1	001	MATERIAL ON HEATEN	1
1	COM	MITTEE ON HEALTH	1
2	CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YORK		
3		V	
4			
5	TRANSCRIPT OF THE	MINUTES	
6	Of the		
7	COMMITTEE ON HEAL	TH	
8		February 7, 2019 Start: 1:07 p.m.	
9		Recess: 2:11 p.m.	
10	HELD AT:	Committee Room - City Hall	
11	BEFORE:	MARK LEVINE Chairperson	
12	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	-	
13		ALICKA AMPRY-SAMUEL INEZ D. BARRON	
14		MATHIEU EUGENE	
15		KEITH POWERS	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
	j		

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED) Gretchen Van Wye Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Vital Statistics at the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene Marissa Hoechstetter Resident of New York City

[gavel]

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Good afternoon
everyone, thank you for joining us. I'm Mark Levine,
Chair of the City Council's Committee on Health. We
have a lot happening around City Hall today so my
colleagues will be coming in and out. We have a big
hearing in the main chamber and, and a budget
presentation on the other side of the building. I
know there's great interest from my colleagues in
this bill and in this hearing and I know many will be
joining us throughout our discussion today. We're
going to have an unusual format for me at least in my
committee hearings, this will be the first time that
we're not asking the administration to present first,
we're going to be hearing from a member of the public
will also say a word or two about in a minute and I'm
also going to dispense with the generally long
informal opening statement and just briefly say a few
words about this issue before we hear from the most
important person. We're here today to talk about
birth certificates which have a very formal legal
role in our society, they are used for access to
employment and education and financial services, they
have tremendous practical importance but they are

2	also a very powerful symbol for someone, they are
3	commonly called the foundational document of
4	someone's life, they have a uniquely powerful
5	symbolic role for all of us and so it is particularly
6	painful to think that there are some people, some
7	parents, some mothers who must look at that document
8	and see the name of someone who has abused them. I'll
9	explain what I mean. This is because of the not
10	hypothetical, now documented instance, instances of
11	medical providers, obstetricians abusing mothers and
12	then appearing on the birth certificate having
13	delivered the baby. These are abusers, these are in
14	many cases people have been convicted whose name is
15	enshrined forever on a document which will follow a
16	child through life, through adulthood. That's
17	unacceptable, that can be fixed and should be fixed
18	very easily, the city has the power to fix it and
19	we're here today to consider a bill that would do
20	that in very simple form. I want preemptively to
21	respond to one point which I've heard from the
22	detractors of this bill which is that any mother who
23	wishes to strike the name of an abuser off the
24	certificate can simply go to the courts. That's not
25	acceptable for a lot of reasons, going to the courts

is expensive, it's time consuming, it's complicated,
it can be humiliating, it makes the information
public of abusers who don't wish to have their
information made public, it's unreliable, the legal
system has failed and the specific case we're talking
about today, the legal systems fail and it's simply
not the way we have dealt with other important public
policy priorities related to birth certificates and
in years past in New York City which I'll talk about
in depth later. I'm going to pause now and invite up
and invite up our first witness, Marissa Hoechstetter
if you could please make your way up. One of the
bravest and most determined people I've had the
chance to work with, I want to thank you for joining
us today Miss Hoechstetter and tell you that I
understand at least theoretically that it can't be
easy to step forward but I'm grateful that you have
and I admire you for doing so and I would like to now
give you a chance to testify about your experience
and, and your position on this legislation. Please
and there's an on button on your mic, you got it.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you. While this is difficult, I'm grateful for the opportunity to address the Committee on Health today. I have

2	publicly shared my experience in an effort to help
3	shed light on sexual assault by medical
4	professionals, on the failings of the criminal
5	justice system in supporting survivors when they do
6	come forward to report crimes and, and on a long
7	trail that trauma leaves in your life. This bill
8	would this bill allowing the Department of Health
9	and Mental Hygiene's Office of Vital Records to
10	redact the name of a physician from a birth record
11	when the physician's license has been suspended,
12	surrendered or revoked by the New York State Office
13	of Professional Medical Conduct would be a tangible
14	step towards justice for me and others like me. I'd
15	like to start by thanking you, Council Member Levine
16	for introducing this legislation in response to my
17	advocacy and in support of survivors of sexual
18	assault. I'm also grateful to Council Members
19	Margaret Chin, Keith Powers, Helen Rosenthal, Kalman
20	Yeger, Donovan Richards, Andrew Cohen and Steve Levin
21	for their co-sponsorship. I'm privileged to have an
22	amazing community supporting me and would like to
23	also acknowledge my husband, David, my family and
24	friends for their unwavering support. Also, my
25	friends Leigh Graham, who is here with me today,

2	Marissa Elkins and Kate Kurera; our attorney Anthony
3	DePietro; Assembly Member Dan Quart and finally
4	Albert Samaha whose thoughtful telling of my story in
5	BuzzFeed News last summer helped me get this out and
6	start bringing the many injustices that I and others
7	have faced to light. The assaults and subsequent
8	experiences seeking justice have dramatically altered
9	my life. I will try to brief today and to focus my
10	remarks specifically on what it means for me to have
11	the name of the doctor who abused me on my kids'
12	birth certificates. A few years ago, while
13	registering my twin daughters for kindergarten, I had
14	to present their birth certificates. I hadn't really
15	looked closely at them before and when I did, I saw
16	that listed under 'name of attendant at delivery',
17	was Robert Hadden. I was shocked. I was pregnant
18	during all but three of my visits as Hadden's patient
19	at Columbia University and New York Presbyterian
20	hospital facilities from 2009 to 2013. During that
21	time, he performed overly touchy exams, made
22	inappropriate comments about my body, examined me
23	without other people in the room and on my last
24	visit, undoubtedly sexually assaulted me. When I
25	realized what was happening. I never went back I

2	turned inward to protect myself, my new babies, my
3	marriage, my job, my life. I'm still haunted by what
4	else he did while I was unaware. He so clearly took
5	advantage of me during a most vulnerable time in my
6	life. The assaults poisoned my memories of my
7	pregnancy. I felt like a failure as a woman for not
8	turning him in. I felt like a hypocrite as a mother
9	telling my daughters to be truthful and to question
10	things. How could I ask them to do those things when
11	I hadn't? So, after much deliberation, in the fall of
12	2015, I reported the assaults to the Manhattan
13	District Attorney. When I went to their special
14	victims' unit, I learned that I was one of more than
15	20 women who had come forward. The ADA told me that
16	my accusation was outside of the statute of
17	limitations, something I would later learn was not
18	true. Cy Vance's office was already negotiating a
19	plea and I saw later that the timing of my report was
20	inconvenient for them and they chose not to act on
21	it. in February 2016, Hadden plead guilty to crimes
22	against just one victim, a criminal sex act in the
23	third degree which is a felony and forceable touching
24	which is a misdemeanor. Two minor very minor counts
25	called down from a long list, a list that would have

2	been longer had the DA included me and others in the
3	case in Molineux or with a second indictment. As a
4	condition of the plea, Hadden had to surrender his
5	medical license to the state's Office of Professional
6	Medical Conduct and agree to not seek licensure
7	elsewhere. He got no jail time and received a
8	nauseating guarantee of immunity. The DA agreed to
9	never charge him for additional conduct that had
10	turned up in the course of the investigation. It felt
11	like they were saying the crimes against me and an
12	untold number of other women never happened and now
13	they could never be tried. Because my abuser was well
14	connected and supported by his employer, he was able
15	to effectively just retire. Much has been reported
16	about the campaign contribution Vance received from
17	Hadden's defense attorney and the Chair of Columbia
18	University's Board, so I won't digress here except to
19	say that Vance's justice system trivialized the fact
20	that I was sexually assaulted and anyone who was
21	culpable has effectively ignored their responsibility
22	or bought their way out of it. I share all of this to
23	say how empty the experience of coming forward left
24	me. I did the right thing and came forward, turning
25	to those in this city who were supposed to help me.

Instead, I was discarded. When friends swapped birth
stories, I cringe, I never want to share my own. My
c-section scar makes me sick. I knew I'd never see
Hadden again after watching him plead guilty in court
so why do I have to keep seeing the name his name on
the birth certificates? I knew that to find some
closure or acknowledgement of my pain, I had to get
his name off of those documents. In some states, that
information isn't even listed. You can order new
copies online, you can request changes for errors,
but you can't change the name of a person who
attended the birth. After nearly, nearly two years of
unreturned phone calls and emails to the Department
of Health and Mental Hygiene, I received a cryptic
email that read; "your inquiry is currently under
investigation, and we will inform you wen an answer
is received". I never heard anything further and two
attorneys helping me at different times couldn't get
anywhere either. I refused to give up though. City
rules allow anyone attending the birth to be listed.
If this had been a home birth, it could have been my
husband's name and for that matter it could have been
my name, I did do the work. Eventually the Department
told me that they'd need an order from the State

Supreme Court to make the change. But I was advised
that a court might reject such a request because
Hadden's name was not there in factual error. If I
obtained a letter from the hospital where I'd
delivered offering, offering an alternative name,
then maybe the change could be made but unfortunately
Columbia and New York Presbyterian, where Hadden
worked for more than two decades, refuses to
acknowledge the role they played in enabling him. So,
getting a new letter isn't an option. That brings us
to the introduction of this legislation. Hadden
continued seeing patients even after the police and
the DA were notified of the allegations against him
in June of 2012. There are dozens of known victims
and the only one who's not unanimous and probably
hundreds or even thousands of thousands of others
like us out there. His own defense attorney said
during the criminal trial that that he had over
30,000 patient visits. Almost all the victims that
I'm aware of were pregnant when we were assaulted and
for ten of us that I know hadn't delivered our
children, that's 13 babies that carry his name on
their birth certificates. I sit up at night thinking
about how many babies he must have delivered in his

2.2

career. A privilege that he used to gain access to
women's bodies. The worst part of all of this for me
is that he's the first person in the entire world to
touch my children. I can't change that. His hands
physically took them out of me during my c-section
and they're the same hands that abused me. I hope the
administration and the Council finds the courage to
do something different than the way things have
always been done. I ask that you support the bill so
that children like my daughters don't have to keep
the name of a serial sexual criminal on the document
that marks their entrance to this world. It's a small
ask but a meaningful one. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Thank you very much for that eloquent opening statement. Is it okay if I ask you a couple of questions? Okay.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: How do you respond to the suggestion that this could simply be worked out in the courts?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Well I've had conflicting information and I think to ask someone like me to have an attorney come forward to a court, you know I'm not anonymous, but I know of a lot of

2.1

2.2

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

other women who don't want to be public about this so bringing it to the court requires a different level if you want to be anonymous. I think what's unique about this legislation is that it does require that the doctor has lost their medical license by the state's Office of Professional Medical Conduct so there is another body in the state that has already weighed in on that licensure.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: I just want to focus in on that because I think that was so… [cross-talk]

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: ...key, could... the...

you repeat the name of the entity that would make a

decision in this case?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: The Office... the

Office of Professional Medical Conduct is the state

body that licenses medical professionals and there

are limited ways but there are ways that they will

either suspend, take, revoke or a doctor can

surrender their license and I shared part of the, the

plea that the DA did make because it required him to

surrender his license so in this case this is a

person who has admitted guilt to crimes against women

2.2

2 like me and has surrendered his license and is no 3 longer practicing so that's not up for debate.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: I think that's a very important point, the legislation relies on a very clear standard... [cross-talk]

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Uh-huh... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: There's no judgment calls here, it's based on a decision by a professional medical, a... the statewide body which presumably doesn't make such determinations lightly or maybe not even that frequently, do you happen to know how many people lose their license a year, how many board-certified obstetricians?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I don't know that number, I know there's something like 90,000 doctors in New York and there's a lot of advocacy around medical boards in, in different states, New York State does not have open records about doctors so there's no way... you can only see final actions. So, if you were to go on the, the Office of Professional Medical Conduct site you could see Hadden listed as having surrendered his license and the reason why. There's no way for us to know if people have been

1	COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
2	filing complaints against him for years that were
3	potentially investigated but did not result. I will
4	say that since coming forward I've heard from
5	hundreds of other women who were either victims of
6	Hadden or other OBGYNs, I think that we will only
7	continue to see more people reporting assault by
8	medical professionals so it's, it's really hard to
9	know, there's very little research or kind of
LO	information out there… [cross-talk]
L1	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Well as, as [cross-
L2	talk]
L3	MARISSA HOECHSTETTER:about it [cross-
L 4	talk]
L5	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE:commonly happens
L6	when one brave person steps forward, other people
L7	then find the courage to step forward as well and
L8	that's clearly happened in this case
L9	MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Uh-huh
20	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE:of the you said it
21	was hundreds of, of, of women who you have learned o
22	since you came forward, could you estimate how many
23	are in New York City?
24	MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: I'd say I've heard

from let's say 50 people who were Hadden's patients,

2.1

2.2

they don't all live in New York City anymore but, you know I mean that's where the birth certificate is from, that's where the… you know…

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Of course.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: And I think we would be naïve to assume that Hadden was the only abuser ever in the history of New York City.

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: And part of the reason why we need public policy action is to protect people who we don't yet know of so that they don't have to go through what you've gone through.

unlike any other situation where you have someone and someone else in the position of power so you go into a medical office, you're there for a reason, you're pregnant, you're looking for their expertise and their help so it's, it's not unlike other discussions we're seeing around sexual assault in other industries and medical professionals, doctors use that to their advantage, you're alone in a room with them and there's often a legitimate reason why their hands might be on or in your body and it's a... they

1

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

use that to their advantage and, and that's clearly what happened in my case.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: When they're... I think... I think there are 100,000 babies born a year in New York City roughly, someone can maybe correct that number for me later but even if it's only one in a thousand or one in 10,000 cases the numbers are still significant in New York City and we need public policy that protects everybody and that doesn't require someone to be heroic and spend years fighting as you have and in my opinion public policy that doesn't require people to go to through the courts because of the reasons I mentioned earlier. I wonder if you could say anything about... else about your experience dealing with the courts in this matter, do you know fees that might have been charged or any other... anything else you can help us to understand about your experience to the extent you've dealt with the courts on this matter of getting Hadden's name off the birth certificate?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: So, I haven't taken it as far as actually, you know taking it to court, I've had two different... this is something I've been working on for about four years so I've, I've

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 had two different attorneys at different points working on that and either have received no 3 information... there's, there's very clearly a 4 lack of precedent, right, and so anybody who did 5 6 respond to me or, you know people were supportive but 7 there... they didn't know what to do, there's a lack of precedence so I think I would say that the Council 8 and, and New York City has an opportunity to make a 9 statement about what, what this means for people and 10 the privilege that I think it also signals to 11 12 doctors, the privilege they have and that, you know if they abuse that they, they can't abuse that, yeah. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: And I just want to 15 understand your experience in dealing with the Health 16 Department you described, two years... [cross-talk] MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Well now it's... 17 18 [cross-talk] CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: ...of attempts... 19 20 [cross-talk] 21 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: ...been four years, 2.2 yeah, uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But could you explain more about the ways in which you attempted to communicate and to the extent something came back or,

23

24

or whether there was simply silence on the other side?

2.2

emailing, phone calls, like I said I've had two different lawyers make outreach to different, you know I'm not sure necessarily who their contacts were but I... it was pretty much radio silence at first and you know this is something that's hard for me so I'd say I sort of come in and out of my ability to do it like I get the birth certificates out and I'm motivated and then it's, it's traumatizing, it's difficult to, to look at them so I've kind of come in and out of it and I think, you know it's been six months and nobody ever wrote back. I did after a year and a half get one email that was... like I read, it was very cryptic. I think... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: That was the first communication, a year and a half in?

MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah, to, to me directly in response to, you know submitting an inquiry I think maybe I've had one or two other formal responses that were also very vague and not specific. I got one that said, you know dear parents, thank you for your inquiry kind of thing with no... and

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 it didn't feel like it was specific to me, it felt 3 like maybe it was sent to a bunch of people who had pending inquiries, so I've had very little 4 communication, yeah. 5 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Dear parents? 6 7 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Did you confirm 8 whether anyone else involved in this case received 9 such an email, do you... do you know what others ... 10 11 [cross-talk] 12 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No... [cross-talk] 13 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: ...have been... [cross-14 talk 15 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: No, I am... [cross-16 talk] 17 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: ...have been in communication... [cross-talk] 18 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: ...in touch with a 19 20 few other women who I know want this change, I know that there are ten of us in this... I know of nine 21 2.2 other women who were patients of Hadden who want, 23 want his name off of their children's birth certificates but I'm... to my knowledge I'm the only 24

person who's, you know done this and once you tell

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

people about it, it makes sense but it's not something that maybe people think of at first but you know the fact that he was first person to physically bring them into the world like it's now part of their story and you know you take a birth certificate when you get get a passport, when you get married like I mean for other things like you mentioned and he's there and I just don't think that he deserves to continue to be a part of their story, you know now that I've been speaking publicly like of course one day they will know about this, I hope that they will be proud of what I'm trying to do but I feel really strongly that he should not continue to be connected with them in their life, you know that's something that I have to carry and deal with but it's not... that's not fair to them.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay, well thank you for your very powerful words and for your courage and for being here today. It's incredibly impactful and I'm, I'm grateful for it. If you're able to stay for the rest of the hearing we would welcome that in case other questions arise but, but for now we are going to pass it on to the administration and, and thank you for speaking out.

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Thank you so much... 4 [cross-talk] 5 MARISSA HOECHSTETTER: Thank you for 6 listening. 7 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Alright, okay. So, would, would DMH... DOHMH like to join us? Okay. And is 8 it Commissioner or Deputy... or Assistant Commissioner 9 Van Wye, thank you for being here and I'm going to 10 11 ask Committee Counsel Sara Liss to administer the affirmation. 12 COMMITTEE CLERK LISS: Do you affirm to 13 14 tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the 15 truth in your testimony before this Committee and to 16 respond honestly to Council Member Questions? 17 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: I do. 18 COMMITTEE CLERK LISS: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay, please. 19 20 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Okay. Good afternoon Chair Levine and members of the Health Committee. My 21 2.2 name is Gretchen Van Wye and I am the Assistant 23 Commissioner of the Bureau of Vital Statistics at the New York City Department of Health and Mental 24 Hygiene. On behalf of Commissioner Barbot, thank you

2	for the opportunity to testify on Introduction 1308.
3	New York City is one of 57 jurisdictions in the
4	United States that registers births. In each of these
5	jurisdictions, the registration of a birth begins
6	with a physician or other professional attendant
7	witnessing the birth of an infant. The Health
8	Department's Office of Vital Records is responsible
9	for issuing birth certificates for all births that
10	occur within New York City. We work closely with
11	other jurisdictions and the federal government to
12	maintain, maintain a system that upholds the
13	integrity and security of this essential vital
14	record. Birth certificates are legal and medical
15	documents for which factual information must be
16	corroborated by external parties. In the United
17	States, a birth certificate is our primary identity
18	document. It is proof of U.S. citizenship, afforded
19	the full faith and credit of other jurisdictions and
20	other countries and is honored by U.S. States and
21	other countries. There are two forms of birth
22	certificates that are issued by the Office of Vital
23	Records. The short form birth certificate, otherwise
24	known as the certification of birth, contains only
25	the name, sex, date of birth, place of birth and

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 parents' names. The short form can be used for most purposes, including applying for a state driver's 3 license and a U.S. passport. The long form birth 4 certificate contains all of the items on the short 5 form, plus other information including attendant at 6 7 delivery. All United States birth certificates begin with the medical certification and federal law 8 mandates the national collection and publication of 9 birth and other vital statistics data. A variety of 10 national standards exist for the reporting of birth 11 12 data to promote uniformity and comparability of data 13 across the United States. Under the New York City Health Code when a birth occurs in a hospital or en 14 15 route thereto, the birth certificate and the 16 confidential medical report of birth are required to 17 be prepared and certified by the physician, the 18 licensed midwife, or the registered physician attendant... in, in attendance or assisting or by a 19 20 certified nurse practitioner or registered professional nurse present or after the birth or by a 21 2.2 designee of the person in charge of the hospital who 23 is trained or approved by the Health Department. The attendant is swearing to the facts of birth on the 24

birth certificate that they are correct. This is

critical given the importance of birth certificates		
as fundamental identity documents. The requirement to		
display the certifier's information on the birth		
certificate also exists in New York Public Health Law		
which governs the vital records processes for the		
rest of New York State. This is also the standard set		
by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,		
which sets a national exemplar certificate to, to		
promote uniformity and comparability of data across		
the United States. In New York City, the only		
information on a birth certificate that is subject to		
an amendment by self-attestation is the gender		
marker. In discussion with other states and advocates		
over the past several years, the Health Department		
found that the gender marker was not something that		
can be corroborated by anyone other than the		
individuals themselves. All of the other information		
on the New York City short and long form birth		
certificates can and must be corroborated by an		
external party through submission of documentary		
evidence. This includes paternity, time and place of		
birth, parent's name and signature of those present		
at birth including the physician. The requirement of		
documentary evidence or some other form of proof is a		

fundamental legal tenet. It is also codified by the		
U.S. Model State Vital Statistics Act, which the		
Department of Health and Human Service promulgates in		
coordination with the 57 vital records jurisdictions		
to provide models for the development of local laws		
and regulations. For anyone seeking substantive		
factual changes to their birth certificates, which		
have legal implications, the Health Department		
requests a court order certifying that the requested		
information is valid. This is the process all		
applicants follow when they seek an official		
proclamation defining legal relationships among the		
parties listed on the birth certificate including		
name, paternity or presiding physician. I would now		
like to turn to the bill under discussion today. I		
want to be clear that Ms. Hoechstetter's experience		
with her former OBGYN is horrific, criminal and		
should never have happened to her or anyone else. The		
Department stands ready to assist her in the process		
of removing the presiding physician's name from her		
daughter's birth certificates. We support the		
intentions of this legislation, as reflected in our		
commitment to helping Ms. Hoechstetter and anyone		
else who wishes to pursue a change. I would however		

like to note that there are legal considerations that we must take into account in altering... in altering our process; we look forward to working with the Council to ensure that our processes continue to be fair, just, and equitable. Thank you for the opportunity to testify, this hearing will generate important conversations. I am happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: I'm really stunned right now at the stance of the administration and I may be missing some things so I, I just want to give you a chance to clarify. So, you're not supporting the bill?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: We are on your side, we want to continue to discuss the bill with you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay but... we've been joined by Council Member Powers, fellow Health Committee member and he and I can tell you that that's generally administration speak for we don't support the bill. You, you listed an objection here which is there are legal considerations that we must make into account, you really didn't go into depth at all on that. So, what, what are the legal

2.2

2.2

considerations that we need to take into account that
would lead you not to support the bill as is?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: So, first of all we share the same goal, we are very sympathetic to this very difficult situation that potentially many women are facing... [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But... and, and what is that goal?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Our goal is to remove the information using a process that maintains the integrity of the birth certificate.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay, my goal is to allow women who have been victims to remove the name of the abuser from the foundational document of their child without them having to go through what can be a humiliating public, complicated, difficult and expensive process in the courts and that is the kind of philosophy that led me and this committee and this council to very proudly pass legislation which the administration supported recently allowing New Yorkers to change their gender marker and the reason we passed that bill is so we didn't want to add undue obstacles to people who needed to change that document so I'm not sure we share the same goal if

you don't adhere to this philosophy of allowing victims to remove the name of their abuser without undue obstacles, cost and public disclosure.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: We want work with you on figuring that out.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay, so tell me again what are the legal considerations which we need to take into account that... [cross-talk]

is the changes that are made to any birth certificate are the legal implications that a, a registrant faces through, throughout their life as they carry that certificate. We want that certificate to be respected by all other jurisdictions and other countries as it is now, we want to make sure that the process is one that's follows that maintains the integrity of the certificate.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But every jurisdiction in the world unless I'm wrong does not require that the name of the delivering physician be on the certificate, right?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Nor does New York City... nor... New York City's short form birth

2.2

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 certificate does not have the name of the attendant on it, that is easily... [cross-talk] 3 4 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: So, who ... so ... [cross-5 talk] 6 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: ...available... [cross-7 talk 8 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: ...who's going to reject the document because someone changed or 9 removed the name of, of the physician? 10 11 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: This, this is... the short form birth certificate doesn't have the name of 12 13 the information, I'm not... I'm not saying that the document will be rejected, I'm saying that we want to 14 15 work with you on a process that maintains the 16 integrity of following the, the change that is... 17 within a process that is maintaining the integrity of the birth certificate. 18 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But, but I don't 19 20 understand how it loses integrity if... there are many birth certificates long form which do not even 21 2.2 include the name of a delivering physician and there 23 are other jurisdictions which don't require it and, and critically this is not a subjective standard 24

here, this is... the bill was designed to only allow a

change in the case of the of the medical provider
having been having lost their license by an
accredited professional body. So, there's a very
clear standard, it's black and white and I'm, I'm
sorry to keep referring to the gender marker bill and
I want to repeat my strong and proud support of it
but in that case we didn't require a physician to
pass judgement there and the bill we're considering
today actually does have a more stringent standard
essentially in that it does only apply in cases where
the medical provider has, has lost their license
because of professional misconduct. So, this doesn't
apply if someone loses their license because they
didn't take their continuing education credits or
didn't pay whatever their annual dues are, its more
narrow than that, right and maybe you know but my
understanding is this is not the kind of thing that
happens often, obstetricians are not having their
licenses take away taken away in New York City
often, this is a narrow clearly defined standard. So,
I don't I don't understand how the document loses
integrity, I don't understand what jurisdiction would
have less faith in a New York City birth certificate
if we passed this law. Just I did want to

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2 acknowledge we've been joined by fellow Health
3 Committee member, Doctor Mathieu Eugene.

do require that the attendant or certifier is on the certificate, it's whether it's on the short form versus the long form, like us many jurisdictions don't include it on the short form. The, the process of making a gender marker change is really different from any other process because there's no one externally in the world who can know a person's gender identity and that's why the, the process in that fact is different from the other facts of birth.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: I'm actually not catching the logic there...

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: So... [cross-talk]

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: I can... [cross-talk]

19 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: I, I think you're

20 | just validating my point, we rightly because of the

21 | fact that gender is an internal... it's an internal

22 matter of identity we rightly have not required

23 external validators and that's, that's a bill that

24 \parallel this body supports, and you support, and we all agree

25 on that.

2 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Uh-huh...

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: And I don't think you believe that led the birth certificate documents to lose integrity in New York City.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Of course.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: So, now we have a bill with a... which does require an external validator and there's a... it's a different case and there are different reasons for that but there is the presence of an external non-subjective standard which is that the medical provider had lost their license or lost... was, was kicked out of the, the state board. So, if it didn't cause us to lose integrity for gender markers why would it cause us to lose integrity to list the name of the doctor?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: So, I think that the...
having the, the ruling by the state medical board is
helpful and we just need to know how to use it to be
directed how to use it because it makes legal changes
to the birth certificate and we do want to work with
you on figuring out how that should happen.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: It, it appears that your position is that, that a mother who wants to

2.1

2.2

2.2

remove the name of an abuser off the birth certificate should go to the courts, is that right?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: That's, that's what we have had so far, that's the process in place, we want to work with you, this is extremely technical. It's, it's... it can be really confusing, we'd be really happy to work with you and get all the right people in the room to work with you on this, to work out the nitty gritty details.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Right but... yes, that has been our process, that has been the only recourse until now but in terms of going forward the bill is attempting to give a, a less onerous route to the victims than going to the court, right, and... but your position is that the court should be the route that mothers go to?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: The, the court is the route that 12,000 people... of... 50,000 people make changes to their birth certificates every year, 12,000 people use... of those changes require court orders and they successfully do that working with us every year.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But many, many of those... sorry, sorry Commissioner many, many of those

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 are spelling changes because they're, they're... they are less complicated and consequential... 3 4 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: These actually are... 5 [cross-talk] 6 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: ...and... [cross-talk] 7 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: ...adoptions, paternity amendments, these are extremely private consequential 8 changes to the birth certificate that are... [cross-9 10 talkl CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Well I'm ... [cross-11 12 talkl 13 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: ...not just regular... you 14 know... [cross-talk] 15 CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: I'm happy to work 16 with my colleagues perhaps to correct... to, to craft 17 legislation that would allow some of those New 18 Yorkers to avoid the courts, we can talk about that at, at... perhaps at a later date but I think these are 19 20 special cases and I think that the desire for privacy in, in such cases unless you have someone who's 21 2.2 willing to be heroic as Ms. Hoechstetter has been 23 that the, the desire for privacy is really quite compelling and understandable and that alone to me is 24

reason enough to give people the option of avoiding

2.1

2.2

the court. I, I do think that there are financial costs associated with courts, you might have to hire an attorney, you might have to take a day off of work, I don't know the process maybe you can enlighten me but... and you might get a no at the end of the day and that, that honestly the, the legal system's track record in dealing with cases of sexual abuse... sexual abuse has not been flawless including in this specific case and so I could... I could understand one of the... one of the survivors preferring to avoid going to court for this.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: We want to help, we do have a process, we want to work with you to make it better, we want to work with the women to enable them to remove the… [cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: So, so... yes, you've, you've, you've, you've said that several times that you want to work with the women, that you, you support the women so would you like to comment on what we heard from Ms. Hoechstetter about her experience in the past year and half or more in dealing with the Department... with the Health Department?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: My... so, I am... first of all, I'm so sorry that she had this experience and

I'm also… this is a horribly difficult situation and
I can very much understand that she wouldn't want to,
you know go through repeated attempts to, to make
contact. I have reviewed our contacts, the first
contact that I see is from May of 2018, I'm very much
going to look follow up on the, the email that she
referred to of the dear parents email, that's not
something I've ever heard of before so what I would
want to do is to just reiterate that from my
knowledge our process is that we, we aim to respond
to any corrections request within 30 days. The
percent that's less than 30 days is low, our goal is
to have it be less than five percent. In 2018 the it
was less than three percent so we want to have a good
customer service experience, to my knowledge we heard
about this case and replied to this case within a six
week period of time so but I'm very much concerned
about what she said and I do want to further
investigate it to see about the dear parents email.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: It's... this is going to be not the right forum to work out exactly what day, what type of content... contact was made but the fact that someone with a New York birth certificate felt they had to resort to contacting their local

2.1

2.2

City Council Member out of frustration dealing with the Health Department, someone who is in a very, very difficult situation to me demonstrates a failure and so I think in addition to us feeling really bad about what this medical provider did to victimize Ms.

Hoechstetter I think we also have to feel really bad and apologize for how the city responded to someone, a survivor of abuse who was taking a very difficult step even to reach out publicly on this and I want to know whether you share my view that the city also owes her an apology?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: My concern is that we always provide excellent customer service and I am... offer my apology in any situation in which we have not done that, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay, well that was vaguer than I would have liked. I... our job is to focus on what the city does and what the city can do better and I'm not proud of how the city has responded in this case and in addition to figuring out a legislative solution to make this easier for other women I think we need to figure out what... how we respond to people who are survivors of abuse who's abuser is on their birth certificate. This is not a

unique case, it's probably not the first time the
Health Departments ever been contacted by a woman in
this position just statistically because of how many
births there are a year and the fact that this one
doctor we know was in was in practice for I think 20
years and unfortunately he is probably not the only
person who has abused the only doctor who has abused
women so I think we need to understand the protocols
that the Health Department have in place for
responding when women are in the worst possible
situation and I the appropriate response in my mind
would have been a human being reaching out, not a
form of email, as soon as possible and to say
something along the lines of, if, if this is the case
which it appears to be that currently the city's the
laws of the city Health Board, Board do not allow us
to change this birth certificate without court
approval and we would like to work with you to fix
that legislatively and when the administration and
the City Council want to make fix something
legislatively we can do it really fast, we can do it
in a matter of weeks but it took a lot longer than
that because it required Ms. Hoechstetter on her own
finding a way to the Office of the Chair of the City

Council's Health Committee in which case we could begin the health... the, the legislative process and, and here we are at the hearing and we're learning that you all don't support the bill and I, I opened up by saying how stunned I am, I have to imagine that any mother out there who is looking for relief has got to be similarly stunned and, and, and surprised and baffled at this response. I'm going to pause now because I want to acknowledge we've been joined by our fellow Health Committee Member, Council Member Alicka Ampry-Samuel and I do think that Council Member Powers has questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Yeah, thank you, thanks for the testimony. A couple of questions, for starters you said... you mentioned other jurisdictions, do other jurisdictions both have the long form, short form and do... does every jurisdiction in every state require the attendant's name and information on it?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Yes, all jurisdictions require it, it's in the federal guidance, it's in the U.S. standard birth certificate so it's a standard of practice for all of the 57 vital records... [crosstalk]

2.2

2 COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: And it's required 3 or it's just, just standard practice?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: It's a... the U.S. standard certificate is a model and then each jurisdiction requires some type of medical certification.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Got it and the state like New York State for instance could say we don't need the information as we... most are discussing here today, they don't... are not required to require... to have... to have, have the correct in... [cross-talk]

Health law also requires a certifying... [cross-talk]

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: But New York...

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: New York State Public

that's what I'm saying... New York... my point being the legislature could repeal that tomorrow, that's correct, and they would not be in violation of federal law?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: The fed... I would... we'd have to get back to you on the, the details of the federal law.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay and what is the purpose of having that information on there?

2.2

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: A U.S... a, a New York
City birth certificate or a New York State birth
certificate is proof of U.S. citizenship, it is given
the full facing credit of other governments, other
jurisdictions and so the, the certifier is
swearing to all of the facts on that certificate.
They're... they are putting their medical license on
the line on saying that everything on here is true.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay and the process today, the... what... if you did want to get it amended for this scenario or for some other scenario what is that process?

experience today and she gave birth there are two different routes. The first route is that the hospital could say please not... put, put the name of a different... one of the different attendants onto that field in the birth certificate, that would be the simplest, cheapest way, it would be free, hospital... these are called hospital substitutions, hospitals do these kinds of changes regularly. The second way after, after more time has elapsed is to go through the court process.

2.2

2.2

2	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: And, and you
3	the… because time elapsed because they no longer can
4	have confidence that they can certify with another
5	name, is that correct?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Well it's... after a year has elapsed it's, it's, it's just a different process and that's just a matter of internal procedure.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay and so today you have to go to court if you want to get your name changed or redacted, is that correct?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, but... and, and you can get it redacted?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: The, the name... this... in this particular case we are saying that we agree that the name can be redacted through the existing process which is the court order.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay and so if you can have it redacted what is the consequence if you legislated a process versus requiring you go... to go through a court process to be redacted, what's the... what is the consequence to the individual if there's an existing process for redaction?

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

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: The, the nuance in the difference is just the type of process.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay. So, understanding the concerns from the Department of Health and the administration about, about the bill I don't... I, I mean I'm... forgive me I am still unclear on what the concern is. There is a process today by which one can go through a court proceeding to have the name redacted that seems to have no consequence to the individual as I understand it but I stand corrected if there are consequences in the real world by having the name redacted but there is a process, we are asking for there to be a law to allow for it if... and under a very particular condition. Is there a process outside of the court process that you feel is more appropriate than... if, if... instead of going to court what is a... what is, is there another substitute process that should be in place?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: As I mentioned I think working with the hospital directly is... would be the most efficient way.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: And it... that's... but after a year you can't, is that correct?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Typically.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, so, so if, if it's within a year you go to the hospital, if you go... if it's after the year you go to court, that's sounds like the process so let's say imagine in all scenarios... or let's say in any scenario where you're out... you're over a year the hospital is not an available option for you anymore so court is your option. As the Council... as the Chair mentioned that, that, that requires hiring a lawyer and I don't know... I don't know the exact proceeding that you go through but that seems like a bit much to ask somebody to go for when they come and tell a story like some... the one that we heard today, it seems like Department of ... you know I still... so, let me... let me take a second, what is the consequence to redacting your name on your... redacting the attendants name on the birth certificate?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: So... [cross-talk]

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: If there is an existing process to do that.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: So, so the, the... just to reiterate there is a... there is a short form birth certificate that we issue thousands and thousands of

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

every year that does not include the attendant's name
on it, that's what most people get... [cross-talk]

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Uh-huh... [cross-talk]

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: That's what most people request, that's what people use to get a passport or to get a driver's license, to go to school, those kinds of things. This other form, this long form birth certificate can be redacted through a court order process and the reason why that we, we have a court order process is because we want to make sure that all of the, the information on there, that people can look at that form and know that it's... if there's a legal consequence it has been changed under... with a legal consideration and we want a legal judgment, we're asking the court to direct us because we want that legal judgment and we want the expectation for all of the information on the certificate to have that, that high bar, that expectation of information and that knowledge.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: You want the court to make a determination that the information that you're redacting is correct and legal, is that... [cross-talk]

1	COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
2	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: It should be that it
3	should be done.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Should be done,
5	got it. And what are situations or historically where
6	people have been able to get the information redacted
7	like
8	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Redacted?
9	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Or and how often
LO	I guess is… [cross-talk]
L1	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Well in this, this is
L2	the very first instance that we've ever been
L3	contacted in my memory and the memory of my
L 4	colleagues asking for an attendant's name to be
L5	redacted.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: So, it's never
L7	happened before?
L8	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: That's correct.
L9	COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay. So, so,
20	where the process is hypothetical about going to the
21	court?
22	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Well right, what
23	we've done is if we, we what we do is we, we have
24	50,000 corrections every year, occasionally there

one comes out of sort of left field, a different

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 direction that we haven't faced before and in general when we have those kinds of corrections we ask people 3 4 to work through the court process because it creates, 5 creates a consistency for making the change across 6 all different types of iterations and it, it allow... 7 it allows people to have confidence that the birth certificate maintains its integrity and if there's a 8 legal consequence, if there's a legal consideration, 9 if something is legally complex the courts have 10 11 considered it. 12 COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, so there's 13 50,000 individuals who go to court every year for 14 some... [cross-talk] 15 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: 12,000 actually... 16 [cross-talk] 17 COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Oh, 12,000, 18 sorry... [cross-talk] GRETCHEN VAN WYE: ...yeah, 50,000 make 19 20 corrections, a lot of them don't require court orders. 21 2.2 COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Gotcha, okay. And 23 this is the first one by which you've seen somebody

ask for the birth attendant's name to be taken off...

24

25

[cross-talk]

1 COMMITTEE ON HEALTH 2 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: That's right... [cross-3 talk 4 COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: ...of it, got it. Do you think there are just anecdotally believe there 5 are other instances out there? 6 7 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: There must be, I completely believe that, that this must be not only 8 something that must exist but that more people as Ms. 9 Hoechstetter said will come forward, I think it's, 10 its good that we develop a process and have... work 11 12 together to figure out the right process to, to go 13 through many circumstances. 14 COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: So, let's say we... 15 let's say... and obviously my, my last question, sorry. 16 Let's say the Chairman... [cross-talk] 17 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Uh-huh... [cross-talk] COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: ...did want to work 18 out a process with you, what would that process look 19 20 like? 21 GRETCHEN VAN WYE: I think that what we 2.2 should do is take... it's very technical and we should 23 take it into a, a different setting where we're

talking about how to make this process work the best

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

to be as transparent and as useful as possible to the people involved, to the women involved.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: The one comment I'd add to that is that it, it could... it sounds like based on where we are from in... from the testimony and, and to questions and answers that that process is going to essentially be the same process which is going to be go to court so if we are saying let's work out a process together to figure out how to do this it sounds like the preference here though is to still have people go through the process by which... so, I don't... I don't... I don't mean to... mean to say this in a... in a megative... and I mean... I don't want this to come up the wrong way but it sounds a bit like we're saying lets work this out off, off... you know out of the hearing which is totally fine and reasonable but we're... but we're basically going to end up in the same place which would be then disingenuous to say let's work out a process together.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Actually we, we were reviewing this matter and review... and reviewing the, the, the concept of the, the change and this has... process has moved along very quickly so we haven't

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 had the full opportunity to explore how this could be fixed so I... [cross-talk]

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: So, you do... but you do envision that there could be a, a process put in place to help address a scenario like this one?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: I do, I do.

COUNCIL MEMBER POWERS: Okay, thank you.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Thank you Council Member Powers. You say the process moved quickly but... and you acknowledge hearing, even if you accept that you didn't hear it from Ms. Hoechstetter until May that's seven months and I'm not sure when exactly we introduced the bill but this didn't happen overnight, right? You, you, you repeatedly said that a woman can simply get the hospital to write a letter but no hospital is going to want to do that because they're potentially admitting that, that one of their employees committed a crime, right? You, you cannot have a system that relies on the hospitals where the abuser works accommodating here because it could implicate the hospital, in this case the hospital is being sued probably very appropriately and so a system that relies on the hospital essentially

1	COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
2	admitting guilt admitting guilt is, is, is destined
3	to fail.
4	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: It's, it's a system
5	that requires the hospital to admit that it made an
6	error in reporting a piece of information to us, no
7	more no less.
8	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But, but made an
9	error on reporting but if but how is that an error
10	in reporting if the person who attended the birth is
11	on the current birth certificate, that person is an
12	abuser but that is who was in the room
13	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: There are typically a
14	number of people in a room at the time of birth that
15	could be appropriate people to be [cross-talk]
16	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: So, this so, this
17	is only an out if there's another individual in the
18	room, a nurse or something?
19	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Uh-huh.
20	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Which wouldn't
21	always be the case but could be in some [cross-talk
22	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Uh-huh [cross-talk]
23	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE:and while I
24	understand technically they're only admitting an

error one could really understand why a hospital

2.2

would, would be... would, would have disincentives to corporate in that way, it, it doesn't seem to me to be a failsafe solution and at any rate I think you explained that it, it, it... that, that solution is only available for a year, is that right?

me. The hospital substitution is available for a year but in this particular case or in these particular cases it could be something that we could explore.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Right, but they are going to be... I mean this, this doctor in question himself was practicing for 20 years and there may be women who come forward now because they hear about this bill or, or read the coverage of this case, it sounds like you're saying you'd offer accommodation to the one year but... [cross-talk]

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Again, this is... this is getting to the technical nitty gritty of how a process would work which we would feel more appropriate to work with you in a different setting.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Well this is... that's getting into the technical nitty gritty of the hospital writing a letter to make the change but that's actually not the heart of this bill, we... the,

	COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
2	the goal of the bill is that the Health Department
3	itself, the vital records unit itself can grant this
4	change. You at a number of points have cited state
5	law around this, the state health code, correct?
6	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: New York Public Health
7	Laws… [cross-talk]
8	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But [cross-talk]
9	GRETCHEN VAN WYE:and the New York City
10	Health Code.
11	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Well, well the, the
12	New York Public Health Law which is a state or, or
13	city?
14	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: State.
15	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: But is the city not
16	exempt from state public health law related to this
17	matter?
18	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: So, I would want to
19	defer to council on any getting into the depth of a
20	[cross-talk]
21	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Well [cross-talk]
22	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: The answer is yes. I
23	just… [cross-talk]
24	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay [cross-talk]
25	GRETCHEN VAN WYE:consulted

2.1

2.2

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Right, I mean it's public health law 4100, duties of the department commissioner etcetera, etcetera, the department shall comma except in the case of the city of New York and I can go on and on and on but it seems like we're in power here, the city is in power here and... whether... no other part of... no other jurisdiction in the state is so I don't understand why you keep citing the state law if we're empowered to do it our own way.

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: So, we for, for many fields of the certificate we do have state... the... we are an independent vital records jurisdiction, but we are bound in certain matters by state law.

we're not bound by the state standards because of the way the law is written. I, I had one piece of information that I think illustrates why the courts are not the right option which is we had our committee counsel call two courts today, the Supreme Court and Civil Court to ask about changing or removing the name of the attendant from their birth documents and the courts both said that this is a matter that must be decided by the Health Department. Now I'm not saying that they are right, we do believe

2.2

the law needs to change for you to do that but it illustrates just, just one example of the kind of obstacle that a mother facing this challenge would have to face, that... now a well-informed, someone who is... a, a survivor who is well informed, who knew their rights, knew the process perhaps could surmount that and ask to talk to a supervisor or cite some sort of legal, legal documents but it's just... it's just one data point, two because, because she called two courts today about the, the inadequacy of this as an option. Does, does that then yet surprise you at all or bother you?

GRETCHEN VAN WYE: It concerns me, and I do want... I want to work with you to figure out the right way to move forward.

CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: Okay. We want to do
that as well. I'm as confident in the, the bill now
as I was two hours ago. I, I firmly believe this is
the right thing to do, I don't think it diminishes
the integrity of the document, I don't think that
steering survivors to the courts is the right answer,
I don't think that's an acceptable answer. I think
that what we just did thankfully on gender markers is
a helpful and instructive case that can guide us on

1	COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
2	this in which case the philosophy was to reduce the
3	barriers when someone needs to make an important
4	change to this document which has practical and
5	symbolic power throughout someone's life and we're
6	going to continue to push on this. Thank you very
7	much.
8	GRETCHEN VAN WYE: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON LEVINE: We, we actually have
10	a short attendance list of witnesses today and this
11	will conclude our hearing, thank you.
12	[gavel]
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

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

February 28, 2019