CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

----- X

November 19, 2018 Start: 10:22 a.m. Recess: 11:07 a.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Rm.

16th Fl.

B E F O R E: MATHIEU EUGENE

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Daniel Dromm

Ben Kallos Brad S. Lander Bill Perkins

Ydanis A. Rodriguez Helen K. Rosenthal

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

Diana Sussman, Deputy Commissioner for Intergovernmental Affairs and Policy, New York City Commission on Human Rights

Sarah Sanchala, Director of Government Relations Planned Parenthood of New York City.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Take your seat and We're going to start right now. please. [gavel] Good morning. My name is Mathieu Eugene, and I'm the Chair of the Civil and Human Rights Committee. Today our hearing will be hearing testimony on Intro 863, which would amend the Administration Code to prohibit employment discrimination based on individual reproductive choices. This bill aims to make a number of changes. The first section of Intro 863 for instance would expand the lease of protected bases by adding sexual and reproductive health decisions to the lease. Section 2 of the bill and while it expands the definition of sexual and reproductive health decisions. Under this section of bills of the bill such a decision would now be classed as indecision by employees to receive services, which are arranged for or offered or provided to an individual relating to-to the reproductive system and its functions including, but not limited to fertility related medical procedures, family planning services and counseling including but not limited to access to all already approved birth

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 2 control drugs and supervised emergency section, sterilization processes, pregnancy testing, section 3 for transmitted for disease testing and treatment, 4 5 abortion processes and HIV testing and counseling. 6 By adding sexual and the parties have decision to the 7 lease of protected integrities, this bill aims to make it unlawful for employees to discriminate 8 against their workers actual and to see sexual-9 employees have choice. We look forward to hearing 10 from the Administration under quidance and the best 11 12 way to strengthen these protections. Before we 13 begin, I would like to acknowledge the members of the 14 committee, the members who are with us, the Council 15 Members. We have Council Member Kallos, Council 16 Member Rosenthal and Council Williams, the sponsor of 17 the bill, and at this time I want to give it to 18 Council Member Williams the opportunity to make a statement. Council Member Williams, please. 19 20 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you for holding this hearing. Again, 21 2.2 thank you Chair Eugene, Speaker Johnson, my 23 colleagues and members of the committee and all who will be joining us today. I do want to take some 24

personal privilege to shout out some family in the-in

access to all medically approved birth control drugs

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

and supplies, emergency contraception, sterilization procedures, pregnancy testing, sexually transmitted disease, testing and treatment, abortion procedures and HIV testing and counseling. Throughout the country we have seen an erosion of rights and access for women, LGBT people, people with more color and our immigrant brothers and sisters and most of them are religious brothers and sisters as well. With Washington rolling back requirements for employees, it is incumbent upon us as leaders of our city, a city that serves as a beacon for protections of the most vulnerable among us to ensure that our citizens never face retaliation, to ensure that our citizens or our residents never face retaliation, unemployment or discrimination for seeking much needed sexual and reproductive healthcare. Protecting against discrimination-this discrimination is an urgent necessity, especially in the time of Trump and allowing discrimination --- I would say in the time of Trump and those who support him, and allowing discrimination based on sexual and reproductive health decisions is clearly meant to deny women and all of our residents their human rights. An employer has no place in these deeply personal matters. The

concerns. I told them this bill was eminently

2 important that we move forward, but we were able to

3 work with them to address the concerns they had, and

4 still have a bill that Planned Parenthood could be

5 proud of. So, I'm thankful we're able to do. Thank

6 you again to t he Chair, and that's the end of my

7 | testimony-my opening statement. 7:28

Thank you very much, CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Council Member Williams for sponsoring this very important bill, and I want to turn and congratulate all the sponsors and those who had—who made this possible. Thank you very much, and I want to mention also that this-today is a very busy day. I have three public hearings, two at the same time. to go to the other Chamber to excuse myself because the Land Use vote is being called at this time, and then another public-and I sit on all three committees, and after this one, I've got another one. So, I know this is a very important hearing, and I'm pleased to be here, and again to all of you who worked hard to make this bill possible, thank you very much. Now, we are going to call upon the Administration to testify, but before that, we are going to administer the-the oath.

24

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

LEGAL COUNSEL: Please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: Yes.

LEGAL COUNSEL: Thank you. Please state your name for the record.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: morning. My name is Diana Sussman, Deputy Commissioner for Intergovernmental Affairs and Policy at the New York City Commission on Human Rights. Thank you, Chair Levine and the bill's sponsor, Council Member Jumaane Williams, Council Member Helen Rosenthal and Council Member Ben Kallos for being here today to discuss this bill, which protects employees from discrimination on the basis of sexual and reproductive health decisions. In my testimony I define or I-I list the definition of sexual reproductive health decisions, but it's been said already. So, I'll skip that. The Commission and the Administration support the goals of the legislation and the right to be free from discrimination based on one's decision to become pregnant, to undergo

cases has steadily increased in recent years, and the

Commission has resolved several significant cases in

this area. I'll share just two examples briefly

23

24

the flight attendant, collected \$10,000 in civil

penalties and required national policy changes on

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

pregnancy and lactation accommodations and training for its New York City based staff. The Commission is supportive of the goals that Intro 863 to the extent it comports with existing law, and is committed to ensuring that New Yorkers do not face discrimination based on their very personal choices to become pregnant, to have an abortion, to see treatment or counseling for sexually transmitted infections. Commission recommends that the protections proposed in the bill and the context of employment be extended to housing and public accommodations. The Commission also looks forward to discussing with Council meaningful strategies for effectively notifying both covered entities of their obligations and workers and other tenants and people who frequent public accommodation of their rights under the city's Human Rights Law. We are grateful for the opportunity to be here today, and to partner with the Council to move the bill forward. Thank you for convening thisthis hearing on the-on this important issue, and I look forward to your questions.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Thank you very much.

Let me say that this is—this is a very important

hearing because we all know that this is a human

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

It was right to decide about reproduction and about the-the health, the sexual health, and I think that we in the City Council and the city of New York we have a moral obligation to do everything that we can do to protect everybody regardless of, you know, the social situation. You know, the worker's positions and I think this is a very important thing that we come altogether to make sure that the right of everyone is respected with respect to the reproductive, you know, decision, and thank you again for your testimony. Let me ask you, you said that in your testimony that the Commission case will forgetwith medicine discrimination cases has steadily increase in recent years, and the Commission hasn't resolved. So there were significant cases in thecould you please give us some detail about it, please and what brought about those cases?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: Sure. So, the—as I mentioned, the Pregnant Worker Fairness Act, which may it explicit that pregnancy accommodations are required so long as they don't pose and undue hardship on the employer. It went into effect in 2014, which gave the Commission another tool to use to ensure that people have a right to an

could be?

2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: I-I think 3 like I said that-that the explicit protections in the Pregnant Worker Fairness Act, which has now been New 4 York City passed it in 2014. I think there's now 23 5 6 such laws across the country. It's a-it's an 7 incredibly important and powerful protection because prior to that under federal law you basically had to 8 show that you-there was another person who was not 9 pregnant who was given a similar accommodation. You 10 couldn't be treated better, quote/unquote "better" 11 12 because of your pregnancy than other workers. 13 there's explicit protections for people to recover, to-to have a healthy pregnancy while working and also 14 15 to recover from childbirth. So, I think having that 16 law in place has been a-has really changed the-the 17 game in New York City. I also think that we, you 18 know, this is an area that is of particular importance to the Commissioner. She was previously a 19 20 workers' rights attorney, and she said, and I can represent that at certain points in her private 21 2.2 practice, the vast majorities are cases were 23 pregnancy discrimination cases. So, one of the first publications we issues back when the Commissioner 24 started in March 2015 was notice of rights about 25

unfortunately we're seeing, you know, narrowing of

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

access to rights in-across the different issue areas with respect to the promulgation of rules at the federal level. You know, there's been some Supreme Court decisions that have given, you know, even privately held corporations the right to exclude certain kinds of care in their insurance policies. So, I think there-there is a real movement both with, you know, our federal administration and also the, you know, the makeup of the Supreme Court. there's a lot of concerns that we will see a further chipping away of reproductive rights. With respect to these types of bills, I have not seen anything at the federal level around discrimination based or reproductive health decisions that propose but, you know, I-I think that we are all sort on edge regularly about what the next sort of proposed rule or-or decision might be.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Intro 863 we all agree this is a wonderful bill, but do you think that, you know, the Intro 863 fits to adjust the issues of discrimination lays on the positive right for—of choices?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: I think so.

You know, there-we-we want to work with Council

2.2

and also in consultation with the Law Department, of course, to ensure that—that the language of the bill reflects sort of our shared interest in ensuring that that people do not face discrimination based on reproductive or sexual health decision and I, you know, we—we agree with the goals of the bill, and—and seek to support it.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: So, what is—do you have all—do you have any recommendations, any advice on what can be done in addition to that to ensure that to ensure that the right of people are respected in term of a positive life.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: One recommendation that we added that I noted in our testimony is—is to consider expanding these protections beyond the employment context to housing and public accommodations as well, and I think, you know, we are amenable to having further conversations about what other ways we might be able to strengthen the bill or strengthen the Commission's ability to enforce the—the law.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: [coughs] Excuse me.

[background comments] It's getting cold, right

outside. So, in terms of the discrimination based on

sexual reproduction—sexual reproductive life the decision, that kind of thing and jobs, and, you know, all seen anywhere in the housing and even in the school. But can you give us an example of cases in which an individuals was discriminated against, and how was it a public accommodation based on sexual reproductive kind of decision?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: As we sort of discussed this bill internally we were trying to explore different scenarios. I mean these are not—the example I'll provide is not one that I've seen at a commission, but were thinking about the context in which someone might seek medical treatment from a provider, and the provider looks at one's medical history and sees that they had had an abortion for example, and the medical provider then determines that they are—they do not wish to—to take that person on as a patient. You know, medical providers are public accommodations like anyone else who has a business or provides a service. So, we would want to consider expanding the bill to address those kinds of service increase.

2.2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Thank you very much.

3 Let me call on Council Member Williams for some 4 questions.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr.

Thank you so much for your testimony and I worked with the Commission before, and we've done some-some great work protecting domestic violence victims, and-and veterans. So, I'm very glad that we can be doing this again. Wait, there's one thing I wanted to read into the record. Sorry, this is from and op-ed on that Ward (sic) and I wanted to make sure it was on the record. Just noting this is not a hypothetical situation. In general in the United States and even in New York employees primarily women have been target for employment discrimination because their personal reproductive health decisions. Michelle McCusker (sp?) a woman in Queens was fired from a religious school on New York for becoming pregnant outside of marriage, an a woman in Wisconsin was fired for using in vitro fertilization. Because all specific protections against such actions they fail-fall into the gaps of the system of law. just wanted to make sure I lifted up the voices of

those women that have to deal with this. Well, my

of anecdotes. I would imagine advocates or, you

2 know, even Council Members if they've had

3 constituents come to them. In the housing context I

4 could imagine in the context of shelter if there are

5 shelters that, you know, privately funded or, you

6 know, that receive private money might not want to

7 allow someone to say if they disagree with certain

8 decisions. So, I'm thinking more in the context of-of

9 | a housing grid (sic) and a shelter context perhaps

10 | than of a private housing provider or sorry, more of

11 a landlord/tenant situation.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So, the impetus for adding areas to increase was just kind of brainstorming of what could happen in—in this

16

scenario?

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1

also think that we are generally reluctant to add certain protections in some context and not the other, and sort of wait for the problems to arise. I think if we're thinking about this, if we're prioritizing this as an area of expanded jurisdiction we'd like to try to be consistent unless we're intentionally excluding it because we have reason to intentionally exclude it.

Attorney General, but thank you all.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We appreciate the support.

do also want to shout out all the women who are

Council Members who are under those well including

Tish James our public advocate and soon to be

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Thank you Council Member Williams. Council Member Kallos, please.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I want to start by thanking Council Member Williams for introducing and reintroducing this legislation and being a leader on this issues on reproductive rights. I want to thank our Majority Leader Laurie Cumbo. Our Women's Committee Chair Helen Rosenthal and, of course, the Committee Chair for this committee on Civil and Human Rights, Council Member Eugene who I had the pleasure of sitting up at every City Council meeting. Thank you. I'll just as a quick question. The United States Supreme Court that I don't necessarily feel is very representative of our nation currently, and may not be for quite some time, issued a landmark decision I guess that will be—live in infamy in Hobby Lobby. Will this introduction and legislation—and if

it comes to pass as a law be able to withstand the
scrutiny of Hobby Lobby and are we as a city able to
tell employers that they can no longer force their
religious views onto the—the women and—and families o

6 our great city.

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: So, these are the kinds of issues that we've been in-in discussion with the Law Department and we hope to have some of these deeper conversations with Council. What I will say is that Hobby Lobby was specifically around in the provision of health benefits and the requirement that a privately—a closely held private employer had to expand their health benefits to include certain whether it was birth control or emergency contraception that they-that the private owner has disagreed with based on their religion. Here we are not addressing the provision of health benefits. It' really about prohibiting discrimination, which, you know, the city has the space to create more protections under the law than federal and even state. So, we actually-this is-this is an area of the law that we have some liberty to sort of go further, and I-so, I think that if we focus it in that way, you know, we can construct

2.2

something and work with the Law Department and work with the Council to—to create legislation that would withstand scrutiny but again we, you know, this is something that I defer to some of the experts at the Law Department on.

who, and I think every attorney fancies themselves as a Constitutional lawyer, I imagine this thing we're looking at is strict scrutiny and because we're mot legislating specifically with regards to healthcare but discrimination throughout the whole scope of the employment relationship that that would survive a strict scrutiny test because there is a public purpose in protecting individuals' rights to plan for a family. Would—would agree?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: I think that's sort of the framework that we're operating under as well, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And so what we'd be saying is you can't discriminate if somebody is pregnant. You can't discriminate if somebody is no longer pregnant or if a person chooses to become pregnant or engages in any other reproductive health decisions and similarly if an employer decided to-to-

legislation from-from my perspective is we want to

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 27
2	make sure that we are not—if we are intentionally
3	listing certain health decisions for example that if
4	there's an omission it's not—it's not interpreted as
5	an intentional omission. So that we are constructing
6	the bill in such a way that can be interpreted
7	broadly and that any omission may be because, you
8	know, in 15 years there's a procedure that didn't
9	exist at the time of drafting or we hadn't thought of
10	that it isn't read to be an intentional omission.
11	CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: But with respect to
12	Intro 63
13	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: Uh-hm.
14	CHAIRPERSON EUGENE:do you think
15	there's any intention or consequences of this bill
16	that maybe negatively add to the Human Rights
17	protection?
18	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: I can't-I-
19	at this point I cannot envision any sort of negative
20	interpretation. You know, again we do want to ensure
21	that we are keeping in mind some of the
22	Constitutional principles that Council Member Kallos
23	had identified, but again I think those can be
24	discussed more extensively in negotiations.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

2.2

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: But can you also elaborate a little more on some of the education of this bill and its core vision?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: I think the implications of the bill are what I think the—the intent is, which is that, you know, an employer would not be able to terminate an employee or not hire someone or, you know, cause any other sort of adverse action like a demotion or taking responsibilities away because they disagree with one's both reproductive or sexual health decisions. I'm sure if I'm fully understanding, but that is sort of my understanding of what the bill would do at this—at this point.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: But in our current city Human Rights Law are you aware of any gaps that are currently in our city Human Rights Law--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: I think--

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: --terms of I just say, you know, just for the nation pays on—on sex and health—producing health decisions.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: Well, currently as I mentioned many of the procedures or—or choices that are identified in the—in the bill may

there's-there's-I would say in this space there might

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

be two avenues. The first is particularly with respect to a claim around let's say pregnancy accommodation where someone is in the workplace and they need an accommodation or to maintain their job or to avoid going on paid leave. We have an Early Intervention Unit that we've created for these kinds of cases that may require more swift intervention because filing a complaint and waiting for a respondent to respond. The pregnant worker may be forced to go out on leave during that time. system, our process is just because of the due process issues and the way that our rules are laid out might just take too long for that pregnant worker. So, in some circumstances if that individuals is still working and needs and accommodation, the pregnant worker will-we will-we will route that to our Early Intervention Unit, which will negotiate hopefully a resolution with the employer so that the individual can get the accommodation that they need. Otherwise, the case might be filed as a complaint, which requires that the individual comes in and meet with-meets with an attorney in our Law Enforcement Bureau. That complaint is signed by the Complainant and then

2 served on the responding party, and that initiates our investigation. Our investigation will involve 3 looking at documents, interviewing witnesses, 4 collecting other forms of evidence and making an 5 assessment as to whether we believe that there is 6 7 probable cause that discrimination occurred or not probable cause. At any point in this process 8 especially if we are leading towards a probable cause 9 determination we will try to potentially conciliate 10 the case, which is essentially a three-party 11 12 resolution. The Commission is a party, the responding party and the complaining party, and so we 13 will-you know in the best of circumstances we will 14 15 negotiate a settlement for the complainant, which 16 could include damages for lost wages, emotional distress damages. It could include if there's back 17 18 pay or front pay or other expenses maybe medic al expenses. Then we would negotiate whatever civil 19 20 penalties that individual the responding party might have to pay to the city of New York as a punishment 21 2.2 or a penalty for violating the law, and we might also 23 negotiate a policy change, training requirements, which we often do particularly identify that the 24 25 employer has not-does not have policies in place or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

training in place to ensure that these kinds of cases won't come up again. And so, if we don't conciliate the case and we issue a probable cause finding that case we're going to enter in litigation, during the investigation the Commission is a neutral investigator. Once we find probable cause, the Commission is no longer neutral. The Commission's interest is in rooting out discrimination so we would litigate that case in most circumstances in behalf of the complainant, and bring that case to OATH to the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings for a hearing, which would involve taking testimony from witnesses, and then the OATH judge, the ALJ wouldwould issue a report and recommendation, and our Commissioner and the Office of the Commissioner and Chair---and Chair would issue a decision and order a final decision and order in the case. But again, most cases don't go through the full litigation process as most cases in litigation and Federal or State Court don't and the case might resolve at any point along that—along that process.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Than you very much.

Commissioner, I know that we know that—that, you know, we may have good intent and we mat be dedicated

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

always some challenges, always regardless how good we 3

and all heart to address an issue, but there are

4 may be, and-and what are the challenges and the

obstacles faced by the Commission when trying to 5

address the discrimination based on one of these 6

Choices?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SUSSMAN: Well, again, at this point, I can only really report around our experience enforcing the law with respect to pregnancy or disability because those are the law that we have, and I think we are continually faced with the challenge of being flexible in our enforcement. Like I said, our-our agency has a litigation type function. So, it's a long-it can be a long process, and a lot of people are busy with many commitments and to engage in a another sort of administrative system is not workable for a lot of people and the-and the time it takes to process cases can-can be lengthy again because we have specific structures and mechanisms in place to ensure due process. So that is one of the challenges that we face and-and we've-we've made efforts to become a little bit more flexible in how we enforce the law. Again, creating an early intervention unit so that we

2 SARAH SANCHALA: My name is Sarah Sanchala, and I'm the Director of Government 3 Relations at Planned Parenthood of New York City. 4 would like to thank Committee Chair Eugene for holding this hearing and Council Member Williams for 6 7 sponsoring this legislation and the entire committee for your dedication to address this important issue. 8 Planned Parenthood of New York City supports the 9 passage of Intro 863, which would prohibit employer 10 11 discrimination on the basis of sexual and 12 reproduction health decisions. Planned Parenthood of New York City has been a leading provider of sexual 13 14 and reproductive health services for over 100 years. 15 Thousands of New Yorkers depend on our essential 16 services each year. We firmly believe that all 17 people deserve access to quality affordable and 18 compassionate healthcare as well as the right to exert control over the reproductive choices. 19 20 critical that New Yorkers are able to access this care without experiencing retaliation from their 21 2.2 employers. Eighty percent of Americans support 23 policies that make it easier to access the full range of birth control options. Despite this overwhelming 24 25 support of a widespread use of birth control,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

employers continue to try to discriminate against employees who rely on birth control as well as many other essential sexual and reproductive health services. Additionally, the Trump Administration have created a hostile landscape for access to sexual and reproductive healthcare through Guide Rules, and tax on Title 10 and other dangerous tactics. Given this reality, it has never been more critical for New York to stand up for sexual and reproductive healthcare access. New York should be a leader in progressive policies that recognize the rights of all people to make their own choices about their bodies, the future and health, and to live free from employer discrimination. Planned Parenthood of New York City is proud to support the Boss Bill and be part of the efforts to ensure access to sexual and reproductive health services regardless of gender, sexual orientation, immigration status or ability to pay. We applaud Council Member Williams for introducing this bill, which would ensure that people are able to access medical care from fertility treatment to birth control to abortion without workplace retaliation. We look forward to continuing to be a resource and partner moving forward. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Thank you, thank you very much Ms. Sanchala. Thank you, but could you tell us what issues related to discrimination based on a positive (sic) price you're having from your client? I mean this is--

SARAH SANCHALA: I-I can't-

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: [interposing] People who go to your organization to the Planned Parenthood what type of issues are complaints they bring to you?

SARAH SANCHALA: We get a lot of them. I can get you specific examples. Regard—regarding specifically employment or—or just the patients in general.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: [interposing] Yes, discrimination in general, discrimination. Days, you know, and they're sick—they report it—it is a decision, a situation. Let's put it— not decision but situation because they are taking treatment, because they are pregnant, because they have to go for some medical treatment or services. Just tell us about exactly, you know, from your experience what type of complaint or cases or issues that your organization is dealing with?

2.2

2.2

SARAH SANCHALA: I—I don't actually have any specific case examples to share with you right now, but I'm happy to report back with you. After, I'll check in with our clinical team.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Okay, but the services that you are providing could you tell us about the services that Planned Parenthood is providing. Just we need some better detail.

SARAH SANCHALA: Yeah, so--

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: [interposing]
Because that may help people.

SARAH SANCHALA: Yeah, and—and yeah I mean we—we—

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: While facing, you know, discrimination are as a preventive measure. Yeah.

SARAH SANCHALA: Yeah, I mean so we provide the wide range of services for—for sexual and reproductive health. So, it's birth control, emergency contraception, gynecological care, breast cancer screening, colonoscopy. The list goes on. I think we provide—I'm must looking at the data here. We have last year we provided 64,206 sexual and reproductive healthcare visits, 500—5,884 pregnancy

2.2

tests in addition to 90—over 90,000 tests for STIs and 32,000 for HIV tests. So, I think in general we see a wide range of clients. We both have a mobile unit and health centers around the city and into the boroughs and so, we—some of our—some of our clients and patients are—are people who don't have permanent housing and don't have—have sort of the traditional life—life trajectories that everyone else has right now. So, the range of impacts is great and—and we're able to provide the service regardless of—of any other barriers that they're facing. So, I think that there are a lot of other barriers in people's lives that—that bring them to because we're easy to access.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: But based on your experience, you know, serving people and do you have any suggestions of how we can strengthen the protection of reported choices? Anything that you feel that you can--

SARAH SANCHALA: [interposing] Yeah, I'mI'm trying to not be snarky about the Federal
Administration.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: But, you know, if you don't—if you don't think about it, but it can always look forward to the—

2.2

2 SARAH SANCHALA: I mean right now 3 honestly that is our biggest--

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: --malfeasance.

SARAH SANCHALA: Yeah, some of our biggest attacks are from the Federal Administration, cuts to funding, cuts to services.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Okay.

SARAH SANCHALA: The public charge, which I know there was a hearing last week, and I think that some of these initiatives like Intro 863 are ways that the City can sort of counter some of these attacks where the feds are failing and/or adding additional burdens, the city is able to step in and add these protections.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Okay. Thank you very much. Oh, Council Member Williams please.

much. Thank you for your support of this bill and all the services that you do at Planned Parenthood, and my-my own question was did you-I don't know if it was-it was surprising to hear the-the expansion that was recommended by the Deputy Commissioner around housing and public accommodations. Was that something you had thought of? Did it make sense?

2.2

2 Did you have any possible examples of how that might work?

SARAH SANCHALA: Yeah, I mean I can obviously go back and talk with our team. We are primarily a sexual and reproductive healthcare organization, and so we tend to focus on the clients and the medical provision of care, but again, we see clients who are impacted by housing and other concerns, and so, we would definitely love to continue to have that conversation as we continue with the Commission. I think it's—it's interesting to expand.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you so much again for your support.

SARAH SANCHALA: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: Thank you, Council
Member Williams. Ms. Sanchala, thank you very much
for your testimony, and thank you also. I want to
thank your organization the Planned Parenthood of New
York City for the services you are—you are providing
to the people in New York because this is a very
important issue field, sexual and reproductive
services are very, very important and I'm saying that
because, you know, I know first hand what it—what it

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you.

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS 43
2	CHAIRPERSON EUGENE: And now the meeting
3	is adjourned. [laughter] [gavel] [background
4	comments]
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

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 10, 2018