing success. Citing a study that found that the performance of tenants with a criminal history was similar to that of participants without a criminal history.

New Yorkers already face significant obstacles in finding a place to live. Affordable housing is in short supply. Housing vouchers are scarce and landlords regularly refuse to rent to voucher holders. Denial of housing based on arrest or conviction compounds these challenges, impacting hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers and their families. Stable housing strengthens communities and improves public safety for all. Housing substantially increases the likelihood that a person

returning home will receive support from their family, find and retain employment and avoid additional convictions.

When people reentering their communities are housed and supported, everyone is safer. We applaud the Council's proposal to bar consideration of a person's involvement in the criminal legal system in most situations. However, we are concerned that housing providers will still be able to deny people on the basis of the seriousness of the offense in limited circumstances. By allowing consideration of this factor, the proposal is likely to result in discrimination against those convicted of more serious offenses.

Instead of focusing on the applicants past,
housing decisions should be based on current
circumstances relevant to their likelihood of success
as a tenant. We therefore call on the Council to
swiftly enact this important piece of legislation but
ask you to first strengthen protections where the
bill permits continued consideration of justice
involvement.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

2.2

2.3

JULIAN MORALES: Good afternoon everyone. My
name is Julian Morales and I am here on behalf of the
New York Civil Liberties Union, NYCLU as their senior
housing strategist to express our upmost support of

Intro. 632 Fair Chance for Housing Act.

I would like to thank the City Council Committee on Civic and Human Rights for hosting this hearing today. We will be submitting our former written testimony to you all but we wanted to share some quick remarks about who we are, our history on housing work and why we support Intro. 632. NYCLU is the New York affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, a non-for-profit, non-person organization with eight offices across the state of New York and over 180,000 members and supporters.

The NYCLU defends and promotes the fundamental principles and values embodied in the Bill of Rights, the US Constitution and the New York Constitution through an integrative program of litigation, legislative advocacy, public education and community organizing.

NYCLU has a long history of pushing the envelope on housing issues for decades. From creating the special inclusionary project in 1974 to fighting back

2.2

2.3

the Koch Administration on homelessness and creating the freeze in the 1980's. Most recently in 2017 being a litigating partner on the historic settlement at the Broadway triangle in Brooklyn, which won almost 400 units of affordable housing along with funds to support housing, counseling and legal representation. We care deeply about civil rights of the people who have served time in prison. Most importantly — the most important thing we can do for civil rights and public safety is to ensure that every chance a successful reintegration into communities.

Denying housing, our core civil right that provides stability and sense of community for those with criminal convictions is unjust and counterproductive. Passing the Fair Chance for Housing Act would further racial justice in New York City. Racial inequities across communities of color are seen at levels of — at every level of the criminal legal system.

As a result, today, almost 80 percent of people with conviction records in New York City are Black and Hispanic. We must not allow the impacts, the racial impacts of the criminal legal system to

2.2

2.3

continue to perpetuate harm to New Yorkers seeking to meet the basic human need. We strongly support this bill and we hope that you pass it immediately. Thank

5 you.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you. I have a question for Mr. Jorge Renaud. Uhm, Mr. Jorge, from your testimony, it seems like you would agree that once a criminal, not always a criminal, correct?

JORGE RENAUD: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, so uhm, those who have been rehabilitated, like yourself should be given a chance at housing, correct?

JORGE RENAUD: One, I don't know of any definition of the word rehabilitated that I would accept and two, is that I think everyone should be given a chance.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

JORGE RENAUD: I said that I don't accept the word rehabilitation in any meaningful sense. I don't think that there was something wrong with me that needed to be fixed.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Well, if someone has |
| 3 | committed a crime in the past but hasn't done |
| 4 | anything wrong in the last 15 years — |
| 5 | JORGE RENAUD: Hasn't gotten caught. |
| 6 | COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: I'm sorry? |
| 7 | JORGE RENAUD: Hasn't gotten caught. |
| 8 | COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Hasn't done what? |
| 9 | JORGE RENAUD: Being sent back to prison only |
| 10 | means that you were caught for doing something. |

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Hasn't committed a 11 12 crime in 15 years.

13 JORGE RENAUD: Okay, right.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Right so uhm -

JORGE RENAUD: It's a false measure is what I'm saying.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: So, you agree that it's important for us to see if someone was in fact rehabilitated? Meaning, they have not committed any crimes in the last 15 years or so, 10 years?

JORGE RENAUD: I don't think that it's important to anyone outside of the individual himself or herself to make that definition. I don't think it's important for you or anyone else to decide whether or not I have been rehabilitated based on whether or not

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 I have come into contact with the criminal justice

3 system. Because there are, there are, one of the

4 reasons that New York has such a high recidivism rate

5 is because they have a high parole replication rate.

6 They send a lot of people back to prison for

technical violations that are not breaking the law.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Okay, so but if this bill passes, you understand that we can't even know that because the landlord would not be allowed to even check whether somebody has been committing crimes in the last year or two?

JORGE RENAUD: Yes ma'am, I understand that under this bill but I don't think it makes a difference whether or not one has been or has not been.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: I understand. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you Council Member
Vernikov for helping me Chair. Is there any other
questions for the panel? No? Just me and Council
Member Vernikov. Thank you so much for your
testimony.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next we will Mary Conway-Spiegel, Melinda Thaler, Yiatin Chu and Susan Lee. You can get started whenever you're ready.

2.2

2.3

MELINDA THALER: Good morning, good afternoon.

My name is Melinda Thaler, I'm a Board Member of the

West Side Community Organization, a member

organization of upper west siders advocating for

issues of community betterment and I'm also a

Professor of Regulatory Law.

I'm also a victim of violent crime and that is a title I will carry for the rest of my life.

Screening housing applicants is essential because it minimizes imposing my life sentence on others just like me.

In other cities, laws that prohibit criminal background checks for housing carve out particular categories of crime that have high risk of repeat offenses and the laws allow background checks for only those specific crimes.

In those jurisdictions that carve out high risk categories of crime, applicants are given an opportunity to present evidence of rehabilitation and other information pertinent to the nature and severity of the conviction. New Jersey and Detroit are two examples.

Introduction 632 has a narrow exemption for sex offenses but not no other exemptions. Nothing or

arson, murder, burglary and other crimes. These are glaringly absent from the bill that the Council is now considering and that is a major reason why the bill should not be approved.

What's more, these criminal background bans have been tried in the employment context and they have failed and wound up hurting the very communities they are trying to help. Studies overwhelmingly show that when decision makers are blocked from knowing anything about an applicant's criminal background, they resort to making their assumptions. They look at gaps in employment history or residency and wonder, what does this gap represent?

Without the ability to answer this question, employers assume the worst and resort to racial profiling. Two leading professors of social justice and policy development hold up these exact kinds of criminal background bans as failures where legislators have neglected to think through how the laws will effect those whose behaviors they are trying to control.

They say that while the aim is to give people with a criminal record a greater chance and I quote, "unfortunately laws without lookbacks have failed and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

11

1314

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

studies have discovered that these laws have the undesirable - 20 seconds, effect of reducing employment opportunities for low-income, low-skilled Black and Hispanic men by approximately 14 percent.

Let's not make the same mistake for housing that was already made in the employment context. I urge you to vote against this bill in its current form.

Thank you.

MARY CONWAY-SPIEGEL: Hi, my name is Mary Conway-Spiegel. I'm a resident in an apartment in lower I handed out photographs of a resident in Manhattan. our building who is terrorizing us currently. are some data. NYPD has been onsite at our location 32 times. I have 22 pages of documentation of this gentleman terrorizing our building, assaulting owners, punching people and ruining the property. There is a picture of glue, spray glue he put in a common fire door. I guess my question about 0632 is this, where is the structure that is going to support these people? I don't see any infrastructure. don't see any scaffolding at all. There was questions asked about how is this going to be policed? How is this going to be executed going forward? How is it going to be supported? I mean,

2.2

2.3

who is supporting these people as they move into housing? This gentlemen who has currently been arrested at least 12 times is being supported by the city. This has been going on since 2019. It is now 2023 and the city tries to get APS to come to our location to give him mental support so he can go to mental health court, but nothing is happening.

So, there is currently no support in a situation where a criminal is in our building. There is no support for the owners and the residents. How in the world is 632 going to be supported when we can't even get rid of someone in our building who is committing crimes?

YIATIN CHU: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you Chair Williams. Thank you Council Member Inna

Vernikov. Unfortunately, I don't see Keith Powers

still here, the Majority Leader. I wish he was still here listening to our testimony.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: He has a joint hearing. He is literally next door.

YIATIN CHU: Okay, well, hopefully he can listen to our testimony because we're here at two o'clock and I signed in a little before 9 a.m. My name is Yiatin Chu. I'm President of Asian Wave Alliance.

2.2

2.3

I'm here to urge Council Members to oppose Intro.

632. New Yorkers have the right to feel safe in their homes and our law should protect residents from known risk in a fair and transparent manner.

Asian New Yorkers have the highest homeownership.

42 percent in New York City, 50 percent in Queens, 77

percent in Staten Island. If passed, this will

effect Asian's disproportionately in New York City.

Many Asian families own multifamily homes that they

rent to supplement their income and consider as their

nest egg for retirement. These are not the one

percenters. These are working class families who

struggle to make mortgage payments, pay taxes and

expenses for upkeep.

Not only have homeowners and small landlords have been distressed and harmed by protenant policies made worse in the past three years, they are not put in danger of living upstairs from possible dangerous criminals.

Intro. 632 is another attack on all of us. Our electives continue to prioritize the lives of convicted criminals over the safety of hard-working New Yorkers. This is a deceptive bill. The reality is that landlords don't live in the buildings that

2.2

2.3

they rent out. We, as neighbors, as the community members, bear the brunt of the harm. This is a safety concern for all the residents who share the same entrances, elevators and laundry rooms with neighbors who have had a violent criminal history.

After a long day of graving our streets and subways, we all deserve the right to come home to a place of safety and security. 632 in its current form threatens to take that away. We call on the City Council Members to pass responsible laws that protect New Yorkers, not put more of us in harms way. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. Do you have questions Council Member Vernikov? Thanks for your testimony and I just want to say, I hear what you're saying and uhm, housing in New York City is so complicated. I have so many friends who have tenants who are harassing them that don't have criminal records and they have trouble getting rid of those tenants because unfortunately our laws do favor tenants most of the time. And so, I recognize what you're saying. I don't necessarily think getting rid of this bill is going to address the issue that you have. I think we have to be comprehensive in our

2 approach and also think about ways to protect
3 homeowners, condo owners, folks who are in co-ops

4 that do have members and residents that are causing a

5 whole bunch of chaos and so, I hear that. It's

6 actually something that my office has been working on

7 because I actually have majority homeowners in my

8 district. I do not have a lot of tenants in my

9 district, and so, I'm very sensitive to issues that

10 small property owners have. And so, I just wanted to

11 kind of mention that to you, that this bill, I get

12 | what you're saying. You want to kind of, from your

13 perspective, you want to sort of limit sort of -

14 YIATIN CHU: No, no, you're misunderstanding me.

15 | The first thing I think about is the only power that

16 I have left on behalf of the people in my building is

17 a criminal background check. Because the system of

18 trying to help this man in a progressive way to get

19 social services, to go to mental health court, to not

go to jail. Because he probably shouldn't go to jail

21 but it seems like the only tool I have now on behalf

22 of the people in my building is a criminal background

23 check. Other than that, we've spent almost four

years doing all the right things, APS, counseling,

25 | help, court.

24

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Right and so, all I'm saying and I get what you're saying, you're talking about support and services for folks who are struggling with something. Maybe mental health, etc., and so -

YIATIN CHU: So, I want a criminal background check for the next person.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I know and all I'm saying to you is, I hear that and I think there are other things that the city can do to support what you're saying, that does not necessarily have to do with criminal background checks.

YIATIN CHU: But that's not what happens on the ground.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I hear you.

YIATIN CHU: I'm sorry. It's like a restaurant. You guys are front of the house. The back of the house is a whole other thing.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: So, that's something, I hear you and so, while we try to reconcile this bill, all I'm saying is there are other measures, other measures that are currently not in place that would also get to what you're saying that have nothing to do with this bill. I just mentioned to you that I

2.2

| have people who own homes who have tenants that are |
|---|
| harassing them. That are very problematic and they |
| don't have any type of criminal backgrounds and they |
| still have trouble and fears of safety. And so, all |
| I'm saying is, I get what you're saying and I think |
| there is a comprehensive approach that is needed that |
| does not just deal with criminal background checks |
| but the housing system as a whole. |

So, thank you so much for your testimony. I think we have one more person that's testifying.

YIATIN CHU: Can I just -

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Right after the person testifies because I didn't even realize that you didn't testify.

MELINDA THALER: I testified already.

YIATIN CHU: She did.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Oh, you, sorry you.

SUSAN LEE: Yes. Good afternoon. Thank you Chairwoman Williams and thank you Council Member Vernikov.

My name is Susan Lee, I'm the Founding President of the Alliance for Community Preservation and Betterment. I am a resident of lower Manhattan. I am a constituent of Christopher Marte, who has

2.

refused to meet with me when I have expressed my concern about this legislation.

Our housing system certainly needs reform but we repeatedly overshot the runway in those efforts.

Intro. 632 is a perfect example. On the surface, this bill would seem like a laudable attempt to address housing and discriminatory practices.

However, as currently written, this bill would do neither. Instead, it could destabilize the housing market and harm the most vulnerable.

Earlier this morning, some Council Member had asked questions about criminal background checks and the percentages of discrimination in the ban the box employment. According to a study in 2018, in the Journal of Labor economics, ban the box studies have shown that Black mans chances of being hired has decreased by 5.1 percent and Hispanic men by 2.9 percent. On the flipside, when more information are available, such as credit and drug tests, the employment prospects improve. I fear that this legislation should it become law, will increase the discrimination of Black and Hispanic men because of the pretense that they might be involved in the criminal justice system.

2.2

2.3

And some of the other issues that others have brought up, such as shortage of housing, crowded shelters, these are the things that the government should be doing. It shouldn't be upon private property owners to resolve these issues. Lastly, with conclusive, collaborative dialogue, the needs of all parties could be addressed. I urge the City Council to be bolder and more comprehensive. A better bill is possible if you just took the time to write it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

YIATIN CHU: Can I make a comment in response?

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Yeah.

YIATIN CHU: Thank you for your sentiment. Uhm, you obviously, it's clear that there are things that are being carved out, such as sex offenders right? And we recognize that there are certain crimes that we don't want to bring into our residences. There are many others. I want to just cite in an instance that that is very real. We have Chinese landlord that have predominantly a Chinese building in the lower east side. He should know, he or she should know if someone that they're putting in the building has a history of being convicted for anti-Asian hate

2.2

2.3

crimes. Why is that not considered? I mean there's assaults. There are so many violent history of people that can come in. Yes, there are some that are rehabilitated and have not committed and those should be given a chance but there are also ones that have repeat offenses. Offenses that actually bring a lot of harm to their neighbors and their community. This bill does not address that. This bill address sex offenders, that's great but you know what? What about everything else that people living in that building should be concerned about and will be concerned about?

As Council Member Holden rightfully said, we do a lot of checks to protect our children in schools.

They spend eight hours in school and we protect them.

They spend the other hours at home. Where are we in protecting the kids that return home? Shouldn't they be safe? Shouldn't they be free from criminals?

I think these are commonsense things that need to be written into the law. And we need you as representatives to really take the time and go through these concerns and address them in this law and not just be bleeding hearts for people that yes, some of them do deserve second chances but there are

2.2

2.3

one's that really are violent, are evil and are repeating offenses that will cause harm to law abiding citizens.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

YIATIN CHU: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I respectfully disagree with some of things that you said but I just want to reiterate, this is the purpose of the hearing. So, you were able; I have given you extra time to talk about your opinion because we do value everyone's opinion and we do want to hear those concerns and efforts to make sure that this bill doesn't have a lot of the unintended consequences that you so eloquently discussed.

So, I just wanted to say like, this is a part of the process of listening, so you know that was introduced but a part of that is hearing from people. Hearing your opinion about the bill. Working with the bill sponsors to then make perhaps whatever amendments may or may not make sense. So, I just wanted to kind of empower you that this is why we hold hearings, is to hear from people, all sides.

2.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We'll now call Wendell Walters, Shameeka France, Douglas Powell and Pastor Carl Garrison. You can go ahead.

WENDELL WALTERS: Good afternoon. Thank you to the Committee. Thank you to the Chair. I know he's not here but thank you to Council Member Powers for his leadership on this issue. My name is Wendell Walters, I'm a Manager of Policy and Advocacy with the Osborne Association, similar to the Fortune Society. We do criminal justice service and policy through our programs. Osborne is one of the oldest and largest organizations of this type in the state serving 10,000 participants each year.

Osborne is also a proud member of the Fair Chance for Housing Campaign as a service provider. We understand the reentry obstacles that returning citizens face. We work with people reentering every day and we know that having a place to call home provides a level of stability they so badly need.

As been stated several times today, there are 750,000 New York City residents, 11 percent of the adult population who are effectively locked out of the hunt for housing all together because they have an arrest or a conviction record. The prison and

2.2

2.3

jail populations as we know in New York State have dramatically reduced in the last 20-years and each year since 2015, as Jackie was saying earlier, more than 40 percent of those released from prison enter the New York City shelter system. We believe housing stability is a matter of public policy and public safety. People are most vulnerable after released and being unhoused can impact all aspects of their life. They're also at risk of ending up back in jail and prison if forced to navigate street life and unsafe shelters.

We as a city must create more supportive housing, traditional housing for the previously incarcerated. We also must create greater access to public housing and prevent the private housing market from unfairly discriminating against those with a conviction history.

New York City has always been — if I could have a couple seconds. New York City has always been the city where it's difficult to find affordable place to live and that's just for the average New York City resident. It's many more times difficult for a person with a conviction record. Landlords are disqualified as individuals, even though we know

2.2

2.3

their prior conviction does not correlate to whether or not you are successful. Tenant [INAUDIBLE 4:03:35] avoid the racial impact of this practice. 80 percent of those with conviction histories in New York City are Black and Brown. How can we as a city exempt all these people? Three-quarters of a million people from an opportunity to find a place to call home. We support Intro. 632. We call on City Council to pass Intro. 632 as soon as possible. Thank you.

CARL GARRISON: Am I on? I want to thank the
City Council for this opportunity, really
appreciative. My name is Carl Garrison, I am the
Minister of Homeless Outreach at the Manhattan Church
for the past 30 years and I've seen a lot of trends
in working with the populations who are unhoused and
also, for those who have conviction records. And as
a member of the faith community, I just have to speak
from that lens and I believe this is a moral issue.
I've recognized all the testimony and the concerns
but this indeed is a moral issue. Our New York City
is in a crisis right now of homelessness, lack of
affordable permanent housing, and a lack of access to
that kind of housing and conviction records of those

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

formerly incarcerated are being used as a barrier. And we've heard it before, the numbers, the staggering thousands of New Yorkers, hundreds of thousand New Yorkers have conviction records and they are Black and Brown and they are being retraumatized, restigmatized and discriminated against in concern for housing and this is indeed is a moral issue. And I just, you know I uhm, I said it earlier today at the rally, you know the absence of faith does not doubt its certainty and I'm just kind of astounded quite frankly at how certain the opposition here is to know the outcomes of those who want housing in the future. I don't have that ability. I'm amazed that people, oh, you right? Do you feel me on that? So, I'm concerned, I'm concerned about that. Uhm, that is lack of faith quite frankly. And I just want to say this last piece, as a member of the faith community, you know we want to work in partnership with the City Council and with New York. communities that we welcome brothers and sisters. believe in strong communities, love in communities, who affirm our brothers and sisters who have been incarcerated. So, this is not a one off. We want to

work in tandem with you. Amen.

2.2

2.3

SHAMEEKA FRANCE: Well, happy thankful Thursday.

I appreciate this opportunity to the Council and anybody, the landlords and the people that stand and they're moving in this movement.

So, me, I was released from prison in the middle of a pandemic and I applied 460 plus apartments. But it wasn't until I got the opportunity for the landlord to see me for not the thing that I did but the person who I was. That I was able to continue on my life as a productive member of society.

Today, I work for Women Prison Association, the longest organization in the field of serving women in justice and families in New York City. I have provided over — provided thousands of Fentanyl test strips and Narcan to citizens of this great city.

I work with organizations like Osborne and

Fortune Society and WCJA and the door, to keep the

doors open and help the people that was in a place of

darkness to see light to live a life that's worth

living, to be a catalyst of change. I pray that you

all really see the impact and the need to have stable

housing. So, I can have that clarity. So, I can

have moments of magnitude that can help the people in

my community.

2.

I mean, it's already barriers with just coming home and your credit is messed up but having that light and having the peace to move forward is so essential. Thank you.

DOUGLAS POWELL: My name is Douglas Powell. I'm a Brooklyn New York Leader of the Homelessness and the Civil Rights Union. I've been incarcerated for 34 years. I was forced to come homeless when I came out of prison. They took me to a shelter in shackles like I was coming off the [INAUDIBLE 4:08:37]. Like I was a slave or something. I had shackles and handcuffs on going to the shelter. I'm being released but I still got on shackles and handcuffs.

This is not about the felonies. It's about race.

It's about Black people. You see them Asian people that just was talking? I live in Rego Park now.

That is the racist neighborhood I ever been in and there's nothing but Asian's in there. And if you go in the store, they will follow you around like you getting ready to steal something. So, that garbage that they was talking up here because that what it was was garbage. You know what I'm saying because they want Black people to live in Black people neighborhood because it's not their neighborhood

2.2

2.3

because they from China, Hong Kong. We from New York. This bill has got to be passed. It got to be passed, so that other people can live better. All New Yorkee's need a permanent house to live. Not just White people. Not just Asian people but all people. You know what I'm saying?

If it wasn't for Unlock New York City, I would still be in that shelter. I was in the shelter for three and a half years fighting to get out. And they wouldn't let me out and the only reason why I got the charge that I got is because the judge, Judge Wash P50 Kings County told me he didn't want to hear nothing I had to say. And if I go to trial, I was going to blow. So, where did that leave me? I had to plead guilty or I wouldn't even be speaking to you all right now.

So, I was forced to get a crime. I was forced to be a felon, just like most Black people that go into the system. Because as soon as you into the system, ain't no real way out for you because you ain't got no money and the lawyer they gave me was a prosecutor. She was supposed to be a defense lawyer but she was the DA. Didn't believe a word I said even though everything I said and showed her wasn't

2.2

2.3

true. Then they came back and said, this is what we're going to do for you. We're going to give you two and a half years but you got to plead guilty right now and we're going to let you go home but they never let me go home. Even though I pleaded guilty, they made me go upstate and take all these programs and I successfully completed and while I was upstate, I saved three White people lives that they never talk about but they still hit me at the parole board. But I saved three people lives up in the prison system. You know what I's saying?

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you for your testimony. I just want to acknowledge we've been joined by Council Member Avilès.

Oh, my name say - it's missing the two l's.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We will now call the next panel. Thank you so much. Next we have Anna Shpakovskaya(SP?), Christopher Leon Johnson, Maria Danzilo, and Edward Klein.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I just want to thank everybody for your patience. I know you've been waiting a long time to testify and for the folks virtually, we will come to you in one panel. After

)

the next panel, we'll go to the virtual room, so just wanted to thank everybody so much for your patience.

CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Good afternoon. My name is Christopher Leon Johnson. First off, I want to say thank you to every Council Member that was here. Thank you to the members right now, Mrs. Williams, Mr. Powers, Mrs. Avilès. Thanks to everybody that came here before. I know it was a long day, so we want to go. I know, long day. Me too.

So, first off, I want to say that this opposition to this bill 632 is not a republican matter. I heard this Carmen De La Rosa, she said that's a GOP matter. That's not a GOP matter. I'm a registered democratic. I'm a registered democrat. I vote for Kathy Hochul on the working families line in the general election against Lee Zeldon and I'm opposed to the bill.

This is not a democratic matter. This is not a worker family conservative republican matter. This is a human matter, human lives matter. I'm opposed to this bill because I care about the lives of the law-abiding citizens in NYC. Law abiding citizens should be living next to non-rehab able criminals.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COMMITTEE COUNSEL:

Thank you. You can go ahead.

If this bill is passed, they'll have dire consequences to the law-abiding tenants that rent the properties and the law-abiding homeowners and the landlord that own the properties. People will have a higher chance of getting seriously hurt or even killed if this bill gets passed.

I know there's members here that have families, they have kids, they have wife's, they have brothers, they have sisters. I have a niece and if you care about them, you wouldn't vote for this bill. I know this bill had like over 30 sponsors, like you know you need 26. I know I can't convince all of them to go for this bill but I know at least ten that go for this bill because the tenants go against this, this won't get passed to the City Council.

So, I just hope that ten members that see this testimony, every body that's oppose this bill goes against this and thank you for having me out here. really appreciate it and just please vote against this bill. I'm opposed it. This is a bad bill and thank you for everybody. I appreciate it. care.

2.2

2.3

ANNA SHPIKOVSHAYA: Good afternoon. Good afternoon Majority Leader and thank you for having us here. I hope everybody is good. I'm one of the advocates for the Child Victims Act from a few years ago, it passed. It's been a very long time in passing and the majority of the City Council supported it privately. So, that increases the penalties for past crimes against children and many of you were supportive of it, which we really appreciate.

I understand that there are a lot of people who have been incarcerated sitting in this room and they deserve to be treated with dignity and respect as human beings and we have really, this society appreciates that you have come out and recovered and you put in the effort to do that.

At the same time, I am afraid of committing a crime because there are consequences for that. I was raised with fear of committing a crime and I have military in my family. I'm friends with cops, I just hugged one yesterday. Uhm, but at the same time, I really care about the society but I also care about safety. So, there has to be a balance and a better written bill if you will pass a bill, you should be

2.2

2.3

or consider to have the words that allow the 90 percent of landlords who do backgrounds on people to be safe in conducting their business in the way that they feel comfortable because they do not want to be marginalized. And the victims of child sex abuse that just had the bill passed to support them, want to feel safe as well.

So, I am asking about it to consider a rewritten bill just like I advocated for the Child Victims Act.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you so much for your testimony. I will now call the next panel.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will be calling Alexandra Dougherty, Lauren Velez, Annette Tomlin, Audrey Johnson and Samantha Balak.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: And thank you so much for your patience. I wish there was a way to expedite these hearings but I don't think there is. Hi, you may begin.

ALEXANDRA DOUGHERTY: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Alex Dougherty. I'm a Senior Staff Attorney and Policy Council of the Civil Justice Practice at Brooklyn Defender Services.

So, first of all, thanks for the opportunity to speak today in support of removing barriers to

3

4

Ŭ

6

,

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

2.2

2.3

24

25

permanent affordable housing for all New Yorkers. At BDS, we see how our clients who are moving out of the shelter system or relocating due to an eviction proceeding or spend months looking for new stable housing during which time they face eviction or extended stays in the shelter.

For many of our clients, housing options are even further limited by an arrest or conviction. clients are also ineligible for federally subsidized housing, which is allegedly the housing of last resort. By shutting people out of the city's limited affordable housing stock, discriminatory background checks prevent people from stabilizing their families and perpetuate cycles of homelessness. BDS enthusiastically supports Intro. 632 as an important first step towards guaranteeing equal access to housing. We urge the Council to pass the bill in its current form. Altering the bill by creating a ban the box system or by carving out specific offenses or look back periods would permit discrimination to continue unchecked on the basis of a conviction or arrest.

I'll just speak briefly about ban the box system.

The city's Fair Chance Act, which the Administration

2.2

2.3

spoke about earlier is an example of the ban the box law in the employment context. And in our experience, employers routinely violate this law by failing to conduct the required analysis or by issuing the boiler plate denial without considering folks mitigating evidence.

We've also seen some large companies who choose to violate the law because they decide that a violation is left costly than complying with the process. We also see how this process has a chilling effect on our clients who are seeking employment but give up on the process because of confusion or delay. So, we think that a similar model in the housing context would be equally ineffective at overcoming bias against folks seeing housing with conviction or arrest history and I see I'm out of time, so I'll just direct the Council to our written testimony with more extensive comments. Thank you so much.

LAUREN VELEZ: Hi and thank you for the opportunity to speak with you all today. My name is Lauren Velez and I am the Associate Director for New York at the Corporation for Supportive Housing or CSH. CSH's mission is to advance solutions that use housing as a platform to deliver services, improve

2.2

2.3

and a CDFI.

lives of vulnerable people and build healthy communities. We're deeply committed to sustaining and increasing access to permanent housing solutions, especially for folks who are highly impacted by homelessness like individuals involved in the justice system. We have 30 plus track year track record of innovation investment in New York City as a nonprofit

We know that there are massive barriers to obtaining housing for folks experiencing homelessness in New York City. And these barriers are even more prominent for those community members who have histories of incarceration. Maintaining practices that push people further away from obtaining safe, affordable housing only perpetuates cycles of institutionalization, trauma and involvement in crisis systems. Formerly incarcerated people are nearly ten times as likely to experience homelessness as the general public. Being unable to access housing forces people into unstable, uncomfortable situations at best and dangerous, sometimes illegal situations at worst.

Fair chance for housing is a step in the direction of dismantling these barriers so that

2.2

2.3

people can find a home and start to rebuild their lives. We encourage Council to take this step and be a part of change that will significantly impact the homelessness crisis in our city and expand affordable housing access to people who are justice involved. We know that housing, particularly supportive housing helps reduce recidivism.

The Frequent User Systems Engagement or FUSE initiative was piloted by CSH in collaboration with New York City over a decade ago. This program identified folks who were high utilizers of jail, shelter and healthcare systems, assisted them in obtaining housing and stabilization through engagement and services. The FUSE pilot was proven to significantly decrease shelter hospital stays and jail stays, which resulted in an overall reduction of costs related to these services. In other words, housing works. It stabilizes lives, reduces crime and makes communities healthier. There's no evidence that supports the idea that someone with a criminal history is more likely to be evicted or be a bad tenant.

I know I'm out of time but I'd be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to spotlight the fact

2.2

2.3

that homelessness, law enforcement interaction and incarceration all impact Black and Latina communities at highly disproportionate rates. Historically racist systems and practices have perpetuated generational cycles of poverty and over representation of minority populations and crisis systems. This comes at a high cost both literally and figuratively. The cost of maintaining these crisis systems, high EDU use as well as the cost of housing somebody in jail and prison is far higher than the investment that we take to get folks housed. Those are the costs for taxpayers. The other costs are paid by folks experiencing homelessness themselves.

They are far more likely to have unaddressed physical and behavioral health issues, at higher risk for infections and complications, and being subject to violence. Continuing business as usual only guarantees that we will continue to perpetuate harm and penalize people who have already paid their debt. Thank you.

ANNETTE TOMLIN: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Annette Tomlin and I am a Vocal Leader and I thank you all for the opportunity to speak. The

2.2

2.3

issue that I have okay, even though I am in support of this bill is that how do we allow a person that has already served their time become more of a functional part of society if we don't give them an opportunity to get housing and employment?

Being in prison and doing your time, showing a repentance, you shouldn't have to carry that for the rest of your life. And if you want to speak about criminal, let's do a background criminal of the history of everything that United States did that's unjust. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Yeah, short and sweet.

ANNETTE TOMLIN: To the point.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you so much for your testimony. Really appreciate it and really, really appreciate your patience. Thank you.

ANNETTE TOMLIN: Thank you.

LAUREN VELEZ: Thank you.

ALEXANDRA DOUGHERTY: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. We will now shift over to witnesses who are remote. If you, you know are in person here and you wish to testify, please make sure to fill out a slip with the Sergeants.

Right now, we will be calling Edward Kline followed

2.2

2.3

2 by Blandon Kasnana (SP?) and then Robert Altman.

3 Edward, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call

4 time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

EDWARD KLINE: Okay, thank you very much. May I start?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Yes.

EDWARD KLINE: Thank you. My name is Edward Kline. Good afternoon. Thank you for conducting this hearing and hearing simple New Yorkers out. I am a managing member of a Law Firm at Offices in Manhattan and Brooklyn and I have lived in this beautiful city of ours for over 60 years.

I'm here to discuss the proposed statute Intro.
632 before the Committee. Respectfully, my heart
goes out to some of the people that have spoken this
morning. But the bottom line is, that the civil
rights nature of this proposal should really focus on
the hundreds of thousands, frankly millions of
tenants that would be adversely effected by the law.
The Committee members believe I understand in the
effort to protect those who have been through the
criminal justice system and want to give them a
second chance. But this whole sale forbidding any

2.2

2.3

background checks of any sorts on anyone simply ignores the rights of every tenant in the city to live safely and soundly in their homes. Please don't ignore the 50,000 signatures and negative comments and negative emails when the statute was brought up approximately a year and three months ago. The public has spoken regarding this proposal and that public outcry needs to be taken into effect and taken into consideration by those who represent their constituents.

This is not a landlord tenant issue. It has nothing to do with landlord tenant. It's simply a human rights issue. We have to balance the rights of a few. Yes, the rights of a few. Those who have been incarcerated have rights. Against the rights of the million plus tenants to live free and live safely. Please consider also the huge increase in violent crime over the past two years. I'm not implying that these people are necessarily a part of that but the crime wave has occurred over the past year, year and a half. It's partly because of the wholesale changes that were made to the criminal justice system by the New York State legislature approximately two years ago.

2.2

2.3

2 | SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

EDWARD KLINE: Okay, I just wanted to say thank you very much. Please vote the bill down and have a nice day.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will have Blandon Kasnana followed by Robert Altman and then Terry Davis Merchant. Blandon, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

BLANDON KASNANA: Excellent, thank you very much. The first line of a New York Post article reads, an eight-year-old boy is fighting for his life after accidently shooting himself in the head with an illegal gun in his Bronx home on Monday. And his father was charged in connection with the tragedy.

The father mentioned here was housing an illegal gun and actually had a history — had a violent criminal background. This does not imply at all that all people who have a past criminal background would result in this kind of risk to life but the fact is, that it does happen. And in our co-op community, we delt with this first hand and we know that the

/

screening process is our first line of defense in keeping all of our residents safe.

Fordham Hill is an historic tower in the Park community and it's been established after decades of research that tower in the park communities have an increased risk to safety and an increased incidence of crime. Right now, we incur a de facto task by also employing 30 security guards to ensure the safety of all residents in our community. What's ironic about this that this bill does not take into account architecture type. It provides an exclusion for one- and two-family homes that are owner occupied but the type of buildings that actually have a greater risk to crime and safety to all, are not excluded.

Fundamentally, all co-op owners who themselves may own one unit. Why are they excluded? What I have found in my history is that, and the history in serving on this co-op board, is that it's the owners who want to sublet their apartment that actually provide rents that are below the levels even of affordable housing. The family and friends that I have in other boroughs also provide housing at affordable and lower rates than —

2.2

2.3

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

BLANDON KASNANA: We have a right to know. We have a right know. We have a right to know. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have Robert Altman followed by Terry Davis Merchant and Hilton Web Jr. Robert, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ROBERT ALTMAN: Thank you. I'm Robert Altman, I represent the Queens and Bronx Building Association.

I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I have submitted the testimony already, so I won't be reading from it. I'll hopefully keep this briefer than the two minutes. I would like to say that this bill is not flushed out. It's not even close to being flushed out. There are major inconsistencies within it and I really don't think it's a serious effort to attempt to do justice to the matter.

However, this is the first hearing. The problem is often after a first hearing, the next time the bill has a hearing is when there's a vote. I would like the Committee to promise the public, not just

2.2

2.3

nice day.

our association, that once there is a full bill, that fully represents one, people are seriously contemplating that there would be a hearing on that as well. That's what is appropriate and proper for an issue of this magnitude. Thank you and have a

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will move to Terry Davis Merchant followed by Hilton N. Web Jr. and then Darren Mac. Terry, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

TERRY DAVIS MERCHANT: Good afternoon Chair
Williams and members of the Civil and Human Rights
Committee. My name is Terry Davis Merchant and I am
Program Director of Housing and Homelessness at
Trinity Church Wall Street. Thank you for the
opportunity to testify today to express our full
support of the Fair Chance for Housing Act Intro.
632. To end housing discrimination on the basis of
arrest or criminal record in New York City.

Trinity Church Wall Street in the episcopal church has a congregation of more than 1,600 parishioners that represent all five boroughs and form an ethnically, racially and economically diverse

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

congregation guided by our faith and our values, Trinity Church is a strong supporter of the Fair Chance for Housing Act. We believe it is critical to break the cycles of mass incarceration, mass homelessness and housing instability for countless New Yorkers. A landlords legal ability to deny housing based on ones criminal record has far reaching impact on the lives of both justice involved individuals and their families. Conviction based housing discrimination often forces those leaving jail and prison to enter into the shelter system. Ιt also dramatically reduces their ability to reconnect with their families and rebuild their lives, undermining financial stability, ability and opportunities to build wealth for their families and future generations, despite the fact that they have paid their debt to society.

Even long after an individual's incarceration, conviction-based housing discrimination often haunts justice involved New Yorkers for the rest of their lives. An unjust form of perpetual punishment.

Further, as shown by a recent New York City Speak survey, New Yorkers recognize that access to safe, stable housing and reducing homelessness are critical

2.2

2.3

for making the city safer. Simply put, housing discrimination on the basis of an individuals criminal record, perpetuates the cycle of homelessness and poverty and does not make our community safer. We commend Council Member Powers and the 30 other Council Members who have signed on as cosponsors and you for your leadership and courage to support this critical measure.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

TERRY DAVIS MERCHANT: We urge the city and City Council to work with City Hall to finalize and enact this bill. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will call Hilton Web Jr. followed by Darren Mac and then Maria Danzilo. Hilton, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

HILTON WEB JR.: Good afternoon City Council

Members. My name is Hilton Wen Jr. and I appear here
today in support of Intro. Number 632, the Fair

Chance for Housing Act. To both of my supporters and
my detractors, I will start with one question. What
must a person do to repay their debt to society. I
spent 27 years, nine months and three days in prison

J

since November 13, 1989. I was free from incarceration on August the 16th 2017 and since then I have acquired a Master of Social Work degree from Leeman College. Passed my license exam on my first try and I'm now a licensed Master of Social Work Working as a harm reduction, mental health counselor.

Some of you might be amazed and some [INAUDIBLE 4:34:41] but the Department of Corrections and Community Services, the Office of Professional Discipline of the United States Department of Education, Leeman College of CUNY, have all determined through various both rigorous and onerous examinations that I am a person of good moral character.

I have a credit score of 745 and rising. I have a job and yet I am unable to secure a permanent place to live because of something I didn't even do in 1989. I'm not here to redress that injustice but today's injustice. Wherein people with criminal legal histories are subjected to discriminatory practices, which unreasonably extends our punishment far past a reasonable expiration date. It is both difficult and invasive to obtain an apartment in New York City already with landlords and realtors

2.2

2.3

requiring complete tax form, including all W2's. 12 months of bank statements, four pay stubs, a salary which is 40 times the monthly rent and an application fee so they can pay an incompetent company to do a background check. I work every day and return home to supportive housing at the Fortune Society and I am one of the lucky ones. I stand before you to ask what about my sisters and brothers who aren't as fortunate as I? I beg you to level the playing field. Pass Intro. Number 632 this year, simply because how long must our punishment continue to satisfy your unreasonable need —

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

HILTON WEB JR.: Thank you for your time and attention. Now, please get to work.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you for that.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will call Darren Mac followed by Maria Danzilo and then Jacob Shrader.

DARREN MAC: Thank you Chair Williams, Majority

Leader Powers and all of the Committee Members for

holding this hearing today. My name is Darren Mac, a

Co-Director at Freedom Agenda, which is a member led

organization dedicated to organizing people and

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

communities directly impacted by incarceration to achieve decarceration assist and transformation. know we believe in fairness and justice. Unfortunately, for far too long, new practices like housing discrimination against people with past convictions has continued to be a roadblock for successful reentry into society. How can we say we live in a fair and just city when a person has paid their debt to society and we keep punishing them? How can we say that the housing system in our city is a fair system if some of the most marginalized people are legally discriminated against? Unfortunately, we know that there still are some people who discriminate against people due to their race. However, we cannot end racial discrimination in housing if we don't end conviction record discrimination. Given the well documented, over representation of the people of color in our criminal legal system, denying people housing based on convictions records is often a proxy for denying people based on race.

That is how the new Jim Crow works. For those, you know our city has an opportunity to move our city towards fairness and justice. The Fair Chance for

U

Housing Act can address this new Jim Crow practice in our city. So, we urge City Council to pass this bill in its current form, so that we can move our city a step closer to a just and fair society. And I'll be submitting my written testimony. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next we will call Maria Danzilo followed by Jacob Shrader than Shen Quack.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Uhm, it looks like we do not have Maria on the Zoom at this point, so we'll move to Jacob Shrader(SP?) followed by Shen Quack(SP?) and Ann Corcheck(SP?).

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

JACOB SHRADER: Good afternoon. I am Jake Shrader. Am I being heard?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes.

JACOB SHRADER: Uhm, okay. I have been a landlord for 44 years. I have managed rooming houses. I have managed other multiple dwellings. I have managed student housing. I own these buildings. I also possess a master's degree in Public

Administration with a concentration in regulatory

2.2

2.3

affairs and I am here to speak on behalf of not the 750,000 homeless or convicted people but on behalf of the other eight million seven hundred and fifty thousand who stand to suffer greatly. The arguments that I have heard here saying that a person's recidivist criminal activities and no indication of the future, whether there is no evidence. Please, the newspapers, the public record is full of evidence that predicts that there will be a large proportion of recidivist activity on criminal issues.

I, myself, have not only been a landlord in these buildings that I've managed but I've lived in them as well and I can tell you from my personal experience, we have had a number of criminal elements in them. I had one super who was murdered by a tenant. I had myself, I had somebody plotting to kill me. He was basically would set up people to be robbed and killed to steal their money. I got rid of him. I will not tell you how but I will tell you that six weeks after I got rid of him, which by the way, was personal to him murdering another one of my tenants —

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

JACOB SHRADER: The rent collector in the next building he moved to was found beaten, strangled, and

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 murdered for the rent money that she was collecting.

3 If this is the kind of people we are going to be

forced to keep, we can't run our businesses. Every

5 | homeless person, every person deserves a place to

6 live but you can't depend on private industry to do

7 this. This has to be a public effort and this

housing has to be built and run by the city -

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

JACOB SHRADER: It will mean in taxes. I'm willing to pay but this doesn't work. It has to be defeated. This bill cannot pass. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'll now turn it to Council Member Avilès.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÈS: Thank you Chair so much.

Uhm, you know I think the thing I've been puzzling

all day and for quite a long time is this notion of

removing discriminatory practices and removing

practices that harm or exclude does not infringe on

the rights of others who have the privilege of

exercising full rights. And this bill certainly

doesn't remove the right and privileges of ownership.

Nor does it remove the rights and privileges of being

able to assess and decide to whom you would like to

rent units to.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

And so, I guess I would implore my colleagues to think very critically around this notion that removing discriminatory practices actually removes rights of people who have the privilege of deciding things to do. And so, I would encourage my colleagues to continue to support not only this legislation but continue to raise the bar and oppose all discriminatory practices and invest in those systems and housing that we need because it is true, as the gentleman before me noted. We need significant investments in housing so that all New Yorkers are housed no matter their income. And so, I applaud my colleagues from moving this in the right direction. I look forward to voting and demystifying and debunking the consistent fear mongering that seems to be happening around this issue. This is not removing the rights and privileges that owners are exerting. It is asking to remove a discriminatory practice that has been proved to be the case not only in New York City but across the country. Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you and now we will return back to Zoom.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will move to Shen Quack followed by Ann Corcheck and then Eric Dillon Berger.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

SHEN QUACK: Can you hear me okay?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Yes, we can.

SHEN QUACK: Hi, my name is Shen Quack. New York City voter and a father of two public school children with an elderly step parent living in an apartment, rental apartment. I am also in Council Member Powers's district. I am here to urge the Committee and Council to vote no on Intro. 632. People who want to give second chances to those with contact with the criminal justice system are being fooled by this bill. This bill will make it even harder to find a place to live for those who have truly learned from their mistakes and are ready to become productive law-abiding members of society. When there are background checks, those seeking a place to live are treated as individuals. records efforts to overcome past mistakes can be brought to light and discussed in good faith with whom they seek to rent from. These individuals will not be expected by those with very serious criminal

2.2

2.3

histories and haven't reformed their ways. There are also existing laws banning discrimination in housing. However, when you ban background checks, property owners will use other data sources to assess whether to rent to someone.

For example, they may look at demographic data on groups with the highest rates of crime and make a decision not to rent to an entire group based on this. This will hurt individuals who have learned from their mistakes from getting a second chance.

Worse property owners simply will drop the market or demand even higher prices to rent. And housing will become even more scarce and expensive. Law abiding tenants will also be fearful of the neighbors and may even leave the city all together and seek to live where public safety is protected by elected officials.

Property owners and law-abiding tenants will leave New York City before the [INAUDIBLE 4:45:56]

New York City of tax revenue. This will worsen the city a death spiral and accelerate the looming and solvency already caused by the criminal laws and to record crime rates in city streets and subways. Give second chances with transparency and individual merit

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 and keep all New Yorkers safe in our homes. Vote no

3 on 632. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will move to Ann Corcheck followed by Eric Dillon Berger and then Sara Newman.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ANN CORCHECK: Hi, uhm, good afternoon. Uhm, I'm not a Social Worker. I'm not a Vocational Counselor and I'm not trained in any way to help a formerly incarcerated person navigate his or her reentry. What I am is as small housing provider and I am charged with providing you know good services to the renters that live in my building and you know, that includes heat and hot water and other you know, wellmaintained facets of the building. And they also count on me to provide them with safety. I have doors that lock properly with high tech keys. I have a video intercom, so that they can see whose buzzing for access to the building. I get my sprinklers inspected, my boiler inspected, my fire extinguishers inspected. I do all of these things to keep them safe.

So, I also need the ability to do background checks to do the same. So, the fact that this bill

2.2

2.3

is even being discussed is a glaring spotlight on the fact that New York has failed miserably in providing supportive housing. We need all sorts of supportive housing but in this case, you know we should have housing that will provide the wrap around services that this population needs. You cannot put this burden on the small housing providers. It's simply unfair.

Our family has provided housing for 40 years in district 6. I heard earlier today that my

Councilwoman Brewer actually authored this bill. So,

I'm calling on her to maybe rewrite another bill

because this one will be a failure. I'm asking the other Council people to consider; you know reconsider their support of this bill. And I just want to add one more thing. One of the groups I heard testify earlier today was someone from the Fortune Society. The Fortune Society has not a great track record.

Last summer, a small property owner out in Queens, his name is Roger Compass, uhm, his story was detailed in the — many newspapers you know with a tenant that was placed by the Fortune Society in his home.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

ANN CORCHECK: Where he destroyed the property

Thank you.

and uh, you it's just made an incredibly difficult

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ANN CORCHECK: So, I ask you not to support 632.

Thank you.

condition you know for the property.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL:

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. I believe the Majority Leader has questions.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. Nice to see you. Thanks for the testimony. I just wanted to clarify because she's not here. Council Member Gale Brewer had an author of the legislation around employment, the Ban the Box legislation I believe she was referring to. I just wanted to correct that because I know you had made a comment on that.

ANN CORCHECK: Okay, yes, thank you yeah, because the way I heard it, she authored this bill, so thank you for clarifying that, I appreciate it.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will move to Eric Dillon Berger followed by Sara Newman and then Jacob Malafsky.

ERIC DILLON BERGER: Hello, my name is Eric

Dillon Berger, I'm a small property owner in New York

2.2

2.3

and I oppose this bill because it eliminates the ability to differentiate between degrees or age of offense making no distinction between the person and convicted of a fist fight and a monster who has carved their initials on somebody else with a knife

and I met that monster.

Some individuals are so dangerous that they merit additional scrutiny. Yet, a tenant with a high income who stopped paying their rent and storing their \$20,000 Harley filled with gasoline inside their apartment and parking this \$100,000 Hummer outside. He was served with a notice to cure and upon service turned to my senior dad, who lived in the apartment next door and said, you do know I went to jail for killing somebody right?

That was an implicit threat meant to intimidate. He had forged his W2. Said he was on parole after killing someone with an illegal gun in Brooklyn.

Now, we do background checks. This is a ten-unit building, not exempt under this bill, where my sibling also lived upstairs and it took over eight months to evict this person. Now, it might take two years. The threat that this person used does not rise to the standard of a crime that NYPD would

interdict, which everyone — an everyone recognizes this threat for what it is.

It's wonderful that some people manage to get their lives right but not all tigers can or do change their stripes. And we have a right to protect our homes, our families, and other tenants by fairly screening. Criminal histories can be inaccurate but that inaccuracy goes two ways. Many times, there's no record of crimes that were committed. The monster who carved his initials on someone went to prison for 20 years for manslaughter.

But no one knows about the other stuff because
the victims I knew, they were too terrified to report
it. Just because some data is inaccurate doesn't
mean we disregard all data. There is a solution.
Several of the states, notably New Jersey have
antidiscrimination laws which fairly balance
legitimate right to protect the public by evaluating
severity and age of convictions. We urge you to
adopt their common-sense approach. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I just want to say and

I've tried not to like invoke my opinion here but you

know, we're nearing the end, I hope. That uhm it is

really discouraging to hear some of the inflammatory

2.2

2.3

language used by people that oppose the bill and I really wish that people chose other words. In addition, one of the talking points and I don't know who decided to make this a talking point and I've heard it recycled quite a few times here, that somehow this bill will add to the marginalization and discrimination that Black and Brown people feel while accessing housing because people will automatically assume that every single or most Black and Brown people that are looking for an apartment somehow have a criminal record and because they can't check that false notion that they may have by a criminal background check, this will lead to further discrimination.

This is as Jayasari so eloquently said, there's so many pretext that exist and that have existed for so long and so, it is disingenuous to essentially use us against us by claiming that this is somehow going to increase discrimination.

So, I just wanted to like put that on the record because it's been quite nauseating to sit here for the last couple of hours and listen to inflammatory language and to listen to notions and claims that are baseless in my opinion. So, I just wanted to state

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that and nothing to do with what you said sir but you said monster and that really triggered me. And so, I just wanted to put some of my thoughts and opinions on the record. Thank you for your testimony and again, I just want to thank everyone so much for your patience. This has been a long hearing and we do want to hear everyone's thoughts. Whether you are for or against the bill, so I just want to thank everybody again for your patience and for testifying today. Thank you.

Yeah, thank you Council MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: I wanted to end my day here with you to say Members. something quite similar, which is the key message that I took away today from opponents of this bill is that they, if not allowed to use a background check, they will use racism as a key tool to discriminate against New Yorkers. I have to ask the people that are standing out on the steps of City Hall going into the press, how they feel about that because that is the key takeaway from my sitting here for hours Is that they will discriminate. They will today. continue to discriminate because there is an incentive or an imperative here for them to want to discriminate and the message, if the message is, we

2.2

2.3

made.

will instead broad use a broader brush to tell
anybody who doesn't look like me that they can't live
in housing. That we should think about deeply who
are making those arguments and why we are listening
to them. And for anybody who's making and repeating
their arguments, I should think they should start
listening closer to those arguments that are being

I also want to say that today was a big day around housing. The Mayor made a very big announcement around housing and we here talking about housing and in the room next door they were talking about the HPD budget and DOE budget and things like that and it's clear housing is on everybody's mind. We got to build it. We have to make it affordable. If you don't let New Yorkers access it, we are wasting opportunities time and time again. And I call here on the Adam's Administration to take a deeper look into the housing discrimination policies that are pervasive throughout this city to create a much fairer system.

At this point, I will stop talking because there's nobody here except for those who have stanchly sat here to listen. But I want to remind

2.2

2.3

New Yorkers the discrimination and the racism in this city is real. We have to use our tools to dismantle it and my time is up. Thank you guys. Thank you everyone for being here today.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we will have Sara Newman followed by Jacob Malafsky and then Maria Danzilo. Sara, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

SARA NEWMAN: Thank you. Thank you Chair
Williams, Majority Leader Powers on the Committee for
the opportunity to testify today. My name is Sara
Newman and I am the Director of Organizing for the
Open Hearts Initiative, which is an organization made
up of hundreds of New Yorkers throughout the city who
welcome and support homeless neighbors.

As folks have mentioned, there are over 60,000 people in shelters right now and one of the biggest issues that we hear about every day from our neighbors in the shelter system is how difficult it is to exit shelter and access housing, even if you have a voucher to help pay the rent. Even if you have a job, even if you have a good credit score. On average people stay in shelters for nearly 500 days

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

19

18

20

21

2223

24

and housing discrimination is one reason why. Our neighbors with conviction records have an especially difficult time finding housing.

People with conviction records are family members, friends, and neighbors. \$750,000 New Yorkers have a conviction record. That is more than one in ten adults in New York City. When people access permanent housing, they don't just disappear. They are still here, just with less stability in their lives. And I also want to note that several folks opposing this bill have brought up supportive and transitional housing as an alternative. Many of those folks have opposed those things when they've come up in their own neighborhoods. The bottom line is that housing for everyone makes everyone safer. The Fair Chance for Housing Act wouldn't just be life changing for the 750,000 New Yorkers with a conviction record. It would also strengthen every neighborhood in New York City.

Council Members, I hope you've seen today that so many of your constituents support this bill and know that even more are standing behind. If you couldn't be here today or couldn't stay for the full length of

time, we urge you to pass Intro. 632 immediately and without watering it down. Thank you.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Sara Newman, nice to see you. Thank you for testifying here today and thank you for waiting a long time. Your organization if I recall formed out of a battle around homelessness and shelter siting in the city, is that correct? Yes, I see you nodding, so also I take that as a yes. And time and time again, is it fair to say that when we ask communities to support supportive housing in shelters, we find resistance to that?

SARA NEWMAN: Absolutely. Uhm, and you often hear many of the same arguments deployed. You know there is a supportive housing project that will be specifically serving folks who have complex medical needs who are formerly incarcerated and experiencing homelessness that is being considered in the Bronx right now and we are hearing the same arguments about fears around having criminals in the neighborhood. The same kind of vitriolic offensive languages about monsters, animals. Uhm, it's very inconsistent for folks today to be arguing that that's —

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: You could almost block out the headline and keep the language and the

_

argument, it would sound exactly the same when its shelter, supportive housing or in this case, is that fair to say?

SARA NEWMAN: Yeah, I think that's totally accurate because I think the real concern that folks have are — it's not a good, big concern about you know is this the right policy? Is this the right particular type of housing? It's not wanting to see people who look different, who make them uncomfortable, who you know they're afraid of.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Yeah, thanks Sara. Thanks for testifying.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have Jacob Malasfsky followed by Maria Danzilo and then Rocaman Cooper. Jacob, you can go ahead when the Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

JACOB MALAFSKY: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Jacob Malafsky. I'm a Supervising Attorney at Queens Legal Services. I want to thank everyone for allowing me to testify today about 632. I'll go briefly into LSNYC's history but I'll put it in my written submission.

2.2

LSNYC is the largest civil legal provider in the country with over 700 staff across five boroughs ready to protect the rights of more than 110,000 low-income New Yorkers every year.

Intro. 632 is an important step to ending perpetual sentences and allowing those with conviction histories to live with dignity and continue on the path of success. Providing stable and affordable housing greatly reduces the risk of recidivism and allow people to reintegrate to society. Stable housing is a basic need and a foundation that is critical to complete school and hold a job.

As a tenants attorney for almost a decade, I have witnessed the culture of housing to perpetuate that individuals with a criminal conviction are bad or monsters as some will call it and do not deserve housing. This belief held by many landlords is generally qualified in factor data and driven slowly by stigmatisms and stereotypes. This is dangerous to both individuals who are reentering in our community as a whole. Many of my clients are great resources to their communities but are scared of pursuing education or certain employment because of the

2.2

2.3

chilling effect that occurs after being denied an apartment. Being released from incarceration can be a mirage of freedom because of all the obstacles one must overcome. My clients have worked hard to rebuild upon employment and/or go back to school. It is not uncommon for landlords to overlook these accomplishments and only focus on mistakes made in the past, which maybe more than a decade.

While many of my clients are protected from discrimination and employment and education, they do not have the same protections in housing. A landlord with no background or reentry can arbitrarily decide when someone is rehabilitated and entitled to housing. When a perspective tenant is denied an apartment on this basis, the landlord generally does not give a reason for their denial.

The perspective tenant has no opportunity to provide additional documentation or any explanation. This discrimination is currently protected by law. Furthermore, it doesn't hurt just tenants wit convictions but the entire —

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time is expired.

JACOB MALASFSKY: Sorry, one sentence then. On a personal level, I also have a conviction history and

2.2

2.3

market.

after I was released, I doubt that would be able to finish college, go to law school, pass the bar without stable housing, or I would be here today testifying as a tenants rights attorney. Thank you for allowing me to testify today and I'll write a written submission later.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have

Maria Danzilo followed by Rocaman Cooper and then

Bernadette Ferrara. Maria, you can go ahead when the

Sergeants call time.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

MARIA DANZILO: Hi, thank you Madam Chair and members of the Committee. My name is Maria Danzilo, I'm Executive Director of One City Rising, which is a community advocacy group whose mission is to bring together communities from across the five boroughs to restore New York's economy, enhance public safety and improve education outcomes for every child. I'm also an advisor to the group, New Yorkers for Competitive Elections. I'm a mother of three children, a lifelong New Yorker and I own a small rental property, which I rent out significantly under

2.

I appreciate all the courageous testimony this morning and the well-intentioned purposes of the bill and second chances are hugely important to all people and I don't dispute that but I don't support this bill in the current form.

After hours of testimony, I have heard no data that shows that decarcerated individuals who are working and able to pay their rent and able to responsible tenants are being denied housing in a scope that we justify diminishing private property rights in New York City and putting the safety of tenants throughout the five boroughs in a difficult situation. Current law does not allow a landlord to use criminal history as the sole justification for denying rent and federal law makes it clear that it is illegal to deny tenancy to someone based on their criminal record unless they're also dangerous.

So, what this bill really is is a law that reduces private property rights and we need to encourage private property ownership in New York.

I'm an intellectual property lawyer for decades and any reduction in property rights is going to have a chilling effect on investing in property. That means keeping property in good condition, renting all

2.2

2.3

vacant units and restoring property to add to the housing stock, which we so desperately need. This is not a law that will effect government owned property but this is a law that targets people who invested their life savings in real property and reduces their rights.

If this was a law that was looking to help people coming out of prison, that would be a different conversation but we're really talking about —

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MARIA DANZILO: A law that's protecting property rights. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

MARIA DANZILO: At a time when New York State has lost more tax revenue than any other state in the country.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

MARIA DANZILO: We really need to do more to invest uh, uh, in private property. Thank you very much. Thank you. Oh, I would like to make one more comment and I do want to note that a number of people were given extra time and I do think it's important to make this a point, that statements have been made but the law contains protections so that landlords

2.2

2.3

will not be liable as a result of not doing criminal background checks. But the language in the bill, I'm a 40-year lawyer. I've been practicing law for 40 years, the language in the bill is not identification and is adequate to provide protection to property owners if they end up renting to someone who goes on to hurt another tenant or a property. So, I do want to say that the bill needs a lot of work in order to be a good bill that protects everyone.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MARIA DANZILO: Thank you. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have Rocaman Cooper followed by Bernadette Ferrara and then Michael Wexler.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ROCAMAN COOPER: Hi, my name is Rocaman

Cooperman. I am a 22-year-old resident of this city.

I'm here to discuss the proposed statute before the

Committee. As a 22-year-old, interested in politics,

I have noticed one thing about this city currently.

The city wants to protect and defend criminals to

rather than law abiding citizens like myself.

Whether it be ignoring the supreme courts, landmark ruling on the right to keep and bear arms or

2.2

2.3

in this case, taking away a landlords ability to protect their tenants by allowing them to run criminal background checks on perspective tenants. I feel for all the people who can't get housing due to the fact that they have a record but it should not be up to the city to tell the landlords that they cannot run criminal background checks on any perspective tenants. The City Council also seems to think that if perspective tenant has any criminal background, a landlord will not rent to that person. But most landlords will rent to a tenant who committed a nonviolent crime years ago.

The purpose of the criminal background check for landlords is to prevent people who have committed violent crimes from becoming tenants in their buildings. The people of the city are fed up with the crime that pervades the city and the politicians who ignore these crimes and say the city is as safe as ever. Why do you ignore the 50,000 negative comments when the same statute was brought up before the City Council a year ago. The public has spoken up against this proposal. You were supposed to represent your constituents. By considering this bill today it is clear that the city has not learned

2.3

anything by the rise in violent crime over the past two years. This has occurred because of the wholesale changes in New York States criminal law, such as cashless bail. Please vote against this bill and please do not diminish peoples concerns. Thank you so much. Have a great day.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: I guess because I've been here for many hours, my patience is wearing thin because I don't think that we have diminished anybody's concerns about public safety but I digress and thank you so much for your testimony and we can go to the next person.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have Bernadette Ferrara followed by Michael Wexler and then Raymond Bergen.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: You have to accept the unmute request Bernadette.

BERNADETTE FERRARA: It's not allowing me.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We can hear you.

BERNADETTE FERRARA: Okay, good. Thank you.

extremely diverse community in the East Bronx.

Good afternoon. My name is Bernadette Ferrara, born, raised, educated, and still living in Van Nest. An

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

have two family, three family, multiple families in apartment buildings. I serve on Community Board 11 representing Van Next since 2008 and I'm a founding member and current president of the Van Nest Neighborhood Alliance formed in 2010.

Today I speak as a lifelong Bronx resident. defunding the police and declining to prosecute, low level crime, this move will make apartment buildings and entire communities less safe. No matter how our governor tries to downplay crime, our public safety is at risk walking down the streets or riding mass transit. We're all vulnerable. I appeal to this Committee to please find a middle ground. Here's what I think would protect the rights of those who might be wrongly accused of a crime or exonerated, as well as promote community safety. All tenants should undergo the same type of screening required before landlords can rent to Section 8 tenants. Drug use, certain types of criminal convictions, like producing methamphetamines, sexual assault and credit eviction checks. However, tenacity should not be denied in cases where a sentence is suspended, discharged, legally nullified or vacated, expanded or sealed, as in the case of juvenile delinquency.

2.2

2.3

This screening required to apply to both owner occupied and absentee owners. Intro. 632 cannot pass as it is right now and make our communities succumb to even more public safety issues. It defies common sense. A priority needs to be addressed right here to what the barriers are and the focus is on that.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired.

BERNADETTE FERRARA: And not tying the hands of landlords with regards to not allowing background checks. I implore the Committee to look at all of this. Thank you for this time. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have Michael Wexler followed by Ramon Bergen and Jeffrey Maisel.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

MICHAEL WEXLER: Thank you kindly for the opportunity. I'm Michael Wexler. I am a President of the Board of the Lafayette Queens. I will send a follow-up comments. My time here today was spent learning about exactly what the issues were today. Understanding why something such as a credit report would be able to be used in order to make decisions about tenants and something which I think many of my residents would be concerned about, which is criminal

2.2

2.3

history would not make many of my issues recovered by Council Members Holden and Vernikov. Who I appreciate being at many of the issues, which present themselves in our community and I'll follow-up later and leave the time to others who have prepared

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next we have Ramon Bergen followed by Jeffrey Maisel and then Robert Lee.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

statements. Thank you very much.

RAMON BERGEN: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Ray Bergen. I live in a co-op in Queens in a development called [INAUDIBLE 5:11:12], where we have 32 buildings and over 1,000 residents and I can tell you, without any criminal referral or anything like that, we have enough problems dealing with tenants where we have troubles and there's been occasions where the police have been called but the thrust of my comment is really on the fact that I think this whole legislation is really a way to defer what the problem is. The problem is that there is no decent available housing for people who are released from jail or who have issues in getting a good place to live. The city should be taking the responsibility

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

of building and providing apartments to people where the rent would be affordable and they could build a track record of some kind to show that they are in fact good tenants, good people, and they should be allowed the opportunity to live anywhere they want. However, keep in mind that in co-ops in particular, we have a board of directors. The board of directors looks at the tenants information and they have to make an informed decision as to whether they should allow somebody to live in their cooperative and by not having some type of a reference for background check, it basically opens up the board to say, we'll allow you in. We don't know everything about you but you're welcome here and then what happens after that person moves in, if there is some type of incident, is the Board responsible? Will the board be sued. Is there an incentive for someone to even be on a board of directors if they can't make informed decisions about who's going to live in their property. Thank you very much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Next, we have Jeffrey Maisel followed by Robert Lee.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

_

COMMMITTE COUNSEL: I don't believe we have Jeffrey; we'll go with Robert Lee.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

ROBERT LEE: Good afternoon all and I thank you for allowing me to testify here today. I'm a small housing provider of two to four families in Brooklyn. I'm a second-generation owner. Many of my tenants have been with me for two decades. I'm very involved in all aspects of management. Recently I had a problem at a building in Williamsburg with constant drug dealing outside the store entrance, outside the building entrance. These guys would not move. It was one of your own Council Member Restler that attended to this before I could blink. You know, and it's all taken care of.

I'm very concerned for the safety of my tenants.

These are people that I've known for a very long

time. I feel obligated for their safety. I have

several tenants that have given birth to their

children in my building and I have watched these

children grow up. I understand the dilemma here but

how do I explain to one of these tenants if you know,

if an incident arises? You know, what do I say? I

2.2

2.3

2 have accepted many tenants present and past that have 3 had criminal backgrounds but they weren't violent.

Please, I ask you to please make safety a number one priority and don't let this bill pass. Thank you again so much for letting me speak.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Uhm, next uhm, actually I don't think we have anyone else here. If you have not been called via Zoom or in person, please make sure to fill out a witness slip or use the raise hand function.

Okay, Sonya, you can go ahead.

SONYA: Uh, thank you and thank you for having me today. Good afternoon Committee Members. I am

President of [INAUDIBLE 5:15:44] Corporation of

Directors. We're the largest housing cooperative in the world centered in Bronx New York.

As a residential cooperative, real estate is owned by tenant shareholders. As such, it should be exempt from the proposal or coverage. As a Mitchel Lama, affordable housing cooperative, real estate is regulated by the New York State division of housing and community renewal and subject to a regulatory agreement would be United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Those entities have

detailed regulations governing the shareholder selection process by River Bay.

Although subsections D and G proport to carveout entities subject to federal or state law, they do not do so absolutely and it should. At a minimum Subjection H, which should be amended to expressly state that proposed legislation does not apply to residential housing properties established under the New York State private housing finance.

Further as drafted, the legislation should impose additional and sometimes conflicting requirements on New York State regulated Mitchell Lama cooperatives. For example, the proposed legislation creates a requirement that available housing units be held open to applicants to dispute their denial based on the proposed Local Law. Such a requirement would add under complexity and delay to what is already a lengthy and heavily regulated process. River Bay currently has a multiyear waiting list with thousands of qualified applicants waiting to move in. The process is regulated by New York State but as currently worded, the Local Law would apply with the states current regulations do not contain identical

2.2

2.3

requirements to the local law. The covered entity does not send the notices required by the Local Law.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired.

SONYA: Adding further details — regulated multiyear waiting lists. As such, the River Bay Corporation opposes this Council bill Intro. 632 and respectfully requests that it not be enacted into law unless Subjection H is amended to expressly state that the proposal should not apply to the sale of rental or affordable housing cooperatives established pursuant to the New York State private housing finance law. Thank you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Seeing no additional witnesses, Chair I'll turn it over to you for closing remarks.

CHAIRPERSON WILLIAMS: Whew, I think this is my longest hearing. Uhm, and we did it. I want to thank everybody so much for your patience. I just wanted to give shout out to people that are still here. I see the Fortune Society, Suzette from Brooklyn and Community Voices Heard back there to Minority Leader Borelli, who's still here and Majority Leader Keith Powers that is still here for this very important topic. I really appreciate

everyone's viewpoints, even the one's that are a little triggering. I do hear you and I look forward to working with the bill sponsor to address many of the concerns that were raised today that helped to break barriers of housing but also, help people maintain their safety.

So, thank you all so much and I look forward to getting this bill passed. [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 December 28, 2022